

Examiners' Report
January 2013

GCE History 6HI01 E

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. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.

ResultsPlus

Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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 raising achievement through innovation in education.

Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

January 2013

Publications Code US034621

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Introduction

General comments – Unit 6HI01

Examiners once again reported that the majority of candidates understood the essential requirements of the Unit 1 examination.

Many were able to structure their work effectively, provide a range of relevant and accurate material to support the points that they were making, and maintain a sustained focus on the question set. At the highest levels of attainment were those who displayed the ability to analyse a range of factors in detail and present a convincing answer overall.

However, examiners also noted that there was a significant number of responses which were limited by specific areas of weakness. Although more candidates are attempting analysis (Level 3) and, indeed, producing analytical responses with some good understanding (Level 4) many are limited to the lower bands due to a lack of accurate and relevant exemplification. In this session, in particular, examiners commented on a lack of secure supporting knowledge and chronological awareness. It is important that arguments be supported with sufficient secure and accurate evidence to make the points stand up. In addition, higher level responses explain how these points relate to the question, whether supporting or challenging the premise of the question.

Also once again, many candidates failed to read the questions carefully, leading to responses which did not focus directly, or even well, on the key issues. In general, this led to marks being awarded at low band Level 4 or Level 3. For example, in Option E/F many candidates confused the Weimar Constitution with the Weimar Republic itself, leading to a limited discussion of the problems caused by constitutional issues. In other cases, the complete misreading of questions led to Level 1/Level 2 marks and, in a few unfortunate cases, there was no rewardable material, despite a developed response having been written.

Quality of written communication is integral to the awarding of marks within the Level descriptors. Although areas of weakness have been highlighted in previous reports, it has been felt that the general quality of organisation, expression and spelling, punctuation and grammar, has been good. Therefore, it is a little concerning to note that many examiners observed that in this session they had seen a slight decline in the quality of written expression, punctuation, particularly the use of capital letters, and spelling.

Some candidates were also clearly disadvantaged by a lack of choice of questions within their topic area studied. It is vital that centres cover all of the content specified in the bullet points in the specification, if candidates are to have a choice. Questions may be asked on specific bullet points or across the bullet points and so failure to cover the specified content adequately may lead to a lack of choice and/or imbalanced answers. Examples of topics where content is clearly not always covered include A2, B5, D4, D5, E/F2 and F7. In particular, centres should note that topic D5 refers to Equality in the USA, 1945-68, and is not focused wholly on the civil rights of African Americans. Topics which have benefited clearly from increased coverage in past sessions include D3, E/F2, E/F3 & E/F6.

Despite the weaknesses noted above, it is important to note that, in general, candidates produce well-organised and knowledgeable answers and that the best responses engaged the examiner to create a very pleasant reading experience.

Option E - General Comments

Over 500 candidates sat the Option E paper this January. Candidates studying for Option E often produce Level 5 responses with direct focus on the question, explicit understanding of the key issues and well-selected, accurate supporting material. However, many good responses remain in Level 4, with many almost formulaic answers which, although focused, do not address the specific question asked. Responses which fail to develop the given factor adequately, particularly those which do not explain why a factor may only be significant to a lesser extent, will only achieve low Level 4 or, in some circumstances, high Level 3. There is clear evidence that weaker candidates are producing more Level 3 responses, showing understanding of the question and attempting analysis. However, these responses often remained in low Level 3, with little secure knowledge and poor chronology.

The majority of Options have entries of over 150 candidates but Options E5 – Germany, 1945-91 and E6 – The Middle East, 1945-2001 are relatively smaller.

Please note: the comments made concerning the approach by students to individual topics E1-E6 are identical to those for F1-F6, apart from reference to numbers of candidates entered. However, the exemplification used in each report is different and Option E centres are advised to consider both Option reports and vice versa.

E1 – The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-70

Over 300 candidates answered E1 questions. As in previous years, candidates studying the Unification of Italy are usually very well-prepared and have good overall knowledge of the period in general, across all of the bullet points of the specification. However, it is important that candidates answer the questions asked with direct reference to the wording of the question, rather than produce general answers to questions with a similar focus set in previous sessions.

Question 1

This was the least popular choice of the two. Most candidates were aware of Mazzini's beliefs and activities during this period and were able to come to a judgement about his significance. However, a number of responses were perhaps too quick to dismiss Mazzini's significance altogether, referring to his role in a few brief sentences before discussing the role of other factors and/or individuals. These responses often only reached high Level 3 because they failed to explain why Mazzini was not significant in relation to other factors. Many candidates did not seem to be aware of his role in the creation of the Roman Republic during the 1848-9 revolutions. The question did not suggest that he was the most significant, but asked how significant he was.

Question 2

Q2. This was by far the most popular of the two question. In this case, it was a pleasure to see the number of responses that were clearly aware of the time frame here and were directly focused on the period from 1860-1870.

However, there were responses that spent too long creating a context for Garibaldi and, indeed, other individuals in the period before 1860, which was an obstacle to good discussion of the time period in question. As with the Mazzini question, this question did not ask for a judgement as to whether he was the most important individual but the extent of Garibaldi's contribution in shaping unification.

Level 3 responses tended towards narrative. Some Level 4 responses became imbalanced through greater reference to other individuals/countries but there were many who focused on Garibaldi himself, or in relation to others. A pleasing number of responses focused on the 'shape' and process of unification, rather than just generalising about contributions.

This is a Level 5 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:

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.) PLAN: - Capture of Sicily } PLANS TO TAKE ROME
- Capture of Naples } ALMOST SCUPPERED
- Made Cavour + Vell realise need to add Venice & Rome CA VOUR DEATH + RELUCTANCE DUE TO FRANCE
- Mazzinian principles of rule e.g. hard reform → DISUNITY, LANDOWNERS + PEASANTS

By the start of the 1860s, the Kingdom of Northern Italy had already been proclaimed under the kingship of Victor Emmanuel II and the Prime Minister of Piedmont, Count Camillo di Cavour. Many believed that by that stage, unification was complete and discarded the remainders of the peninsula as irrelevant and unworthy of annexation. However, Giuseppe Garibaldi, a war-buckling soldier realised the need for entire unification and was heavily involved in shaping ~~the~~ its process, as could be seen by his capture of Naples

(This page is for your first answer.) & Sicily as well as his influence on the likes of Victor Emmanuel to complete the process and his attempt at installing egalitarian Mazzinian principles so as to unite the people of Italy as one.

