

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2013

GCE History (6HI01)

Option E

The Expansion and Challenge of
Nationalism

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. 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 for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson. Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2013

Publications Code US036135

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

General Marking Guidance

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

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

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

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

GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

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

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

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

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

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

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

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

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

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

Unit 1: Generic Level Descriptors

Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)

(30 marks)

Essay - to present historical explanations and reach a judgement.

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

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

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

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

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

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

Unit 1 Assessment Grid

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

E1 The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-70

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>The question is focused on the attitude of the Catholic Church towards Italian nationalism in the years from the restoration Treaty of Vienna (1815) to the capture of Rome for the Kingdom of Italy in 1870.</p> <p>The conservative restoration (1815) of autocratic and foreign rule over the Italian peninsula was welcomed by the Catholic Church as both the religious arbiter of the majority of Italians and the secular ruler of the Papal States. The two foreign powers with interests in Italy remaining divided politically; Austria and France, were staunchly Catholic. Throughout the period to 1848 the Catholic Church supported the Metternich System throughout the Italian peninsula with clear antagonism to both nationalist and liberal ideas. However, during this period Gioberti developed a nationalist ideology of a federal Italy presided over by a Papal president which saw increased interest. Between the years 1831-46 Pope Gregory XVI maintained autocratic rule in the Papal States and refused to introduce any reforms which might spread nationalist ideas, such as freedom of the press and the building of railways. The election of the reformist 'Pio Nono', Pius IX, in 1846 led to increased hope for change leading to calls for reform in other parts of Italy. The Austrian reaction provoked an 'Italian' response which had the potential to lead to a 'war of independence', and did create the foundations of the 1848-49 revolutions, but Pius proved to be a moderate liberal at most and was unwilling to commit the Catholic Church to support any move towards Italian unity which threatened another Catholic State. The Allocution against Catholic participation in Piedmont's war against Austria began a reaction against a united Italy which was to continue well after 1870. With the French protecting the Pope after the short-lived Roman Republic of 1849, Pius published both the <i>Syllabus of Errors</i> (1864) and the doctrine of Papal Infallibility (1870, which together made it clear that the Catholic Church was unwilling to accept the forces behind the creation of the Kingdom of Italy. The Catholic Church remained opposed to a united Italy, excommunicating both the King and his government and decreeing that Catholics should not participate in the new state.</p> <p>Weaker responses may describe the attitude of the Catholic Church over the time period whereas higher Level answers will analyse the extent of change over time. For example, some responses may suggest that although the Church remained ostensibly opposed to nationalist ideas, there was an apparent softening in the 1840s which ultimately led to an even stronger reaction after 1849</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the changing attitude of the Catholic Church across the period, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus mainly on the attitude of Pope Pius IX. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate</p>	30

	material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	
--	---	--

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>The question is focused on the key events in the process of Italian unification in the years 1859-70 and requires the candidate to consider whether the defeat of Austria in 1859 was the most significant event.</p> <p>Candidates may refer to the following key events in establishing the significance of the 1859 defeat but are not required to refer to all of them and may use different events: the defeat as a consequence of the Pact of Plombieres (1858), the plebiscites of the Central Duchies (1859), Garibaldi's invasion of Sicily and Naples (1860), the meeting at Teano (October 1860), the creation of the Kingdom of Italy (1861), the union of Venetia to Italy (1866) and the occupation and incorporation of Rome (1870). Weaker responses may describe the process of unification over time with some reference to significance, but stronger responses will compare the relative significance of the Austrian defeat to other events. The defeat of Austria by the French at Solferino and Magenta in 1859 led to the armistice at Villafranca and the Treaty of Zurich which took Lombardy from Austria and gave it to Piedmont whilst ceding Nice and Savoy to the French. With diminished Austrian power in Italy and an extended Piedmont it can be argued that Austrian defeat began to kick-start the process of Italian unification. However, the Piedmontese failure to participate meaningfully in the war and the failure to secure control of the Austrian province of Venetia as well may lead to responses which suggest equally significant or more significant events. Some responses might suggest that it was not the defeat of Austria in 1859 but the armistice at Villafranca which was more significant.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the significance of the Austrian defeat and other relevant events, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on other events for example. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

