



Examiners' Report

June 2019

GCE History 9HI0 2G

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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 or 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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.

June 2019

Publications Code 9HI0_2G_1906_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates continue to engage effectively across the ability range with A Level paper 2F which deals with the rise and fall of fascism in Italy, c1911-46 (2G.1), and Spain, 1930-78, republicanism, Francoism and the re-establishment of democracy (2G.2).

The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two linked sources. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was very little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. Examiners continued to comment on the fact that a significant minority of scripts posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers were able to develop reasoned and supported inferences based on the sources. Such responses evaluated the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the enquiry on the basis of both the contextual knowledge which was on offer and through an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It is pleasing to note that last summer's advice was taken on board by many candidates and there were fewer examples this summer of candidates suggesting that weight can be established by a discussion of what is missing from a source. The question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and it was pleasing to see that the vast majority of candidates continue to be aware of this requirement. It can be achieved using a variety of different approaches. This summer there was some evidence of more candidates using often extensive contextual knowledge to drive an answer to the enquiry, rather than using it to illuminate and discuss the source. This resulted in candidates not dealing with the sources adequately.

In section B it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. Weaker candidates often engaged in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates are encouraged to ensure that they take the most appropriate approach to answering a question. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology, not merely using the start and end dates as bookends with little consideration of the events between. It continues to be the case that not all candidates have a secure understanding of what is meant by 'criteria' in terms of bullet point 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates continue to explicitly state in the introduction to the essay that they are naming the criteria that they plan to use, when in actual fact they are referring to the issues or the factors that will be discussed in the response. 'Criteria' in bullet point 3 of the mark scheme refers to the basis on which candidates reach their judgement, not the issues that are discussed in the process of reaching that judgement. There was some tendency this summer, in all sections of the paper, for some candidates to replicate the words and phrases of the mark scheme in their responses. It is the application of the requirements of the mark scheme that is crucial.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1

This question enjoyed the full range of responses with the majority of candidates in level 3 and low level four although there were some extremely good answers which fully utilised the sources establishing valid criteria to reach a judgement based on weighing the evidence. The most effective responses made good use of the source material to explore the inferences that could be drawn from Source 1 regarding the special nature of the relationship between Italy and Nazi Germany based on their common ideology and the claims made in Source 2 regarding the need to break away from Germany. The best answers showed a clear awareness of a developing relationship from its high point in 1937 to its decline by August 1939. Many candidates made good use of contextual knowledge to interrogate the inferences and claims made as part of the evaluation of the sources. However, some candidates picked up on the references to youth in source 1 and became side-tracked by providing lengthy descriptions of fascist policy towards youth rather than keeping focused on ideological similarities as a driving force for the relationship. There was some good evaluation considering the different nature of the sources and hence the differing messages they propounded. Those candidates who took note of the different dates were able to develop a sophisticated evaluation based on the changing nature of the relationship.

There was a noticeable trend this summer for some candidates to use the structure of the generic mark scheme to write their answer. Whilst this meant that they addressed all three bullet points, it did mean that they did not integrate the ideas in their answer so that, in particular, knowledge was free standing and not used to develop and explain inferences. This technique would be best avoided for candidates who wish to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.

Together ~~to~~ Sources 1 and 2 might appear extremely contradictory and therefore not useful in investigating the extent ^{of the} relationship between Italy and Germany - where Source 1 claims the similarities, ~~both~~ ideologically, and between Germany and Italy mean they 'stand together', compared to Source 2 which considers how ~~the~~ the outbreak of war between Germany and the democracies meant Italy was convinced they must 'not march unconditionally' with Germany. However the nature of the sources means a historian would find them particularly useful in ~~being~~ investigating the nature of the German and Italian agreements and Mussolini's ~~own~~ views on the agreement, and how

this has developed by 1939.

Source is useful as it explains that by 1939 'the Duce' was preparing a 'break with Germany'. This suggests that Germany and Italian relations were tense because of ~~Germany's~~ Germany's very explicit aggressive foreign policy in contrast to Italy, ~~which was~~ whose 'position' does not 'permit' men to prepare for war.

