



Examiners' Report **June 2022**

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 2022

Publications Code 9HI0_2G_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this first post-Covid set of exams with A Level paper 2G 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. A minority of scripts posed some problems with the legibility of handwriting; 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 that was on offer and through an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. The question requires candidates to use the sources 'together', but it is not a requirement to use them 'together' throughout the response. There was some evidence of some candidates attempting to do this. Depending on the sources, it was not always possible to do this convincingly, and some candidates engaged in some superficial argument and analysis as a result. Some candidates used their contextual knowledge to describe events in great detail, rather than using it to illuminate and to discuss the sources. This sometimes resulted in candidates not dealing with the sources adequately. In other cases, it was clear that, despite Advance Information, some candidates had insufficient contextual knowledge to deal effectively with the sources.

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 either engaged in a narrative approach that made links to the question in the conclusion or shaped their responses analytically but lacked sufficient substance and accurate contextual knowledge to support the arguments that they were making. Candidates are encouraged to ensure that they take the most appropriate approach to answering a question. Candidates should always aim to show the links between the issues raised, not merely to present a list of factors. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology. 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 note 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.

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 achieving at least level 3 and low level four, and there were also some extremely good answers which fully utilised the sources establishing valid criteria to reach a judgement based on weighing the evidence and hence achieved higher level four and secure level 5.

The most effective answers considered the sources together at key points throughout the answer, rather than leaving it until the conclusion. They also used exact contextual knowledge to make clear the calculations of Mussolini and of the government at the time of the March on Rome and in this way showed a real understanding of the values of the society from which the sources were drawn. Many answers were unbalanced in the consideration of the sources, spending much more time on Source 1 and this does impact on the overall evaluation. Commonly, separate sections on each source would begin with a lengthy consideration of provenance which dominated any development of inferences or application of contextual knowledge. This was particularly the case when considering the authorship of Source 2. Lower scoring answers tended not to consider the sources together at all or focus almost entirely on provenance. They tended to struggle to set the historical context at all or to be misled by Source 2 into writing at length about the Matteotti murder. The better candidates drew out the pros and cons of Source 3, considering not only Seldes' animosity to fascism but also his absence during the march itself, and weighed this against his ability to write an uncensored account of the event. Similarly, high achieving responses considered the value in Mussolini's propagandistic speech with its rallying call and what could be deduced about what Mussolini wanted readers to believe and balanced this against the reality of the situation. In this way, candidates successfully interrogated the source and justified their comments on value/limitations by deploying the evidence of the source.

Source 1 also suggests that the March on Rome was a significant threat, something that could not be stopped. Source 2 notes the point that the March on Rome was not a genuine threat, it was the king's fear that allowed it to succeed. The sources agree that the March on Rome took place, although it could be argued that the event was not a revolution at all. Used together the sources can show a closer depiction of the reality of events and the ^{false} narrative that was used by the Fascists to fool the masses.

Source 1 is written by Mussolini himself. While this limits the truthfulness of his description, it does show how he believed he had wanted others to believe the March on Rome happened. The fact that it was a newspaper article, written on the day of the ~~March~~ 'revolution' it demonstrates the propaganda that led to the development of the myth of a 'March on Rome', immediately attempting to mislead people the day the event occurred. One claim made by the source is that the 'Mussolini Law of Fascism' would be created

with the March. This suggests that the Fascists had full control over the Italy at the time of the March. In reality, the Fascists had taken some surrounding towns outside Rome, but they in no way had the power to install a dictatorship at this point. Mussolini also claims that 'the Italian army must not take part in this struggle' and does not march against the police. While this attempts to lead readers into believing that the army refused to fight the Fascists and the ideology of Fascism prevented sympathisers from attacking the police, it was more because the King had ordered them to stand down. This shows how Mussolini manipulated the reality of events in a way that made the March on Rome seem more of a threat than it actually was. Still, there is some truth in these claims as both the police and army tended to be sympathetic towards the right-wing Fascist cause, so even if the King had not ordered a submission, they may well have done so regardless. The main point made by source A is that a 'battle' would occur. This clearly implies that there would be genuine fighting as part of a revolution. At this point however,

Mussolini had ~~already~~ been appointed prime minister by King Emmanuel III, but diplomacy did not appease the Ras or look as impressive. This news Mussolini is likely attempting to make people believe the planned parade through Rome was an actual revolution when it occurred. Therefore, source A1 tells my claims which are often bending the truth. Still it is useful for showing how the 'March on Rome' was a significantly exaggerated in the threat that it posed, especially by the fascists for propaganda purposes.

