

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report June 2010

### GCE History 6HI01E

**ResultsPlus**  
look forward to better exam results  
[www.resultsplus.org.uk](http://www.resultsplus.org.uk)

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com). If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034

## ResultsPlus

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online tool that offers teachers unrivalled insight into exam performance.

You can use this valuable service to see how your students performed according to a range of criteria - at cohort, class or individual student level.

- Question-by-question exam analysis
- Skills maps linking exam performance back to areas of the specification
- Downloadable exam papers, mark schemes and examiner reports
- Comparisons to national performance

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus).

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2010

Publications Code US024069

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## Introduction

Once again the current cohort of candidates were generally well prepared, answered two questions without apparently experiencing difficulties with timing, and made a genuine attempt to engage with the question. However, it was noticeable that even well prepared candidates underachieved due to an increase in formulaic answers which did not directly address the specific question asked or show explicit understanding of the key issues. The comments below are intended to encourage both centres and future candidates to improve on past performance.

An important issue which was raised by many examiners this year concerns candidate interpretation of the questions set. Many candidates appear to believe that all the questions on the paper require them to consider the importance of a given factor in relation to a number of other factors. It is important that centres impress on future candidates that this is not the case; if it were, it would reduce the examination to a simple formula. The mark scheme requires an essay to 'present historical explanations and reach a judgement' and this is achieved through a variety of different question stems such as 'to what extent', 'how accurate', 'how far', 'how significant' and 'why'. Although the majority of questions require an analysis of relative importance not all of the questions do. Questions requiring the candidate to analyse relative importance are indicated through the use of trigger words such as 'main reason', 'key factor', 'primary reason', 'due to', 'responsible for' and 'explain'. Questions which do not refer to relative importance require a balanced answer with a counter-argument giving reasons for and against the given statement/factor. Questions which refer to 'significance' or 'importance' can often be addressed using either approach whilst 'why' questions do not require a counter-argument (although this is often present in higher Level answers) but an overall judgement of the different reasons put forward.

The following examples indicate how some students underperformed by misinterpreting the question set:

Question A13: 'How accurate is it to say that Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck were both serious threats to Henry VII's security?' Some saw this as an invitation to deal briefly with the two pretenders before considering other threats to the king's security, including the nobility, the Yorkist rump and the taxation rebellions.

Question A14 : 'How far did Henry VII's financial policies strengthen the power of the monarchy?'. Many candidates wrote about other ways in which the monarchy was strengthened.

Question D7: 'How successful were the Five-Year Plans in transforming Russian industry in the years 1928-41?' Many dismissed the plans briefly before investigating the role of terror and the purges in transforming industry.

Most candidates produced a readable answer with, at the least, some historical knowledge and, at best, a sophisticated analysis. The analytical and evaluative answers at high Level 4 and Level 5 were impressive for their breadth and depth of knowledge, and by their sharp focus on the question. However, a significant number of answers were less directly targeted on the question; these seemed to be answering practice questions, or were a prepared response. As always, there is evidence that candidates were not answering questions on the current paper, but those on the previous one. This often leads to responses which 'relate well to the focus' (Level 4) but not 'direct focus' (Level 5) e.g. in Option E/F Question 5 candidates often referred to Mussolini's rise to power rather than growing support for the Italian Fascist Party. Now that there are ten sample questions for each option (the four examination papers plus the sample questions) centres might consider it appropriate not to use the most recently asked questions in trial examinations.

A lack of both general and detailed chronological awareness is a growing concern. The importance of covering the timescale in the question is still a discriminating factor between candidates, and is dealt with in the reports on various questions. Candidates do need to be aware of the importance of key dates in the topics studied and, quite simply, the order in which events took place. A failure to understand why the dates in the question have been used led to a significant number of candidates failing to cover the whole period set, and thus to miss out some key events or developments, or referring to the wrong time period altogether.

Perhaps the most significant discriminator between different answers was the range and quality of supporting information. It is impossible for a candidate to frame an analytical response if the evidence offered in that answer is lacking in depth of development or is not directly relevant to the question. The generic mark scheme makes clear that progression through levels depends on the answer displaying two linked qualities; the strength of the explanation or analysis offered, and the range and depth of accurate and relevant material.

Examiners are required to reach a judgement on the quality of communication before awarding their final mark; it is an integral part of the mark scheme. Future candidates should be reminded that slang and argot have no place in an AS History answer; that spelling, punctuation and grammar may influence the quality of their argument; that it is worth learning how to spell the historical terms used in the topics studied; and that abbreviations, and the absence of capital letters, should remain in the realm of text messaging. It is also important to use correct terms when referring to people of different races and cultures.

## Option E

In general, centres prepare candidates in Option E very well indeed. Most candidates provide sound factual knowledge with secure chronological awareness and many are able to combine this with the clear analytical approach required at the higher Levels of the mark scheme. Examiners comment on the quality of written communication and depth of knowledge of many of the candidates, particularly in Topics E1 and E2 (although a significant number of candidates who do both these topics seem to confuse the years in which Cavour and Bismarck were appointed). However, in this examination session there were many well-prepared candidates who were unable to access high-band Level 4 or Level 5 because of a failure to focus directly on the question set. As suggested in the general comments, many candidates wrote responses which seemed to be pre-prepared or were more suited to previous examination questions. It is important that candidates are aware of the need to focus on the key words, phrases and dates in the question set rather than write responses with detailed knowledge but generalised analysis of concepts related to the Topic.

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

This is a popular topic and the responses were evenly balanced between Q.1 and Q.2. Candidates are very well prepared with both detailed factual knowledge and a good understanding of the 'big questions' involved in the process of unification.

Q.1. Most candidates were aware of the need to select relevant material appropriately considering the lengthy time period and number of revolutionary outbreaks involved but were not always able to deploy the material effectively. Some candidates followed a narrative commentary whilst others chose to analyse the failures using a variety of different factors. Good time management was vital in both cases with some narrative commentaries failing to reach the 1848-9 period and more analytical responses failing to provide appropriate accurate supporting evidence. A significant number of responses were able to generalise about the strength of Austria but were surprisingly lacking in support with little specific reference to Metternich, Laibach, Troppau or the events of 1848-9. There was also much evidence of candidates writing responses which, although adequately dealt with the failures of the revolutionaries, seemed pre-prepared about obstacles to unification rather than directly focused on the responsibility of Austria. The best responses were able to identify the strength of Austrian power throughout the period and to compare this to other external factors and internal weaknesses using specific, relevant factual supporting evidence. Some candidates suggested in the conclusion that Austrian interference during the period ultimately created the seeds for the eventual unification of Italy in the decades after 1849.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .  
 If you change your mind, put a line through the box   
 and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12 |

(This page is for your first answer.)

Austria responsible for failure of Italian revolutionaries in years 1820-49.

- Austria - Metternich - main enemy. Vienna 1815.
  - Military intervention 1820, 1831 + 48-9
  - N.S.P.      <sup>War on Austria.</sup>
- Divided aims of revolutionaries
  - Secret Societies

Many attempts at revolution by Italian revolutionaries took place in the years 1820-49, after the restored monarchs restoration of the restored monarchs and with them absolute rule in 1815 through the Vienna Settlement. A clear reason for the failure of the revolutionaries is the role of Austria and Metternich's constant military intervention to crush the <sup>Italian</sup> revolutionaries, however other reasons such as the divided aims of the revolutionaries <sup>and role of other powers</sup> do hold some responsibility.

It is clear that Austria was responsible to some extent for the failure of Italian revolutionaries in the years.

