

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2013

GCE History (6HI01/F)

Unit 1: Historical Themes in Breadth

Option F: The Expansion and Challenge
of Nationalism

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk for our BTEC qualifications.

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

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

January 2013

Publications Code US034626

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

General Marking Guidance

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

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

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

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

GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

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

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

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

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

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

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

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

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

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

Unit 1: Generic Level Descriptors

Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)

(30 marks)

Essay - to present historical explanations and reach a judgement.

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

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

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

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

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

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

Unit 1 Assessment Grid

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

F1 The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-70

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>The question is focused on the opposition to both autocratic and foreign rule in Italy in the years 1831-49 and requires consideration of the significance of Mazzini on the growth of such opposition. Candidates may establish significance either through a balanced discussion of the Mazzini's effect on opposition or through comparison in relation to other contributing factors. In the wake of the failed 1830-31 revolutions in Italy, Mazzini created the 'Young Italy' society. 'Young Italy' promulgated opposition to both the foreign and autocratic nature of the Italian rulers with its desire for the creation of a republican nation-state. 'Young Italy' was still a small-scale, secret nationalist society, similar to the Carbonari groups of the earlier revolutionary period but it was planned as a youth movement for the whole peninsula so had the potential to gain widespread and active support. Mazzini was a prolific publicist continually publishing letters and articles and was feted by many European liberals. Mazzini's ideas encouraged several attempted invasions and insurrections in the years 1833-48 and in 1849 Mazzini was able to take advantage of the Pope's flight from Rome to declare a Roman Republic. However, Mazzini's ideas remained a minority view in Italy and direct action taken in his name was singularly unsuccessful, for example, his invasion of Savoy in 1834 or not supported by him, as in Naples in 1844. Mazzini was in exile in London in the years 1837-48 with negligible direct influence. The initial success of the Roman Republic did not spread to the rest of Italy as Italian Catholics were reluctant to challenge the authority of the Church directly and it was crushed by French intervention which resulted in greater foreign influence in Italy. Some candidates may suggest other factors which were more/also significant but to access the higher levels should attempt to evaluate the factors in relation to Mazzini. Other factors which encouraged liberal and/or nationalist opposition might include the resurgence of Italian culture, support for economic reforms (<i>Riformisti</i>), the attitude of Charles Albert in Piedmont (<i>Albertisti</i>), the election of the 'liberal' Pope Pius IX (1846) and growing resentment of Austrian influence in the light of growing economic and social problems in Italy. At the higher levels candidates might conclude that, although not particularly significant during these years, Mazzini's influence on Garibaldi and the events of 1849 were to have long term significance on the nature and growth of opposition, but this is not required.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the significance of Mazzini in relation to the growth of opposition across the time period, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on the failures of 'Young Italy'. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be</p>	30

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>The question is focused on the process of Italian unification and the extent to which Garibaldi influenced the shaping of Italian Unification in the years 1860-1870. Candidates may choose to approach the question by discussing the arguments for and against his responsibility and/or suggest other individuals or factors which may have been more responsible or contributed to the outcome. Candidates will probably put the situation in 1860 into context and those who show explicit understanding of the starting date of the question should be rewarded. Those who spend too long outlining the events of 1858-9 will probably create an imbalance in their response. The war of 1859 had resulted in French negotiations with Austria after the armistice at Villafranca to cede Lombardy to Piedmont through France in the Peace of Zurich, creating the first stepping stone to potential unification. However, at the beginning of 1860 there was still a question mark over any future advance in the unification process with uncertainty over the future of Nice, Savoy and the Central Duchies and with Cavour having resigned as Prime Minister of Piedmont. Garibaldi had been frustrated by the role of France in the 1859 war and, already unhappy with the agreements made at Plombieres, was angry at Cavour handing over Nice and Savoy to France on his return. Cavour's return in early 1860 reinvigorated Piedmontese attempts to expand and subsequently the people of the Central Duchies voted in favour of unity with Piedmont. These plebiscites meant that Piedmont was now in control of the majority of northern Italy. An uprising occurred simultaneously in Sicily and Garibaldi, in the middle of plans to organise a military expedition to Naples, took advantage of the situation to launch an invasion to take leadership of the revolt. Garibaldi and his supporters overthrew the authorities in Naples and marched on the Papal States and Rome. Piedmont intervened in the Papal States to prevent Garibaldi's capture of Rome and at a meeting at Teano (October 1860) Garibaldi handed over his conquests to King Victor Emmanuel of Piedmont. Following plebiscites Victor Emmanuel became King of Italy in 1861 encompassing all of the peninsula except for Venetia and Rome. Venetia was gained as the result of the Austrian defeat in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 and, despite two attempts by Garibaldi to capture it in 1862 and 1867, Rome became the capital after the withdrawal of the protective French garrison in 1870. Some responses might suggest that Garibaldi was very significant in determining the shape of unification with his support for Piedmont to expel Austria, the invasion of the Two Sicilies, most importantly, his handing over of the South to 'create' the Kingdom of Italy in 1860 and his subsequent attempts to take Rome. While others might suggest he was dependent on events and individuals in the</p>	30

