



# Mark Scheme

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel GCE AS  
In History (6HI01) Paper 1E

Paper 1E: The Expansion and Challenge of  
Nationalism



## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2017

Publications Code 6HI01\_E\_1706\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

*i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear*

*ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter*

*iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.*

## **GCE History Marking Guidance**

### **Marking of Questions: Levels of Response**

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

- (i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question's terms
- (ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
- (iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
- (iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
- (v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer's worth.

### **Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level**

The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate's ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4, would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

### **Assessing Quality of Written Communication**

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

## Unit 1: Generic Level Descriptors

Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)

(30 marks)

Essay - to present historical explanations and reach a judgement.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</p> <p>The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
2	7-12	<p>Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between the simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</p> <p>The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>

3	13-18	<p>Candidates' answers will attempt analysis and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be accurate but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 17-18 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.</p> <p>The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
4	19-24	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 23-24 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p>

<b>5</b>	<b>25-30</b>	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which directly addresses the focus of the question and which demonstrates explicit understanding of the key issues contained in it. It will be broadly balanced in its treatment of these key issues. The analysis will be supported by accurate, relevant and appropriately selected which demonstrates some range and depth.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 29-30 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 5.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing extended writing will be in place.</p>
----------	--------------	--

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

#### **Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication**

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

#### **Unit 1 Assessment Grid**

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	Total marks for question
Q (a) or (b)	30	30
Q (a) or (b)	30	30
<b>Total Marks</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>% Weighting</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>25%</b>

**E1 The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-70**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>The question is focused on the slow progress of Italian unity in the years 1815-1859. It requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the relative importance of the Vienna Settlement in creating an obstacle to this progress. In reference to the importance of the Vienna Settlement candidates might suggest that the provisions of the settlement in the form of a divided Italy ruled by autocratic government and heavily influenced by Austrian conservatism was the underlying reason for the lack of progress. Responses may refer to the reaction of Italian rulers to nationalist ideas, the use of force by Austria in putting down revolutionary activity in the years 1815-48 and to the localism that a divided Italy reinforced. Candidates might also suggest that the Settlement dissuaded the French from supporting nationalist activity in the peninsular for the majority of this process. To counter the argument candidates might suggest that the Vienna Settlement may have actively encouraged the growth of nationalism by providing a cause against which to fight and/or provide alternative reasons for the slow progress.</p> <p>Alternative reasons for slow progress may be suggested such as the limitations of <i>Risorgimento</i> politics and politicians such as Mazzini, the weaknesses of the revolutions including a lack of popular support, preparation and unity, a lack of cultural unity combined with strong localism and the role of the Catholic Church. Candidates who are clearly aware of the dates of the time period indicated in the question should be rewarded with the level of response achieved. At the higher Levels such responses might suggest that it was not until the liberal government of <i>Statuto</i> Piedmont combined with a newly confident France to challenge the power of Austria that Italy was able to progress more quickly towards unity.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will clearly address 'how far...most important', by considering the importance of the provisions agreed in the Vienna Settlement in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement. At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the role of the Vienna Settlement by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages. <b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by outlining the provisions of the Treaty and/or slow progress towards Italian unity during the time span. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. <b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30



Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>The question is focused on the relative importance of key individuals in the shaping the process of Italian unification and requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the suggestion that Garibaldi was more important than Cavour. To reach the higher Levels responses should be focused on the relative importance of the two key individuals rather than a general discussion of the contribution of other individuals and/or factors. Candidates may suggest that either Garibaldi or Cavour was more important or that the contribution of both was inextricably linked to each other. Arguments in favour of Garibaldi might refer to the romantic appeal of his Mazzinian past and desire to unite the whole of Italy, physical take-over and then handover of the southern states to Piedmont, and his determination to make Rome the capital city of the new Kingdom of Italy. Those who favour Cavour might refer to his contribution to the growing strength of Piedmont, his negotiations with France in 1858-9 and his involvement in the events that would bring most of the northern, central and southern states into the Kingdom of Italy. Some may argue that both were equally as important or that their actions were linked. For example, responses might suggest that Cavour helped to build up Piedmont as the foundation for unification while Garibaldi provided the vital parts of the structure by unifying the south with the north or that without Cavour's manipulations Garibaldi would never have carried out his actions in the way he did in 1860-61. Some candidates might point out that from 1861 neither man was directly influential with Cavour's death and the failure of all Garibaldi's future activities.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will give balanced consideration to the importance of Garibaldi relative to Cavour, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on one individual. <b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. <b>Level 1</b> response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