Firstly, it is clear that Garibaldi had enormous influence in shaping the process of unification as it was his determination and drive which led him to capturing the Southern states of Naples and Sicily, ~~and~~ resulting in a more complete state of unification with a country comprised of the whole peninsula. The fact that Garibaldi's successful conquest of the two Southern states with 'The Thousand' (his army of redshirt soldiers) culminated in him agreeing to hand ^{them} over to Victor Emmanuel and Piedmont at Teano in 1860, is evidence that he ~~had~~ played an enormous role in enforcing the entire Italian peninsula to be united under one king, not just the Northern elite states as Cavour intended. ~~It~~

~~However~~ It can be argued that Garibaldi's military actions to physically take over states in order to add them

(This page is for your first answer.)

to the unification process was in fact ^{however} nearly a hindrance, as his attempt to add Rome to a united Italy, nearly lost French support for a unified country of Italy and ~~may~~ may well have precipitated in losing the support of Napoleon and thus his diplomatic manoeuvres to grant Italy Venetia. Garibaldi's defeat at Aspromonte in 1862 ~~is a true example of~~ (in which he attempted to take Rome) is a true example of the ~~his~~ hindrance that he nearly caused to the unification process. However, it is evident that this fighting spirit of Garibaldi did much to actually shape unification as it inspired Victor Emmanuel and others to resolve the Question of Rome and retake it to make up the ~~to~~ completed Italian country.

Garibaldi was also incredibly influential in the unification process as his rule over the states of Naples and Sicily was a blatant attempt to unite the ~~people~~ population of these two states and unify the people with Mazzinian ideas. His

(This page is for your first answer.)

attempts at land reform ~~were~~ ^{were} ~~probably~~ significantly egalitarian and ~~attempts~~ were designed with the intention of uniting Neapolitans & Sicilians as Italians, with socialism and wealth distribution the primary economic ways to unify the people.

However, it can be argued that this did extremely little to unify the people and in fact caused great disunity.

Gaibaldi was by no means a ^{skilled} political leader and in his haste to add to Italy and his siege on Rome & the Papal States he allowed for landowners to reassert their dominance and crush the peasant revolts that took place in 1860-62, as clearly his domestic policies ~~was~~ were ~~not~~ neither favourable, nor working.

Despite, one must consider that Gaibaldi's domestic policies did still very much shape unification as they were designed to bring the backwards economic south in line with the semi-industrialised North, therefore uniting the people.

It can of course be argued that Gaibaldi had no hand in

(This page is for your first answer.)

the eventual annexation of Venetia after the 1866 ~~the~~ Austro-Prussian war, or the the capture of Rome in 1870 once French troops had left to fight in the Franco-Prussian War. Certainly, these were the final pieces of the unification problem but by no means can one simply disregard Garibaldi despite his retirement after the failed capture of Rome at Aspromonte in 1862. It was Garibaldi's original capture of Naples + Sicily which made figures such as Victor Emmanuel realize that Piedmont, Tuscany, Lombardy & Emilia were not enough and that all areas of the peninsula had to be annexed to complete unification; even Cavour was won round by Garibaldi's ambition after his impressive victory in Naples, (however he died in 1861, so never saw its completion).

In conclusion it is evident that Garibaldi was at the centre of the unification process between 1860 and 1870, and despite what could be argued as the diplomacy

(This page is for your first answer.)

of Napoleon & France in simplifying
unification, it is evident that his capture
of ~~the~~ Naples & Sicily at the start of
the decade inspired both the people to unite
and other figures to realise that the entire
peninsula including Rome & Venetia could be
united.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The question is directly focused on the extent to which Garibaldi was responsible for shaping Italy the years 1860-1870. It creates an argument for Garibaldi having great influence and using supporting material to advance the argument. The roles of other factors and individuals are always discussed in relation to Garibaldi's contribution. It does not reach the higher band because some of the points made and material used are not wholly secure.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

When questions are not focused on the 'main reason' or other similar terminology, the main focus should be on the subject of the question. This response is directly focused on trying to establish the extent of Garibaldi's influence.

E2 – The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

Over 200 candidates answered questions on E2. As with topic E1, candidates were usually very well-prepared and knowledgeable as to the process of Unification. However, it is important to cover all four bullet points within the specification. This includes both the earlier references to the periods 1848-50 and post-1871. Questions may also be set on consequences, just as much as they may be framed around causation or significance. Centres are reminded that questions can be set both within the time frame of a bullet point or across bullet points.

Question 3

A very small number of candidates chose to answer this question. Those who did produced some interesting responses, either based on the situation in 1850, or with reference to the longer term consequences of the events in 1848-50 on the position of Austria within Germany.

Question 4

This was a very popular response, with differentiation often based upon the ability of candidates to discuss Austrian weaknesses in relation to Prussian strength. Many candidates were able to access Level 4 but were limited by their selection of supporting material and knowledge with relation to Austrian weakness. Many candidates simply agreed that Austria was weak, using general assertion and then proceeded to write a response that was wholly based on Prussian strength. These responses also often did not come to a judgement as to the role of Austrian weakness in their conclusion. Some answers also generally referred to Austrian weaknesses with assertions that the economy was backward and with vague references to weak leadership, rather than providing secure supporting evidence. The best answers usually argued for Prussian strength but were able to establish this directly in relation to areas of Austrian weakness.

This is a Level 5 response.

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.) 1850-1871

Plan

1. Austria was poor - Zollunion, low taxes and expensive wars
2. Austria was in revolt - uprisings etc, politically isolated - Crimea
3. Prussian military dominance + economic power
4. Role of Bismarck - promoted German uni + Prussian hegemony

The rise of Prussia throughout the years 1850-1871 was marked by the steady decline of Austrian dominance in the German states. Financially, Austria was in severe trouble and couldn't afford to defend its position as leader and revolts and poor decisions had left her politically isolated. However, it is important to consider the impressive rise to power Prussia experienced. Its booming economy and well-organised military gave it a vital edge. Indeed, the diplomatic role of Bismarck and his Realpolitik mustn't be ignored. Austria's slide towards lessening power was crucial to allowing eventual unification.

(This page is for your second answer.) During this period, Austria was in severe financial trouble. As it was excluded from the Zollverein, it had no access to the free trade that the other states, notably Prussia could enjoy. This both encouraged trade and made it more profitable, driving the Prussian economy. To exacerbate matters, their attempt to create a Zollunion, failed dramatically. Furthermore, in order to maintain support for Austrian rule, low taxation was in place throughout the empire. Finally, costly wars against the Italians and French in 1859 had levied even greater burdens upon Austria. As a result, Prussia could become more and more comfortable with making decisions that would threaten Austria. They were unwilling to field an army unless it was absolutely necessary due to their poor finances. Therefore, Prussia was able to take more and more decisions, culminating in the 1866 Austro-Prussian war, when Prussian hegemony was finally confirmed. Austria's poor finances made it weak, allowing Prussia to be comfortable with trying to gain power and allowed them to defeat them in 1866.

Not only was Austria increasingly poor, it was becoming more and more politically isolated and troubled. Revolutions throughout its empire, notably in Italy in 1859, where they were defeated by a French and Italian force, kept eyes in Vienna away from Germany. They couldn't handle all problems at once, so close those within their own

(This page is for your second answer.) borders. Indeed, their neutrality in the 1854 Crimean War had allowed them to lose their only real ally in Russia. Prussia could now see that Austria was both fragmented and politically isolated. In comparison, Prussia was peaceful and making treaties with both Italy and France, in Biarritz in 1865. Prussia could risk all out war that would confirm their dominance as they knew they would only have to fight one enemy and they would be disjointed and troubled. Austria's decline was key in giving Prussia this military confidence.