Source 2 is written by an American journalist, which immediately suggests that their claims are more credible. By virtue of being external to the Fascist regime, they ~~are~~ ^{were} likely less influenced by the propagandised version of events. Additionally, their expulsion due to likely reporting on the Matteotti crisis suggests that they were keen to report a more accurate version of events for readers outside and inside Italy. ^{This} ~~is~~ also shows a lack of sympathy for Fascism, although an opposition to it does limit how likely they are to ~~show any~~ ^{show any} positives. The journalist was also not present during the actual 'March on Rome' and news they are likely relying on the reports of Italian witnesses, who

themselves may have their own opinion on fascism.

The source makes sure to put 'marched' in quotations. This implies that the journalist ~~was~~ ^{believed} that the actual threat of the Fascists was exaggerated. They also describe '800 poorly-dressed and ill-fed' fascists. These claims paint the picture that the Fascists were ^{extremely} ~~weak~~ ^{weak}, in ~~fact~~ there was very little threat. While this is supported by the military massively outnumbering the fascists, their weakness may be exaggerated. Although poorly armed, 50 thousand fascists did gather and take towns outside of Rome, far more than a merely 800 and definitely enough to pose a threat. The source also makes the claim that the king was frightened by the Duke of Aosta taking his place, which led him to allow the Fascists to gain power. While it is a fact that the king could have been replaced, there was a more valid reason that he backed down. The March on Rome posed a genuine threat to the king because there was a high risk of a civil war developing. There was also the issue that the army would side with the loyal ex-fascists. Therefore, source 2 does have weaknesses in showing that the 'March on Rome' was exaggerated.

part of a component of Fascist propaganda. However, ^{it} they disregard the genuine threat that was posed, even if the Fascists were not absolutely huge in number.

In conclusion, both sources portray a very different experience ^{view} of events. Mussolini portrays a glorious battle for victory. Jellso portrays a weak and feeble revolution ^{only} that was only successful due to the King being misled by rumours. The sources are best used together ~~as~~ as ~~sources~~ ~~documentaries~~. Source A is a clear example of Fascist propaganda which shows us how they wanted the world to see to be remembered while Source B shows a closer to reality description of events, ^{although it may} ~~also~~ ^{actually} downplay the threat posed by the Fascists to some extent.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a secure level 5 response. It confidently interrogates the evidence of both sources. It clearly distinguishes between information and claims made by the writers and develops a series of inferences. It deploys context both to illuminate and consider the limitations of the sources. Although there are a couple of errors of detail, there is secure evaluation.



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. Many answers developed inferences at length from source content. However, a significant number of candidates did not link the provenance or context in any depth. This does depress achievement in the levels. The better answers linked Source 3 to the wider political history of Spain or picked up on the outrages referred to in Source 4. Secure answers were also able to link the context to the analysis of source content and provenance. However, while many noted the different authorship and nature of the sources, relatively few developed the significance of the authorship beyond 'Republican' and 'Nationalist'. Some candidates projected a little too far into the future for Source 3, assuming that the left knew civil war was about to break out.

There were few very low scoring answers to this question, though occasionally responses relied on paraphrasing the sources.

Given that source 3 emanates from a Socialist Party newspaper, it is therefore from the likely broad perspective of the Popular Front government, which is seemingly well considering their victory in the 1936 elections. Whereas, source 4 emanates ~~from~~ broadly from the right-wing's perspective given that it is from Bolin, a known right-wing associate and therefore is also well as both sources have contrasting origins, demonstrating a broad view of the significance of the election when used together. Arguably, both sources are of ^{considerable} utility, however, a closer inspection is required.