## E2 The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	<p>This question focuses on the events of the 1848 revolutions in Germany and, in particular, the creation and collapse of the Frankfurt Assembly. It requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the reasons for both its initial success and ultimate failure. Candidates should attempt to address both aspects but even at the highest Level a complete balance between the two is not expected. Those who address both aspects separately can achieve the highest Levels but higher Level responses will probably find direct links and inter-relationships between success and failure. The initial success of the Assembly was due to the rapid spread of revolution from France across Europe leading to a loss of authority amongst the German princes and, in particular, both in Austria and Prussia. The liberal nationalists were able to take advantage of this situation and had the ability to organise the <i>Vorparliament</i> in one of the city-states very quickly. This combined with the apparent willingness of some German rulers to engage with the liberal aspects of the revolution lead to success. However, the collapse of Assembly was equally swift. Despite its rapid creation, the Assembly spent over a year arguing over aspects of the new German constitution and by the time a federal kingdom of Germany under Prussia with an elected Reichstag was agreed the princes had regained control of Germany. The Prussian king refused the offer of constitutional monarchy, Austrian forces had regained control in Vienna and the city government forced the remaining deputies from Frankfurt in the spring of 1849. Some candidates might suggest that the initial success was due to the success of the revolutions across Germany while the collapse was due more to the disunity within the Assembly. Others might suggest greater links, for example, that success of the revolutions were illusory and so once the German rulers had regained control it was unlikely that the Assembly would have ever survived.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the reasons for both success and failure, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. <b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. For example, response may chart the rise and fall of the Frankfurt Assembly with only implicit reference to the question. At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. <b>Level 1</b> response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>The question is focused on Bismarck's significance in the process of German unification and requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the extent to which he was responsible for shaping the unification process. Many responses will determine Bismarck's significance in the unification with generalised discussion of his role in relation to other factors which caused unification. However, those candidates who evaluate Bismarck's significance with reference to the shaping or pattern of the process of Unification will be more focused on the question. Although not required these responses will probably discuss the extent to which Bismarck 'planned' the unification with specific reference to the chain reaction caused by Prussian involvement in the Prussian Revolt (1863), war with Denmark (1864), Austro-Prussian War (1866) and Franco-Prussian War (1870-71). Other responses might refer to Bismarck's belief that 'blood and iron' shaped the process of unification. They might also consider the role of other individuals such as Louis Napoleon. Candidates might counter Bismarck's significance by referring to chance events or by discussion of long-term underlying determining factors such as Prussian economic strength, Austrian weaknesses or the development of German nationalism.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will clearly address significance, by considering the relative significance of Bismarck in shaping the process of unification either by establishing both his strengths and limitations or referring to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement. At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the significance of Bismarck in the unification by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages. <b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by outlining the actions of Bismarck and/or the process of unification. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. <b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

**E3 The Collapse of the Liberal State and the Triumph of Fascism in Italy, 1896-1943**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>The question is focused on the relative importance of the reasons for the weakness of the Liberal State in Italy from 1896-1919. In the years 1896-1919 the Liberal State in Italy experienced almost continuous instability which was political, social and economic in nature. It requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the extent to which economic problems were the main reason for the weakness of the Liberal State. In consideration of economic problems candidates might explain weakness in relation to the slow progress of industrial development, the lack of natural resources, economic differences between the North and South, standards of living, financial difficulties and the effect of emigration. To establish the relative importance of economic problems in causing instability responses might discuss alternative factors, for example, the nature of the Italian constitution, <i>Trasformismo</i> politics, political divisions, social divisions, the failure of great power politics and the wider aspects of the North-South divide. Some candidates might suggest that for much of the time period Italy was becoming stronger economically and so other factors may have been more important. The best responses may suggest that different factors inter-linked to create the overall impression of a weak state. For example, that economic problems undoubtedly caused much of the instability in the post-World War I period but that this was, in itself, due to the political problems that plagued Italy throughout the period.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will clearly address 'how far...main reason', by considering economic problems in relation to other factors , and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement. At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider economic problems as the main reason addressing strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages. These responses might focus on the North-South divide or the post-War period. <b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by outlining the economic problems and/or describing the weakness of the Liberal State in general. The supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. <b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>The question is focused on the relative effectiveness of the methods used by the Fascists to maintain control of Italy in the years 1925-41 with specific reference to the suggestion that propaganda was more important than terror. To reach the higher Levels responses should be focused on the relative importance of the two key methods rather than a general discussion of the contribution of other methods and/or factors to maintaining control in Italy. Candidates may suggest that either propaganda or terror was more important or that the contribution of both was inextricably linked to each other. It is possible that candidates may suggest that another method/factor was more important than both but to reach the higher Levels would require explicit comparison of the relative contributions. Arguments in favour of propaganda might suggest that after 1925 methods of persuasion were the main focus of the Fascist regime. Having used aggressive tactics to take power Mussolini began an all-out effort to use propaganda to win over the majority of the Italian population. Policies were presented with a positive spin, newsreels highlighted the achievements of the regime and control of the media meant that there was little negative information. As a result many Italians may not have supported the regime but were not inclined to oppose it. Those who favour terror might suggest that despite being less overtly aggressive after 1925 the presence of the OVRA, the use of vicious punishments and the existence of prison camps all created an atmosphere of terror which was responsible for maintaining control. Some may argue that both were equally as important or that their actions were linked. For example, the although propaganda was the mainstay of control during the years 1925-41 it was the underlying fear of the use of physical methods, already experienced during the take-over of power, which allowed the regime to maintain control.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will give balanced consideration to the use of propaganda relative to the use of terror, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on one method/factor. <b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. Responses may outline the methods used to control Italy during the years 1925-41 with only implicit reference to the question. At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. <b>Level 1</b> response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