This idea is supported by the fact that ~~soon after~~ ^{started in 1939 September} before the war, Italy and Germany had signed the Pact of Steel, which although ties ~~between~~ Italy and Germany both economically and militarily together had a clause which allowed Italy to stay neutral after war started in September 1939.

This claim can also be partially substantiated by looking at the author: Count Ciano, as Mussolini's foreign minister 1936-43, ~~was~~ and this being a contemporary account

written in August, he would have had access to Mussolini's thoughts on the matter and the reality behind Italy's relationship with Germany because of his position. The fact Ciano claims he spoke with 'brutal frankness' further substantiates his claim that Italian-German relations were not completely secure.

This is ~~argued~~ disputed in Source 1 which claims that Italy and Germany were 'linked and that 'we have in common many elements of our ideology'. This can be supported by the fact that both countries were dictatorships and had similar military policies. ~~How~~ Furthermore the 'Rome-Berlin Axis', signed in 1936 suggests Germany and Italian relations were strong. However, we must look at both the date and the name of this source to understand the development of Nazi-Fascist relations. As this was a public

speech by Mussolini, a notorious liar and famed for his use of propaganda, we can understand that he is speaking in support of Germany because he wants to portray an image of the 'demonstration of affection' they share. Furthermore, as this is ~~written~~^{spoken} in 1937 Mussolini's speech only gives an explanation of German-Italian relations up to this date.

Therefore source 1 can only be partially substantiated because it is ~~written~~^{spoken} by Mussolini to gain support for his alliance with Germany, and written in 1937, ² years before the threat of war in 1939 because something to consider ~~there~~.

Therefore together, both sources are extremely useful in helping a historian investigate the relationship between Germany and Italy and how this fluctuated throughout the period.

1936-39. Where source 1 suggests Mussolini's support for the relationship between these two countries, ⁱⁿ source 2 Ciano details how Mussolini's initial refusal to 'act independently of the Germans' changed into a need for a 'solution'. Source 1, as a public speech works to show how publicly ~~relations~~ the relationship between Germany and Italy was strong. Despite ~~Mussolini~~ it only being partially substantiated by Mussolini's reputation, together with Ciano's admission about Mussolini's ^{initial} eagerness ^{up} to work with Germany right until August 1939, a historian could use this to suggest relations between the two countries had been good. This can be substantiated by the fact that in 1938, Mussolini allowed for Germany to invade and take Austria-Hungary - in a policy called Anschluss - which he had previously refused to allow ^{to} happen.

in 1934, suggesting the strength of their relationship. Furthermore, ~~Source 2 is key for a~~ ~~in together~~ ~~from~~ sources are key in suggesting how the relationship changed between 1936-39. Where Source 1 is a public admission about Germany and Italy's 'unshatterable determination', the private nature of Ciano's admission in ~~1938~~, August 1939, suggests that ~~the~~ substantiates Mussolini's change in attitude. as it is Ciano's claim that Mussolini decided to prepare for a subtle 'break with Germany', is consistent with the terms of the Pact of Steel and later Italy's being allowed to refrain from entering war by Germany. This change in attitude, suggests ^{the} relationship ^{by 1939} was not as strong as initially perceived and that 'war' the increasing threat of 'war' limited the extent that Mussolini was willing to fully support Germany.



This is a secure level 5 response. The two sources are used together very well. The evaluation of the reliability of the sources is woven into the discussion throughout the answer and the candidate really stands back from the sources to consider the use the historian could make of them. Contextual knowledge is used to both illuminate and challenge the content of the sources. The different dates and nature of the sources is used very effectively to assess value and reach a judgement of the weight they bear in an enquiry.



Justify comments on the reliability of the sources by drawing upon their content.

Question 2

There were some effective answers to this question, well answered with some useful source analysis and focused evaluation. Many candidates were able to make reasoned inferences and the general level of contextual knowledge was good. The best responses showed a clear awareness that the sources were drawn from different time periods and different political ideologies. These candidates made reasoned inferences from Source 3 about Azaña's concern about the influence of the Church on youth and Source 4's claims about the key role the Church was to play in the shaping of culture in Franco's Spain. Many candidates were able to interrogate the sources using well selected knowledge to aid their analysis of the sources and test the validity of the evidence as accurate information of claims and opinions with varying reliability. The best responses showed a real appreciation of the values of the time and were able to use this to query, for example, the extent to which Azaña spoke for the Spanish population. Most candidates were successful in using the two sources together, many using them to trace the changing pattern of State-Church relations and to discuss the differing nature of the sources. The best evaluations, achieving in level 4 and level 5, commented not only on the provenance of the source but justified comments on the weight of the evidence by applying them to the evidence in the source.