However, Prussia didn't stand still during this period. It constantly reformed and advanced, allowing it to swiftly overtake Austria. Economically, Prussia was leagues ahead, producing steel, coal and other materials at huge rates. The Krupp works near Essen produced modern artillery and weapons such as the breech loading needle gun. These weapons would provide decisive in defeating not only the Austrians in 1866 but later the French in 1871. Austria's outdated and poorly equipped army was simply no match for Prussia's state of the art force. Another example was at the Battle of Koniggratz when the Prussians' superior railway network allowed a much faster deployment of their troops. This economic and military superiority allowed Prussia to dominate Austria in both peace and war, providing the tools to create the state

(This page is for your second answer.) that would lead a unified Germany.

It is important to also consider the role of Bismarck within the achievement of Prussian hegemony. His diplomatic skill, meant that Prussia easily conquered Austrian opposition, but also made Prussia a faster and more powerful state. This is perfectly shown with his handling of the Schleswig-Holstein crisis in the early 1860s. The outcome was perfect for Prussia, not only did he gain land, but he also provided the ideal way to provoke war whenever he chose, something necessary to show Prussian dominance. In addition, his diplomacy meant that the French remained neutral in 1866, as well as securing Italian help. While the plans may have still worked without Bismarck, he ensured they ran as smoothly as possible.

In conclusion, it wasn't Austria's ~~just~~ weakness that enabled Prussia to take control by 1871, it was Prussia's simultaneous economic success. This allowed them to defeat the Austrians in 1866, by providing both the funds and the army to do so. Austria still possessed a vast army, it was by no means an easy target. The smaller, yet well equipped and trained Prussian army ensured their hegemony in 1866, and at the end of the day, this was down to economic success and expansion.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The response is directly focused and is able to show explicit understanding of the key issues concisely. Austrian weakness is developed and explained, despite the overall argument suggesting that Prussian strength was the key factor in the emergence of Prussia as the dominant German power. Prussian power is developed but in relation to Austrian weakness.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Linking sentences made at the beginning of paragraphs leads to discussion rather than assertion.

This is a 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: _____

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.) _____

1850-1871 → Austrian weakness.

- Economic weakness ✓ One bank + Crimean war + 2nd Italian war.
- Austrian Isolation ✓ Crimean war + Frankfurt parliament + Erfurt plan.
- Prussian Ascendency X - Zollverein Zollfreie
- Bismarck. diplomacy X

Before the mid 19th century Prussia and Austria fought for the title of dominant state, and it seem Austria had the title due to her vast empire. In the 1850's Austria lost her grip on power leaving Prussia to take power. There were many reasons for this which includes Austria's weakness both economically and otherwise, but also Prussia's ascendancy and Bismarck him self.

Austria's economy was growing ever increasingly worse. She was involved in

(This page is for your first answer.) many wars that were draining her economically. The ~~that~~ second Italian war of ~~the~~ Independence saw Italy and France fight Austria, leading to a bitter loss as Austria had to hand over ~~her~~ some of her territories. This led to an economic downfall after money was used to fight them, but it also saw ^{the} Austrian population lose some pride for their country, showing ~~to~~ two ways Austria was weakened. Not only was ~~the~~ Austria's economy worsening but she only had one bank to start with, the Creditanstalt found in only 1855 was the single bank in Austria coping with her economic problems. Austria was also involved in the Crimean war, ~~at~~ which started in 1853 and lasted for 3 years, Austria saw her ~~late~~ economy worsening as she kept troops mobilised. ~~This~~ This shows 3 clear examples of Austria's economic weakness which I feel greatly disadvantaged her as in the fight for domination of power in ~~the~~ Germany.

The Crimean war not only hindered Austria economically but it also ~~too~~ isolated her from Russia, how would have been a great

(This page is for your first answer.) ally during her was ~~aged~~ against Prussia. Austria found it difficult to decide which countries to side with during the Crimean War ~~isolate~~ isolating her from all three, Russia, Britain and France. Austria was also isolated from many of the states in Germany due to actions from the Frankfurt ~~per~~ ~~Parliament~~ Parliament, the ~~these~~ chose to unite Germany under Kleindeutschland, meaning little of Germany ^{in 1849} ~~without~~ excluding Austria. ~~Despite this~~ Although the Frankfurt Parliament was dispersed ^{later} in 1849, the Erfurt plan used her policies ~~+~~ and ideas of ~~the~~ Kleindeutschland in 1850. Again this was dropped in the Capitulation of Olmütz in 1851 ~~for Austria Frankfurt diet, including Austria.~~ ~~Despite this not working~~ to exactly working to isolate Austria it still ~~lead~~ ~~to her~~ showed her weakness, as whilst fighting the ~~the~~ Hungarian uprising, she could do nothing. ~~It is~~ It is clear that Austria was losing her grip on power and although Prussia ultimately ~~is~~ lost out to the Frankfurt diets, Grossdeutschland, they were seen as ready to gain power and ~~the~~ only need a bit to more strength.

(This page is for your first answer.)

That strength came to Prussia economically, she ~~greatly~~ was rich in ~~iron and steel~~ natural resources including ~~at~~ coal and ~~of~~ iron, this was helping Prussia militarily. The Prussian Customs Union, ~~was~~ which was set up ~~to~~ before 1850 in 1834 was ~~gaining~~ gaining ~~of~~ Prussia strength every ~~day~~ ^{year,} and also isolating Austria further. Austria was almost the only state not included. The railways and free trade tariff system had brought the states closer together under ~~a~~ ~~Pr~~ economic ~~pru~~ Prussian leadership. So it seemed Prussia was to be the natural political leader for a united Germany. This economic ~~growth~~ ^{growth} made Austria seem that much more weak and helped greatly with mobilisation and weapon equipment during the wars, ~~but~~ showing how crucial it was in Prussia's being able to become the dominate state.

Helping Prussia with her ascendancy was ~~a~~ Prussia's chief minister as of 1862, Bismarck. Bismarck used his great diplomacy skills during the three wars of the 1860-

(This page is for your first answer.) 1870's, the danish war in 1864 saw Bismarck create a war with Denmark and giving Austria Holstein gave him a reason to go to war with Austria in 1866. Before the seven weeks war against Austria Bismarck secured French neutrality at the Convention of Aachen in 1864 by promising suggesting some compensation of the Rhineland. He also secured Italian and Russian neutrality, Russia by being supportive in the Polish revolt and Italy with the promise of land. The neutrality of these ~~sea~~ countries was crucial in winning the war which led to their dominance. He did the same in 1870 gaining Austrian ^{and Britain} neutrality at the Treaty of Prague. Bismarck also fought through the Army reforms in 1862 leading to breech-loading rifle guns being used against Austria leading to her the Prussian win.