North and later became rather a marginal figure or suggest alternative individuals/factors were more responsible, such as the ambitions of Piedmont, the role of Cavour, the role of Victor Emmanuel, the 'will' of the Italian people or the interference/actions of foreign powers. An integrated response might suggest for example that, building on Mazzinian nationalism, Garibaldi manipulated Piedmont/Cavour into unifying the whole of Italy despite their misgivings and by continually pushing for the inclusion of Venetia and Rome did not allow the new Kingdom to lose sight of complete territorial integrity.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the responsibility of Garibaldi and other relevant points, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus mainly on the period 1859-61. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.

F2 The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	<p>The question is focused on the impact of the German revolutions and the restoration of conservative rule in the years 1848-50 on Austrian strength in Germany. candidates may suggest that the status quo of Austrian political and Prussian economic influence had been restored with Austria surviving well whilst others might suggest that, although this may have been so on the surface, the pre-conditions for the <i>Kleindeutschland</i> unification of the 1860s had already been created. Discussion of events post-1850 might also be used effectively to exemplify the extent to which Austrian influence survived. Austria and the Metternich System had dominated the German Confederation since 1815 politically, and to an extent psychologically, whilst Prussia (itself not being within the German Confederation territorially) had begun to dominate economically in the 1830s through the <i>Zollverein</i>. The central European revolutions of 1848-9 affected Austria's political dominance significantly with the possibility of Austrian power being lost completely. By March 1848 Metternich had resigned as Austrian Chancellor and the Emperor was more concerned with events to the east and in Italy than Germany. In May 1848 the revolutions had been so successful within the German Confederation itself that the liberal-dominated Frankfurt Parliament had been organised as a basis for a 'united' Germany. However, when determining the future leadership of a 'new' German governmental system the revolutionaries still looked to the Austrian Habsburg family first and envisaged a <i>Grossdeutschland</i> (Greater Germany encompassing Austria). When Archduke John turned down the opportunity, in the light of imperial gains against the revolution in Austria, the King of Prussia also turned down the offer of a <i>Kleindeutschland</i> German Crown (1849) partly due to the belief that Austria had 'divine right' to dominate Germany. This in turn led to a situation at the beginning of 1850 where Austria was still obviously a very significant force in Germany but also one where Prussia had made great political gains in Austria's absence, and the two states had differing views on how to re-establish a confederation of German rulers. Prussia proposed the 'Erfurt Union' (March 1850) in which Prussia would become the dominant influence in northern Germany which was unacceptable to the Austrians. Austria, still not wholly recovered from the revolutionary upheavals, suggested a second Union linked to 'Erfurt' which brought all German states together in free trade and foreign policy. Having reached a stalemate it was the 'middle-states' who would eventually determine where political power lay; eleven of these states were reluctant to join 'Erfurt', Austria was becoming stronger by the month and when a crisis emerged in Hesse-Cassel its leader chose to ask Austria rather than Prussia for help. At the 'Capitulation' of Olmutz (November 1850) Prussia accepted the re-establishment of the German Confederation under Austrian presidency.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the extent to which Austrian influence had survived, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material</p>	30