Source 3 suggests that rightist elements and their demands were repressed and ignored ~~by~~ as a result of the election, and leftist demands and needs were championed. The source states that the election "will result in the absolute defeat of our enemies", and during the Popular Front's Government, agricultural reform was introduced which saw the nationalisation of land 'grabbed' by ~~the~~ 30,000 Extremadura peasants, who took over 3,000 farms, destroying the elite/right's

Agribusiness interests and objectives, and this is one of many examples which the source alludes to, all elitist/rightist interests were ^{many} "destroyed", which included banning the rightist party the Falange in 1936. Moreover, the source ~~is~~ mentions as to how they were going to fulfil leftist interests, "The whole country is demanding that our most fundamental objectives be fulfilled". This can be seen with the ^{many} leftist reforms which were introduced as a result of the election, for example, Catalanian autonomy was restored, a known anarchist area, and therefore championing leftist interests which would not have occurred if the election results differed, proving its significance. Contextually, the source is undoubtedly partisan, originating from a left-wing newspaper, and therefore does present some issues in determining the significance of the results as it likely only sheds light on the positive elements of the Popular Front government, ~~and is there~~ ~~however~~, as it is clearly aligned with the government politically. Moreover, it is dated only 2 days after the election, and therefore cannot demonstrate the full extent of significance regarding the elections as it is so early on and many of the events which occur that

demonstrate the significance of the election are in the latter years of the Republic. However, the source is arguably representative of leftist objections which were to come into fruition after the publication date of the source and therefore is arguably representative. However, once again its emotive tone is indicative of how the source aimed to invigorate the left following the Popular Front's victory in the election, and therefore may be too overly positive and thus misleading, especially considering that the repression of all rightist interests were not as thorough as the source suggests, for example leading Rightist Military generals like Franco championing the Right's interests was relocated to the Canaries instead of imprisoned. Therefore, in light of the source's context, the source is useful in revealing the significance of rightist demands being ignored and leftist demands being championed, however is more representative of what the left aimed to gain, not in fact what they achieved, considering the source's dating.

Source 42 ~~suggests~~ places weight on the ~~fact~~ significance of the further polarisation of Spain post-elections and how the country progressed from

moderate to extreme views politically as a result of the election. Source 4 highlights how "Spain was splitting into two extremes", the results being 48% to the Popular Front and 46% to the right, demonstrating how Spain was becoming more polarised politically. This can be seen with how the source also implies a communist / far-left state, "This programme was ~~the~~ a first step towards the dictatorship of the proletariat", and considering that it was in fact Stalin who was championing the Popular Front government model, the significance of them being elected demonstrated how the left had moved further left and thus Spain had become more polarised, as they were ^{now} politically influenced by the USSR, also demonstrating how as a result of the election, Spain was drawn further in to the ideological battle between communism and fascism. Moreover, the source states how "The left introduced a programme that included the removal of President Zamora", demonstrating the significance of the election as the moderate-right Zamora was replaced by leftist Azana as President and Casares Quiroga, also a leftist, became Prime Minister.

and now both the head of state and government were further left politically, increasing Spain's moderation to going further left. Contextually, the source is useful in that it is published in 1967, and is therefore after the election majority, and can therefore be more in favour of the events post-election, however, there may be recollection issues considering it is more than 30 years after the election, and therefore may not be entirely accurate. Additionally, the source is from Spain and is therefore also partisan, ~~therefore~~ ^{therefore} an emotive and bitter tone is used, like "all willing puppets of the Red extremists" and therefore likely has a tendency to exaggerate. Therefore, in light of context, the source is useful in revealing as to how Spain became further polarised, however, is limited in that it ~~pre-~~ postdates the election significantly which arguably greatly affects its accuracy.

Both sources agree that growing unease of the Spanish populace occurred as a result of the election, proving its significance. Source 3 states "power belongs to the people", and many Socialists began openly dissenting,

particularly the Socialist both against the Falangist JAP, which was also a result of growing polarisation, as aforementioned. Source 4 demonstrates how the significance of the leftist government restored years of renewed government anti-clericalism, as seen with "Several churches were burnt and three nuns... were assaulted by an infuriated mob". This was in fact worsened by the elected government releasing the 1934 political detainees, some without government authority, which led to 100 attacks on public buildings, demonstrating increasing violence and 250 of these attacks were on churches. Source 3 is less candid in its nature, only implicitly implying growing political violence as a significant product of the election, as it is a Socialist newspaper and therefore will protect the government's reputation more carefully, unlike source 4 where Folín is greatly opposed to the Government and is a member of the right and therefore has less to lose and more to gain in revealing the growing violence of the Spanish populace, and therefore in light of this context, both sources are

Still useful, however source 4 proves to be of more use.