Taken together, sources 3 and 4 are extremely useful for the historian to investigate the dramatic change in both the legal relationship between Church and state and the general attitudes ~~towards~~ ^{of} members of government towards the Church.

Source 3 epitomises the anti-clerical attitudes that many left-wing Spanish politicians held upon what the position of the Catholic Church should be in relation to ~~the~~ the state and society. In his speech, Azana makes reference to his belief that 'there is no place in the Constitution of the new state for an official connection with religion'. This emphasises the determination of anti-clerical leaders to reduce the influence of the Church and of course when the Constitution was ratified in December of 1931, Article 3 established the separation of Church and state, thereby achieving what Azana sets out in source 3. So too was Azana's proclamation that 'the budget for the clergy will obviously be abolished' which was established through Article 26 of the Constitution. ~~Source~~ Therefore, a historian can attach a great

degree of certainty to the fact that what Azana is saying in source 3 actually reflects what the relationship between the Church and state was in the early 1930s - Azana's words were carried into action. In this sense, source 3 is an authoritative text.

However, it must be said that this is merely the belief of one politician in the era and Manuel Azana was of course ~~of~~ one of the more anti-clerical members of his government between 1931-32 - in May 1931 after a series of Church burnings - Azana proclaimed 'all the convents in Madrid are not worth the life of one Republican'. Indeed when CEDA took power in February 1933, the anti-clerical reforms mentioned in source 3 were ignored and the Church's position re-established. This therefore serves as a limitation to the usefulness of the source as arguably Azana's attitudes were not reflective of all and indeed the reforms turned out only to be temporary.

Source 4 presents the dramatic changes in the relationship between Church and state in comparison to the one presented in source 3.

Source 4 has great authority because the Concordat formed the basis of the relationship between the Francoist state and the Church - it is objective in this regard and unlike source 3 represents the universal attitude that the government had towards the Church, not merely the view of a left-wing politician. Source 4 makes reference to the Church becoming the 'sole religion of the Spanish State' enjoying certain rights and privileges. Immediately the historian can see the contrast between what the legal position of the Church would be under the Republic compared to what it was under Franco as whilst source 4 speaks of privileges suggesting a close relationship between church and state, Azana proclaims in source 3 that 'the budget of the clergy will obviously be abolished', suggesting an adversarial relationship. The Church did indeed enjoy a range of privileges established by the Clerical Laws of 1938 and then by the concordat such as the right to form organisations independent of the state - for example the Catholic Action Workers' Association which worked with the urban proletariat to fight for change workers' rights.

The historian can also infer a notable difference

not just in the legal position of the Church but also the general attitudes towards its values. Source 4 says that the 'Spanish State recognises the ~~character~~ in the Catholic Church, the value of a perfect society' and indeed during the regime these traditional values were prevalent across society both in terms of the role of women and education. In complete contrast, Aznar claims in source 3 that the Catholic Church's 'monitoring the consciences' of the people is an effort to a 'perfect society' and therefore the sources clearly show what a dramatic change in attitudes there was between 1931-1956.

Overall, I think that the sources are extremely useful for an enquiry into the relationship between church and state as they epitomise how this relationship was far stronger under Franco's regime both in terms of the legal relationship and general attitudes with the anti-church language of Aznar providing the contrast to what is suggesting a positive relationship.



This is a secure level 5 response. It argues the limitations of Source 3 very effectively. The use of contextual knowledge to interrogate the sources shows a clear understanding of the values of the time. Valid arguments are developed about the weight that can be placed on Source 3 as the view of a left-wing politician compared to Source 4 which reflects the views of the Francoist society.



Remember to use the sources to explore the claims being made by the writer and to consider how valid they are.