Overall I feel that ~~prussia~~ Austria's weakness was a key part of the

(This page is for your first answer.) Prussia becoming the dominant power in Germany, but her economic and political weaknesses. But if Prussia had not grown stronger Austria's weakness would not have been so prominent, so I would say it was not primarily due to Austria's weakness.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response is well-focused with some understanding of the key issues. However, the organisation of the material is imbalanced and, at times, lacks coherence and clarity. The supporting material, although relevant, is not always secure and some of the statements have simple elements. However, it does address the given factor with some depth, if not detailed security.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Always try to develop and explain the given factor or the key subject of the question as fully as possible.

This is a Level 3 response.

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.)

Plan How far do you agree that Prussia was able to become the dominant state in Germany in the years 1850-71 primarily because of Austrian weaknesses?

Points -

* Austria wasn't involved in a customs union with other German states. (Zollverein).

* Prussia's economy was superior.

* Prussia's military was superior.

* Prussia's resources was superior.

* Prussia's diplomacy was superior.

(This page is for your second answer.) How far do you agree that Prussia was able to become the dominant state in Germany in the years 1850-71 primarily because of Austrian weaknesses?

Prussian dominance over the ~~German states~~ other German states in the years 1850-71 most certainly was because of Austrian weaknesses but not entirely. Prussia's economy was booming at a frightening rate and many other factors like key political movements and wars were of great significance in Prussia being the most dominant German state at that time.

Prussia was ~~more~~ able to use other German states to its advantage. The ~~an~~ founding of the customs union called the Zollverein in 1834, allowed Prussia to trade with other German states with no tariffs. The Zollverein excluded Austria which was of huge disadvantage to Austrian Economy. The exclusion of Austria in the ~~in~~ Zollverein was undoubtedly one of the primary ~~was~~ weaknesses Austria had. This certainly allowed Prussia to be ~~the~~ the dominant state when economy was concerned.

(This page is for your second answer.)

With an admirable economy for its time, Prussia was allowed to indulge more in its own military. ~~The~~ Prussia's military was of huge importance in dominating Austria in the years 1850-71. ~~Refer to~~ Ministry of Defence, Von Roon, ~~was~~ invested in breech loading rifles which could fire more rounds than the Austrians' rifles. The strategic placement of railway was also influential to Prussia, allowing soldiers to travel quickly. Railways also happened to reduce the price of transport by 80% for Prussians. The Austrians lacked such ~~luxury~~ luxuries and once again Prussia ~~was~~ was in ~~the~~ the lead.

Fortunately, Prussia had plentiful of resources. This certainly allowed Prussia to fund for otherwise expensive wars like the Seven Weeks War ~~and~~ of 1866 and the War against France in 1871. However it would be foolish to disregard one man that gave Prussia the overwhelming advantage ~~over~~ over Austria. Otto Von Bismarck, the Prussian Junker and Prime Minister of Prussia. His clever yet manipulative

(This page is for your second answer.) that would lead a unified Germany.

It is important to also consider the role of Bismarck within the achievement of Prussian Hegemony. His diplomatic skill, meant that Prussia easily conquered Austrian opposition, but also made Prussia a faster and more powerful state. This is perfectly shown with his handling of the Schleswig-Holstein crisis in the early 1860s. The outcome was perfect for Prussia, not only did he gain land, but he also provided the ideal way to provoke war whenever he chose, something necessary to show Prussian dominance. In addition, his diplomacy meant that the French remained neutral in 1866, as well as securing Italian help. While the plans may have still worked without Bismarck, he ensured they ran as smoothly as possible.

In conclusion, it wasn't Austria's ~~fast~~ weakness that enabled Prussia to take control by 1871, it was Prussia's simultaneous economic success. This allowed them to defeat the Austrians in 1866, by providing both the funds and the army to do so. Austria still possessed a vast army, it was by no means an easy target. The smaller, yet well equipped and trained Prussian army ensured their hegemony in 1866, and at the end of the day, this was down to economic success and expansion.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The response has an understanding of the question and attempts analysis. However, Austrian weakness is discussed in relation to Prussian dominance, rather than in relation to it being the given factor. Austrian weakness is asserted, rather than established.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

In a question which requires the discussion of relative importance to other factors, always try to develop and explain the given factor in some depth and detail.

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

This is an increasingly popular topic, with over 300 entries. Candidates are becoming increasingly secure in their knowledge and centres clearly cover all bullet points. As observed in previous reports, it is a pleasure to see how many candidates are now able to answer questions on Italy pre-1919 but there are also many wide generalisations beginning to appear which make little reference to the chronology of the period.

Giolitti was often cited as a 'catch-all' Prime Minister who appeared to be in control of government for all the important decisions made. Also, although Italy had been a sovereign nation for a relatively short period of time, 1896 is twenty-five years after the annexation of Rome and over thirty years had passed since the creation of the Kingdom of Italy. When assessing change over time in this period it would be more beneficial to candidates to be aware of the specific situation in 1896, rather than make general references to events over the two decades previously. Unfortunately, there were also still some candidates who mistook the 1896-1919 period as one of Mussolini's rule, leading to responses for which very few, if any, marks could be awarded.

Question 5

This was the more popular of the two questions and the use of the term 'great power' allowed for a wide-ranging discussion of Italy's strengths as a nation. The mark scheme reflected the likelihood of a discussion of both international and domestic issues and candidates who concentrated almost exclusively on domestic issues were unlikely to be able to determine the extent to which Italy was a 'great power'.

Responses were differentiated mainly through candidate-ability to provide a relevant definition of the term 'great power' and to provide supporting evidence to establish its extent. Weaker responses tended to provide a general discussion centred round the extent to which Italy was divided, as opposed to a 'great power', combined with relevant, but not always secure, supporting evidence. More confident responses ranged securely across the whole time period, coming to a clear judgement as to 'great power' status.

It is worth noting that many candidates have a rather simplistic view of the Italian defeat at Adowa in 1896 and some responses referred to the strength of the Abyssinian forces in terms that could even be deemed as inappropriate in expression. There is a reason why Abyssinia was one of the last two areas of Africa to remain independent. The Abyssinian army was the most modern, indigenous army in Africa; it was large, well-organised and well-equipped, with munitions supplied by other European countries. It was humiliating but this was no defeat of a European power by an under-strength African tribe.

This is a low Level 5 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:

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.)

To determine whether or not it is accurate to describe Italy as a great power in the years 1896-1919, one must first consider the factors that made the other great powers of the day, Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary and Russia, so prominent. These countries were generally economically sound, ~~it~~ and had the capacity for industrial production without importing many raw materials*. They also had relatively stable governments, with a developed political system. Where foreign policy was concerned, a great power ~~was~~ was imperialistic, possessing territory all over the world, with an army capable of effectively defending a nation in wartime (* This meant that the country's population had to be based in industrial centres to work the machines, rather than largely residing in rural areas, working the 'old-fashioned farms'.) These factors must be used to assess Italy's ~~status~~ ~~capacity~~ ~~appear~~ potential great power status.