To conclude, whilst both sources are useful in revealing the significance of the 1936 election results, arguably source 4 is more useful. Despite its emotive tone and dating greatly after the incident it is the most candid and is more representative as it is not 2 days after unlike source 3. Unier does not give a broad view and does not originate from ~~to~~ a source of leftist origin, who won the election, and therefore is more unlikely willing to cover up the extent of the significance of the election results in February 1936.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a top level 5 response. It interrogates both sources and uses well selected contextual knowledge to demonstrate a really secure understanding of the values and concerns of Spanish society at this key moment in 1936. There is some effective evaluation, for example on p3. It considers Source 3 as representing what they left wanted and not what it achieved. It is full of reasoned inference and weighs up the sources effectively in reaching its judgement.



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 the most popular question on 2G.1. Most answers took the question at face value and followed it in the structure of the response. The best answers were characterised by the inclusion of exact knowledge and examples. Many detailed responses looked at the two policies and were able to support their arguments with precise considerations of the outcomes which enabled them to conduct a genuine 'weighing up' of the truth of the statement, with secure balance being brought to the response. In these responses, candidates often concluded that while the evidence supported the claim that 'the battle for births was a complete failure', it was less convincing that the 'battle for grain was a success'. In less effective responses, the approach was quite broad and a lack of depth of knowledge of the Battle for Births and Battle for Grain drew in separate analyses of the Battle for the Lira and the Battle for Land. This needed to be tightly focused in order to be credited as relevant support.

Lower scoring answers tended to be unbalanced, focusing on only one of the Battles and therefore lacking any comparison.

It can be said that the 'Battle for Grain' was somewhat successful at improving wheat production and leading to the stockpiling of agricultural produce. However its success was not entire, with consequences of reducing other products impacting not only the export industry ~~by~~ but also the living standards and lives of the Italian people. The battle for births, although intended to increase the population significantly by the 1950's, ultimately failed to increase births and actually led to an increased proportion of married women seeking employment, highlighting its lack of success. The statement hence can be partially agreed with. //

To begin, there are some fundamental aspects of the 'battle for grain' that did appear to yield success. Introduced in the mid 1920's, Mussolini aimed to achieve 'Autarky', or self sufficiency, enabling Italy to become a leading power. The subsidies provided to farmers for expensive equipment, fertilisers and seeds allowed wheat production

to double, with a stockpile of produce even achieved. Although on the surface this can be seen as a success, ^{in terms of the wheat industry} consequences of this agricultural policy ~~have~~ had large scale impacts. Many farmers took advantage of the scheme to change crops, thus significantly reducing the number of vineyards and olive tree farms. With these industries ~~to~~ (previously being Italy's largest agricultural exports) sacrificed for the 'Battle for grain' it becomes difficult to acknowledge it as a complete success. A further dimension, the impact of the scheme on the Italian people, further contradicts the suggestion of the policy being a complete success. With a reduction in the number of cattle livestock farmed, the Italian diet lessened in quality. With the battle for lira and ^{the fixation of the lira value} ~~previous economic policies~~, prices rose exponentially. The combination of these factors meant families (on average) had to spend 400 lire more on food per year, with the cost of living becoming higher than wages. It can therefore be said that although the battle for grain was a success purely in terms of increasing

wheat production, the economic impact of the loss of major export industries, and its effect on the lives and living costs of the Italian people mean it cannot be seen as a complete success, contrasting the view in the statement.

The Battle for Births launched in the mid 1920's aimed to vastly increase the size of the Italian population, producing future 'soldiers and mothers' to improve the international standing of Italy. Although measures (such as reducing women's wages in 1927) and providing loans for marriage, ^{a bachelors tax for single men,} were intended to achieve these aims, they were largely unsuccessful. The reduction of women's wages, although intended to discourage them from work, actually led to employers seeking women to go into employment. By 1930's Italy even had the greatest proportion of married women in work, providing clear evidence of the policies failures. Further evidence can be seen in the continuous fall in birth rate. It could even be potentially suggested that this fall ^{partly} linked to the consequences of the Battle for Grain, with many families not

in the financial / living position to have more children. Although a number of policies were introduced to achieve this aim, it cannot be seen as a success, ^{and therefore} supports the view expressed in the statement.