#### E4 Republicanism, Civil War and Francoism in Spain, 1931-75

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>The question is focused on the causes of the Spanish Civil War. It requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the extent to which the outbreak of the war can be explained wholly by the failure of the military coup carried out against the Popular Front government in July 1936. Candidates may focus on analysing the short-term factors leading to the outbreak of full-scale civil war in 1936, for example, suggesting that the division with the Popular Front or the murder of Sotelo were more significant causes but are more likely to refer to both short-term and longer-term factors. In consideration of the failure of the military coup candidates might suggest that if the coup d'état had been successful then it unlikely that civil war would have broken out at all. Even though the Republic controlled Madrid, the Nationalist generals had a military advantage and with the support of the traditional conservative elites would probably have been able to establish effective government quite quickly. It was the failure to carry out the coup effectively which led to the stalemate and degeneration into civil war itself. To determine the extent of responsibility responses are likely to refer to other short-term factors, such as those mentioned above, and/or longer-term factors such as underlying political and social tensions in Spain, the consequences of the rapid reforms passed in the years 1931-32, the grievances and strength of the Spanish military and the desire to maintain those reforms by supporters of the Republic. Some candidates may suggest that the failure of the coup triggered the civil war but that the fundamental long-term divisions within Spain more responsible.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will weigh up the extent to which the failure of the military coup contributed to the outbreak of the war, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth. These answers will establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate the arguments to reach an overall judgement. At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, they will begin to consider the extent to which the attempted coup was responsible by addressing its limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages. <b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by outlining the events leading to the outbreak of war in 1936. The supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. <b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>The question is focused on the nature of Franco's rule in Spain in the years 1939-75 and requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the extent to which his success depended on authoritarian policies. In consideration of authoritarian policies candidates may refer to the harsh policies and terror tactics used against Republican supporters, the creation of a conservative political structure and legal controls. By carrying out an aggressive policy of 'purification' Franco hoped to use the Falange, the army and the Church to re-establish control over Spain politically and to gain consensus through aspects of social conservatism. Responses may refer to policies regarding press censorship, propaganda, corporatism, autarky, regional autonomy and civil society. To establish extent of dependency candidates may suggest that Franco's policies changed over time. For example, responses may focus on the nature of Franco's authoritarianism before 1960 and compare this with the extent to which this changed in the years after. Responses might refer to the economic reforms introduced to combat growing tensions in the 1950s, the social liberalisation resulting from increased tourism and moderate political reforms which led to less press censorship, religious toleration, the introduction of a form of parliamentary election and the decision to reinstate a form of constitutional monarchy on the death of Franco. Other responses might suggest that Franco's rule relied on underlying authoritarian rule throughout the period and that, even though there were some minor reforms in the 1960s, as opposition to Franco's regime grew from workers and some elements of the Catholic Church repressive measures were reintroduced in the early 1970s.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the role of authoritarian policies in Franco's success across the time period relative to other policies, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well and begin to consider the role of authoritarian policies, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. <b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. These responses may outline Franco's rule over Spain from the end of the Civil War to his death. At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. <b>Level 1</b> response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

**E5 Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
9	<p>The question is focused on the changing relationship between East and West Germany and requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the extent to which the relationship changed a consequence of Brandt's introduction of <i>Ostpolitik</i>. Since construction of the Wall in 1961, and despite the fact that the <i>de facto</i> division of East and West was not wholly accepted by either government, the relationship between the two states had been one of almost complete segregation. Each state had separate sporting teams, movement between the states was highly restricted and political discussion was non-existent. Brandt had been mayor of Berlin in 1961 and hope to introduce a policy of '<i>rapprochement</i>'. In determining the influence of this policy candidates may refer to the gradual application of <i>Ostpolitik</i> including Brandt's apparent acknowledgement of the division of Germany in Moscow in 1970, his visit to East Germany in March 1970, the agreements leading to the Basic Treaty in 1972, the granting of loans and the creation of increased economic, communication and sporting links. Candidates may suggest that despite Brandt's resignation in 1974 the <i>Ostpolitik</i> legacy continued in subsequent years. To establish the extent of change candidates may refer to aspects of the relationship which did not change. Although in signing the Basic Treaty each side acknowledge the others existence, West Germany still did not recognise the East as a separate state under international law and this led to continued restriction on movement between the two. Both states continued to develop contrasting political and economic environments which the East German leader, Honecker, was determined to encourage and both states continued to field separate sporting teams. There were also still obvious tensions between the two states over human rights and as a result of increased Cold War activity in the late 1970s fear of nuclear war became an issue on both sides. Most candidates will consider factors suggesting change and continuity across the period as a whole but better responses will probably consider change over time as well.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the extent to which the relationship was changed by the introduction of the policy, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well with a consideration of the impact of <i>Ostpolitik</i>, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. However, supporting evidence may lack balance perhaps with reference to the more positive aspects of the policy. <b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. These response may describe the relationship between East and West Germany over time with implicit reference to the key issue in the question. At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. <b>Level 1</b> response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30



Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
10	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the prolonged separation of West and East Germany from 1949-1990. It requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the suggestion that the influence of the USSR was entirely responsible for preventing the re-unification of the two states during these years. Candidates may agree with suggestion referring to the continued support for the Communist-controlled government in the East and the presence of Soviet troops in East Germany for much of the period. During the years of the Cold War it was unlikely that the USSR would encourage re-unification unless it was in their interests. Candidates might note that once Gorbachev became Soviet leader and the SED was no longer unconditionally supported by the USSR it was only a short amount of time before re-unification took place. Other responses may suggest that although Soviet influence was an important obstacle there were other obstacles to re-unification including the Cold War aims in the West, the West German insistence on not recognising East Germany in international law and the actions of the East German government itself, not least the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961. Response might suggest that one of these factors was more important or that the difficulties of achieving re-unification lay in the complex interaction of all the factors.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will clearly address 'how far agree...entirely responsible', by considering the influence of the USSR in preventing re-unification in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement. At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the part played by the USSR by addressing strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages. <b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining the role of the USSR and/or the relationship between East and West Germany over the time period. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. <b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

**E6 The Middle East, 1945-2001: The State of Israel and Arab Nationalism**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
11	<p>The question is focused on the relative importance of the reasons for the deteriorating relationship between Jews and Arabs in Palestine in the years 1945-49. It requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the suggestion that the Jewish immigration into Palestine was the main reason for the breakdown. Jewish immigration into Palestine had been a cause for tension before 1939 but after the end of World War II and the revelations of the <i>Holocaust</i> there were calls for increased immigration quotas. Candidates might consider the statement with reference to circumstances surrounding Jewish immigration to Palestine from 1945 onwards in relation to other factors. The British were reluctant to allow more immigration but this led to increased militancy amongst Jewish political groups which brought further tensions to Jewish-Arab relations. US support for increased immigration intensified matters and was directly linked to the UN partition plan of 1947 which divided the two further. Publicity surrounding the migrant ship <i>Exodus 1947</i> was one of the events which led to the decision for Britain to withdraw from its UN mandate and this withdrawal opened up the potential for war between Jews and Arabs in Palestine. Other factors considered might include the long-standing animosity between Jews and Arabs in Palestine, Jewish terrorism, Arab nationalism and the role of the British, the US and the UN, including the withdrawal of the British mandate and the breakdown of the UN partition plan. Some candidates may suggest that underlying long-term tensions were the main reason with factors such as Jewish immigration merely exacerbating problems that already existed.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will clearly address 'how far agree ...main reason', by considering the effect of Jewish immigration into Palestine in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement. At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the impact of Jewish immigration by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages. <b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by outlining the deterioration of the relationship between Jews and Arabs but with only implicit reference to the question. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At <b>Level 2</b> will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. <b>Level 1</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
12	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for disunity amongst the Arab states, despite the existence of an apparently overwhelming united hostility towards the state of Israel, in the years 1948-1979. Candidates may choose to approach this question by addressing general themes regarding disunity across the period or by reference to the individual conflicts which took place. However, responses at the highest Level should reflect upon the statement concerning common hostility towards Israel and make reference to the whole period up to the Egypt-Israel agreement of 1979. Candidates may weigh up the relative importance of factors such as the individual aims of Arab states, differing attitudes towards Arab nationalism, Cold War allegiances, proximity to Israel and inter-Arab rivalry. Other candidates might suggest that the only reason that such a disparate group of mainly artificially created states had to unite was their support for an Arab nationalism that focused on Israel as the common enemy and even then states were willing to come to agreements with Israel at various times, for example, Jordan in 1949 and Egypt in 1979.</p> <p>Answers at <b>Level 5</b> will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the relative importance of different reasons, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At <b>Level 4</b> candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. These responses may be imbalanced with reference to earlier or later decades of the period. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive, for example, outlining Arab-Israeli relations, and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30