Question 3

This was a very popular question and drew many responses. Most candidates had secure knowledge of the Acerbo Law and were able to explain its purpose in Mussolini's attempt to create a dictatorship. Many explained that the 1924 electoral victory meant that it played a lesser role in the evolution of the dictatorship by 1926, although fewer candidates seemed aware of the electoral pact with the right-leaning leading liberals, former nationalists and a few *Popolari* members which led to the creation of a government-supporters list and played a key role in Mussolini's electoral success. Most candidates considered a range of other factors including the March on Rome, the assumption of emergency powers, the impact of the Matteotti crisis and Aventine Secession, the introduction of press censorship, the pressure from the *ras* and the passing of the *Legge Fascistissime*. The most successful developed clear criteria for judging the relative significance of the factors in relation to the Acerbo Law. The most common error in addressing this question was to consider it as a rise to power question and focus on the period 1918-22. These responses often included factors that were out of period, such as the mutilated victory or the changes in fascist ideology between 1919 and 1921. Other candidates strayed beyond 1926 and explored the development of the dictatorship including the role of the OVRA. This material could not be credited.

In many ways, the passing of the Acerbo Law in 1923 was a significant development in the creation of an Italian dictatorship, however arguably more important was the banning of political parties and groups, and Mussolini's actual appointment as dictator in 1925.

The Acerbo Law proposed that the majority party in the Chamber of Deputies would automatically win two-thirds of seats, with the other third allocated according to proportional representation. This greatly furthered the evolution of a dictatorship for several reasons. The law was passed by a 65% majority, however ~~it~~^{this} was done in a vote controlled by the intimidation of the Fascist squads, meaning its legitimacy was undermined. In addition, Matteotti's discovery of this led to his murder in 1924, showing the growing violence of Fascism, and leading to authoritarian measures such as press censorship in July 1924. In addition, the Acerbo Law meant that the NF won 60% of the vote in a coalition with right-wing liberals, and therefore his seat number increased ten-fold from 35 to 375. This increased presence in the Chamber of Deputies meant Mussolini had greater control

and influence. Therefore, the Acerbo Law was clearly a very significant development, owing to the fact that it both gave Mussolini and the PNF greater power achieved illegally, and it revealed elements of fascism which showed it to be increasingly authoritarian.

Another development in the evolution of a dictatorship was the banning of opposition parties, groups and their outlets. ~~By~~ ^{In} 1925, all opposition parties had been banned, ~~including the~~ and in 1926 it was forbidden to meet in a political ~~or~~ opposition group. Furthermore, press censorship was introduced in July 1926, and the last opposition newspaper was banned in 1926. ~~This~~ This removal of opposition is very significant, ~~and~~ as it made the PNF the only party in Italy, and made any opposition to the regime illegal, thereby greatly increasing Mussolini's control and authority. This development is arguably more significant than the Acerbo Law, as it shows that more had to be done to ~~lessen~~ ^{challenge} opposition, and simply reducing it was not enough; it had to be removed. In addition, ~~it~~ while the Acerbo Law was simply ~~as~~ a passing improvement, the ban in 1926 marked a stark turning point in Mussolini's authority, and was therefore a more significant development in the dictatorship than the Acerbo Law.

~~However, perhaps~~ However, arguably the most significant development was Mussolini's actual

assumption
~~assumption~~ of dictatorial powers, in December 1924. 33 PNF members approached Mussolini asking him to become dictator. As they said they would resign if not, Mussolini accepted this, and told Parliament in January that he would become dictator in 48 hours. This development is arguably the most significant, as it began a whole series of authoritarian measures, including banning opposition parties^{by 1926}, and replacing elected mayors with appointed Podestats in February 1926, as well as taking 2000 actions in January 1926, and being granted 1 year of absolute rule in a 92% favourable Senate vote. Therefore, it is clear that this was most significant, as it sparked many authoritarian measures, and marked the beginning of the dictatorship.

In conclusion, it is clear that while the passing of the Acerbo law was fairly significant in growing PNF influence, the banning of opposition parties was more so, as it really revealed the insufficiency of the Acerbo law. Nonetheless, Mussolini's assumption of dictatorial powers was most significant, as it marked the beginning of the dictatorship, and enabled other dictatorial measures such as the banning of opposition parties to take place.