(This page is for your first answer.) Indeed it is a well known fact that Metternich, the Austrian chief minister considered himself the sworn enemy of revolutionary activity. Through the Troppau Doctrine in 1820, initiated by Austria, it was agreed amongst the Great Powers that military force would be used if necessary to restore any overthrown government in Europe, showing Metternich's clear intent to crush the aims of Italian revolutionaries.

~~In the 8~~ This was put into action by Austria in 1821, when, ~~the revolutionaries~~ after the initial success of revolutionaries in Naples and Sicily, Austria <sup>deemed</sup> ~~realised that~~ this was unacceptable and used military force to crush the revolutionary governments in 1821. Furthermore, in the 1831 revolts in the papal st Naples <sup>with the help</sup> ~~managed~~ of Metternich and Austria, Ferdinand was able to re-establish autocratic rule in Naples and therefore ~~again~~ <sup>firmly</sup> reunite Sicily with Naples. Again, in the 1831 revolution in the Central Duchy of Modena, led by Italian patriot and academic Giuseppe Mazzini, it was Austria that the ~~war~~ leader Francesco appealed to and Austria that eventually crushed the revolutionary government that had been set up. Austria was a significant military power in Europe and its conservative nature meant that revolutionaries realised that unification or even <sup>liberal</sup> reforms, could not be achieved without a power such as France to counterbalance that of Austria. Even in times of war such as

(This page is for your first answer.) In 1848 when Charles Albert accepted revolutionary demands from Lombardy and Venetia, in an attempt to annex Lombardy, declares war on Austria, even with the help from troops ~~with~~ <sup>from</sup> Pope and from Naples and Sicily from Papal States, it became clear that the military strength of Austria was almost invincible, with the crushing defeat of Piedmont at Custoza in 1848 and Novara in 1849. Indeed this victory of Austria over revolutionary aims completely humiliated Piedmont and left Charles Albert having to abdicate, showing that clearly the role of Austria was very responsible for crushing both the aims and the actions of Italian revolutionaries.

However, there is some evidence that suggests that it was not the force or role of Austria that prevented the success of Italian revolutionaries. Indeed, in fact it could be argued that other powers were more responsible, however this does not seem a completely convincing view. Although intervention of Austria did directly cause failure, it was not without the appeals to Austria by rulers of other Italian states, such as Ferdinand in 1821 and Francesco in 1831, that led to the intervention, putting some responsibility on these rulers. Indeed in the ~~1848~~ <sup>second</sup> revolts in Naples and Sicily, it was Ferdinand who used Neapolitan force to overcome the revolutionaries, bombarding the city, earning him the nickname 'King

(This page is for your first answer.) Bombas. Also the fall of the Roman Republic in ~~March~~ June 1849, after only 100 days of Mazzini's power, it was France and Napoleon III who crushed the Republic, sending 20,000 French troops in, and rendering the gallant efforts of Garibaldi and his troops hopeless. Therefore this ~~was~~ ~~also~~ revolutionary failure was due to Napoleon III's attempt to win Catholic support in Europe, and not the ~~main~~ role of Austria.

It could also be argued that although Austria was partly responsible for the failure of the ~~the~~ Italian revolutions, it could in fact be the divided aims of the revolutionaries themselves that partly contributed to the ~~the~~ overall failure. It is clear that the revolutionaries were severely limited by their localism, with the insurrections being regional rather than national.

This is clear from the fact that revolutionaries in Bologna refused to give help to Modena in 1831. Indeed the revolution in Modena, led by patriot Giuseppe Mazzini had the clear aim of destruction of Austrian influence and the eventual unification of Italy - he even reported this to his ruler Francesco, however the revolutionaries in the Papal States were uprisings against the ~~the~~ oppressive rule of Church authority, ~~the~~ and not in any way national demands, showing the limitations of the revolutionaries and the divided aims of <sup>the different</sup> ~~them~~ localities.

(This page is for your first answer.) The Secret Societies ~~in~~ throughout the revolutions ~~in~~ in the years 1820-49, although seen as a major influence for ~~providing~~ ~~unlike~~ the views of many Italian citizens, were mainly limited to the professional and middle classes. The peasants who made up 80-90% of the Italian population had no real wish for unity and remained unaffected by the revolutionaries' aims. The motivation for peasants was economic rather than political. The secret societies were also divided in their aims, with the Carbonari, making up 60,000 people and 5% of the adult male population, having mild aims in Piedmont such as a constitutional monarchy. Other societies such as Italian Federation wanted a federal state headed by Pope. A "Young Italy" founded 1831 wanted the revolution and a ~~total~~ aim of a republic. This meant that no one individual ruler - Mazzini, Pope or Charles Albert was acceptable to all. Indeed for many, Mazzini's aims for a "brotherhood of people" were far too radical and anti-clerical to rouse mass support.

Therefore, it seems ~~clear~~ clear that the role of Austria holds direct responsibility for the failure of the Italian revolutionaries in the years 1820-49, crushing both the aims and successful actions of them, however it would not be right to consider Austria wholly responsible, as other contributing factors such as role of France, ~~and~~ the

(This page is for your first answer.) Bombard: Also the pillar of the Roman Republic in March June 1849, after only 100 days of Mazzinian power, it was France and Napoleon III who crushed the Republic, sending 20,000 French troops in, and ~~ending~~ rendering the gallant efforts Garibaldi and his troops hopeless. Therefore this ~~was~~ ~~also~~ revolutionary failure was due to Napoleon III's attempt to win Catholic support in Europe, and not the ~~main~~ role of Austria.

It could also be argued that although Austria was partly responsible for the failure of the ~~the~~ Italian revolutionaries, it could in fact be the divided aims of the revolutionaries themselves that partly contributed to the ~~the~~ eventual failure. It is clear that the revolutionaries were severely limited by their localism, with the insurrections being regional rather than national. This is clear from the fact that revolutionaries in Bologna refused to give help to Modena in 1831. Indeed the revolution in Modena, led by patriot Francesco Melzi, had the clear aim of destruction of Austrian influence and the eventual unification of Italy; he even revealed this to his ruler Francesco, however the revolutionaries in the Papal States were uprisings against the oppressive rule of Church authority, ~~there~~ and not in any way national demands, showing the limitations of the revolutionaries and the divided aims of ~~them~~ <sup>the different</sup> localities.

(This page is for your first answer.) *divided aims of the revolutionaries  
and the lack of mass support meant that the  
failure of the Italian revolutionaries seemed somewhat  
inevitable.*

Q.2 produced some very interesting and well-reasoned responses with examiners commenting on the many thoughtful responses which engaged well with the question asked. Once again candidates tended to approach the question either through a narrative commentary or through a more analytical thematic approach addressing the territorial, political, economic, social and cultural unity of Italy during the period. Those who provided a narrative commentary were often very effective but many were unable to manage their time to reach 1861 or produced pure narrative. In some cases chronological knowledge proved to be very insecure with the period between Garibaldi's success in Naples and the meeting at Teano particularly weak. There also appears to be some confusion as to where and when the different plebiscites were held. There were, however, some excellent answers which clearly showed the territorial consolidation within the Italian peninsula during the period but questioning the 'nationalism' behind it and the extent of political, economic and cultural unity.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .  
If you change your mind, put a line through the box   
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your first answer.)