In 1896, Italy was economically backward. All coal was imported, the only industrial centres were in Northern Italy, in Piedmont and Lombardy, and the population of the country was predominantly rural. Indeed, 60% of the Italian population lived and worked in rural areas in

(This page is for your first answer.) 1896. When comparing this with Great Britain, a great power ~~with~~ with a rural population of 20%, it would certainly suggest that Italy lacked economic power, with rural workers in the South living in poverty working the land. A tariff war with France also put pressure on Italy's already struggling banks, leading to their collapse, harming Italy's economic capacity further. That said, Italy did experience some economic and industrial development in the 1900s, with the advent of hydroelectric power diminishing Italy's dependence on expensive imported coal. Hydroelectric power also helped Italy to develop a steel industry, which was an important industry in all expanding great powers. Orders of railroads extending to Southern Italy and 2000 locomotives by the government developed this industry further, and there was a budget surplus every year until 1910, indicating a stable and thriving economy, a key factor of great power status.

Compared to the other great powers, Italy was politically unstable. Limited franchise meant that the corrupt practices of trasformismo was rife, with corrupt deputies securing bridges for villages ~~and~~ or appointments for ~~people~~ ^{the ruling elites} ~~in return~~ ^{that} ~~kept~~ ^{kept} the government in power. ~~Over~~ Changes of government were frequent, which created significant political instability and held back Italy's development. Following the first World War, this liberal government came under significant threat from the ~~the~~ revolutionary Socialist PSI and Catholic ppl at the 1919 election and lost their hold on power. Such political upheaval was certainly unbecoming of a great power.

(This page is for your first answer.) Italy was not as successful as ~~the~~ the great powers in terms of foreign policy. It's lack of an empire was a source of embarrassment for Italy and her people. In 1896, ~~the~~ an Italian army, in pursuit of empire fought a much larger Abyssinian army at Adowa and lost, ~~with many soldiers~~ with thousands of soldiers killed and castrated. This defeat to a supposedly 'primitive' African army was a great humiliation for Italy and highlighted their inferiority to the ~~the~~ great powers. A war with Libya in 1913 did indicate that Italy had the intention to become a militaristic and imperialistic force, but the great powers may have seen this as delusions of grandeur. Indeed, ~~fighting~~ fighting on the side of the Entente in the first World War 1914-18, Italy's performance was not considered worthy of all the territory promised to it by the other Great powers, indicating that the great powers saw Italy as inferior, therefore not a great power. What's more, the war contributed to political and economic instability in Italy, ~~it~~ with demobilised soldiers unhappy at Italy's ~~poor~~ scant rewards for their efforts becoming disillusioned with the liberal government and supporting the Socialist PSI in growing numbers, whilst the country was left with a 23.3 billion lira deficit, damaging their economic power, and inevitably, their ~~other~~ intentions to become a great power.

Italian society was also backward. People in the South were much poorer and illiteracy rates were much higher than in the North, where ~~where~~ where people were more prosperous and 'civilized'. There was little sense of national unity, a key ~~for~~ consideration in deciding great power status. Many Italians spoke regional dialects, so many could not even understand

(This page is for your first answer.) This division, a true factor in a divided society. A divided society meant there was no consensus on the future of Italy, which was a very significant problem for any country wishing to become a great power.

In conclusion, in the years 1896-1919, Italy it would be inaccurate to describe Italy as a great power. Though there were some ~~economic~~ ^{growth} economic ~~improvements~~, living standards rose and there was some attempt at imperialism, Italy was nowhere near great power status, though it had improved since 1896. Italy's political instability, social division and lack of military power meant that, by 1919, Italy was still inferior to the other great powers.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response is focused directly on the question with explicit understanding of the key issues involved. It discusses both domestic and foreign policy although it could develop international status a little more. Each paragraph is related to great power status and is concisely explained and developed.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

A good use of vocabulary and historical terminology leads to concise explanatory paragraphs.

Question 6

Most candidates who chose this response tended to concentrate on specific policies and analysed the success or failure of each in turn. This led to some well-focused answers but many responses were rewarded at low Level 4, because they tended to rely too heavily on discussion of the 'battles'. As such, they gave little reference to policies across the whole period or change over time. Answers at Level 3 often attempted to analyse different policies but lacked secure knowledge and awareness of chronology. More confident responses were aware that the time-frame began in 1922 and were able to discuss early, more ambiguous, policies and to discuss Giolitti's success in creating a 'corporate state' in relation to the economic situation at the outbreak of war. Candidates do seem to have difficulties with questions relating to economic concepts but there was some impressive knowledge of economic policy.

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

As noted in previous sessions, this is becoming a popular topic but more with Option E than Option F. Considering the sometimes convoluted and complex nature of the events taking place in Spain in the 1930s, centres are to be congratulated for preparing their candidates so well. Although some candidates do confuse Nationalists for Republicans and vice versa, it is rare, and most candidates are aware of basic chronology.

Question 7

Candidates tended to approach this response from one of two angles. Responses either concentrated on the short-term causes of 1935-36 with specific reference to the events leading to the outbreak of war, or discussed the murder of Sotelo in relation to longer term causation. Both approaches were deemed as equally valid and there were some very interesting responses, particularly from those who concentrated on the events of 1935-36. However, those candidates who tended to dismiss the murder with little reference to the context and move directly on to other longer term and short-term causes, often found it difficult to move out of high Level 3 or low Level 4 because they were unable to explain why the murder was not the main reason. Some more confident answers referred to the murder as the trigger event in relation to more fundamental long-term causes.

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

For	Against
Monarchists	Reforms
Murder of Sotelo 13 th July by a socialist.	Popular Front
In retaliation to a murder of a socialist in the army.	Asturias uprising
18 th - war began.	Preparation for uprising.
	CNT
	Army's discontent.

In 1936 Spain was unstable politically and socially. When the murder of Sotelo took place it pushed tension over the edge. But was this the main reason for Civil war outbreak? Could it have not been the seemingly uncontrollable CNT or the disgruntled attitudes towards left-wing reform?

On the 13th of July 1936 Sotelo was murdered by a socialist in the army in retaliation to a left wing party member being killed days before Sotelo, head

(This page is for your first answer.) of the Monarchist party in Spain, was one of the ~~Popular~~ Popular Front's main opposition. He held a lot of influence, and, if he was not assassinated, could have very well been in Franco's position as dictator at the end of the war. His murder certainly sparked tensions even further and pushed Nationalists to the point of a takeover. When Quiroga, current prime minister of the government of the Popular Front coalition, offered Mola a position in government, Mola refused and that same day, July 18th, the Civil War started. From the facts and dates, on the surface it looks as though Sotelo's murder was the reason for a split between the republicans and the nationalists, but underlying problems and tensions played a large role.