This is a secure level 5 response. It considers the relative significance of 3 factors; the Acerbo law, the banning of the opposition and the assumption of dictatorial powers. It has a sustained analysis focused on relative significance and secure knowledge which leads to a fully explained judgment based on explicit criteria.



This question focuses on significance. To address it effectively, you need to establish criteria for judgement.

Question 4

Many candidates chose to answer this question. Most demonstrated a good knowledge of fascist economic policy and an ability to tackle the question in an analytical framework. The most effective responses had a clear understanding of the nature of autarky and considered the achievements of fascist economic policy in terms of its impact on the Italian economy and population. Most candidates explored the successes and failure of the battles for grain, land and the lire in relation to autarky. Some excellent answers considered the purpose of the battle for births, with its focus on expanding the Italian population, within the policy for autarky and its necessity to ensure a large workforce to allow economic development. Candidates could relate the aims of the Corporate State to autarky. Some responses described economic policy, without a focus on autarky, and these tended to achieve level 3 and below. The best responses were able to develop clear criteria which were used to assess 'beneficial' and reach supported judgements.

Mussolini's policy of autarky aimed for self-sufficiency for the Italian economy in preparation for war; ^{which distorted the economy.} The policy of autarky ^{also} can be seen both in the 1925 Battle for Grain, aiming for complete self-sufficiency in grain, and the Battle for Births from 1927, which aimed to grow Italy's population to 60 million to sustain a self-sufficient and strong nation. Overall, despite there being some ~~benefits~~ ~~benefits~~ benefits to the economy from autarky, the policy distorted Italy's economy and ~~was~~ ^{was} not beneficial for its development.

Mussolini's policy of autarky can be seen in the 1925 Battle for Grain. The government provided farmers with fertiliser, more resistant seeds as well as education on modern farming techniques, ~~with~~ aiming to have Italy achieve complete self-sufficiency in grain. There were some benefits to the economy for its development, including the modernisation of the agricultural industry with new machinery being introduced. Furthermore,

from ~~1925~~¹⁹²⁷ to 1939 cereal production doubled, showing a success for autarky. Wheat production increased from 5 million tonnes in 1925 to 7 million tonnes by 1935, with Italy being fully self-sufficient in wheat by the late 1930s.

However, in many ways the Battle for Grain hindered Italy's economic development. As a result of wheat being highly profitable for farmers, many farmers removed their vineyards, citrus fruits and vineyards from their land to have more land available to grow wheat. Consequently, meat and egg production fell, causing an increase in food imports. This evidently undermined the aims of autarky, as did the continued importing of fertiliser, and also damaged previously profitable agricultural industries such as olive oil. The Battle for Grain also damaged Italy's economy because the distorted economy focused on particular industries, neglecting others, with farmers' wages falling 50% from 1925-39. Overall, the Battle for Grain was not beneficial for the economy, damaging much of the ~~poor~~ agricultural industry.

Mussolini's Battle for Births aimed to increase Italy's population from 40 million to 60 million by the 1950s. Mussolini introduced loans to married

couples to encourage an increase in the birth rate by conceding part of the loan for every child born, with six children conceding the entirety. This desire for an increasing population supported Mussolini's aim for autarky because he believed a strong and growing Italian population was necessary for self-sufficiency to be successful so that there would be a large workforce. A bachelor's tax on unmarried men aged 25 to 50 was introduced, raising over 200 million lire by 1943. However, Mussolini's attempts were not successful, with the live birth rate declining from 1911 to 1936 and the marriage rate failing to rise. Some policies of this ideological Battle for Births damaged the development of the economy. For example, Mussolini set a quota in 1933 limiting the employment of women in the public sector to 10% of the workforce. This demonstrates him prioritising ideology over the benefits of women employees during the Great Depression. Mussolini cutting women's wages actually encouraged employers to employ women over men, demonstrating the ineffectiveness and backwardness of these economic policies. Overall, the Battle for Births was not beneficial for the development of the economy because it demonstrates Mussolini pursuing ideology over practical economics and its aims failed, in terms of increasing the birth rate.