To conclude, the statement can be partially agreed with. The fall in both birth and marriage rates support the suggestion that the 'battle for births' was a failure. However the view that the battle for grain was a success can be dissected. Although it was successful purely in terms of achieving an increase in wheat production, the multiple consequences of the policy contradict its success. The impact on other previously successful export industries, and the longstanding effect on the Italian population's living standards and diet quality, mean the policy can not be said to be entirely successful as the statement suggests.



This is a secure level 5 response with sustained analysis. Its particular strength is in the assessment of the relative achievements of the battle for grain on pp.2-3 and in the conclusion. It establishes valid criteria for judgement, eg rising employment of women in assessing the battle for births.



This question focuses on consequence. To address it effectively, you need to establish criteria for judgement. In this double headed question, the consequences may be the same or different for both policies.

Question 4

There were some excellent responses to this question. Answers at the top end were exceptional. The best answers were able to equally balance the comparison of the two regimes. A thematic approach proved most effective. These candidates tended to see development or continuation of ideas/policies as well as the obvious difference of context. Candidates referred to the Germans' attitude to Mussolini, the use of violence, popularity, strengths/differences between both regimes linked to how both institutions were governed. Many considered the role of anti-semitism in both regimes. This question enabled prepared candidates to display detailed knowledge in support of their arguments and achieve the highest level. It was a question that allowed candidates to play to their strengths, enabling them to select the key features that they could best compare. Most answers tended to focus on the Nazi domination of Salò, comparing it with Mussolini's personal power in the period up to 1943. Weaker responses were not able to extend much further than this and this meant that these responses failed to fully analyse the wider implications of the question.

In essence, the key features of the Republic of Salò were ~~markedly~~ quite different from his regime between 1922 and 1943. Primarily, it had different ideals, a different level of violence and less control over itself. These factors all combine to make a very different government than the one he dictated from Rome.

The Republic of Salò held very different values compared to the previous government. While the core of fascism - right-wing populism - was present in both, its other ideals were markedly different. Salò's manifesto was more akin to Mussolini's original fascist program: staunchly atheist and anticlerical, anti-republican, having more in common with left-wing socialism rather than the right wing. This is a hard counter to the '22-'43 government that signed the Lateran Pact, made concessions to Catholic youth groups and returned the crucifix to schools. Furthermore, the RSI was a much more violent regime than the Kingdom of Italy. All 13 fascists that had overthrown Mussolini were sentenced to death if they were ever captured, Grandi was sentenced to death in absentia, Enea Ciano, one of Mussolini's in-laws, was safe. Not only that but the entire cabinet were made up of the oldest and most violent RAs from the Squadristi days. Finally, the regime had a lot

less power than the old one - not just over Italy but also over itself. The regime was set up explicitly on Hitler's command, as it was an elite German unit (led by Otto Skorzeny) that freed Mussolini from prison during the Gran Sasso raid. The RSI took part in the Holocaust mandating the transport of Italian Jews to Auschwitz. Their land was mostly occupied by German forces, with German command naming to kill 10 Italians for every 1 German soldier killed by partisans. While Mussolini had plans for the new values of the republic, Hitler never actually allowed him to put them into place ~~any of these ideas~~. For the most part, the Republic of Salò was more than a German puppet state. In contrast, the Pre-Salò government was entirely independent and made its own laws irrespective of Germany. In fact, the two were even militarily connected until 1939 - 17 years into Mussolini's tenure. With all of these factors considered, it is demonstrable why, in terms of violence, values and authority, the RSI was very different from Mussolini's Italy in 1922-1943.

