

# Examiners' Report

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
in History (6HI01) Paper E

## **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 2016

Publications Code 43894

All the material in this publication is  
copyright © Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

## **6HI01E - The Expansion and Challenge of Nationalism**

### **Introduction**

#### **General Comments – 6HI01**

The June 2016 6HI01 examination session produced a wide variety of responses and overall the majority of candidates were able to produce organised responses with at least some sound analysis and relevant supporting material. Most candidates produced responses within Levels 3-5 but there were a few candidates who misunderstood questions or who provided responses with predominantly irrelevant material. Examiners commented on the quality of argument in many of the Level 5 responses and there were many interesting responses to read. Centres and their candidates are once again to be commended on the hard work and effort that clearly goes into the preparation for the 6HI01 examination.

Please note: 6HI01 is standardised across the Option papers and so it is recommended that Centres read the reports and exemplification for all of the Options as comments made generally apply to all papers. In the case of Option E and F exemplification, where there are identical questions, this is particularly the case.

#### **General Comments – Option E**

As this qualification draws to a close it is worth noting that, as usual most candidates were well prepared. Most were able to select and deploy relevant supporting material to great effect in answering their chosen questions. At the higher Levels, examiners noted some outstanding answers commenting both on the quality of the responses and how engaging many of the responses were. At the lower Levels, however, there were responses that showed some understanding expressed in simple developed statements (L2) rather than attempted analysis (L3).

#### **The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815–70**

**Q1.** This was the less popular of the two questions but many candidates actively engaged with concept of the legacy of the 1848-49 revolutions in relation to the eventual process of Italian unification producing some very engaging problems. Most responses suggested that although Italian unification was influenced by lessons learned from 1848-49 there were also factors specific to the later period which were of great significance. A range of influences were offered, but the position of Austria was frequently cited; either from the point of view that foreign intervention was actively sought to combat Austrian influence due to the lessons learned from the failed revolutions; or because Austria had become politically and economically weaker by 1870.

**Q2.** This was by far the more popular of the two questions producing a variety of responses of variable quality. However, there were very few response that achieved less than Level 3. As one examiner commented, at Level 3 there was a tendency to embark on a chronological journey through the geographic milestones of Italian unification without addressing ‘how far’. Across all levels, there was recognition that although geographical unity had been all but

achieved by 1870, there were still cultural, religious, and economic barriers that existed. Better responses at Level 4 and above analysed these factors on a thematic basis and weighed them accordingly.

### **The Unification of Germany, 1848–90**

**Q3.** This was by far the more popular of the two questions. Most of the responses were able to weigh up the significance of economic strength in relation to military strength effectively, with the majority achieving at least Level 3. The question focus led to some interesting discussions with many responses suggesting that although military strength was ultimately more significant it was underpinned by the economic strength developed in previous decades. Some candidates attempted a more multi-factored response which was less relevant to the question focus. However some higher Level responses were able to integrate the role of Bismarck's diplomacy very effectively into the discussion.

**Q4.** Very few candidates provided responses to this question. Several responses were unsure of the focus and provided a commentary on Bismarck's policies in the 1850s. However, there were some very good responses which explored a variety of key issues with regard to the development of a national identity such as the constitution of the German Empire, the creation of 'national symbols', unified economic policies and Bismarck's policy of *Kulturkampf*.

### **The Collapse of the Liberal State and the Triumph of Fascism in Italy, 1896–1943**

**Q5.** This was a popular question that was well understood by most candidates. The 'mutilated victory' and subsequent events with regard to Fiume, along with the economic impact of the First World War, were common factors across most answers in supporting the given factor, but the inherent weaknesses of the government, and the communist threat were frequently cited as 'other' factors. Better answers established sound causal links between the effects of war, and 'other' factors, for example, the economic crisis and the failure of the Liberal governments. Mussolini's role and leadership qualities were often discussed, but not perhaps as much as has been the case for similarly focused questions in previous years. It was not uncommon to see reference to the role of the king in the rise of the Fascists. Some candidates were unsure where to place the end of the rise of Fascism within the time period of the topic but most chose a year from 1922-25. Responses which continued after 1925 often included irrelevant material and wandered away from causal factors.