The period 1851 to 1861 involved several key political changes to the complexion of the Italian peninsula, arguably resulting in greater unity, yet the accomplishment of a single unitary Kingdom of Italy, although seeming to indicate greater Italian unity, ~~was~~<sup>was</sup> subverted by factors which indicate that the peninsula was still relatively divided, including the existence of the Papal States in 1861, the 'Italia Irredenta' which was still under Austrian control and the cession of Nice and Savoy in the Treaty of Turin in March 1860 which undermined Italian unity in the perspective of many Italian nationalists like ~~the~~<sup>non</sup> Garibaldi. Moreover, regional and economic differences still remained after the political changes and there were cultural factors which subverted the concept of Italian nationhood. Thus the process of greater unification ~~in~~<sup>from</sup> 1851 to 1861 including the 1859 War, the subsequent events in the Duchies and Garibaldi's intervention may not be entirely conducive of ~~the~~<sup>the</sup> fulfillment of substantial national

(This page is for your first answer.) <sup>unity.</sup>

During the 1850s, Italy became arguably ~~more~~ unified due to the role of Camillo Cavour, the Prime Minister of Piedmont-Sardinia. Through free trade agreements with powerful trading partners such as the Zollverein and Austria, he managed to cement the rise of the "Historic Right" in Piedmont, an alliance between royalist bureaucrats and liberal landowners who believed that free trade would be beneficial for them and thus supported greater unity to ~~abolish~~ <sup>get rid of</sup> the Austrian tariff barriers. Thus, there was some sense of a unity of purpose in the North, a creation of a movement with substantial support to create greater unity, supplemented by the establishment of the "National Society" in 1856, illustrating an economic unity developing earlier than 1861 which aids the notion that greater unity was achieved in Italy.

However, considerable changes came with the ~~the~~ foreign developments such as the Crimean War which isolated Austria and allowed for Cavour and Napoleon III to have a valuable and informal relationship, leading to the Plombières Pact in 1858. ~~which~~ Despite this, in the 1859 War, the victories at Magenta on June 4th and at Solferino on June 24th only led to an armistice

(This page is for your first answer.) at Villafranca on July 8th, including the cession of only Lombardy rather than Lombardy and the Venetia and the revision of central Italy. Although the Plombières Pact was not entirely fulfilled Italy did become more unified by gaining Lombardy in 1859, and the war itself led to liberal revolts in Tuscany, Modena and Parma. These revolts, allured for greater Italian unity because Bettino Ricasoli and Luigi Farini, with the help of Victor Emmanuel II, campaigned for the Duchies' incorporation into Piedmont-Sardinia ~~the~~ bribed key influential figures and organised plebiscites. The plebiscites were in favour of ~~unified~~ incorporation and <sup>eventual</sup> this process was aided by Cavour gaining the consent of Napoleon III at the Treaty of Turin in 1860 in return for Nice and Savoy. Thus the <sup>North</sup> extension of Piedmont-Sardinia to include Lombardy, Tuscany, Parma ~~and~~ Modena and the Romagna was a clear step towards greater unity in Italy.

Italy ~~was~~ achieved even further unity in the years 1851 ~~and~~ 1861 due to the intervention of Garibaldi ~~in~~ the Kingdom of Naples-Sicily in 1860. After defeating King Francis II at Volturro in October, Garibaldi handed over the kingdom to Victor Emmanuel II, thus establishing the Kingdom of Italy. This highlights an

(This page is for your first answer.) ostensible alteration in the political structure of Italy during the years 1851 to 1861 and one clearly of greater unity.

However, during this period there were several factors which undermined national unity. Firstly, by incorporating the Duchies, Cavour had to cede Nice and Savoy in the Treaty of Turin, thus arguably Cavour actively undermined Italian unity ~~in a~~ view held by Garibaldi who was born in Nice and believed that it ~~was part~~ should be part of a single unitary Italian state. Moreover, through allying with Napoleon III, Victor Emmanuel II and Cavour had to respect the position of the Papacy as Napoleon III was, in a sense bound by public opinion ~~of~~ Roman Catholic conservatives in France to protect the Pope. Thus, when Cavour sent troops to ~~intervene~~ stop Garibaldi in 1860 Piedmont-Sardinia only seized control of the Marches, leaving the rest of the Papal States to continue ~~existing~~, so ~~the~~ Italy's unity in the years 1851 to 1861 was subverted by the Church and Napoleon III. In addition, despite ~~the~~ gain gaining Lombardy, the Venetia and the "Italia Irredenta" still remained under Austrian control, thus ~~despite~~ although ~~the~~ ~~fact~~ greater Italian unity had been achieved in some ways, there were still territories ~~that~~ which

(This page is for your first answer.) were not conquered by Piedmont during this period.

Moreover, these substantial political changes did not necessarily result in a more unified Italy. ~~The~~ By 1861, there were still key regional and economic differences between different Italian regions, illustrated by the devastating effect of free trade on the southern economy during the 'Piedmontisation' process. Furthermore there was a constant fear of secession, highlighted through the Brigands War of 1860-1866 and the grist tax riots of 1868, thus undermining the idea of greater Italian national consciousness in the years 1851-1861. This inadequate form of nationalism is emphasised by the lack of a common language, as Italian was only spoken by 2-5% of the population, therefore despite the cultural nationalism developed through Italian arts, illustrated by William Tell by Rossini in <sup>the</sup> 1829 and Nabucco by Verdi in 1842, Italy had been conquered by Piedmont and many Italians had no sense of belonging to a nation. Also the economic advances made by Garibaldi increased the national debt from 12 million in 1847 to around 725 million lire in 1859, <sup>around</sup> which <sup>was</sup> undermined unity as it imposed costs on the Italian population which divided

(This page is for your first answer.) *the peninsula.*

Thus despite the numerous political changes which led to the formation of a "kingdom of Italy", the unification process was undermined by the existence of territories claimed by Italian nationalists which were not gained during this period and the extent of division in Italy which made the unitary state unstable. Therefore the ~~unified~~ supposed unity was not a unity of a mass movement for Italian unification or Italian nationhood, merely the actions of a conquering <sup>the concept of</sup> power, Piedmont-Sardinia.

**Topic E2 - The Unification of Germany, 1848-90**

This is a popular topic with the majority of candidates being well-prepared. However, the overwhelming popularity of Q.3 and the quality of the responses to Q.4 would suggest that the candidates are less secure in their knowledge of the period 1871-90 which is covered in the fourth bullet point of the specification. Candidates should be encouraged to revise adequately for questions covering the whole time period.

Q.3 was by far the most popular question. Many candidates were well-prepared in terms of factual knowledge, chronological security and understanding of the process by which Prussia became the dominant state. However, this question, in particular, seemed to suffer from a failure to focus directly on the question asked and many responses achieved high Level 3 or low-secure Level 4 as a result. Many responses took economic factors to mean exclusively the role of the Zollverein (too many candidates believe that it was created by Bismarck), the focus of a previous question, or interpreted the question as being about the process of unification rather than reasons for Prussian dominance. Some candidates took a narrative commentary approach which, although at its best allowed candidates to analyse the emergence of Prussia from the 'false start' of 1848-52 to dominance over the German Empire in 1871, resulted in many being unable to cover the time period involved. The best answers were able to discuss the role of economic factors in comparison to the political, military and international advancement of Prussia and the growing weakness of Austria with some candidates able to manipulate the various historical debates surrounding the Bismarckian concept of 'blood and iron' to considerable effect.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .  
If you change your mind, put a line through the box   
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12 |

(This page is for your first answer.) The 1848 revolutions that had occurred throughout Europe had ~~ensured~~<sup>ensured</sup> that Prussia would surpass Austria as the ~~kingdom~~<sup>kingdom</sup> foremost and most powerful state of the ~~German Confederation~~<sup>German Confederation</sup>. The developments of the Industrial revolution ~~of~~<sup>of</sup> the middle ~~of~~<sup>of</sup> the 19<sup>th</sup> century meant that industrialisation and economic dominance were the keys to political power. The creation of the dominant Prussian customs union in 1818, furthered by the ascendancy of the Zollverein, allowed a move of Prussian policy to one of free trade and expansionism. The Zollverein allowed Prussia to ~~expand~~<sup>expand</sup> vastly expand its industry, agriculture, transport and navigation, amongst other things. In contrast, the Austrian Empire was always isolated ~~due to~~<sup>due to</sup> its policy of protectionism and lost large German trade as a result. Its key waterway of the Danube, for example, suggested ~~due to~~<sup>substantially such</sup> due to Austrian policies, and lost commercial opportunities and trade to the Rhine ~~and~~<sup>and</sup> North sea ports of Prussia. The Seehandlung, or overseas trade corporation, granted Prussia control over trade routes ~~inland~~<sup>inland</sup> inland waterways, such as those on the rivers Elbe and Oder. ~~It~~<sup>It</sup> It also operated steamships and owned numerous textile mills, engineering plants and chemical industry that further aided Prussian ~~development~~<sup>development</sup>.