	<p>in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on the events in 1850, for example. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	
--	---	--

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>The question is focused on the process by which Prussia became the dominant state in Germany in the years 1850-71 and the extent to which the weaknesses of its main rival, Austria, were responsible for this growth in power. During the 1850s Prussia increased its capacity in relation to Austria in economic developments, military technology and diplomacy. However, their influence over Germany still remained split with Austria being pre-eminent in politics and Prussia in economics. A shift in the balance of power towards Prussia began to move decisively in the 1860s. Economically a final <i>Zollverein</i> agreement in 1865 excluded Austria. In 1862, after a constitutional crisis in Prussia, Bismarck with a belief in the significance of 'blood and iron' was appointed as Minister-President. In 1863 the King refused to acknowledge Austrian attempts to reform the Confederation. Between 1863 and 1866 a series of events led to Austria's withdrawal from 'German' affairs; war with Denmark over Schleswig-Holstein, the Gastein Convention and the Austro-Prussian War, the Treaty of Prague. Prussia was now firmly dominant over the North German Confederation, but the southern states were still 'independent' and it was possible that Austria might take advantage of this. After 1866 a series of military agreements with the southern states and the Franco-Prussian War would eventually lead to the creation of a Prussian-led German Empire in 1871. Some responses might support the statement in the question by suggesting that economic backwardness, political conservatism and geographic extent prevented Austria from competing with Prussia in the 1850s which in turn led to the defeat in war. For example, the lack of industrial growth and the need for protection allowed Prussia to continue to expand the <i>Zollverein</i> and develop advanced military technology which contributed directly to the swift, Seven Week defeat in 1866. To establish the comparative importance required other factors that might be referred to include Prussian economic and military strength, the role of war, the influence of liberal-nationalists, the external European situation and Bismarck's diplomacy. Stronger responses might lead to a more integrated answer suggesting, for example, that Austrian weakness contributed to Prussian gains in the 1850s but that it was a combination of Prussian strength and Bismarckian policies which resulted in ultimate dominance or that</p>	30

although Austrian weakness may have lead to their defeat in 1866 it required Prussian actions gain complete dominance in the years 1866-71.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the responsibility of Austrian weaknesses compared to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on the events of the 1860s or mainly on other factors. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.

F3 The Collapse of the Liberal State and the Triumph of Fascism in Italy, 1896-1943

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>The question is focused on the aim of the Italian state to be recognised as a great power and the extent to which this was achieved in the years 1896-1919. Candidates may choose to establish the extent to which great power status was achieved either by reference to foreign policy and international achievements or by a broader discussion of Italy's domestic and international strengths. Responses should be judged on the extent to which the judgement on Italy's position as a great power has been established. However, to achieve the higher levels reference to foreign policy and/or international status will be required. Successive Italian governments sought great power status through achievement in European diplomacy, <i>irredentism</i> and colonial conquest. Italy began 1896 as part of the central European Triple Alliance (1882) and with colonial ambitions. In terms of European diplomatic power Italy renewed the Triple Alliance every year until 1914 and signed a treaty with France in 1902 agreeing spheres of influence in North Africa. The Triple Alliance, however, prevented further attempts to regain the <i>Irredenta</i> as most of this territory was governed by Austria-Hungary. In 1914 at the outbreak of war in Europe Italy declared neutrality and the two major power blocs vied for Italian support. In 1915, having been promised substantial territorial gains, the Treaty of London brought Italy into the war on the side of the Entente. After early setbacks, and near defeat at Caporetto (1917), the Italian army was re-organised leading to the successful offensive at Vittorio-Veneto in November 1918. Italy was one of the 'Big Four' at the Treaty of Versailles but the early failures of the Italian military and President Wilson's support for self-determination meant that Italian territorial gains were not extensive. Italy's colonial ambitions were thwarted very early on with the humiliating defeat at Adowa (1896) by Abyssinian troops and although Italy gained Libya in war from the Ottoman Empire in 1912, it was more as a result of other factors than Italian military strength. Some responses may support the statement by reference to Italy's obvious importance to the alliance system throughout the period, successes in World War I and significance at Versailles. However, this may be counter-balanced by suggestions that Italy was always a junior partner within alliances, failed to secure significant colonial conquests, required allied support at Caporetto and was subject to a 'mutilated victory' in 1919. Responses which take a broader view of Italy as a great power may discuss issues of national unity and political unity and effectiveness along with economic strength, probably with some reference to Fiat.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the extent to which Italy achieved great power status across the whole period, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some</p>	30