E2 The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

Question Number	Indicative Content	Mark
3	<p>This question is focused on the forces underlying the process of German unification and the extent to which it was driven by Prussian economic policies.</p> <p>The German Confederation which emerged from the upheavals of 1848-52 was dominated politically by Austria and economically by Prussia. The political situation remained so until challenged by Prussia in 1863 but Prussian economic policies strengthened the <i>Zollverein</i> up to 1865. The defeat of Austria in 1866 virtually guaranteed a <i>Kleindeutsch</i> solution to German unification and resulted in Austrian withdrawal from Germany, a North German Confederation and the 'independence' of the south German states. Germany was finally unified as a Prussian dominated German Empire after the Franco-Prussian War in 1871. Candidate responses might suggest that Prussian economic policies contributed to this process with reference to the creation and growth of the <i>Zollverein</i>, and the subsequent exclusion of Austria, Prussian support for railway building across Germany, encouragement of industrial growth and investment in military technology. To establish extent responses may refer to alternative 'driving' forces such as Prussian political ambition, liberal-nationalism, war or Bismarckian diplomacy. Weaker response may describe the contribution of Prussian economic policies but stronger answers will explain the contribution to establish extent and at the highest level may refer to the contribution of different forces at different times or show how different forces were inter-related. For example, perhaps suggesting that whilst the establishment of the <i>Zollverein</i> and the railway system encouraged unity it required wars ('blood and iron') or diplomacy to achieve full unification.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the Prussian economic policies as a driving force in comparison to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and, even at this level, may focus mainly on the contribution of the <i>Zollverein</i>. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>The question is focused on the success with which Bismarck attempted to control the influence of political parties in the parliamentary system, created by the new constitution of the German Empire, from 1871 to his resignation as Chancellor in 1890. Weaker responses may describe Bismarck's relations with the different parties whilst responses at the higher levels may evaluate his</p>	30

success with reference to his initial aims and/or change over time.