When the second Republic originally began, there was a decisive vote for the Spanish government to be centre-left with 150 seats each for the republicans and socialists. The opposition, mainly CEDA (Catholic Party) and the Radicals, hated the idea of the republic. The left and right division increased when a series of dramatic reforms took place. 40% of Army generals were retired and replaced with pro-republican generals. This proved to be a large misstep in judgement ~~as~~ as it caused a polarisation of

(This page is for your first answer.) the army as they became political. Other reforms include the 1932 autonomy of Catalonia. Allowing Catalonia to become independent angered the Nationalists as it was a loss of power from Spain. Agrarian reform was a massive change to Spain as well with the 1932 Agrarian Statute. This gave many more rights to peasants and did not allow the latifundia to exploit their workers or suddenly evict them. This greatly displeased large landowners (the latifundia) and the elite. Finally Azarza's 1931 to 1933 left centre government pushed for independence of the state from the church, such as 2 years notice before evoking their weekly penny. This was so controversial in largely Catholic Spain that the original prime minister, Alcalá Zamora, resigned due to it. The reforms worked to alienate just about every ~~group~~ of political and social group within Spain, even managing to disorient socialists with the disappointing and slow pace of reform. Just a few years before the Civil War tensions were running high and divides deepening.

Another instance of deep divides and fighting within Spain before the Civil War was the Asturias Uprising. In December 1934, CNT anarchists stole 30,000 guns and took over the town of Oviedo within

(This page is for your first answer.) Asturias. They had the town overrun before Franco and his troops came to take back the town. Hundreds of anarchists were shot in cold blood. By this point communists and socialists had joined the anarchists to form a united front, naming themselves aptly; the Frente Unido. Once Oviedo had been taken back by Franco the consequences had already set in. The left had been shown the merits of a united front against the current centre-right coalition of Lerroux. This uprising almost worked to pre-empt the Civil War as it showed divisions between political parties were very prominent.

By the time the Popular Front came into power in ~~Feb~~ February 1936 there was huge opposition from both the left and right-wing extremist parties. With Primo de Rivera leading the falangists and Salas leading the monarchists on the ~~left~~^{right} and the communists on the left, the Popular Front did not seem to have a chance to last long in office. These extremist parties and Civil Parties of CEDA told their followers to prepare for an uprising by the summer of 1936 and to cooperate with the army if the time came. The army and Africanist generals including Goded, Mola, Sanjurjo and Franco ~~was~~ also

(This page is for your first answer.) felt that it was time for a coup against the government. With so much powerful opposition against them, the Popular Front only had a matter of time before an uprising could break loose.

Before Sotelo's assassination in July 1936 there were already social and political divisions in Italy. With the outrage at the left-centre reforms introduced in Azana's first government, opposition was created quickly against republicans and the left. Infighting such as Oviedo in the Asturias uprising make it clear that things within Spain were at a breaking point. This evidence suggests that, while the Sotelo murder was the turning point that pushed the Nationalist side over the edge and began the war, problems within Spain were already so strong that it was only a short matter of time before a Civil War broke out anyway. This shows that it can be argued that it is not the main reason for the outbreak of civil war in 1936, but rather long underlying tensions that had been festering since the beginning of the second Republic and Spain was at boiling-point anyway.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response is directly focused with explicit understanding of the key issues with regard to immediate and longer term causes. It develops the given factor well and explains the importance of the murder in relation to other factors, in order to come to a judgement. Other factors are developed using detailed and usually secure supporting material.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

This is a good example of the fact that analysis can be made just as effectively at the end of paragraphs as at the beginning. Here, the supporting material is summarised at the end of each paragraph, with links to the next point.

This is an example of a low Level 3 response with narrative approach.

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 far do you agree that the outbreak of Civil war~~

How far do you agree that the murder of Sotelo was the main reason for the outbreak of the civil war in 1936?

PLAN!

INTRO - Spain pre-civil war

P1 - D = Repub + Nation ^{long time} P4 - D =

P2 - D = frustration of WC. P5 - A = death was outrage

P3 - D = Bi-racial regime

CONCLUSION - Main argument

P.T.C. →

(This page is for your second answer.)

Spain in the 1930s had problems socially, economically, politically and religiously. Prior to the civil war small events took place which eventually built up opposing sides: Republicans and Nationalists.

The Second republic government came into power after the great depression. Spain was in need of desperate reforms but had little money to do so. The Republican government, lead by Azaña had an impact of anti-clerical views. Meaning that instantly the Churches opposed the government. Ultimately, when it came to the Civil War the Churches - who had a lot of influence sided with the nationalist. This suggests that the outbreak of the Civil War could have been pending from as early as 1932 when enemies began to be made and sides were being taken.

Azañas government also granted Catalonia autonomy. Under the Catalan Statute. This Reform gained the support for the Republicans from Catalonians. However, Nationalists believed that this broke up the unity in Spain. This further suggests that as early as 1932 issues between the Republicans and nationalists was the main reason for the outbreak of the Spanish 1936 Civil War.

After the second republican government ruled for two years successfully, tensions between right wing parties grew. The creation of the CEDA along with the radical republicans started to roll back reforms made in 1932. This was known as *Biennio Negro* (Two Black years). This brought ~~to~~ a harder life back to the population. Conveying that the main outbreak of the civil war could have come from the lack of ability to get along within Spain, affecting farmers and agricultural workers the most. This led to working class frustration which could also be another reason why war broke out.

However, Sotelo's murder could be seen as the main reason for the outbreak of the civil war as it caused outrage making it the final straw.

The civil war could be seen to have many causes. But the main cause is seen to be the running tensions between Republicans and the Nationalist along with the Spanish political parties. The main reason for the civil war was the ongoing divisions. Sotelo's murder may have sparked it but it was not the main reason for the outbreak.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The response understands the focus of the question and attempts to show the reasons for the outbreak of war by developing a narrative account, which briefly mentions the given factors. The material is relatively secure and understands change over time but lacks depth and range.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

When questions are concerned with the causation of a specific event, always try to discuss the reasons suggested in the question first. This way you may begin to analyse by developing other factors in relation to the given factor.

Question 8

This question led to some very interesting responses, which were a pleasure to read. Responses were differentiated by the extent to which candidates were able to explain why the Nationalists took so long to win, as opposed to why they won. Those responses which were able to discuss the elements of military advantage, along with reasons for the length of the war, were rewarded at the higher Levels. There is obviously some very good knowledge as to the events of the war. Candidates were able to refer to the early geopolitical advantage of the Republicans along with the tactics of Nationalist generals and the political nature of the war in general. It was clear that many candidates were able and willing to select and deploy their knowledge to answer the specific question set.

This is a secure Level 4 response.

Chosen Question Number:

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

(This page is for your second answer.)

Why despite their military advantages in July 1936, did it take so long for the Nationalists to win the Spanish Civil War?

The Spanish Civil War lasted from 1936 to 1939. Even under the expertise of General Franco and General Mola it still took a long time for the Republicans to surrender. Military troops, the divided nature of Spain and Mola's tactics to the war are contributing factors.

Most importantly, Franco's and Mola's tactics was to halt Republicans ^{in two years} however that was unsuccessful by 1937. It may have been successful in keeping the Nationalist troops casualties relatively to not a bloodshed but took time and did not result to an immediate victory.

(This page is for your second answer.)

In order to win the war, Nationalists needed to secure the Capital Madrid and big cities such as Barcelona which the republicans had under control. Strategically, it took time to weaken the republicans military trade ^{supply} off from the Suez Canal and blockade them. Mola was more diligent than Azana, and was aware of not making any haste move which could have made the Nationalists retreat. Mola's strategic plan delayed victory.