(This page is for your first answer.) economic dominance. <sup>Also</sup> ↑ The Realschule of the 1850s developed into a ~~(factory)~~ model <sup>for</sup> technical schools throughout Europe. Therefore by the early 1860's this economic dominance also ensured political domination ~~(factory)~~ of the German confederation, and this would be the first step towards the establishment of the North German Confederation of 1866 and the German second Reich in 1871. ~~(factory)~~ Prussian army and military also ~~(factory)~~ developed considerably as a result of the increased outcome. The ~~(factory)~~ Confederation railway system also centred on the Prussian capital of Berlin. Additionally, ~~(factory)~~ from the 1850s to the 1870s Prussia was almost on par with the UK and France in steel and Pig Iron production. The effects of this economic dominance were seen in Prussia's victories in the ~~(factory)~~ wars with Denmark (1864) and Austria (1866), in which Prussia incorporated vast territories including Hannover, Hesse-Cassel, Schleswig-Holstein and Nassau, and this generated additional financial income. Alsace-Lorraine <sup>seized during the Franco-Prussian war of 1870</sup> provided vast Iron ore reserves, that further helped develop the Prussian military and economy. By 1871, Prussia was ~~(factory)~~ not only the dominant power in ~~(factory)~~ Germany, but in mainland Europe itself.



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The response has some understanding of the focus of the question, attempts analysis and selects some relevant supporting material but the essay lacks depth, organisation and a paragraphed structure.

Q.4 was answered by relatively few candidates. Those candidates who were secure in their knowledge of the period were able to produce succinct responses clearly showing the methods used against the socialists, the counter-policy of social welfare and an awareness of the role of anti-socialist legislation in Bismarck's downfall. However, there were a significant number of responses which were only able to access low Level 3 due to a generalised understanding of Bismarck's anti-socialist legislation and social welfare reforms or Level 2 due to a lack of accurate knowledge (candidates confused the attack on socialists with Kulturkampf and some even suggested that 'attempts to undermine the socialists' was a factor in the process of unification concluding the response in 1871).

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

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12

(This page is for your second answer.)

Bismarck - successful - undermined socialism 1871-90.

AIMS  
SUCCESSSES - state socialism  
FAILURES - ~~see - underground~~ - ~~Wittum II.~~ BSL passed 78.

Otto von Bismarck, Prussian Prime Minister from 1862-1890, although in 1871 aligned himself with the National Liberals, rejected these in 1879 to join forces with the Conservatives and Centre parties in his clear intent to ally himself against an even more threatening enemy, other than the Catholic Church - socialism. Having risen in Germany from 1870's onwards, with the Social Democratic Party forming in 1875, Bismarck considered them a major threat with their determination to wage class warfare and destroy the established authority in Germany. Bismarck turned with his anti-socialist views, to reduce the threat of socialism in Germany, and at the same time gain support for the Conservatives which was waning through the years 1871-90.

(This page is for your second answer.) Clearly, Bismarck could be argued that Bismarck did achieve some successes in his attempts to undermine socialism in the years 1871-90. Although he did not achieve any clear anti-socialist legislation early on, <sup>his</sup> anti-socialist law was passed in 1878, after the attempted assassination of King William I roused discontent against the National Liberals and SPD, even though the socialists did not have anything to do with the anarchist attempts. This law was initially a clear success by Bismarck, with it saying that socialist meetings would be disbanded, socialist organisations banned and socialist propaganda outlawed. ~~The~~ Bismarck ~~prop~~ anti-socialist propaganda, such as speeches and articles, after the 1878 attempted assassination, worked to persuade ministers and the <sup>educated</sup> ~~middle~~ classes that socialists were behind the assassination which helped him in his aims to reduce the socialist threat and gain support for the Conservatives. In the following 1878 elections, the SPD lost a huge amount of votes and the National Liberals ~~lost nearly 50,000~~ lost 29 seats, showing a clear achievement in Bismarck's attempt to undermine ~~socialist~~ the socialist threat through his propaganda. Although after this, support for the SPD started to increase once more, another of Bismarck's attempts to reduce <sup>the</sup> socialist threat in the 1880s was his policy of state socialism which was meant to reduce the ~~the~~ when the working class.

(This page is for your second answer.) the idea of <sup>supporting</sup> ~~state~~ social laws by introducing various welfare reforms. This was a success in the way that many other countries admired this policy and used it for many years to come. Bismarck managed to pass various measures in the Reichstag to wean the working class off socialism. The 1883 Sickness Insurance Act gave pay to workers for 13 weeks of sickness and the 1884 Accident Insurance Act was also a success, completely financed by employees. Furthermore the 1889 Old Age and Disability Act gave pensions for over 70's <sup>and</sup> which did contribute to increasing the support of Conservative Bismarck and therefore reducing the threat of socialism.

However, although Bismarck certainly achieved some short term successes in his attempts to undermine socialism in the years 1871-90, these cannot be considered completely successful. Ultimately, Bismarck failed to achieve his aim to reduce the support of socialism in Germany. Indeed even his policy of state socialism was considered a "sham" by many workers, who refused to support the Conservatives and remained avid supporters of socialism. The 1878 ~~the~~ anti-socialist law, although a success to have been passed, did not limit the opportunities for socialists to express their views in the Reichstag and the SPD simply went underground, gaining increased support over the 1870's. Indeed, it could be argued that instead of reducing the threat of socialism, Bismarck's

(This page is for your second answer.) policies in fact worked to unite socialists against him and therefore ~~increased~~ subsequently increase the threat. It was only with the ~~assurances~~ <sup>assurances</sup> ~~Even~~ attempt of 1878 that persuaded people to Bismarck's attempt in 1888 to make the anti-socialist law permanent were not favoured by conservative new chieftain Wilhelm II of Prussia who wanted them "watered down". Eventually, the law was completely abandoned and dismissed with it being an ultimate failure by Bismarck and only a very short term success - ~~for the SPD~~ <sup>for the SPD</sup>. This means that ultimately, Bismarck's aim in reducing the threat and support for socialism through conservative laws, were a ~~complete~~ complete failure as his law was eventually abandoned. This attempt to ally the support of the workers, whom he considered to be the basis for preventative revolutionary activity, was an eventual failure more than a success because despite his state socialist policy, he was unable to raise mass support for this and ended his time as Prussian PM representing extreme conservatism. This attempt in 1890 before his dismissal to create a new extreme anti-socialist law and completely ban socialism in Germany which would significantly undermine socialists, was rejected by the parliament, leaving Bismarck's final attempts to win conservative support and reduce socialism in Germany as useless and parallel with them coming to nothing. Indeed it was the tension created by this <sup>anti-</sup> socialist law between Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm that led to the



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

This is a popular topic and, although Q.5 was generally more popular, a significant number of candidates answered Q.6. Candidates are generally well-prepared for this topic but there is much variability in the quality of responses with many candidates being able to analyse effectively but lacking the ability to select relevant supporting material, particularly in questions concerning foreign policy.