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>The question is focused on Mussolini's economic policy from his appointment as Prime Minister in 1922 to the outbreak of war in 1940 and the extent to which his aims and objectives were successful. Italy's economic problems were an underlying cause of Mussolini's rise to power and in 1922 Italy was suffering from a budget deficit and mass unemployment. One of the keystones of the Fascist programme was to create a strong economy. Early policies in the years 1922-25 were designed to solve Italy's economic problems in the short-term and create some stability. Liberal politician Di Stefano reduced government expenditure, created a budget surplus and reduced unemployment considerably. However, from 1925 a more 'Fascist' style economic policy was introduced that included corporatism, protectionism, autarky (self-sufficiency) and national 'battles' for growth. Corporatism was designed to bring employers and workers together to control economic output and deal with industrial relations on a local scale. However, in reality the Ministry of Corporations had the power and neither employers nor unions were consulted over economic policy, labour laws favoured the employers and labour representation was regulated. Protectionist policies were re-introduced in 1925 with the re-introduction of heavy tariffs on imports and currency exchange rate changes which made exports more expensive. The Italian economy was already slowing down before the Wall Street Crash. Protectionism was allied to a policy of autarky which began before 1929 but became more prominent and centralised during the Depression. This included the 'battle for land' to increase land fit for agricultural production, the 'battle for grain' and the 'battle for births'. In the 1930s the Institute for Industrial Reconstruction (IRI) and a rearmament programme were also introduced. By 1940 Italy had weathered the Depression era with an increased population of 7 million, was producing 75% of its own grain using thousands of hectares of reclaimed land, had managed to survive economic sanctions and had a well resourced navy. However, compared to other European nations, the Italian economy was relatively weak, the Abyssinian campaign (1935-6) had affected the economy and Mussolini did not feel strong enough to enter the War in 1939. Italy's weakened economy contributed to the ineffectiveness of the Italian armed forces and the collapse of Mussolini's government in the years 1940-43. Most candidates will determine the extent of success based on initial aims and policy objectives identified. Weaker response may lose focus with</p>	30

imbalanced reference to social policies while stronger responses may show the pattern of change over time as well as the success of individual policies.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the successes and failures of economic policies over time, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on the national battles. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.

F4 Republicanism, Civil War and Francoism in Spain, 1931-75

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>The question is focused on the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War in 1936 and the extent to which it was caused by the murder of the conservative politician Calvo Sotelo (July 13th). Candidates may choose to respond to the question by focusing on events in 1936 or by references to short-term and long-term causes. Both approaches are equally relevant but answers which cover the longer period should attempt to explain why the longer term causes led to the outbreak of war in 1936 to reach the higher level bands. Sotelo was assassinated on July 13th, the army/nationalist uprising which ultimately led to the outbreak of civil war began prematurely in Morocco on the 17th and spread to the mainland on the 19th. After the election of the Popular Front in February 1936 the army and many right-wing politicians believed that the only way to maintain 'order, peace and justice' (General Mola) was to overthrow the government by force. Plans were organised through most of 1936 but the generals and the politicians found it difficult to come to an agreement and by May despite General Mola having published a detailed plan many were unsure whether to carry it out. The assassination of Sotelo, in reprisal for the Falangist assassination of a left-wing officer, persuaded many that it was time to support the rising and became the 'trigger' for the events which followed. Some responses may concentrate on the events of 1936, suggesting that as the 'trigger' for the uprising the murder was indeed the main reason for the outbreak despite the earlier reaction to the Popular Front government and planned uprising while others might suggest that earlier events of the year were more important or that the relative 'failure' of the initial uprising led to the stalemate situation which was to become the Civil War. Answers which consider the longer-term factors might refer to the history of military coup d'etat (pronunciamento) in Spain, the failure of republican government to create political stability, the conservative resentment of reform and the disillusionment of the left leading to the problems of and reaction to the coalition Popular Front government.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the role of Sotelo's murder in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on the more general reasons for the outbreak of the Civil War. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