However, it would not be a stretch to say that the core of this ideal got its start in the first regime. As previously mentioned, the ideals of the RSI are deeply connected to Mussolini's original fascist programme. As Mussolini gained power ~~over time~~ and popularity over time, these ~~ideals~~ ^{values} shifted, becoming more conservative and religious. However these beginning approaches were still present. While Mussolini did originally have an amenable relationship ~~in his early years~~ with the church in his early reign, this began to fall apart in the 30s, with the

the suppression of Catholic youth groups in violation of the Lateran Pact. The situation was only barely avoided by the death of the anti-fascist pope before he could release a letter publicly denouncing fascism. However, in a previous open letter titled "We have no need," the pope argued that fascism was "stealing children away from Christ" to "worship the pagan state". Here, we can see that even at its beginning, time in the first regime, fascism was against the church, supporting it only for political reasons. Additionally, while Germany may not have de jure controlled Italy until 1943, the foundation for it is present throughout the war. During Italy's invasion of Greece, the Italian army failed to conquer the Greek peninsula and were forced to call on the Wehrmacht for help, who managed to defeat Greece over the course of a few weeks. In Africa, when Italy failed to repel allied forces coming in from Egypt, they called on the German army and Erwin Rommel to help fight the Allies - the German force contributed significantly more to the North African campaign than the Italian force. Consistently, throughout the war, Italy was shown to play second fiddle to their northern neighbour, repeatedly relying on the German army to swoop in and perform damage control after an Italian failure. One could argue the satellite state of the RSI was merely an extension of that pattern - seeing Mussolini's failed defence of Italy. With all this in mind it is clear that there are at least some similarities between these two regimes, even if they don't outweigh their differences.

Pto →

In conclusion, while there are many similarities between the two regimes, (and some 'differences' that are extensions of key features from the previous government), the Republic of Salo's key features of heightened violence, opposing ideals and German subordination mean that it is very different at its core from the regime that came before it.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a top level 5 response. It has sustained analysis and very good knowledge deployed to support the argument which is fully focused on the concepts. The criteria for judgement are established from the start.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

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

Question 5

This was the least popular question on Option 2G.2. Overall, it produced some well-reasoned responses which fully investigated the significance of the fall of each city. They were able to draw parallels/comparisons and link the two events. Conclusions developed this 'weighing up' approach. However, in weaker responses, candidates failed to really consider the importance of Barcelona in relation to Madrid and the reasons why Franco had to pursue this route; the decisions he had been forced to make. The majority of responses lacked balance and a real understanding of the issues.

The fall of Barcelona, to some extent ~~was~~ could be argued to be more important than the fall of Madrid. This is because of the conflict between the left-wing increasing as the ~~the~~ Civil War progressed. Overall, ~~it is~~ it is without a doubt that the fall of Madrid was more vital to the outcome of the Spanish Civil War.

The fall of Barcelona was very important as it represented the final defense before Madrid was almost completely surrounded. It is also important as it shows the major issue with the Republican forces by the end of the Civil War. There was internal conflict between the radical socialists and communists that argued over when Social ~~Revolution~~ Collectivisation should occur. This created a weakened defense of the Republican forces, allowing for a Nationalist victory.

The reason this allowed for Nationalist victory was because it meant the Republicans weren't focused on the Civil War. However, it is inaccurate to say that the fall of Barcelona specifically was significant to the overall loss. Just that what the fall of Barcelona represented, which was the effect of the internal conflict, was significant to the Republican loss. Overall, though some may argue that the fall of Barcelona was significant in the overall result of the ~~entire~~ Civil War, it can clearly be seen that by this point, Republican loss was guaranteed. Their morale was at an all time low and the Republican side was already collapsing.

The fall of ~~Barcelona~~ Madrid, however, is far more impactful. This is because it represented the official government and was the figure head of Republican defense. There could not be Nationalist victory until Madrid was taken. Madrid had shown to hold strong.

for almost the entirety of the Civil War. Though it could be argued that this is due to France redirecting troops to Toledo, it is ~~an~~ important to consider the vigour of the Republican defense and morale. Under the constant barrage of Nationalist assault, Madrid held strong. However, by the time Madrid was taken, the internal conflict of the Republicans had led to a ~~a~~ small war between them in the walls of Madrid. Overall, the fall of Madrid was significant as it represented ~~to~~ the Nationalist victory of the Civil War. However, the Nationalists were already recognised as the official government and so it could be said it was only significant from a national perspective.