Q.5. Most candidates were able to address the issues surrounding the consequences of First World War on Italy well with knowledge of the indecision, events of the war, the 'mutilated victory' and post-war economic problems. They were able to contrast/integrate these with the long-term problems of the Liberal State, the rise of socialism and the methods of Mussolini and the Fascist Party itself in the increasing popularity of the PNF. Some excellent answers were able to focus explicitly on how the 'disappointment' with outcome of the war, particularly the 'mutilated victory' and the economic hardship, linked directly to the ideas and methods used by the Fascist Party whilst making it clear that this support was growing slowly rather than creating overwhelming support. Other responses focused on support from different groups in Italian society.

However, many answers, although able to access high Level 3 and low-secure Level 4 did not achieve the higher Levels because there was a lack of focus on the question asked. Some spent too much time describing the Italian war effort rather than focusing on the 'disappointment' with the outcome whilst others responded to this question in terms of Mussolini's rise to power or the failure of the Liberal State. Many answers merely stated that the territorial 'disappointments' of the war led to an increase in support without explaining why. There were a significant number of candidates who mentioned events which happened after 1922, particularly the Acerbo Law, death of Matteoti and the Lateran agreements. There also seems to be a growing tendency to assert that the north-south divide explains most of Italy's problems during this period with little evidence of reasoning.

Below is a secure Level 4 answer:

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .  
 If you change your mind, put a line through the box   
 and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12 |

(This page is for your first answer.) plan

WWI	Other Factors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• created <del>at</del> vast economic + social problems</li> <li>• Divided liberal leaders even more</li> <li>• political violence increased</li> <li>• Mutilated victory + Fiume</li> <li>• created openings for new political parties - N's</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mussolini's skill - squadristi</li> <li>• Fear of communism - <sup>king</sup> church</li> <li>• inability of Liberal Italy to form a stable government - gave Mussolini a chance to provide a stable government + could unite</li> <li>• N/S divide</li> <li>• Giolitti put M on government list = respectable.</li> <li>• Long term weaknesses - Transtommo</li> </ul>

(This page is for your first answer.)

World war one created a vast array of problems for liberal Italy but mainly it just exacerbated its longterm weaknesses, for example it divided liberal Italy's leaders even further and created vast economic problems that a divided government could not cope with. These problems caused by world war one left an opening for extremist parties, such as the fascists to come to power as the Italian public was hugely disillusioned with the unified liberal Italy. However, it was not just world war one that allowed the fascists to come to power in 1922, a major factor lay in Mussolini's own skill and his ability to couple violence with compromise and respectability which gained him support as the fascists seemed to be the only party protecting the interests of the public when the official government were not, for example one from the labour leagues. Fear of communism was also a major reason the fascist party gained support, as both the king and church saw accepted that the left were better prepared to protect ~~the~~ Italy from a revolution than the liberal. It was a combination of all these factors that led the fascist party to gain support from 1919 - 1922.

However, it is certainly possible to argue that ~~as~~ the disillusionment of world war ~~was~~ <sup>one</sup> were the main reason the fascist party gained support up to 1922 as ~~the~~ world war ~~created~~ created many economic and social problems that caused political and social unrest, for example after world war one Italy had borrowed heavily from abroad and had a large budget deficit and this led to unemployment and ~~a~~ price rises which led to food riots and ~~a~~ civil unrest.

(This page is for your first answer.) In both the South and North. Not only this but it could be argued that ~~the~~ the war widened the North-South divide and created a feeling of anguish in the South towards the government and hence leading them to support new parties, like the Fascists. It could also be argued that the war allowed new parties to flourish and emerge because of the discontent, such as the Fascists and gain support because of the 'mutilated' victory at the Paris peace conference which led to Italy not gaining as much land as they wanted but also the disastrous Fiume crisis. Fiume showed the liberal Italy leader as weak and proved that action could be valued over words and led to a huge amount of support for the Fascist party who valued action over thought. It is also arguable that World War One undermined Transfommimo politics and created a weaker and more divided Italy that could not achieve an effective government as it was divided between those who opposed and those who did not and furthermore it was aggravated by a wider franchise given in 1918 by Nitti.\*

However, it is clearly arguable that there are many other factors that caused the Fascists' support between 1919 and 1922, for example it is arguable that it was Mussolini's own personal skill and abilities that gained the Fascists' support as he was able to couple violence with compromise and political manoeuvring. The violence in both northern and rural areas gained him support as the ~~major~~ Fascist squadristi battled the left-wing labour leagues and were seen as 'protectors' of the ~~the~~ Society of the Fascists were opposing the left-wing when the government seemed

(This page is for your first answer.)

ineffective and not to care.

Not only this, but it is arguable that Mussolini's defiance against Communism gained him support from the Church and the King,

both of which feared a communist revolution, as you could not have a socialist monarch or a religious Italy when the left were about.

Mussolini gave the image that the fascist party were better equipped to protect Italy from a revolution than the liberal leaders.

Furthermore, it is evident that the fascist party gained support due to the weakness of ~~the~~ his opposition, many liberal leaders

thought that Mussolini should be given a chance to provide a stable government and also due to Giolitti putting fascists

Fascists on the government candidate list in 1920 made the

Fascists look respectable and gave them a step to power. This respectability

coupled with the weakness of his opponents due to Transfornismo

policies led both the people of Italy ~~to~~ to believe that Mussolini could provide <sup>more</sup> a stable and effective government than his predecessors.

As many had memories of the weak, coalition government ~~formed~~

formed since Italy's unification, this also argues that Mussolini

gained support from many political figures as they might

Mussolini ~~the~~ and the Fascists were just another coalition party

that could be tamed under Transfornismo.

\* that led to more people voting for the fascist party who aimed

to recognise and praise for those who served in the war, unlike ~~the~~

the liberal Italy politicians who had opposed it, which left many

(This page is for your first answer.)

feeling disgruntled and discontent toward the liberal leaders  
due to opposition when they had fought to defend Italy.

Therefore, it is clear that it was a combination of these factors  
that led to the growth in support of fascism, as world war one  
created many divisions and economic and social problems that  
Mussolini used to gain support for his party by appearing to be  
the only party that 'protected' the Italian people. ~~and~~ This support  
was further enhanced due to the weaknesses of the liberal  
leaders, church and king to cut off fear of socialism.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The response relates well to the focus of the question with a clear understanding of a range of issues involved in increasing support for the Fascist party. The 'disappointment' is discussed with other factors and the conclusion begins to reach a judgement. The organisation and use of supporting material is variable.

Below is a low Level 4 response:

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .  
If you change your mind, put a line through the box   
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12

(This page is for your first answer.)

In the First World War, Italy performed far below expectations, and eventually ended up with a 'Mutilated Victory'. From this arose the power of Fascism under Mussolini. However, other key factors added to the success of the Fascist party, such as the threat of Socialism at the time, which many Italians feared. The Fascist regime gained support from many different aspects.

The first point of support came from the failure of World War One. When the war began in 1914, Italy refused to take part as Austria-Hungary would not allow them to join or trade if they won the war. Italy remained neutral until 1915, when they eventually joined the war on the side of the Triple Entente. Italy as a whole up to 1915 was poor, and had embarrassing losses at the Battle of Caporetto. Eventually, the war came to an end and Italy proved successful. However, at the beginning of the battle, they were promised cities and land. When negotiating the Treaty of Versailles, Italy was given much less. They had wanted Fiume, but this was instead given to Yugoslavia. The country suffered badly after the war, economically, socially, politically and even in the treaties. In the war, over 650,000 Italians died in warless battles, and over 1 million were injured. The majority of these were from the poorer South, which infuriated the Socialist party. The economy was also in great debt at this stage as they had a budget of over 85 billion lire.