**Q6.** A significant number of candidates answered the question which was generally well understood. The primary focus for most candidates was foreign policy, although a significant number tackled domestic issues, with the 'Battles' being most frequently cited. A few candidates made a clear distinction between 'feared' and 'respected' in their analysis of Mussolini's foreign policy decisions, but generally most candidates treated them as different aspects of the same issue. The time period provided candidates with a range of foreign policy to consider and the best responses were able to select relevant examples from across the time period. Most responses concentrated on the exemplification from the 1930s with brief reference to either the 1920s or the period post-Abysinia.

## **Republicanism, Civil War and Francoism in Spain, 1931–75**

During the lifetime of the qualification candidates have increasingly become more prepared to answer questions across the whole time period of this topic. It has been a pleasure to see candidates become more confident in deploying knowledge of the history of Spain in the years immediately before the Spanish Civil War and the years of Franco's rule post-1939.

**Q7.** This was the less popular of the two questions but the focus of the question was generally well understood and candidates had a good knowledge of the history of the Second Republic in the years before the outbreak of the Civil War. Most candidates were able to discuss the initial reforms of the Second Republic and give a variety of reasons for the growing political instability. Many suggested that political instability was caused mainly by a combination of the failure of the left to meet the raised expectations of many ordinary Spaniards and the hostile reaction of the right wing political elite led by landowners, the army and the Catholic Church.

**Q8.** This was by far the more popular question and most candidates were generally well prepared. Key issues discussed included the role of Franco as a unifying figure, military support for the Nationalists from Italy and Germany and the impact of the various factions within the Republican forces. The majority of candidates across all levels tended to analyse Republican weakness and Nationalist strength separately, although the best answers did adopt a more synthesised approach. However, Level 5 responses were seen that did not necessarily employ a wholly comparative analysis throughout.

## **Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945–91**

**Q9.** There was a small entry for this topic this session and Q9 was the less popular of the two questions. Most responses were able to focus on the contrasting development of the 'two Germanies' in the years to 1962 and to develop the given factor – the emergence of Cold War attitudes. However, some weaker responses were unable to provide a range of other causal factors. Better responses often discussed the impact of the Second World War, the role of underlying economic factors, the domestic policies of the FRG and the GDR, and/or contrasting political leadership.

**Q10.** This was the more popular question and most responses were able to discuss both the physical and symbolic significance of the Berlin Wall in the process of reunification. Many responses suggested that, although the fall of the Berlin Wall was significant in a symbolic sense, long-term factors were more significant in the process leading to reunification itself. Some of the best responses suggest that the significance of the fall of the Berlin Wall was that it signalled the collapse of communism within the GDR which, in turn, began the actual process of reunification itself.

## **The Middle East, 1945–2001: The State of Israel and Arab Nationalism**

**Q11.** This was the more popular of the two questions. Most candidates were able to offer factors relevant to the question but overall depth and range relating to the stated factor was limited. Weaker responses tended to produce a limited narrative commentary on the reasons for Arab-Israeli hostility focusing on a limited time period up to the 1960s. As in previous sessions many of the weaker responses also spent too much time discussing the origins of

Arab-Israeli hostility rather than focusing on events during the given time period. The best responses were able to address the changing nature of Arab support for the Palestinian cause across the time period in relation to other factors influencing hostility such as Cold War attitudes, the ambitions of individual Arab nations and the actions of Israel.

**Q12.** Although this was the less popular of the two questions, most of the candidates choosing to answer this question were well prepared and there were some interesting and thought provoking responses. Candidates are much better prepared to answer questions on Arab nationalism and the causes of radical Islamist activity than they were at the beginning of the qualification and this is being reflected in the quality of the responses. Most responses were able to discuss the role of Western involvement in the Gulf region in the development of increasing radical Islamist activity citing the Western response to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the Western relations with Saudi Arabia and other Gulf states. Other causal influences discussed included the long-term impact of the Iranian revolution, the decline of pan-Arab nationalism and developments within Palestinian politics.