--	--	--

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>The question is focused on the length of time it took the Nationalists to win the Spanish Civil War despite having some initial military advantage. Although the Nationalists did appear to have a military advantage in terms of leadership, officer corps, trained troops and weaponry in July 1936 against the forces of the Republic it took almost three years before the War ended in March 1939. Any initial advantage was lost by August 1936 when the two sides appeared to be more even in terms of popular support and geographical control, particularly with the Republic in control of Madrid. By March 1937 the Nationalist focus on capturing Madrid had failed and it was not until the summer/autumn of 1937 that the Nationalists made real gains by occupying Northern Spain. Despite the Republicans recapturing Teruel in January 1938 it was recaptured in February and the Nationalists advanced to the Mediterranean dividing Republican held territory in two. It was still not, however, until March 1939 that the Nationalists were able to capture the capital city of Madrid. Responses might suggest a variety of reasons why it took so long for the Nationalists to achieve their goal, such as the lack of decisiveness during the initial uprising, the dogged efforts of the Republican forces despite disorganisation and division, Franco's determination to take Madrid before changing tactics in 1937 (although some stronger responses might suggest that he did not necessarily want to finish the war quickly but to destroy the republican support completely), 'non-interventionist' sympathy for the Republicans as news of atrocities such as Guernica became known, the support for the Republic from the Soviet Union and the International Brigades until the final months, the delayed effectiveness of German/Italian support for the Nationalists and the defence of Republican areas by Spaniards fearful of reprisals. Although it is not a required response, some candidates might question the suggestion in the statement that the Nationalists were militarily at an advantage in July 1936 to start with; there is evidence that apart from the senior officer corps the army was split fairly evenly and that much of the airforce and the navy remained loyal at the start of the war.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the reasons why the Nationalists took so long to win the war, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on either the strengths or the weakness of the Nationalist forces. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited</p>	30

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

F5 Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
9	<p>The question is focused on the 'economic miracle' experienced by West Germany in the years before 1969 and the extent to which Germany's economic recovery after World War II was the result of the actions and policies of Ludwig Erhard. Candidates may choose to approach the question by discussing the arguments for and against Erhard's responsibility/success and/or most likely by making reference to the contribution of other factors. In such cases, to reach the high level bands candidates should establish responsibility in comparison to the contribution of Erhard. At the end of the Second World War Germany was in ruins, from 1945-8 a 'West German' economy was created, during the 1950s and 60s the newly established West Germany (1949) was the leading western European economy and in 1970 was the world's third largest economy. Ludwig Erhard was prominent in the economic development of West Germany throughout most of this period as Economic Director of the Bizone Council, Economics Minister under Adenauer and as Chancellor in the years 1963-66. After strict, externally enforced economic regulation by the Allies in the years 1945-8, on the introduction of a new currency in June 1948 Erhard, without authorisation, announced an end to price controls and in 1949 as Economics Minister introduced policies to support both freer trade and increased government investment. Despite some inflationary and unemployment consequences these policies kick-started industrial production in the 'west' Germany and meant that the new state was able to take advantage of the demand for industrial production caused by the outbreak of the Korean War. Erhard continued to establish a 'social market economy' (combination of free trade, free market enterprise with subsidies and social welfare expenditure) through the 1950s. By 1960 West Germany was described as going through an 'economic miracle' with real economic growth of 8% pa, inflation at 1.1% and unemployment at 1.3 percent. However, despite continued relative growth globally West Germany did experience something of a downturn in the mid-1960s and Erhard resigned the Chancellorship when he was unable to get agreement on tax increases to meet a budget deficit in 1966. Other factors which may be referred to as contributing to the development of a successful economy are the myth of the 1945 'zero point', the availability of German and immigrant skilled labour, Marshall Aid, currency reform, the Korean War and the role of Adenauer in creating political stability and German integration into the post-war economic order of Europe (GATT, ECSC, IMF, EEC).</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the argument for and against Erhard's responsibility and/or other relevant points, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on the earlier chronology covered by the question. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the</p>	30