(This page is for your first answer.) In 1919, Italians were ashamed of how Italy did in the war, and this was made worse by their embarrassing display in negotiating the Treaty of Versailles. From this display, Italians would have looked elsewhere and in the form of Mussolini and Fascism, there was a brighter future. If Italy had gained more spoils from the Treaty, then the situation could have been very different.

After the failure in World War One, there was also a clear Socialist threat of revolution. The party was furious with the outcome of the war, and wasn't even happy with the decision to join it in 1915. The Socialists had the intention of the South in mind, and would try and negotiate what was best for them.

The threat of Socialism reached a peak, when Felice D'Annunzio, leader of the party, marched on to Fiume in 1919, with 2000 armed men, and they easily occupied the city for 15 months. This act of violence showed that the Socialists felt actions spoke louder than words, and were doing what was right for Italy. The Liberals, who were currently in charge of government, were exposed to be weak from this as if they really wanted possession of Fiume, they would have done the same. The people of Italy clearly saw the threat of Socialism, and were worried of what may come, which also explains increased support for Fascism as they were a solution.

The weakness of the Liberals also played a crucial role in support for Fascism. The people of Italy wanted a change, and saw Mussolini as a great leader. The weakness of the Liberals was clear for all to see in their dealings in the Treaty of Versailles and the Treaty of Germain, and this was further exposed by the Socialists taking over in Fiume in 1919. The Liberals clearly had no answer to the issues in Italy, and were settling with the embarrassing results of the Treaty. The people of Italy wanted change from the Liberal State, and as Socialism was not a viable option, Fascism was next line.

(This page is for your first answer.) The attitude of Mussolini as a leader was also key to him becoming Prime Minister in 1922. After the war, it was clear Mussolini was keen to exploit any chance to take power. He was seen as a strong leader, who wanted to unite Italy after a time of turmoil. When the Fascist Party were first brought in to government under Giolitti's bloc, they were given building stepping stones. The Fascists had 35% members in government, and were keen to exploit this. There were calls for general strikes against the Fascists, but these failed miserably. The Fascists under Mussolini now felt they were in control, as the Squadristi showed the violent side of the party. Socialists were being suppressed and killed between 1919 - 1922 by the Squadristi, reaching a 2000 number of deaths. The Squadristi also closed down Socialist newspapers. Mussolini was keen to use violence to quieten the Socialists, and make them fear for their lives. Mussolini was showing Italy he was keen to clean up the mess, and felt the Socialists were a threat, which the people agreed with. Violence and repression played a big role leading up to Mussolini's regime.

Another major factor leading up to Mussolini's reign as Prime Minister was the weakness of the King. This was clearly displayed by the March on Rome in 1922. By this stage, Mussolini felt he had enough power to perform a coup d'état (overthrowing of government), and finally become supreme. He had carefully planned his rebellion and waited until October to perform it. He was going to expose the weakness of both the Liberals and the King. On the 27<sup>th</sup> October 1922, the rebellion began as cities and towns were taken over by leading Fascists. That night the King agreed to enforce Martial Law, where the Fascists would be suppressed. However, from the next morning, the King's weakness was clear, as he changed his mind due to fear of a civil war. The Fascists were now unsupported, and could do as they like as Victor Emmanuel was clearly cornered. The King asked Salandra to form a

(This page is for your first answer.) government. Salander tried to negotiate a deal with Mussolini, but by this stage, Mussolini would accept nothing less than the role of Prime Minister. On the 29<sup>th</sup> October, the king had no choice but to ask Mussolini to be Prime Minister, and he accepted. This ordeal clearly showed the king was scared to place his authority, and did not want a Civil War.

Overall, many factors contributed to the success of the Fascist regime in 1922, all escalating from Italy's performance in World War One. The weakness of the Liberals was clear, so they allowed the Socialist threat to go on. From this, the Italian people turned to Fascism. However, I feel the weakness of the king played a pivotal role in the success of Mussolini, as if he had not changed his mind about granting the March on Rome, then the Fascists would have been suppressed and would not have taken charge. Violence was also key, as Mussolini was able to intimidate the Socialists into fear, so no-one could oppose him. The World War One was the start point of the corruption and violence that followed, as if they had done well in the war, the people would have been satisfied with liberal rule.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The response relates well to the focus of the question with an understanding of the key issues in the rising support for the Fascist Party. The given factor and other factors are discussed with adequate supporting evidence. However, the focus is not always direct with elements suggesting an answer on the 'rise to power'.

Q6. produced some very interesting answers. The focus of the question was the success with which Mussolini increased the international prestige of Italy. It was expected that most answers would concentrate on the success with which this was achieved through his foreign policy. However, there proved to be a variety of different responses with some candidates balancing a discussion of foreign policy with comments on the role of Mussolini's domestic policies in enhancing Italy's international prestige. Many candidates produced engaging responses with well-reasoned discussion of the fluctuations in international approval of Mussolini's actions. There was sound discussion of early attempts to increase prestige in the Mediterranean and at the international conferences of the late 1920s, the domestic 'battles', forays into Abyssinia and Spain, relations with Britain, France and Germany in the 1930s and the final disastrous period of the war to 1943. Some candidates followed the change over time through a succinct chronological narrative analysis but many found it difficult to cover the whole period or showed some chronological insecurity. In general, most answers were discursive and success depended on the ability to provide appropriate and relevant supporting material. Some weaker candidates focused solely on domestic policy and/or prestige in general.

This is a Level 5 example of a foreign-policy driven response to Q6. The response does not have an introduction but launches into an effective narrative analysis of Mussolini's international relations with reference to prestige. The answer covers the whole time period succinctly making pertinent points and showing change over time. The changing pattern of the international response to Mussolini is clearly evaluated in the conclusion.

**Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .**  
**If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then put a cross in another box .**

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your first answer.) How successful was Mussolini in increasing the international prestige of Italy in the years 1922-43?

<u>Plan</u>	25 - Corfu	26 - King Zog
League of nations	<del>28 - League of Nations borders</del>	27 - Hungary
	28 - Kellogg-Briand	29 - Latin Accords
	34 - Dolfus	30 - Austria
	26 - Spanish Civil war	31 - Stresa Front
	31 - Anti-Comintern Pact	35 - Abyssinia - No League
	38 - Annexed Albania	36 - Oct. Accords
	41 - Lost east African empire	38 - Munich
	43 - Lost NA.	40 - WW2 starts
		42 - Major defeats

Mussolini was ~~very~~ successful to a certain extent in increasing the international prestige of Italy in the years 1922-43. In 1923 ~~an~~ Italian diplomat was killed near the Balkans and the border of Albania ~~and~~ and Mussolini felt that this was wrong and he needed to get payback for it. Mussolini also had ambitions of making Italy 'great, respected and feared' and so to emphasise these two points in 1923 Mussolini invaded Corfu, <sup>this</sup> ~~which~~ was seen by many other countries as a bullying tactic an attack on such a small island by a great force such as Italy. But in some people's eyes it proved Italy's strength in the Army. Also, in 1926 Mussolini had great

(This page is for your first answer.) influence and <sup>control</sup> over King Zog of Albania which effectively gave Mussolini and Italy more land and more empire and thus enabling them to keep up with the expanding Empires of Germany, Britain and France for example. Mussolini's empire was growing and the respect he was earning was growing with it. So in 1927 Italy became friends with Hungary which gave them a helpful ally and brought them closer to becoming a more influential figure in Europe.