## **Paper Summary**

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- Well-reasoned conclusions which refer to the criteria used to establish the line of argument being developed provide evidence for substantiated judgements on the question asked.
- Candidates should read the question carefully and acquaint themselves with the focus of the question, taking particular regard of the timescale.
- Candidates should be prepared to select and deploy their knowledge and understanding for the question set, not the question they hope for, and, indeed, they should always be prepared for the unexpected.



An Example of Level 5

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer . Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice. If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

- Chosen question number: Question 1  Question 2  Question 3   
Question 4  Question 5  Question 6   
Question 7  Question 8  Question 9   
Question 10  Question 11  Question 12

(This page is for your second answer.) .....

~~Economic~~

Prussian dominance over Germany was achieved through economic more than military

By 1871 Germany had been united as the German Confederation. Prussia had led the way for the unification process and was the dominant state in Germany. Bismarck said that Prussian dominance was created through 'blood and iron', however many historians such as Keytes believed it was the economic power of Prussia that led it to be the dominant German state, saying it was done through 'coal and iron'. There are also other factors to take into account when looking at Prussian dominance such as the role of Bismarck and the comparative weakness of the Austrian Empire. To start with Bismarck's perception that Prussia rose to what it was through the might of its military is undoubtedly a key factor. Since General von



(This page is for your second answer.)

Roon's military reforms of 1862 Prussia had by far the best equipped military out of the German states, and arguably Europe. A large part of Prussia's dominance in Germany was down to the victories it managed to achieve against key opponents. In the Danish war of 1864, Prussian troops, besides Austrian troops, swept aside the Danish troops in Schleswig-Holstein. However, this did little to assert Prussian dominance over Germany. However, it was a key factor in the eruption of the Austro-Prussian war in 1866. It was in this war that Prussia was able to assert itself as the key leading state in Germany through the defeat of the equally political influential Austro-Hungarian empire. At the Battle of Sadowa (Königgrätz to the Prussians/Germans) the military strength was key in showing Prussian dominance over Germany. The Prussian military although outnumbered was much better equipped than the Austrian army. The Prussian army were equipped with breech loading needle guns compared to the barrel loading weapons of the Austrian troops. This meant that they could shoot 5 times faster than the Austrians. They had the same advantage with their cannons. Krupp cannons were made of steel and were rifled allowing them to have much greater accuracy and range than the Austrian bronze cannons. Along with better faster deployment due to the railway links, Prussia had 5 whilst Austria 1, meant that



(This page is for your second answer.) Austrian casualties amounted to 115,000 whereas Prussians were 9000. The victory of this war meant that Prussia emerged as the leading state in the newly formed ~~German~~ North German Confederation, with Austria being losing large amounts of its influence through Prussia's 'annexation' of many Austrian supporting states.

Overall Prussian military strength was ~~largely~~ a significant factor in Prussian dominance over Germany as no other German state could match them and it meant that Austrian influence ~~was~~ was diminished and Austria's involvement in German affairs was completely removed.

However, none of the successes of the Prussian military could have happened if it wasn't for Prussian economic strength. The introduction of the Zollverein; a trade customs union headed by Prussia, in 1834 ~~was~~ ~~largely~~ meant that Prussia's economy was very modern and it had huge ~~political~~ economic influence over the member states of which only 5 <sup>of the 39 states</sup> were ~~not~~ a member by 1842, one of which was Austria. However the Zollverein was only one aspect of Prussian economic dominance. After the congress of Vienna Prussia adopted ~~many~~ lands rich in natural resources such as the Saar region, which had large amounts of coal and iron ore. It was these resources that helped the Prussian economy to expand.



(This page is for your second answer.)

Furthermore Prussia's re-investment in its infrastructure furthered its economic dominance. They created 11,000 km of railway lines; improved tele-communicators and dug canals. Furthermore the international success of Prussian companies such as Krupp and Essen which transported weaponry across the world helped to increase the Prussian dominance.