The policy of autarky aimed to prepare Italy for war from 1935. Consequently, restrictions on imports were put in place and Mussolini aimed to produce synthetic substitutes for products, such as rayon for cotton. However, Italy's economy was lacking basic raw materials, including iron, oil and coal, and therefore Italy still required imports. Therefore, Mussolini prioritised imports of materials necessary for war such as iron. However, this had an adverse effect on other industries. For example, without imports the lucrative textiles industry struggled, showing the adverse effects of autarky. Autarky completely distorted the Italian economy with its focus on war preparations, and living standards declined significantly from 1936 to 1939 as a result. Therefore, it is clear that the autarkic focus on war was not beneficial to economic development.

In conclusion, Mussolini's policy of autarky was not beneficial to the development of the Italian economy, instead hindering it. Despite Mussolini achieving some success with autarky, especially ~~achieving~~ ^{being self-sufficient} in wheat, the ideological focus of the policy impacted Italy's other successful industries as well as the standard of living. Furthermore, Mussolini's own policies sometimes undermined the goal of autarky, further limiting

any possible benefits of a completely self-sufficient economy.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a secure level 5 response. It focuses on three key policies in the attempt to achieve autarky; the battle for grain, the battle for births and policy towards imports and raw materials. It is underpinned by good knowledge, an assessment of successes and failures and a weighing up of these to reach a sound judgement about the 'benefits' of autarky.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

This question focuses on consequence. To address it, you need to look at impact

Question 5

This was the least popular question on Option 2G.2. There were some very well considered answers that tackled the question effectively. These candidates considered the differences in the number of victims on each side and carried out successful comparisons examining the similarities in the cruel nature of the terror and the choice of political opponents as victims, as well as drawing out other differences including the length of time over which the atrocities were committed and the use of terror by the Nationalists to curry support from the Catholic Church. The most common error was to describe the terror rather than focus on the second order concept - similarity and difference.

Plan: NO

R	N
67,800 35-55,000 dead	200,000 dead
Repetitive murders	Organised
Night raids, driven out	- 20,500 ^{Badosoz} lost in the ^{the} area ^{area}
Latifundistas in Aragon	- would leave bodies unburied
Forcibly evicted in Barcelona	- chemical operations
Stopped in 36' → worked supplies	← continued throughout ↳ the ^{the} area ^{area}
↳ attacks on buildings	

Indeed the ~~difference~~

Though both ^{the} Republicans ~~and~~ and Nationalists ~~also~~ committed atrocities, the nature and degree in the Nationalists atrocities, coupled with their intended sentiment indicates that ^{that there was a} ~~major~~ ^{clear} difference their atrocities in comparison to the "Red Terror" of the Republicans.

In order to assess this question, I will use the criteria of ~~the~~ the amount of similarities and differences and the extent of these similarities or difference, as well as the nature of the atrocities.

In terms of the number of killings, the Nationalists killed up to 200,000 ^{civil people,} ~~people,~~ whilst the Republicans killed up to 55,000, thus somewhat agreeing with the statement. However, one could argue that it is the notion

In terms of agreeing with the statement, though both Nationalist and Republicans ~~zones~~ completely atrocities. ~~The~~ Though the ~~Nationalist~~ the republicans killed as many as 6,800 priests

In the Republican side, Republican militias would seek havoc in what would be called the 'Red Terror', with 6,800 priests being murdered, ~~latter~~ latifundistas being killed in Aragón and ~~villages~~ ^{factory owners} being killed in Catalonia. Furthermore, nightly raids of Republican towns would be taken by anarchists and extremists, with Nationalist sympathisers being taken ~~from~~ and driven out of the city to be shot, ~~there~~ ^{thus} no treaty

a degree of organised terror. Lastly, there were many attacks on religious buildings and churches, thus indicating the degree of atrocities as ~~it did~~ ^{it was} also symbolical atrocities. However, in 1936, the government called for halting of these atrocities as the government hoped for support from democratic nations like Britain and France and this terror would not appeal to them. Though churches were still vandalised after this, ~~there~~ there was a step towards the atrocities of the Republicans as only 55,000 ~~dead~~ ^{people} were killed in comparison to the 200,000 Nationalist killings. In summary, there is a large amount of atrocities to begin with and perhaps may have continued if government did not call for it to stop, however, it appears to pale in comparison to the nature ~~of~~ as well as the amount of atrocities the Nationalist side committed.