Furthermore Italy ~~want~~ needed to have allies in Britain, France or Germany to become the hugely influential figure ~~and then~~ ~~influence~~ that Mussolini wanted them to be. In 1928, the Kellogg-Briand pact to ban war was brought about and Mussolini took this opportunity to gain prestige and worth with Britain and France and so he signed the pact.

In 1929, Mussolini signed Lateran accords with the Papacy to give Mussolini some papal land in return for Mussolini helping the Pope with his financial troubles. Whilst this did not effect nor include any other country, Mussolini was inadvertently gaining prestige with Pope and thus his reputation would go up around the world. In some dominantly catholic countries such as Spain, the agreement with the Pope made Mussolini the 'great' figure he wanted to be.

Following on from this, Mussolini became friends with Austria and in 1934 when Hitler attempted an attack, Mussolini backed Dolfus of Austria and Hitler backed down. This made Mussolini seem like a great diplomat in the eyes of other countries such as Britain and France as he prevented a possible war and also a country from being taken over. This led into 1935 when

(This page is for your first answer.) Mussolini joined the Stresa Pact to stop German rearmament. This made Mussolini appear to be on the same side as Britain and France and thus their view of him went up again as <sup>he</sup> appeared to want the same ideals as Britain and France.

However, despite remaining in the League of Nations for so long, and thus increasing his credibility and reputation, Mussolini invaded Abyssinia and the horrific war that took place here was brought to the League of Nations who explicitly told Mussolini to stop but he pressed on with the fighting, fighting a battle of vengeance for Italy from past defeats in Abyssinia. This lost him much respect with the League of Nations and the countries he was once trying to impress. In 1936, Mussolini then went on to aid General Franco in the Spanish Civil War on the side of the Nationalists who were also backed by Germany. This then led Mussolini to return to his ideals of Fascism and sign the axis with Germany in October 1936, an agreement which enabled Mussolini to try and invade the Mediterranean and Hitler to invade the Baltic and east so neither power would come head to head. Mussolini then agreed with Britain not to invade the Mediterranean but he was not much of a peacekeeper and so went back on his word anyway. In 1937, Mussolini signed the Anti-Comintern pact which made his reputation change with Britain and France and increase with Germany as this pact was signed with Germany and Japan against the

(This page is for your first answer.) Soviets. Although, his reputation had not plummeted perhaps as much as expected with Britain as in 1938 Neville Chamberlain asked Mussolini to act as a Diplomat at Munich between Hitler and Chamberlain. In 1939, Mussolini finally annexed Albania and finalised the Pact of Steel with Germany committing himself to war. Despite this, Italy did not join World War 2 until 1940 and when they did they needed several countries Germany had left only to feed their army to be too weak and Germany had to bail them out which embarrassed Italy in front of many countries. Their weakness was shown further in 1941 with the loss of their east African Empire of Somalia, Eritrea and Libya and in 1943 with the loss of their North African Empire.

Mussolini had signed many agreements and allied with many countries but he could never fully stick to one ideal. The changing between allying with Britain and France and ~~Germany~~ allying with Germany meant that ultimately when it came down to it he was not strong enough to keep up with any of these great powers as his empire was in ruins by 1943. The international prestige Italy had gained in the late 1920s and early 1930s had been wiped away by their stumble actions taken in and around WW2 for the whole of the world to see. To conclude, Mussolini was successful in creating international prestige in the late 1920s and early 1930s but what prestige he had created was brought down in

(This page is for your first answer.) The duration of World War II and left  
Mussolini with very little international worth and prestige  
by 1943.

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

Candidates studying E4 are becoming more confident with the factual and chronological material involved and it was pleasing to see more candidates attempt questions covering the Franco period this session.

Q.7 was the most popular of the two questions and candidates used the material at their disposal to produce some very interesting answers. In general, candidates were able to bring together supporting material to discuss the political, military and territorial strengths of each side at the beginning of the war alongside discussions of the nature of support both internally and externally. The best responses were able to focus on the situation at the outbreak of the war itself providing some detail on the support of the different sections of the military, support from foreign powers and territorial strongholds. However, fewer candidates than might have been expected referred to the German aid given to airlift the Army of Africa. Also there was a general assumption that the Nationalists were potential stronger and more united at the outbreak because Franco was already the clear leader when his position was initially less obvious. Weaker candidates tended to explain the reasons why the Nationalists won the Civil War but were able to include enough relevant material to achieve solid Level 3 answers.

Below is a typical Level 4 response to Q.7.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your second answer.) How accurate would it be to describe the Republican and the Nationalist forces as being evenly balanced at the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War in 1936?

Spain was very tense politically leading up to the 1936 outbreak of Civil War. The right wing ~~and~~ monarchists, conservatives and Falange were close to giving up on democracy, and after the left wing won the election in 1936, they finally decided that enough was enough, and attempted a coup. This was the start of the civil war.

The left wing, known as the popular front, had a number of strengths to their forces. Fighting with them were Anarchists and Communists, who were used to fighting in the cities, and were extremely committed to the cause. The communists were able to call for help from Moscow, potentially greatly helping the Republicans, whilst Communists and Anarchists from all over Europe came to Spain to fight for the left. As they were democratically elected, the left also had to majority of the general

(This page is for your second answer.)

public on their side, which would prove ~~a~~ vital in defending the major cities such as Madrid and Barcelona. The left also had a number of Army officers and soldiers on their side, along with a brigade of Russian troops sent by Moscow.

The left wing forces were not without weaknesses. Although a lot of the population were on their side, many were unable to fight, and of those that were, the vast majority were untrained. The Anarchists and Communists were also untrained at ~~the~~ <sup>actual</sup> combat, ~~and~~ and the Communist brigade sent over took orders from Moscow, not Spain, which could potentially have caused confusion and a lack of organisation. The left also faced the problem of having very low quality equipment and struggled to find weapons. Due to the non-intervention pact, no countries would sell Spain weapons other than Russia, and for a highly inflated price, so the left were forced to buy weapons on the <sup>re-let</sup> illegal black market.

The right wing, National Front, had strong points. The majority of the Army stayed loyal to the right, most importantly, the elite troops from Morocco commanded by Franco, which were vastly superior to the soldiers fighting for the left. The Nationalists were supplied soldiers, tanks and planes from Mussolini, free of charge, giving them a key advantage. They were also

(This page is for your second answer.)

supplied many planes by Hitler, however, they had to pay. The planes were very important; as the Navy generally stayed loyal to the left, Franco's elite troops were stuck in Morocco until Hitler's planes airlifted them to mainland Spain. The right had far superior equipment to the left, and had far more organisation.

The right wing forces also had their faults. Far less soldiers than expected joined the coup attempt, this left the right with a split in their forces, Franco in Southern Spain, Mola in Northern Spain, with communication between the two difficult. Although Franco had elite soldiers, they were stuck in Morocco, without Hitler's help the civil war may very well have been lost.

It would not be accurate to describe the ~~the~~ Republican and the Nationalist forces as being equal at the outbreak of the civil war. The republicans were primarily untrained civilians, combined with inexperienced soldiers, with little outside help and shoddy equipment. The Nationalists on the other hand were primarily very experienced soldiers, received large amounts of help from Italy and Germany, and had far better equipment. The forces were not balanced, the Nationalists were very clearly superior to the Republicans.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The response relates very well to the focus of the question in that it attempts to address the position at the outbreak of the war. There is an understanding of the key issues experienced at the outbreak of war, with particular reference to the airlift from Morocco. The answers discuss mainly the political and military situation leading to some lack of range and depth.

Q.8 was less popular but the responses generally showed a good understanding of the pattern of change over time in Franco's Spain. Almost all candidates were able to give some definition of totalitarianism to establish extent and were able to refer to initial repression in the 1940s and 1950s followed by some liberalisation through technocrats, economic policies and foreign relations. Better candidates were able to discuss the nuances of totalitarianism as opposed to an authoritarian regime and were also more aware of subtle changes over time with the continuous control of information and the return to greater repressive measures in the early 1970s.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your second answer.) To what extent did Franco create a

totalitarian state in the years 1939-1975?