The Nationalists did receive troops from Italy who were trained, the Republicans troops were not trained but were successful in numbers. Many people were afraid of Nationalist take over and lost people joined Republicans sides. Stalin's Russia joint the Republicans in numbers and brought the war to a greater scale. The war was not a guerrilla war and it was representing Europe's fight against socialism. More interest yet took even longer to finish.

The German Condor League was successful but did not come until the end of the Spanish Civil War. This led to the war being mostly fought in attrition and not having the military air force for overnight raids and a swift victory until the end.

(This page is for your second answer.) International attention was focused on Spain and it pre second world war made diplomatic tension in Spain high. CEDA and the Popular Front had already by the end of the War secured Franco by the King as generalissimo. However rebellion was widespread in the Catalonia and Basque regions that wanted independence. A nationalist longer ~~period~~ but secure victory was more beneficial than a quick but not long-standing one.

The Spanish War only came to an end when the republicans surrendered and Azana was captured and ~~executed~~ ^{executed}, this did not happen until 1939. A clear image of the opposition dead was vital in bringing the war to a definite end and stop socialist opposition and foreign intervention from making long-term decisions to have Spain as a conflict of interest.

Most importantly:
In conclusion, Franco and Mola's tactics and planning of the war did secure victory however it's steady trapping of the republicans did not make it's deadline in 1937 leading to outside intervention turning

(This page is for your second answer.) a civil war into a European battlefield. The German Condor Legion did not enter until ~~the~~ 1938 and Russian troops though not trained like the Nationalist ~~the~~ Italian troops from Mussolini were in numbers from Stalin for the Republicans. The Nationalists did not secure the capital of Madrid and Barcelona immediately and had to come through in the challenge of ~~regions~~ rebel regions such as Basque and Catalonia that wanted independence. Franco became Generalissimo in 1939 by the King ~~and~~ diplomatically but revolutionarily the dear image and end only came once Azana was killed and the Republicans surrendered. The civil war may have seemed clear cut but took longer due to diligent planning and the Republicans international support and the already unsteady nature Spain was in in this war where its estimated that from 500,000 to 1,000,000 people died.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response is well-focused and understands some of the key issues behind the length of the war. It centres on Nationalist reasons for prolonging the war, but the organisation gives it some imbalance.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Try not to write too-lengthy a conclusion. Some of the material here would have been more effective creating a more direct discussion, in the body of the essay.

F6 – Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91.

This topic has a steady entry but with a smaller entry for Option E, with less than twenty responses. Candidates are generally well-prepared but there is a noticeable lack of chronological awareness, with many candidates finding particular difficulty with events of the 1950s/1960s, and the chronology of the end of East Germany.

Question 9

Candidates were aware of the economic role of Ludwig Erhard but many of them did not seem to know that he became Chancellor of Germany (1963-66). Also, some responses were focused on the extent to which the West German economy was more successful than the East German, so misunderstanding the focus of the question. Those who did understand the focus were able to discuss Erhard in relation to other individuals such as Adenauer and/or external factors such as the influence of the West, the Korean War etc. However, most candidates tended to discuss the earlier period, leading to the imbalanced answers that are a feature at Level 4.

Question 10

Candidates tended to approach this response from one of two angles. Responses either concentrated on the short-term causes of 1989, with specific reference to the events leading to Honecker's resignation, or discussed the resignation in relation to longer-term causation. Both were deemed to be equally valid responses. Stronger responses were able to differentiate between the withdrawal of Russian support and the more general influence of Gorbachev's policies in the USSR. Most candidates suggested that although withdrawal of Soviet support was important, it was also the intransigence of Honecker's beliefs, combined with his incapacity, at a vital time in 1989 that ultimately led to the collapse of his government. There was some insecurity as to the year in which Gorbachev came to power (1985) and the chronology of events after this.

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

This remains a popular topic, with over seventy entries for both Option F and Option E. Although candidates are clearly still more comfortable with the content of the specification up to 1979, it is clear that centres are more focused on the development of Arab nationalism across the whole period. Those candidates electing to answer questions on the broad development of Arab nationalism are producing interesting and thought-provoking answers. Some candidates still find the overall chronology of this period daunting but centres are to be congratulated on an improvement in this area, leading to less imbalanced answers in relation to questions on Arab-Israeli relations in particular.

Question 11

Most responses were well-focused but many concentrated on Israeli victories, rather than survival. Those candidates who concentrated either on the early period, or gave generalised responses with little specific supporting evidence, were often unable to attain more than Level 3. Responses which focused on victory, rather than the means for survival, were often able to achieve good Level 4 marks. The strongest responses were able to discuss why Israel was able to survive as a state and discussed issues which were wider than just military victory. There was a tendency to refer to US support in general, with little specific evidence and little differentiation between the US government and pro-Israeli supporters in the US. A common reflection of this type of approach is that a significant number of responses suggested that Israel had the full support of the US government during the Suez Crisis.

This is an example of a mid-Level 5 response.

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"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 9 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <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.) PLAN: - Strength of military power
- Arab disunity
- Foreign intervention from the West & the Cold War

Between 1948 and 1973, the State of Israel was involved in numerous conflicts with its Arab neighbours, most prominently the 1948 War of Independence, the 1967 Six Day War and the 1973 Yom Kippur War. It is argued that it was the strength of Israel's military power which enabled the newly formed state to survive. However it is evident that Arab disunity, the Cold War & Western intervention all played prominent roles in Israel's survival and that (going along the lines of revisionist historians such as Benny Morris), Israel's army was not

(This page is for your second answer.) or indestructible and almighty
or some believe.

Firstly it is evident that it was not the strength of ^{Israel's} military power which enabled it to survive, but was rather the result of Arab disunity. Evidence of this could be seen in the 1948 War of Independence in which the Arab states all seemed to have different motives as to why they launched attacks into Israel; for instance, Abdullah's Arab Legion (the Jordanian Army) successfully maintained a hold on Eastern Jerusalem but ~~the Arab states~~ ~~of interest~~ were not interested in sending troops to the Egyptian border to help them in their attempts to take control of Jewish Settlements in the Sinai. As a result Israel could only defend itself and therefore clearly survived as the surrounding Arab states refused to help each other.

One might argue that due to British military training during WW2, Israel survived in 1948 as their army used this past experience to outwit their opponents and tactically thwart the Arab onpour. Therefore, it

(This page is for your second answer.) could be suggested that Israeli military power was primarily responsible for halting the Arab attack. However it is clear that Arab disunity still allowed Israel to survive as the Jordanian army were ~~as~~ as militarily advanced as Israel, & having also received training during WW2. ~~Despite~~ Despite this, it is clear that due to a lack of desire to support ^{its} other Arab allies, Israel could easily crush the attack & ~~and~~ maintain its survival.