	question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	
--	---	--

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
10	<p>The question is focused on the end of the Honecker government in East Germany in October-November 1989 and requires an evaluation of the extent to which the withdrawal of Russian support for the regime was responsible for its collapse. Honecker's resignation in October 1989 and the opening of the Berlin Wall in November brought the symbolic end to Communist control of East Germany. Soviet support had underwritten, and at times physically maintained (1953), Communist rule in East Germany since the end of World War II but the East German leadership had also followed its own practices. As economic and political crises began to spread across eastern Europe in the 1980s pressure on the East German government to reform began to increase. The <i>glasnost</i> and <i>perestroika</i> reforms of the new Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, from 1985 added to the pressure. In 1988 the Soviet Union abandoned its commitment to the Brezhnev Doctrine, which had virtually guaranteed Soviet military aid to Communist states in difficulty. In 1989 the situation in East Germany came to a head. In January Honecker declared that in its 40th year East Germany would continue and the Berlin Wall never come down. In May Hungary opened its border and mass emigration from East Germany began and the involvement of opposition groups in monitoring local elections led to increased opposition protest. External events added to the crisis with US President Bush in a visit to West Germany declaring support for 'self-determination' in the East and protests against Communist rule stretching as far as China. Honecker himself was 'out of action' during crucial summer months owing to illness. Unlike other Eastern bloc countries, Honecker's government became increasingly intransigent, blaming the West for its troubles and refusing to make reforms being urged by the Soviets. On October 6th Gorbachev visited East Berlin for East Germany's 40th anniversary celebration but rather than supporting the regime it became clear that Gorbachev was directly encouraging reform whilst adamantly unwilling to provide intervention either economically or militarily, to uphold the unpopular government. On October 9th mass demonstrations began in Leipzig and, despite preparations for violent repression, Honecker refrained from using armed force and Soviet soldiers garrisoned in East Germany did not act. On October 18th Honecker resigned. Candidate responses may be equally effective by focusing mainly on the events of 1989 or approaching the question with reference to short-term and long-term causes over a longer period. Candidates might suggest that the gradual withdrawal of Soviet support since 1985 combined with the more direct effect of</p>	30

Gorbachev's October visit did lead to government collapse or that this was only one of several factors, such as long term domestic issues, the external situation or Honecker's actions (and inaction). Some responses might suggest that it was not so much the withdrawal of Russian support as the overall growing weakness of the Soviet Union which created the conditions for collapse.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the role of the withdrawal of Russian in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on the general causes of the end of Communist rule rather than the collapse of Honecker's government. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.