A conservative, authoritarian by nature, Bismarck knew that he would have to work within the constitutional structure, not least because of the support given to his policies and actions by the nationalist-liberals in the unification process, but was determined to ensure that he would be able to govern without party interference. This was potentially achievable through the 'pressure group' nature of German political parties and the working of the constitution. With the resounding success of the National Liberals in the first elections, Bismarck appears to have hoped to create a working environment in which having a good share of conservative support he could capitalise on the nationalist elements in the National Liberal party. Combined with a nationalist policy of '*Kulturkampf*' to undermine Catholic politicians and anti-socialist, pro-social reform policies to undermine left-wing politics Bismarck was in a good position to 'control' the political parties. From 1871 to 76 his control of the National Liberals appeared to be relatively 'under control' with a growth in their popularity and Bismarck able to prevent the liberal element gaining ground. However, his attack on Catholicism as an 'enemy' of Germany was increasingly unsuccessful, with the Catholic Centre Party holding its electoral support throughout the period and gaining liberal sympathies. The effects of the 'Great Depression' of the 1870s forced Bismarck away from the National Liberals towards the more conservative industrial and agricultural elites and, although this was more in line with his political thinking, resulted in a less benign relationship with the conservative parties and forced him to appease the Centre Party with a withdrawal from *Kulturkampf*. After 1878 Bismarck was less in control of the political parties as a whole. The strength of the National Liberals (and liberalism) declined dramatically, apart from a brief resurgence in 1887, whilst the Centre Party support remained constant and the Socialist party, although affected by suppressive policies and in spite of social reforms, grew in support and eventually numbers. It was an argument over the introduction of permanent anti-Socialist laws which was the trigger for his forced resignation in 1890. Bismarck had control of a conservative, nationalist political system but his ability to control the political parties was less certain; he was not in control of his relationship with the Conservative, the National Liberals had lost their significance as mediators, the Centre Party had remained strong and the Social Democrats were rapidly gaining ground.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider Bismarck's success explicitly, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on Bismarck's failures with the *kulturkampf* and anti-Socialist measures. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>The question is focused on the reasons why Mussolini was able to achieve and consolidate power in Italy in the years 1919-25 and, in particular, the extent to which this was mainly due to weak political opposition. Weaker responses may describe the general rise in to power of Mussolini while higher Level responses will focus on both the achievement and consolidation of power, although not necessarily balanced.</p> <p>Between 1919 and 1922 Mussolini created a Fascist political movement and subsequently party (PNF) in opposition to both the ruling Liberal politicians and the growing power of the Socialists. Having been appointed in 1922 as the Prime Minister of a coalition government, by 1925 the Fascist Party was in control of parliament and Mussolini could declare himself 'dictator'. Candidates might support the statement with reference to the weaknesses of the Liberal politicians. The consequences of World War I, for example, economic problems and the 'mutilated victory', undermined the already fragile security of Liberal politics, allowing Mussolini to offer a 'strong' alternative to the weak coalition politicians. Ineffective policies and direct action against the Socialists allowed Mussolini to offer the Fascist <i>squadristi</i> as protection for the Italian upper/middle classes. The Socialists may have been growing in support but were unable to take advantage against <i>trasformismo</i> politics. Having turned down Giolitti's offer of coalition government, Mussolini was able to use the threat of the March on Rome in October 1922 to persuade the King to offer him the position of Prime Minister. Following on from this, the consolidation of power in the years 1922-25 was aided by Liberal politicians who were uncertain whether to contain Mussolini through coalition politics or to create a strong opposition. Fascist intimidation of political opponents became increasingly 'legalised' as a result and when the Socialist deputy Matteotti was murdered in June 1924 Mussolini's political opposition withdrew from parliament rather than force a confrontation.</p> <p>In order to establish the importance of the given factor candidates may refer to other enabling factors such as Mussolini's own leadership/opportunist skills, the growing support of the Italian public, the attitude of the Italian elites, particularly the King, the use of violence and intimidation and attitude of the Catholic Church after 1922. Some responses might suggest that it was not so much the weakness of his political opponents as the reaction of the Liberal state and the Italian elite to the strength of the Socialist opposition which allowed the rise from minority party leader to dictator.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the significance of weak political opposition and other relevant points, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on either the achievement or the consolidation period. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about</p>	30