It could be argued that foreign intervention from the West was largely responsible for Israeli survival after the Arab-Israeli ~~conflict~~ ~~of~~ conflicts of 1956 in the Suez War and the 1973 Yom Kippur War. It is evident that the West in '56 (France & Britain) devised a controversial plan which allowed Israel to assert its military dominance and achieve survival by re-establishing shipping through the Tiran Straights (closed by Nasser). Their attempt to compromise resulted in UN intervention and this protected

(This page is for your second answer.) Israeli settlements along the Egyptian border from ~~the~~ Fedayeen raids contributing to the safety of Israeli civilians and hence its survival. Similarly in 1973, the US provided arms to Israel as well as tanks & artillery, providing a significant weapons boost to Israel, allowing it to defend itself and maintain its survival.

It could be argued that military strength of Israel, however, was the main factor in these two wars as ultimately the Israelis ~~it~~ demonstrated their superior military prowess in 1956 ~~it~~ with their temporary quick conquest of the Sinai, whilst in 1973, Israel eventually diluted the Egyptian-Syrian threat by militarily crushing the ^{Arab} ~~Arabs~~ and causing them to retreat. Despite this, one can evaluate that ^{in 1973} the oil weapon produced by the Arab states played a massive part in the West being responsible for Israeli survival, as American hesitancy to lose its main source of oil from Saudi Arabia, meant that Western troops took control and stepped in to ensure the ending of war and thus maintaining the

(This page is for your second answer.) survival of Israel.

However, it can be argued that Israel's military strength was the decisive factor in ensuring its survival as proved in the 1967 Six Day War. Israel's pre-emptive strikes on Egyptian & Syrian airfields as well as its capture of the Sinai desert, Golan Heights, West Bank and most significantly the East side of Jerusalem in just six days, is an overwhelming demonstration of the military capabilities & strength of the Israeli Defence Force and this was crucial in ensuring the survival of the state of Israel.

Whilst a revisionist like Avi Shlaim could argue that the Six Day War ~~was~~ victory for Israel was only caused by the lack of leadership of Arab countries who all looked up to Nasser as the champion of Arab unity and therefore disrespected their own leaders, it is still clear that Israel won and ensured survival through the might of its military which overpowered the Arabs.

(This page is for your second answer.) In conclusion it is evident that other factors such as Western intervention and Arab disunity were key reasons as to why Israel survived through its conflict. Whilst many consider that Israel's military strength enabled it to tactically and militarily dominate its enemies, it is clear that the Arab's lack of unity and goal meant that they couldn't unite to destroy Israel whilst the West provided crucial aid to allow Israel to win its wars.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The response is directly focused on the question, with an explicit understanding of the key issues discussed. The answer does more than discuss Israeli victory and there is a clear awareness of Israel's survival as a state. The supporting material has weaknesses in places but it is secure and usually well-selected. The response attempts to show the importance of the given factor in relation to other factors.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Always try to show relative importance and to show links between factors in the conclusion. This is a relatively brief conclusion which successfully addresses the argument made in the main body of the essay.

(This page is for your second answer.) Strengths as resentment was high which resulted in universal Arab condemnation of Israel as an 'illegal state'. This was a key starting point of Arab nationalism and as time progressed nationalism would be underpinned by the creation of the State of Israel.

In 1953 Nasser came to power as president of Egypt following a military coup. Nasser was a charismatic figure and spread huge nationalism through a number of different ways and different reasons. Firstly, he resisted western involvement in Arab affairs and through the 'Voice of the Arabs' radio station he unleashed a nationalist frenzy in response to the western Baghdad pact. This type of nationalism was a huge change in ways from previously and the methods used were seen as modern with radio becoming the new affordable technology of the Arab world. Following the success of this nationalism, Nasser ~~agreed~~ tried to use its strength to remove Britain from Egyptian territory. He used speeches and provoked the situation to create huge Arab passion for his project. This was a move away from just the anti-Israel writing piece as Nasser tried to create internal Arab nationalism through the medium of technology and culture. This shows a huge change in the evolution of Arab nationalism.

From 1973 onwards the method of Arab nationalism changed once again. This change came through

(This page is for your second answer.) President Sadat who sought peace with Israel and the west for economic and stability purposes. Sadat returned to the old form of Arab nationalism - war on Israel however this time the arms were different. After the war diplomacy and the 'oil weapon' were used and through USA pressure peace talks with Israel started. This method was well received in the Arab world as it portrayed the strength that Arab countries had as well as seeing an end to the affliction of 35 years of on/off war. This kind of nationalism was so popular that it had strong future influences on countries such as Jordan with its peace treaty with Israel in 1994 and over Palestinian diplomacy with the US and Arab states regarding the Oslo accords with Israel. This decision from Sadat was a fluctuation from anti-Israel nationalism to a new method and aim of nationalism. The method was increased domestic prosperity as wars ended and government money was transferred from defence to social welfare. The arms were new and after 40 years an Arab country had recognised Israel. This demonstrated the fluctuating yet changing dimension of Arab nationalism.

Following 1973 and in response to the 1982 Lebanon war, Arab nationalism was channelled through terrorism, the weapon the two-fold aim of peace yet the destruction of Israel. Some such as Sami al-Harithi went on suicide missions as they believed Israel

(This page is for your second answer.) Should not exist, yet others such as the PFLP and Father Jihad terror to spur on the process of peace-making as the Oslo accords and peacekeeping processes slowed. This showed a reversion back to the old methods of peace and Israeli destruction whilst introduced new methods of doing so. This demonstrated the changing nature and situation of Arab nationalism as methods such as war used previously, seemed unfeasible without Egypt's support.

The overall struggle in the Arab nationalism was rooted in the destruction of Israel with the aim which in several types of nationalist desires. However the methods used did develop from war at first, to technology under Nasser and finally to terrorism under groups such as the PLO, Hizbullah and Hamas. The aims of Arab nationalism moved from Israeli destruction, to peace with the majority of the Arab world wanting a two state solution that was being agreed under the Oslo accords. This makes it clear to see that nationalism has developed to a large extent yet is still rooted in the contempt for Israeli existence.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The response is well-focused with some understanding of the key issues. It attempts to provide evidence across the whole period and charts the main trends and changes. The development is not always wholly analytical but the conclusion shows a clear understanding of change over time.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

It is important that responses cover the whole time period of the question set.

Paper Summary

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

- Candidates must focus more clearly on the question set, noting its specific wording and the timescale to be covered.
- Chronological awareness is sometimes weak. Candidates should know key dates, and should be able to explain and expand on points made, with accurate reference to the order in which events happened.
- The range and depth of supporting material is often the key to success. This support should be relevant, focused, accurate, and in sufficient depth to allow the points made to stand up.
- Candidates sometimes find it difficult to answer questions using sufficient supporting material and/or have a limited choice of questions, if centres do not cover all of the content indicated by the bullet points in the Specification.
- Centres should ensure that candidates are familiar with historical concepts and vocabulary relevant to the course of study. In January, many confused the Weimar Republic with the Weimar Constitution, economic and political policies, and social and political policies.
- Several could not frame a secure definition of a totalitarian state.

Grade Boundaries

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

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

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 US034621 January 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

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



Rewarding Learning