In conclusion, it is clear that the fall of Madrid had a much greater ~~in~~ impact ~~of the~~ on the result of the Civil War than the fall of Barcelona. Though the fall of Barcelona represented the start of physical internal

conflict on the Republican side, ~~the~~ the fall itself is not that important to the result of the Civil War. Losses of the Basque were far more impactful. However, it could be said that the fall of Barcelona tanked the morale of the Republican leaders, allowing for ~~infighting~~ ~~to~~ take over the capital. ~~This~~ The fall of ~~Barcelona~~ ^{Madrid}, however, represents the end of the Civil War and Nationalist victory. Though it could be said that Franco was recognised as the leader of Spain before the fall, it was the fall specifically that allowed for the complete control of Spain to ~~fall~~ come under the Nationalists.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is level 4 entry response. It has focus on the question and takes an analytical approach. However, there is a lack of depth in the knowledge used. It does try to develop some criteria for judgement, eg the argument Republican defeat was guaranteed by the fall of Barcelona.



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

Question 6

This was the most popular question on Option 2G.2. This question allowed candidates to display a thorough understanding of the years 1939-56 and the consequences of Franco's victory in the Civil War. There were some excellent responses that showed a thorough understanding of the role of the Falange and the extent to which Franco 'allowed' their domination initially, whilst considering other consequences such as the role of the Church and the lasting effects of such all-encompassing dominance. Candidates with some understanding of the consequence of Franco's victory in the Civil war were able to produce good or reasonable answers, whilst many well-prepared candidates, with a thorough understanding of events, explored a number of consequences before arriving at a well-supported and convincing judgement. The most effective responses showed a developed understanding of the impact of the Falange on Franco and the 'new state'. They considered influence as well as examples of policy. These responses were also careful in analysing the extent of Falange influence compared to other consequences of the 'new state'.

There were a number of answers that dismissed the influence of the Falange or dispensed with it in an opening paragraph. These responses then focused in much more detail on other aspects of the 'new state' before returning to a brief consideration of relative significance in the conclusion.

Lower scoring answers tended to ignore the role of the Falange completely, focusing on a description of other aspects of the 'new state'.

France had won the Civil War after the fall of Barcelona in 1939 and this allowed him to set up his dictatorship via many methods such as a new approach to the economy via autarky and corporatism ~~the~~ that led to consequences such as Franco having a cult of personality along with the Church joining back to the state as a consequence along with the complete return to traditional roles.

It is accurate to say that from ~~1939~~¹⁹³⁹ to 1956 the main consequence in the victory of the Spanish Civil War was the Falange's domination of the 'new state'. The Falange was the party Franco used to set up his government. Franco then passed the Law of Political Responsibilities in 1938 which in the formation of the new state allowed the Falange to execute, exile, ^{and} imprison or

anyone who previously supported the Republic, ultimately allowing them to drive out any opposition via very harsh methods. This allowed the Falange to dominate the 'new state' as people feared them ~~as~~ ~~so~~ to the point ~~most~~ around 200,000 fled the country to avoid being dominated and executed by the Falange. The Falange used similar methods like they had during the Civil War White Terror in which they encouraged the killing of any Republican supporters or sympathisers which resulted in 200,000 to 400,000 deaths alone. This meant by removing political opposition, the Falange would have no left wing political opposition and could completely dominate the ~~the~~ 'new state'. So the main consequence of the Civil War was the domination of the Falange in the new state as they removed political opposition and allowed for the formation of a one state party through fear; however the Falange started to lose influence and power once they completed their fear and terror.

It is ~~not~~ ^{more} accurate to say that the main consequence of victory for France in the Civil War was the new approach to the economy. Due to the Civil War a lot of agricultural and industrial production came to a complete stop along with in 1939 the start of the Second World War leading to a ~~lack~~ lack of world trade. Franco implemented two new policies in order to combat this, ~~Autarky~~ autarky and corporatism. Autarky is becoming a self sufficient economy and corporatism is when the workers have a say in policy making based on their employment. Corporatism in Spain forced workers to join a syndicate specific to their job and then this syndicate would speak on their behalf. This meant that ordinary people now had a stake in the government, ~~by~~ trying to to them. By staying self sufficient, Franco actually stayed neutral in the war and was rewarded with oil and loans from U.S and ~~the~~ Britain. This was the main consequence as it started out quite successful at first.

with ~~80%~~ of the only 5% of the GDP of Spain came from international trade which meant the other 95% was self sufficiency of Spanish workers and the economy. This meant that Spain did not have to rely on other countries and could stay within itself, however it stifled foreign investments, leading to a slight economic depression also being a consequence of the First World War and it was hard to rebuild from poverty. So, economic policies were the main consequences of the victory of the Spanish Civil War as it allowed for France to stay neutral allowing him to earn loans and oil in the era of the Second World War but also allowed for the country to become self sufficient in a time it was difficult to rebuild and trade.