	the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	
Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>The question is focused on Mussolini's foreign policy from 1922 to 1943 and the extent to which it was successful both before and after 1939.</p> <p>Mussolini's ambition was to make Italy 'great' both at home and abroad and, after the merger with the Nationalists in 1923, became increasingly nationalistic. Foreign policy aims and objectives included creating a 'new Roman Empire' through an increase in territorial borders and colonial conquest, participation in European and world diplomacy and the export of Fascism to other countries. Responses in support of the statement may refer to Mussolini's early success in earning some respect in the international community, for example, his attitude at the Treaties of Lausanne and Locarno, his direct action over the Corfu incident, gaining Fiume and his extension of Italian influence in Albania. In the 1930s Mussolini remained at the forefront of diplomacy with his moves to prevent Anschluss (1934), joining the Stresa Front (1935), switching support towards Nazi Germany in 1936 and 'brokering' the diplomacy during the Munich Crisis (1938). Italy also successfully invaded Ethiopia (1935-36) and supported the Nationalists in the Spanish Civil War. Early 1939 brought further success with the annexation of Albania and the Pact of Steel, but faltered when Mussolini felt that Italy was not able or ready to support Germany at the outbreak of World War II. On entering the War in 1940 Mussolini hoped to take advantage of the imminent French defeat and to extend Italian influence in North and East Africa, the Balkans, Greece and the Mediterranean. However, the intention was to make quick gains during the 'end-game' and the Italian military was not prepared for extensive campaigns; early difficulties in North Africa and Greece resulted in German intervention to save the situation, the Battle of Taranto (1940) destroyed Italian naval power in the Mediterranean and East Africa was lost by 1941. Once Allied forces took the initiative in North Africa in 1943 Sicily was captured and the mainland was invaded resulting in the complete failure of Mussolini's foreign ambitions for Italy.</p> <p>To establish balance responses may refer to the negative aspects of Mussolini's pre-1939 policies and actions. Despite gaining some prominence in the diplomatic negotiations of the 1920s Mussolini's bluster and belligerence during the Corfu incident and his self-promotion at Locarno caused some to question Italian ambitions. The 'successful' invasion of Ethiopia involved the use of poisoned gas, leading to League of Nations sanctions and the breakdown of relations with Britain and France, ultimately in favour of Germany. By allying with Germany, Italy was essentially a junior partner and Mussolini proved this by remaining neutral in 1939, the decision having been affected by the military and economic weaknesses highlighted by participation in the Spanish Civil War. Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the extent of success over the time period, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus mainly on the failures or on the 1930s. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance</p>	30

	<p>in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	
--	---	--

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>The question is focused on the Republican defeat in the Spanish Civil War (1936-39) and the extent to which this was due primarily to the internal political divisions from which it suffered. Most candidates will approach the question by reference to a variety of different causes for the defeat, alluding to both Republican weaknesses and Nationalist strengths. It is possible that some candidates might argue that the Republicans actually remained relatively strong throughout the War and that it was effectively the Nationalists who won the war; such answers should clearly be rewarded but there should be adequate coverage of the Republican position to access the higher band levels of the mark scheme.</p> <p>The Republicans began from a position of potential disunity as their forces were initially representing the coalition Popular Front government which was in turn resented by their potential allies on the radical left. Whilst attempting to fight the War, different political factions were also trying to implement their own political ideas and reforms which in turn led to political in-fighting, such as the confrontation between the POUM and the anarchist, for much of the autumn-spring 1936-37. The need for external support led to the rise of Soviet-sponsored Communists and after 4 days of internal fighting in Barcelona in May 1937 the Communists became the dominant force. This meant that, despite often strong defensive and offensive Republican military action, the Republicans were not united enough to take advantage of opportunities, such as the breakthrough of weak Nationalist lines in 1937, were disorganised and at times relied on Soviet influence which favoured the interest of the USSR over the Republic; above all it meant the failure to appoint a clear leadership. Further Republican weaknesses included the effects of 'non-interventionist' economic embargo and the relative ineffectiveness of its military leadership and officer corps. In contrast the Nationalists were relatively united, after the death of Mola, by the leadership of General Franco, in control of the agricultural regions of Spain, supported militarily by the Germans and Italians with little interference, helped economically by American companies willing to ignore the economic embargo and an effective military fighting force.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the contribution of internal political divisions to the defeat of the Republic, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on Republican weakness in general or Nationalist strengths. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p data-bbox="322 309 1385 405">The question is focused on the nature of Franco's rule over Spain in the years 1939-75 and asks the candidate to consider the extent to which it was brutal and repressive throughout this period.</p> <p data-bbox="322 443 1385 1317">Franco's rule is usually associated with a period of repressive, and often brutal, rule in the years to 1957, followed by a period of continued authoritarian rule but combined with more modernised economic policies, and consequently social attitudes, in the 1960s leading to a less overtly repressive regime. Following the Civil War the repression and brutality meted out in areas of Nationalist occupation was extended to the whole country. Franco used the conservative elites, particularly the Church, censorship and propaganda, and corporatism to repress dissenting voices and any potential opposition. The policy of the 'purification' of society was continued with both legal, and extra-legal means, intimidation and violence being used against those with any connection to the Republican movement, with over 200,000 executions. In the 1940s the country was also subject to highly conservative social policies which made women legally dependent on their male relatives/husbands and controlled social behaviour. However, towards the end of the 1950s having achieved control through a climate of fear, Franco's government appears to have attempted to maintain rule more by gaining the consent of the Spanish people through economic policies and political reform. In the 1960s Spain developed at tourist economy which brought economic stability for many and also more liberal social attitudes. Also Franco introduced a series of laws which allowed more political associations, less press censorship, some religious toleration and a degree of 'democratic' politics. From the late 1960s and up to Franco's death a resurgence of opposition from a variety of different groups, including radical priests, saw a return to more repressive policies against political opponents. It could also be noted that there was always a strong degree of popular consent from those who supported both Nationalist rule and/or Franco himself.</p> <p data-bbox="322 1355 1385 1659">Some candidates might suggest that, having used repression and brutality up until the late 1950s more diverse methods of rule were used in the 1960s so that by 1975 Franco was seen as more benevolent than ruthless; weaker responses may just assert that repressive rule existed until 1957 but that after this date Spain became more modernised. Others might suggest that, although repression and brutality seemed to become less overt during the time period, authoritarian and conservative rule was maintained throughout the period particularly in relation to political opposition and was underlined by the crackdown on dissent during the early 1970s.</p> <p data-bbox="322 1697 1385 2024">Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the accuracy of the suggestion that Franco's rule was brutal and repressive balanced against other methods of rule and/or in relation to change over time, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth while coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on examples of brutal and repressive policies. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and</p>	30