F6 The Middle East, 1945-2001: The State of Israel and Arab Nationalism

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
11	<p>This question is focused on the survival of the Israeli state in the years 1948-73 and extent to which Israeli military strength was responsible for its continuing existence. Candidates may approach this question by discussing each war in turn or thematically; responses which deal with each war separately need to analyse the reasons for Israeli survival rather than describe the reasons for the outcome to reach the higher level bands. Between 1948 and 1973 the Israeli state fought four separate conflicts with Arab opponents and each time survived or emerged victorious. As the years progressed Israel accumulated a powerful military strength which contributed greatly to its survival. In 1948-9 despite apparently having fewer weapons than its Arab opponents the Israeli's were able to win. However, although starting at a military disadvantage by the second phase of the war in July 1948, they were more evenly balanced militarily in weapons and trained, effective fighters. In 1956 a strike on Egypt by the well-armed Israeli Defence Force, supplied partly by the British and French, was able to make swift gains across the Sinai which prevented Israel losing out territorially in the fiasco which followed. In the pre-emptive war of 1967 the Israelis showed formidable military power as they destroyed the air forces of three Arab nations, occupied Sinai and won control of the West Bank and the Golan heights before the UN stepped in to mediate. Even when Arab nations attempted a pre-emptive strike on Yom Kippur in 1973 initial Arab successes ended with the Israeli's pushing the Arab forces back into their own territory. The more balanced military situation shown by the 1973 war was, however, significant in influencing a move towards negotiation as a survival strategy from the mid-1970s. To establish the relative contribution of Israeli military strength to its survival candidate might suggest other reasons such as Arab divisions, Israeli determination, the effectiveness of external support from the Cold War powers for both sides and the intervention of the UN.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the significance of Israeli military strength in relation to other possible factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
12	<p>The question is focused on Arab nationalism in the years 1948-2001 and the extent to which nationalist views changed. Arab nationalism grew out of the desire for independence from colonial rule and mandated power in the first decades of the 20th century. Although there was some desire for a pan-Arab state the decolonisation process led to the emergence of independent states. In 1945 a meeting of the leaders of such states led to the formation of the Arab League. The treatment of Palestine post-1945 and the creation of the Israeli state in 1948 led to the involvement of the Arab League in a war against Israel in 1948-49. This resulted in a humiliating defeat which highlighted Arab divisions, for example the actions of Transjordan, as opposed to unity. Alongside a hatred of the Israeli state, the Arab powers also resented the influence of Western powers in the Middle East and Gulf regions. By the 1950s resentment of the West was growing and the new nationalist leader of Egypt, General Nasser, led Arab opposition to the newly created British anti-Soviet alliance called the Baghdad Pact (1955). Nasser wanted the Arab world to become part of a non-aligned movement in opposition to Cold War politics. Arab nationalism was boosted by the Egyptian-Czech arms deal of 1955, the British-French humiliation of the Suez Crisis (1956) and the ambitious creation of the United Arab Republic with Syria in 1958. It appeared that Arab nationalism was uniting the Arab states. However, by 1961 the UAR had collapsed and Arab unity was divided by individual state ambitions and divisions over the nature of their support for the Palestinians and their geographical proximity to Israel, particularly after the crushing defeat in the 1967 war. With the death of Nasser the momentum for traditional Arab nationalism disappeared and when Anwar Sadat of Egypt began moves towards negotiations with the Israelis in the 1970s faltered almost completely. In the 1980s Arab nationalism was replaced to some extent by the growth of political Islam. With the leaders of Arab nations negotiating with both Israel and the West political Islam filled a vacuum. Political Islam offered a response to foreign influences and secular 'betrayal' in the Arab states grounded in the Muslim religion. In 1978 Islamist guerrillas sought to oust the Communist take-over of Afghanistan, in 1979 the creation of an Islamist state in Iran provided a blue-print for future revolution, in 1987 the Palestinian <i>Intifada</i> began and after Saudi Arabian supported, western intervention in Gulf War of 1991 al-Qaida was established to fight a 'jihad' to further Islamist beliefs. As conventional peace negotiations between Israel and Arab states faltered in the 1990s Islamist groups increasingly used terrorism against both foreign and Arab targets, culminating in the attack on the Twin Towers in 2001. Weaker responses may describe the changes and developments which took place whilst stronger responses may explain the change over time and evaluate the extent to which the nature and aims have changed, perhaps suggesting that despite the change from secular politics to Islamist politics the aims of breaking free of foreign influence and fighting for Palestinian rights remain the same.</p>	30

	<p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the nature and extent of change, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on either the period before or after 1967/1979. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	
--	---	--