~~The~~ It is more accurate to say that the main consequence of victory in the Civil War for France between 1939 and ~~the~~ 1956 ~~was~~ was the reestablishment of

power of the Church and state,
leading to more traditional gender roles.
France removed all anticlerical laws
and actually agreed to a concordat
with the Church in 1853 to
make Catholicism the main religion
of Spain again. This allowed for the
Catholic Church to gain power and
influence once again along with previously
introduced laws such as
the Criminal Code 1869 which lay
a framework for day to day life.
~~This allowed for~~ such as the
criminalising of extra marital affairs
along with the aim to domesticate
women once again. This meant that
Spain became much more traditional
and conservative after this in
consequence of the Church to
the point homosexuality was
illegalised in 1954 along with pornography,
cannabis and contraceptives, causing
a black market to form. This meant
that many who experienced the freedoms
of the left were placed back
into a choking right wing traditionalism.

and so that the Church highly promoted this to be in law. So, the unification between Church and State leading to a traditional lifestyle in Spain being enforced ~~was~~ was the main consequence of the victory of the Civil War for Franco as it removed all previous modern civil rights and liberties. The Church and Franco thought to be damaging and ~~damaging~~ to the name of a once previously conservative and traditional Spain that Franco felt he needed to return.

In conclusion, it is not accurate to say that the victory of the Spanish Civil War for Franco during 1939 → 1956 led to the main consequence being the Falange domination of the 'New State'. The Falange did dominate the state at some point with fear and terror but not until 1956 as at the start of the 1940's Franco combined the Falange with the Carlists to produce the Fet-Jos who were ultimately

just for show for the Government cabinet but Franco actually held all control which allowed for him to carry out more accurately main consequences of his victory, the Spanish Civil War such as his reintroduction of the Criminal Code 1869 that allowed him to traditionalise society and reintroduce the Church back as state religion that led to even further traditionalisation of Homosexuality, porn and contraception becoming illegal from 1954, that could be facilitated by the new autocratic economic policies that allowed for self sufficiency and so stopped production of untraditional goods, completely censored society. These were the main consequences as my lasted until Franco's death in 1975 but ~~the Falange domination of the new state only occurred~~ and kept developing whilst the Falange domination of the 'new state' ones occurred for a year or so until the Falange and Carlists were crushed.

into the Falange, which retained all their power. The Falange domination of the new state was a minor consequence in the aim to actually get up other methods to control the people. So it is not accurate to say that the domination of the Falange was the main consequence of the civil war as they did not last as long as other major consequences such as the suppression of the Church and the ~~B~~ retraditionalising of society via conservative methods of domesticated women and the illegalising of any modern products or ideas, which continued on ~~after~~ long after the Falange ~~so~~ had their little power removed and absorbed by France.



This response is sufficient to achieve level 5. It focuses on the importance of the Falange as the only political party and its role in the terror. It considers alternative consequences including autarky and the powerful influence of the Church. It is rather contradictory in its judgements, claiming initially that dominance of the Falange was the most significant consequence and later claiming that its consequence was minor, but it does engage with the issues and develop criteria for judgement.



When addressing the word 'main', plan your answer so that you are secure in your arguments.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should aim to draw out reasoned and developed inferences that go beyond comprehension and summary of the sources
- Candidates should read the caption carefully so that they can make full use of it when evaluating the sources
- Contextual knowledge should be used to illuminate and discuss what is in the source, rather than provide an answer to the enquiry. Long descriptions of linked events are unlikely to gain any credit
- Candidates should make use of the sources together at some point in the answer but are certainly not required to do this all the way through the answer.

Section B

- Candidates should not assume that every question will require a factor/other factors approach
- Candidates must provide precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses generally lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues rather than merely present a list of factors.

Grade boundaries

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

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