	there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. A Level 1 response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	
--	--	--

E5 Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
9	<p>The question is focused on a comparison of the nature of the political and economic development of both West and East Germany in the 1960s and 1970s and the extent to which the West was more stable than the East. Weaker responses might assume that the economic and political 'success' of West Germany was obvious whilst stronger answers may attempt to define 'stability' and refer to growing tensions in West Germany and the concept of the 'niche society' in East Germany to establish a comparison before reaching a judgement. At the higher Levels candidates should show awareness of both political and economic development but it is not expected that this will be balanced. Contextual references to the late 1940s and 1950s are relevant but the focus should be on the Germany in the 1960s and 1970s.</p> <p>On the surface the democratic constitution and the social market economy of West Germany seemed to have led to representative government and an 'economic miracle', while East Germany suffered from a centralised, repressive regime whose citizens had a lower standard of living compared to those in the West. However, the stability of both states was more complex. At the beginning of the 1960s West Germany was at the height of the 'miracle' with high growth rates, low inflation and low unemployment, so much so that many East Germans crossed the border to work or live, whilst the CDU/CSU party which had provided the leadership of Germany since 1949 was a majority party. West Germany was also becoming increasingly integrated into the wider international community. However, despite the obvious difference in living standards and political freedoms, from the mid-1960s onwards the stability of West Germany both economically and politically was less certain. Although a world economic power throughout the period, West German economic indicators began to falter in the mid-1960s and in the early 1970s a combination of social welfare expenditure and the 'oil crisis' led to problems. These economic issues coincided with, and in some ways, caused political tensions as well. The CDU/CSU lost its majority position at first to coalition governments and later to the Social Democrats. This reflected political disagreements which were growing, with student demonstration in 1968 and the rise of political terrorism, for example, the creation of the Red Army Faction. The politics of the past came back to haunt West Germany with the Israeli-Palestinian hostage crisis at the Munich Olympics (1972). Helmut Schmidt's government brought increased stability towards the end of the 1970s in both the economy (although temporary) and politics but there still remained tensions especially over green and nuclear issues. In East Germany the beginning of the 1960s brought increased tensions with an increase in economic emigration and growing resentment of a repressive government unable to provide the living standards of the West Germans. As the situation escalated Ulbricht's government constructed the Berlin Wall (1961) and closed down the border. Organised opposition did not emerge and during the 1960s the East</p>	30