Plan

use of Garrote / execution

silencing opposing

media censored

passive support

BUT

education cont.

tried to get in EEC

tourist industry ↑

cars industry ↑

4th largest economy.

France created a totalitarian state in the years 1939-1975 to a certain extent. Immediately after the Spanish Civil War

France imprisoned ~~and~~ many of his opposition and used them

in forced labour camps to work for the needs of his country. This

imprisonment deterred any opposition arising throughout Spain

which meant that Franco was able to rule in a very despotic

and unopposed way. Also, the Spanish Civil War and the brutality

of it meant that many people had a passive support for Franco

and merely ~~imprisoned~~ <sup>suffered</sup> him due to fears of another brutal war.

This also aided Franco in being able to rebel without opposition.

(This page is for your second answer.)

Furthermore, the ~~garrote~~<sup>garrote</sup> and execution was used until around 1976 when Franco's Prime Minister was assassinated. The use of such brutal punishments again deterred the general public from speaking out and opposing the views of Franco. Also, Franco controlled the media within Spain and thus controlled everything the Spanish people were able to know. When television was introduced there were only government controlled channels as there were with radio and similarly the newspapers were all state controlled. This enabled Franco ultimate control and repression of the Spanish people. He could stop any news from being heard if it was something that may affect his regime in any way. This is an extremely totalitarian measure as it gives Franco complete control over the people of Spain and means he can influence them in whatever ways he wants to because he controls everything they know from both outside of Spain and inside of Spain.

However, not all of Franco's regime showed a totalitarian side to it. Education continued throughout Spain and whilst the education was still state controlled it was not as completely state controlled and influential as other countries were. Franco also tried desperately to get into the EEC which shows that he was not as strict about censorship as perhaps one may first think. Although, it was the strict regime and censorship that Franco wanted to continue with whilst in the EEC that

(This page is for your second answer.) stopped him from joining the EEC.

Also, the tourist industry continued increasing throughout Franco's reign and ~~was~~ ~~there~~ reached 21 million by 1969 and 34 million by 1974. This shows that whilst his regime may have been strict, harsh and censored, it was not completely totalitarian as the country was able to attract an increasing amount of tourists each year whilst still under this regime. This increase can also be seen in the car industry. The Spanish car company Seat continued to produce mass amounts of cars and the Spanish public were predominantly using cars by 1975. In comparison to other dictatorships and totalitarian states around the world this was not as strict. Some countries insisted that only certain types/ages/makes of cars could be driven or even bought. The economy in Spain also increased during Franco's reign and this was greatly due to foreign workers sending money home. Franco did not stop nor even discourage foreign workers suggesting he was not as strict about Spain being Spanish and all confined to the one country as some other totalitarian states and dictators were. Although, it could be said that the money from foreign workers greatly increased Spain's economy and enabled them to tackle their debts and become the 9th largest economy in the world by 1975 and so perhaps Franco saw the attraction of a higher status for his country as of more worth than keeping people confined to Spain when the money would not come in so fast. TV ownership also greatly increased despite

(This page is for your second answer.) It being controlled by the government which ~~shows that~~ suggests that perhaps the government channels were not as harsh and strict as they sound. If this is the case, Franco's censorship was perhaps not as strict and totalitarian as it initially may seem:

To conclude, Franco ~~did not particularly create~~ created a totalitarian state in the years 1939-1975 to a lesser extent. Whilst the repression of opposition and the censorship of the media were strict measures that forced Spanish people to live by certain rules, the majority of things that happened in Spain in these years show a modernising economy and society and not one that is greatly ruled by a totalitarian state. Car ownership and TV ownership increased, industry increased creating more jobs and better standard of living and the tourist industry boomed despite the harsh measures Franco took to repress opposition and censor media. This shows that whilst Franco was a dictator who wanted control, the increased modernised society and economy of Spain in the years 1939-1975 shows that regime Franco had in place can only be in parts a totalitarian state as opposed to a complete totalitarian state, especially by 1975 and the abolition of the ~~garotte~~ in 1974.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is a lower Level 5 response to Q.8. Although the supporting material and coverage of the whole period is not secure enough to reach the higher band there is a clear discussion of Franco's rule in terms of totalitarianism as defined by the candidate. There is a direct focus on extent.

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

The quality of responses concerning this Topic on post-war Germany is very variable ranging from extremely well-prepared candidates with excellent detailed knowledge to candidates with a very insecure understanding of the chronology of events. The textbooks available for this Topic often cover material which is useful for both AS and A2 units across a variety of boards and so it is important that centres select supporting material for the 6HI01 specification carefully. In general the Topic produces interesting responses which are often very engaging.

Q9. was by far the most popular choice and many candidates were clearly aware of the need to determine the success of the West German economy during this period and whether it really constituted an 'economic miracle'. There were many well-reasoned answers with strong supporting material however, most struggled to discuss the whole period to 1969. There was clearly an understanding of the arguments for and against 1945 as being 'Year Zero', the role of external and chance factors and the extent to which the West German economy was built by Adenauer and Erhard. Weaker responses often narrated the story of the recovery in the 1950s with little judgement or seemed to be prepared only to answer a question required a comparison with East Germany rendering much of the answer irrelevant.

Q.10 was both less popular and less well answered. There were generally two approaches with candidates addressing the long-term reasons for the collapse of communism or focusing on the events of 1989. Both approaches led to some interesting answers integrating the external pressures from both the Soviets and the West with internal developments in East Germany. Most candidates were aware of external factors but a few candidates stated that Gorbachev's role was a completely separate factor. There was a general weakness with knowledge of both the chronology of events over the long-term, with some candidates confusing the Berlin Airlift, the building of the Berlin Wall and the opening of the Wall, and the lead up to and events of 1989.

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

As with Topic E5 the textbooks which cover this period are generally written to cover a variety of AS and A2 units across different boards it is, therefore, important to identify the relevant supporting material which corresponds with the specification.

Q.11 was overwhelmingly the most popular question. Most candidates were able to explain why Israel was so successful in surviving suggesting a variety of reasons such as national unity, external military and diplomatic support, disunity amongst Arabs and military tactics and to suggest which was the most important and/or the inter-relationship between the different factors. The best answers were able to focus on and, in some cases, question the phrases 'so successful' and 'threats to survival'. Some candidates concentrated on explaining Israeli success through a narrative commentary of the Arab-Israeli wars whilst others produced a multi-factored answer. Most candidates are very well versed in discussing each of the Arab-Israeli conflicts succinctly and as such are able to cover the time period well. However, the multi-factored answers tended to struggle to produce the most relevant and appropriate supporting evidence connected to a particular theme.

Q.12 appears to have been answered by very few candidates and, in general, seem to have been very weak. A few responses showed an awareness of the role of Iran in Middle East relations during the period 1979-2001 and/or were able to discuss differing reasons for instability such as the Palestinian question, Iraqi policies, non-Iranian Islamist politics and external factors. However, several answers also showed virtually no knowledge of events with Iran being mistaken for Israel and the time period discussed finishing in 1979.

In conclusion, as one of the examiners commented in their final report, "Able candidates wrote articulately and coherently and demonstrated a logical mind as well as good linguistic skills. Weaker answers were characterised by poor sentence construction, spelling and poor writing skills, which was a limiting factor in some answers where candidates clearly knew their history but struggled or failed to produce a coherent readable response."

### Mark boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	39	33	28	23
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40



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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code US024069 June 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit  
[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