Prussian dominance over Germany must also be linked to the decline of Austria. In economic terms Austria was much weaker than

Prussia. In the years 1853-6 Prussia's economy grew from 360 million thaler to 460 million thaler, whereas in the same time period Austria decreased from 185 million thaler to 150 million thaler, largely due to the fact that Austria's economy was based on textiles for which there was little demand. In the same years Prussia produced 12 million tonnes of coal whereas Austria produced only 5.7 million. Furthermore Austria was politically weak as after its refusal to join the Crimean war in 1854 it had meant that neither Russia or France would ally themselves with Austria. The decline of Austria's influence is important in Prussia's dominance of Germany as it left only 1 superpower in Germany.

Finally it is impossible to determine the reason for German dominance in Prussia without looking at the role Bismarck played. It was Bismarck who



(This page is for your second answer.)

priced through General von Roon's army plans ~~seeing~~ he had 500,000 troops ready to persuade the parliament and collecting taxes himself. He also manipulated Austria to wage war with Prussia through the events at Schleswig-Holstein making them seem like the aggressor limiting the possibility of pre-emptive intervention <sup>and the Gastein Convention 1865</sup>. He did much the same in helping to ignite the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 through his role in the Hohenzollern affair and the resulting Ems telegram, which he edited for William I to make France look weak ~~and~~ and provoke them. This also played a key role in uniting the southern German states with Prussia as the lead state, ~~the~~ rallying them to fight together against ~~the~~ France and enticing the King of Saxony to ~~join~~ annex his lands.

Overall, Prussian dominance over Germany came about as a result of all of the factors mentioned above. However it is ~~undoubtedly~~ that Prussian economic strength was the key ~~factor~~ as without it the restructure of the army would have been impossible and the quick victories through the use of railways again would not have been possible. Furthermore Bismarck ~~was~~ played an important role in making the Prussian forces seem as though they were fighting against the aggressors and without his diplomatic approaches, Prussia could have faced off against larger forces where





(This page is for your second answer.)

Therefore  
Overall Progress  
Progress had increased  
document was due to  
Progress economic strength



P 4 3 8 9 4 A 0 1 7 2 0

An Example of Level 4



~~Condor Legion Africa~~

~~Guernica~~

~~South America beans~~

Put a cross in the box indicating the **SECOND** question you have chosen to answer . Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice. If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1  Question 2  Question 3   
Question 4  Question 5  Question 6   
Question 7  Question 8  Question 9   
Question 10  Question 11  Question 12

(This page is for your second answer.) How far do you agree that the outcome of the Spanish civil war can be explained more by Republican weaknesses than by Nationalist strengths?

As war broke out in 1936 sparked by the catalyst highlighted as the murder of José cano Sola, there was a clear divide throughout the country between support for the Republicans and Nationalists. In 1939 after the victory of Franco and the Nationalists, there were many reasons for the outcome including both Nationalist strengths and Republican weaknesses. To a degree the outcome of the Spanish civil war can be explained by Republican weaknesses however the strength of the Nationalist force played a large role in General Franco's victory and ultimately led to his



(This page is for your second answer.) totalitarian regime.

After the abdication of King Alfonso XIII, Spain became an extremely discontented country after tensions within the North/South divide, and the weaknesses of the economy due to the Wall Street crash.

The country was not happy with the republic and the civil war began in 1936 due to the murder of members of both the nationalist and republican camps.

The country was plunged into war on the 17<sup>th</sup> July 1936 after the murder of Nationalist José Calvo Sotelo on the 13<sup>th</sup> July 1936. The nationalists and republicans began to split into zones within the country that became strongholds for each side.

The failings of the Republicans was mainly due to unification. The Republican camp was split into several different groups that wouldn't work together as they felt they had different aims. However the Nationalists strength was that they were able to unify all their camps, they brought together the army, the monarchists



(This page is for your second answer.) (Alfonsoists) and the right wing were all joined together to create one solitary, unified force.

The Nationalists strength had always been a worry even before civil war. The Republic had stationed General Franco in the Canary Islands in order to prevent a military coup and the eventual overthrow of the government. However Franco had been able to bring together the army force through the help of General Mola, with troops from Gran Canaria and Morocco who were well trained military the Nationalist force was a greater threat than the Republicans. The Nationalists had properly trained soldiers with the right equipment whereas the Republicans had the working class and peasant fighters backed by other young men and women who had travelled from Europe to fight for the communist cause.