	<p>German economy developed strongly in comparison to other Eastern bloc countries creating what has been termed a 'niche society' in which the East Germans accepted their situation. In the 1970s these economic trends continued under Honecker. However, this was achieved not only through economic policies but by the 'Stasi' system, which kept the population under surveillance. Mass opposition groups did not emerge but opposition did exist and Honecker's government relationship with the Protestant Church showed some need to compromise with potential outlets for repression. The Church would take the lead in many of the protests of the 1980s.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will make a comparison of the stability of the two states across the period, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on levels of economic success and political repression. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	
--	---	--

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
10	<p>The question is focused on the re-unification of Germany in the years 1989-91 and the reasons why it happened so rapidly.</p> <p>In East Germany between October and December 1989 the Honecker government fell, the Berlin Wall was opened and Communist rule came to an end. During the same period the West German Chancellor, Helmut Kohl, announced of his own initiative a 10-point plan to bring stability to the situation and to re-unite East and West Germany in a confederation. Despite the likelihood that Kohl's intention was to achieve this over several years, and that the reaction of both other European powers and the European Community was luke-warm, formal re-unification occurred within a year and the last vestiges of the Berlin Wall were dismantled in 1991. Once the SED withdrew from power events took place rapidly with the new moderate leadership declaring support for re-unification and the US clearly supportive. Free elections within East Germany took place in March 1990, currency unification occurred in July followed by the Soviet agreement to allow the East to join NATO, the Two-plus-Four Treaty (September) brought full international agreement to re-unification, the Unification Treaty between West and East was signed in August leading to the abolition of the East German state in October and the first all-German election to place in December with Helmut Kohl becoming Chancellor.</p> <p>Weaker responses may describe the process of re-unification whilst stronger answers will analyse with reference to a variety of reasons. Higher level band responses will evaluate the reasons with reference to the rapidity of the process. Candidates may suggest a variety of reasons including the role of Helmut Kohl (as initiator, driving force, mediator etc.), the weakness of the East German political system, the weakness and willingness of the Soviet</p>	30

	<p>leadership in coming to an agreement, the 'will' of the German people, the support of the US and the acceptance by Europe in the face of an economic recession.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will evaluate a variety of different reasons with regard to the rapid nature of re-unification, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus mainly on the role of Kohl. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	
--	--	--

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
11	<p>The question is focused on the reasons why the UN plan of 1947 failed to achieve a peaceful partition of Palestine in the year to 1949. Candidates may focus on an analysis of either events between November 1947 and 1949 and/or on the long-term influences and short-term causes of the failure of the UN partition plan but higher band level responses will clearly address the consequences of the partition plan itself.</p> <p>Post-war, the British mandated territory of Palestine saw growing tensions between its Palestinian Arab and Jewish populations with increased Jewish immigration, the growth of Zionism (strongly supported by groups in the USA) and acts of terrorism against British rule. In 1947 the British sought the advice of the UN which set up a special committee (UNSCOP) to investigate the situation. UNSCOP recommended a solution in the form of a partition plan which they hoped would create Arab-Jewish co-operation rather than further division. This was passed by the UN General Assembly in November 1947. The plan recommended the creation of both an Arab and Jewish state based on proportionate land ownership and population with 'kissing points' where such territory met and international control of Jerusalem. The Jewish Agency accepted the plan despite worries about control of Jerusalem, but the Arab Higher Committee rejected it as it gave more territory to the Jews than had previously been planned. This led to immediate unrest and, in December, unwilling to deal with the situation any more, the British announced their intention to withdraw from Palestine in May 1948. During the next six months a state of civil war existed in Palestine. Despite support from neighbouring Arab states many Palestinian Arabs left in March-April 1948. Jewish groups conceived and implemented Plan D which was designed to take military advantage of the coming British withdrawal and expel as many Arabs as possible, by force if necessary. In particular, fighting was heavy in and around Jerusalem resulting in numerous atrocities on both sides; during this period 300,000 Arabs left Palestine. On May 14th 1948 the British withdrew from Palestine leading to the immediate proclamation of the creation of a new state of Israel in Jewish occupied territory and at midnight the first Arab-Israeli conflict began. After a relatively short conflict, armistice agreements were signed which created a demarcation or 'Green line' between both sides and which encompassed more land under Jewish control than had been envisaged by the UN plan.</p> <p>Strong responses may suggest that the short-term failure of the plan was directly related to longer term issues surrounding Arab-Jewish relations, including promises made to both sides during World War I, and the governance of Palestine after World War II (mentioned above). Short-term reasons might include perceived US/UN bias towards the Jews by the Arabs, more land being designated to the new Jewish state, the decision of the British to withdraw in the face of continued tensions and attacks on its own troops, the potential problems of the 'kissing points' and the importance of Jerusalem to both sides. Responses might suggest that the plan did little to alleviate the situation which the UN had been called upon to solve in the first place and made the existing situation worse leading to civil war, the declaration of Israeli independence and war between Israel and the Arab states.</p>	30