In terms of the Nationalist side, 200,000 were killed, clearly discriminatory in contrast to the Republican side as the title suggests.

However, unlike the somewhat disorganised and free-willing militias of the Republic, the Nationalists consisted of the notorious savage

colonial ~~army at the~~ ^{African army} which committed atrocities as a means of "communication" as historian Daniel Slater puts it. ~~France~~ For example, on their way to Madrid at the very start of the war, 4,000 were massacred at Badajoz and left unburied as a sign to those who opposed Franco and create a state of fear, which is a stark contrast to the Republican side as they killed Nationalist sympathisers, not simply civilians. Furthermore, the systematic nature of an army carrying out atrocities in compensation to a frenzied militia indicates further difference in the nature of these atrocities. The action that Franco pursued a "cleansing" of homosexuals and 'evils' in Nationalist zones indicates further difference as atrocities were committed due to sexual orientation rather than ideology and war. Furthermore, the 'M Planeta' 'bloody sacrifices' were held to celebrate the Virgin Mary, indicating that even the ~~the~~ ^{religion} was revered by the Nationalists and the notion of human sacrifice further indicates the drastic difference in atrocities. ~~hence~~, Franco even killed his own officers

like his cousin for disobeying orders in the military, this even causing atrocities against his own people in order to create a state of fear to prevent uprising. ~~the~~ Lastly, the atrocities, unlike the Republican atrocities continued throughout the whole period of the civil war, and Franco already controlled 65% of the Spanish territory by ~~the~~ December 1937, this indicating that the atrocities were widely spread but also they were prolonged, & this being different from the Republican zones as they ^{stopped} ~~appeared~~ the majority of their atrocities by 1936, so early in the civil war.

In conclusion, though the difference in amount of atrocities is statistically different, the nature of these atrocities as well as how many people it affected clearly shows that there was clear difference in atrocities between the Republican and Nationalist sides. There were similar in ~~all~~ ^{the region} ~~atone~~ that both committed atrocities out of spite for the other side, however Franco* and the Nationalists appeared to take on different motives and agendas in their atrocities, this shows clear difference.



This is level 5 response. It has an explicit focus on similarity and difference throughout the answer. There is a depth of knowledge. There is a greater focus on what was different and underlying theme of considering similarities.



In similarity and difference questions, a brief plan helps you to focus on the second order concept

Question 6

This was the most popular question on Option 2G.2. The most effective responses were able to look at the origins of regionalism versus centralism not only in the Basque areas but also Catalonia, and then to consider the relative significance of other factors weakening Franco's hold both domestically and internationally. Weaker responses had a more limited focus on regional nationalism with insecure knowledge and tended to focus on alternative factors such as left-wing attitudes in the Church and challenges by students. Without a sharp focus on the given factor, they were unable to develop the criteria to judge relative significance and these responses were rewarded in level 3 and below.

From the late 1950s, as Spain loosened its 'authoritarian grip, the country saw a growth in demonstrations of government opposition, in which some ~~fractly~~ created great problems for ~~Francos~~ Franco's government. To investigate if the growth of regional nationalism was the most significant problem, I will assess the magnitude of problems created by the growth of regional nationalism, opposition from students and the Church ~~and~~, as well as workers, assessing ~~to what~~ the impact on Franco's government and how long the problem stood for.

Firstly, it can be argued that the growth of regional nationalism was the most significant problem faced by Franco's government. Towards the last decade of Franco's reign, Spain saw a surge in demonstrations for regional nationalism, in which

The ETA (a political group fighting for Basque nationalism) posed the biggest threat to Franco's government. For example, in 1968 the ETA killed Franco's head of police and repeated this again in the same year and in 1969. This issue was worsened by the trial that followed in which the terrorists used the court as a platform to encourage public attacks against Franco threatening his base of control in Spain, thus being a significant problem.