F7 From Second Reich to Third Reich: Germany 1918-45

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
13	<p>The question is focused on the political situation within Germany in the years 1919-33 and the extent to which the nature of the Weimar Constitution was responsible for the political instability which occurred. Although relatively stable politically in the years 1924-8, Germany went through periods of more obvious political upheaval in the years 1919-23 & 1929-33; in particular, challenges from extreme right and left-wing political parties. The Weimar Constitution, created in 1919, was an attempt to create a Germany that was both democratic (proportional representation, universal suffrage, referenda) and federal (Reichsrat) but could also become autocratic and centralised (Article 48). Candidates might suggest that the introduction of proportional representation meant that in the years 1919-23 extreme political groups on both the left and right were able to challenge coalition government, federal government led to regional challenges particularly in Bavaria, the use of a referendum undermined the Young Plan in 1929 and that the years 1929-33 were dominated by the use of Article 48, political intrigue and ultra-extremist politics. Stronger responses might suggest that even during the 'golden years' the political situation was not stable. To establish responsibility comparisons may be drawn with alternative factors such as the pre-existing political divisions in Germany, the consequences of the Versailles Treaty and the economic situation or evidence might be selected to show that the Weimar Constitution was influential in maintaining the Republic for most of the period helping it to survive the early extreme challenges, creating a basis for the years of recovery and using the 'Grand Coalition' to ward off the early stages of the Depression before the economic situation became too difficult to overcome. At the higher levels candidates will have a good grasp of the chronology for example responses that understand that the Constitution was framed during/after the events of the Spartacist Rising and/or take the response securely into the events of 1933 before the Enabling Act.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the significance of the Weimar Constitution and other relevant points, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth. At Level 4 candidates will address the focus of the question well, supporting their analysis of key issues with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus on either the earlier or later time period or may refer in too much detail to economic instability. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies; this may include poor chronological awareness or discussion of economic instability without clear reference to the focus of the question. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 response will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question</p>	30

	asked.	
--	--------	--

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
14	<p>The question is focused on the nature and development of Nazi policies towards Jewish people and other minorities and requires an evaluation of the extent to which policy changed during the years 1933-45. It is expected that at the higher levels candidates will still focus mainly on Jewish people but will provide some balance with specific reference to minority groups most obviously affected by Nazi rule such the Roma, the mentally ill, the physically disabled and homosexuals. Some responses may refer to minority religious groups such as Jehovah's Witnesses. Candidates who refer to 'Jewish people and other minorities' as a single group throughout the response will probably only access Level 3. Candidates may choose to focus on each group separately over time or may produce a more integrated response with reference to exclusion over time from the 'National Community' or <i>Volksgemeinschaft</i> due to race, genetics or 'deviant' behaviour. By 1933 the racial politics of the Nazi leadership had already become apparent in election rhetoric and from an early stage both Jewish people and the Roma were sent to concentration camps. Attitudes towards other minorities were, perhaps, less apparent although anti-Semitic, ultra-conservative and eugenicist views all existed in Germany beforehand and Hitler had supported the sterilisation of those with 'genetic' disabilities in <i>Mein Kampf</i>. In 1933 an early attempt at open discrimination on the streets against Jewish people (boycott of Jewish shops in April) was not a success and discrimination became more bureaucratic. Some candidates might suggest that the development of discriminatory policies for all minorities saw a steady escalation over time from segregation, to persecution, to victimisation to extermination using appropriate examples whilst others might argue that the policies were less systematic and more ad hoc, reacting to both domestic and external events. It is probable that most candidates will refer to the drawing back of policies during the 1936 Berlin Olympics but stronger responses may refer to the pattern of change over a longer period; the relative calm of the bureaucratic discrimination of 1933-4, the impact of the Nuremberg Laws on all racial groups, the violence of 1938 & 39 and the introduction and official climb down over the euthanasia programme, Operation T-4, carried out against the mentally ill in 1939-41. With the occupation of new 'German' territory and the pressures of war, policy turned towards a 'Final Solution' in the years 1942-45; Himmler's 1942 conference in Wannsee one of a series of actions resulting in the construction of mass extermination camps primarily for the mass murder of Jewish people but also to exterminate all who did not fit into the 'National Community'.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the extent to which policies changed towards different minority groups, and will support the analysis with a range of</p>	30

	<p>accurate factual material in some depth. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus more on the treatment of Jewish people. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements concerning the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	
--	--	--

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US034626 January 2013

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

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

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