	<p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the relative importance of the reasons for the failure of the UN plan to achieve a peaceful partition, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on long-term reasons rather than short-term reasons, for example. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive of the consequences of the plan and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	
--	--	--

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
12	<p>The question is focused on Islamist politics in the Middle East and Gulf regions after 1979 and requires an analysis, and evaluation of, the role of the Iranian Revolution on its growth.</p> <p>Some candidates might suggest that the Iranian revolution was pivotal to the growth of Islamist politics whilst other responses might suggest that despite potentially undermining the whole of the Arab secular world in the 1980s other factors determined that Islamist politics would not support state creation but the spread of Islamist ideas through a political religious <i>jihad</i>. Most candidates will probably compare the relative significance of the Iranian Revolution to other general and specific factors.</p> <p>Islamist politics was part of a religious revival which began in the Middle East and Gulf regions after the 1967 Arab-Israeli conflict and the growing tensions caused by the Palestinian 'problem'. The perceived betrayal of some Arab secular leaders in their search for a negotiated settlement with Israel only fuelled this revival. In 1979 the Iranian Revolution replaced the secular Shah of Iran with an Islamist government ambitious to spread Islamist politics; this also coincided with the <i>mujahideen</i> (Islamist guerrilla groups) resistance to Soviet controlled rule in Afghanistan. As a non-Arab, Shiite majority country, the revolution in Iran was unlikely to lead to widespread political revolution in the Sunni majority Arab states but, nevertheless, encouraged and directly influenced Islamist groups (Hamas; Hizbollah), and led to the Iran-Iraq war. The revolution proved that an Islamist state was possible to achieve and appealed to those who felt that foreign influence was too great in the region. The Iran-Iraq war ended in stalemate but increased foreign influence even further in the region and contributed to the events leading to the conflicts in the Gulf region in 1990-91. The secular Arab states remained mainly resistant to Islamist influence and Islamist politics became focused on the guerrilla-style <i>jihad</i> which had been developed in Afghanistan, in particular, Osama bin Laden led al-Qaida. Their aim was not to create Islamist states on the model of Iran but to spread Islamist beliefs through the Arab Muslim world and to wage a global war of terrorism on the enemies of Islamist politics. Islamist politics also began to flourish during the <i>Intifadas</i> (1987-93, 2000) in the Palestinian territories as groups like Hamas gained in prominence as many Palestinian grew tired of</p>	30

	<p>protracted 'peace' negotiations with Israel. Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the significance of the Iranian Revolution and other relevant points, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on the beginning or end of the period. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	
--	---	--

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US036135 Summer 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit our website
www.edexcel.com

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