Moreover, the ETA planted a bomb in 1974 killing Franco's ultra-conservative Prime Minister, Blanco and by 1975 they had made 37 victims of their attacks. Moreover, by

On one hand, it can be argued that the growth of regional nationalism was not the most significant problem as Franco had arrested 3000 of its members and killed 5 of its leaders, regaining control over the situation. Moreover, there were many police units as well as Franco's new Prime Minister cracking down on the ETA. However, the fact that in 1974, there were still over 1000 members suggests the issue persisted

and in focusing parts of his government on cracking down on the ETA, Franco had to sacrifice a great amount of resources on the issue thus disrupting his government. In summary, the growth of nationalism was a threat as their attacks meant the magnitude of government disruption was high and the threat persisted ~~thru~~ through the period.

On the other hand, it can be argued that opposition ~~from~~ from workers was a bigger threat. Most persistent in the 1960s, workers fought for better rights, which was mainly demonstrated through strikes. For example, in 1969 workers took part in the Cereales demonstration in which 2 people were killed. Moreover, due to strikes, in 1968, 2 million hours were lost and by 1976 this was 18 million. Moreover, in 1974, 4,500 workers were fired. On one hand it can be argued that was not a threat, as exemplified in the Cereales demonstration and the fact of prominent demonstrators is such, the government were able to contain demonstrations. However, strikes greatly affected productivity levels.

This being a significant threat as it affected the economy, and because of this, there was only so much Franco could do as he could not afford to fire every protester. In summary opposition from workers was a great problem as Franco's government were left helpless at times as punishing workers had a close tie to the economy and the number of hours lost in 1976, suggest the issue to be a continuous one.

Contrastingly, it can be argued that student and Church opposition was the most significant problem. Concerning students, from the 1960s, students and teachers began to protest against issues such as living standards and Franco's style of ruling. One way students held protest is by taking control of buildings, however, the failure of this is exemplified in Gironde in 1969 when martial law is put in place and teachers were either removed or arrested, which suggests the issue not to be as significant. Concerning the Church, following Franco's ~~Freedom~~ religious freedom law in 1967, the Church began to feel isolated and

As many privileges being taken away. Consequently the likes of clergymen who no longer received state funds began to ~~support~~ support students. On one hand, it can be argued that their opposition was a big threat as they formed influential groups in society. However, ~~as~~ ^{was} a form of appeasement for students, Franco increased the number of universities from 12 to 22 in the late 60s and in 1973 the Church ~~wrote & praised~~ praised Franco and his government, which suggest that their issues were able to be ~~control~~ controlled by Franco, thus not greatly disrupting his government. ~~However, in 1974~~ In summary, opposition from the Church and students was not a great threat. Franco government was able to control demonstrations, exemplified in the use of martial law ~~in~~ in Ceuta and the Church's suggested change in attitudes show the issue to not be long-lasting.

In conclusion, the growth of regional nationalism was the most significant problem faced by Franco.

and his government. ~~The~~ Opposition from ~~the~~ the Church and students did not last as long as the growth in regional nationalism and opposition of workers thus not being the most significant threat. Moreover, whilst the growth of regional nationalism was a long-standing issue in the period, its magnitude was the greatest. Though government reaction ~~did~~ ~~due~~ to worker opposition did have the ability to severely affect the economy, thus affecting government, the assassinations carried out by the ETA did actually and directly affect them. This is exemplified in the assassination of Spain's Prime Minister and rather than the trials deterring further attacks and controlling situations, the terrorists used it to voice their ideologies thus encouraging further attacks ~~from~~ the government.



This is a level 5 response. It has good knowledge of the actions of ETA and the way that they threatened the Franco regime. This threat is contrasted with that from workers, the Church and students. There is a sustained argument. Clear criteria for judgement are explained in the conclusion. The answer would have been improved by a consideration of the regional opposition.



Remember to explore the given factor in depth.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should ensure that they deal with both enquiries
- Candidates should aim to draw out reasoned and developed inferences that go beyond comprehension of the sources
- Candidates should move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature, origin and purpose of the source. Comments about this should be specific to the provided sources rather than generic comments that might apply to any source
- Contextual knowledge should be used to illuminate and discuss what is in the source, rather than provide an answer to the enquiry.

Sections B and C

- Candidates should not assume that every question will require a factor/other factors approach
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates must be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, so that they can address questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should aim to range across the breadth of the chronology in Section C questions. This entails not just the bookend dates but some range across the whole chronology within the parameters of the specification.

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>