Another important factor that contributed to Nationalist strengths and Republican



(This page is for your second answer.) weaknesses was ~~the~~ Foreign Aid. The Nationalists greedily benefited from aid sent by Germany and Italy to ensure the eradication of communism in Europe and see the introduction of a fascist regime. They sent ~~armies~~ troops equipment and Hitler sent the Condor Legion to Guernica in order to test out his planes for the up-coming world war.

Whereas the Republican side only recieved aid in the form of beans sent from communist south American countries. The Republicans had to give their gold reserves ~~over~~ over to Russia in order for them to send weapons. Russia was not concerned with the strength of communism in Europe, it only cared that both Germany and Italy were already occupied with Spain to prevent them turning on communist Russia.

The Republican's weaknesses were a major factor in the outcome of the civil war as they were not able to unify themselves into one substantial fighting force that could overthrow an ever increasing



(This page is for your second answer.) Nationalist Orreat, however Nationalist strength was key to General Franco's victory in 1939. The ability of the Nationalists to bring about unity in their zones and their great amount of foreign aid ~~led~~<sup>led</sup> them to a victory over the Republicans. The Nationalists were a unified force that had the skill and tactics of the army combined with the reinforcement of the powerful elites and worked with these strengths to lead to the victory of fascism in Spain. Therefore the outcome of the war can be explained more by Nationalist strengths rather than Republican weakness.



An Example of Level 3

Put a cross in the box indicating the **SECOND** question you have chosen to answer . Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice. If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1  Question 2  Question 3   
Question 4  Question 5  Question 6   
Question 7  Question 8  Question 9   
Question 10  Question 11  Question 12

(This page is for your second answer.) Plan

- Mutilated victory
- Frailness of *Trasformismo*
- D'Annunzio's actions at ~~the~~ Fiume
- ~~Growing~~ Political pressure
- Fear of Socialism.

The Fascist Party (PNF) rapidly rose in popularity from 1919 to becoming elected in 1922. The rise of this growth in popularity can be attributed to many different reasons: The mutilated victory, weakness of *Trasformismo* and the fear of Socialism. Post war Italy was the perfect place for a nationalist party, such as the PNF, ~~to~~ to gain popularity.

After the Russian Revolution, many countries in the west became fearful of Socialism. This fear of Socialism meant that



(This page is for your second answer.) In the case of the PNF alternatives were seen as far better. The fact the fascist ~~Archia~~ ~~Motta~~ Militia started to beat Socialists, eventually resulting in the collapse of the government and murder of Matteotti, meant that the PNF were seen as heroes. This did result in a growth of popularity of the PNF.

On the other hand there is the fact that Italians became disillusioned from the trasformismo system. The frailties of the system were exposed post-war as the weak coalitions could not achieve anything. The one man who had seen a chance to achieve something during trasformismo was Giolitti. He had been Prime Minister 5 times during the period of the Liberal State. Giolitti eventually added Mussolini to the bill, effectively securing an end to the period of trasformismo.

Another reason as to why the PNF became more popular is due to the actions of D'Annunzio at Fiume. D'Annunzio accompanied





(This page is for your second answer.) by 2000 armed men was able to secure Rome for 15 months.

This invasion showed to the Italian public just how weak the liberal state was. This when coupled with the nationalist aims of the fascist Party showed that the PNF was a viable alternative to the liberal state.

However, the most important factor in the growth of popularity of the PNF was war itself. The term 'Mutilated victory' was coined by the nationalists who argued that Italy had not gained from war and had only been swept the crumbs. The Italian economy was riddled by high debts, 85 million lira (5 times pre-war levels) and rampant inflation (4 times pre-war levels). This meant that post-war Italy was seen by Italians as a mess. This when coupled with the weakness of the liberal state meant that alternatives were always going to increase in popularity. The only two real alternatives to the liberal state was either the PNF or the Socialists. When considering the



(This page is for your second answer.) Fear of Socialism is not hard to see why the PNF gained popularity post war.

Therefore it can be concluded that the impact of world war one is responsible for the rise in popularity of the fascist party (PNF) in Italy after 1918.



