

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report January 2010

GCE History 6HI01/E/F

ResultsPlus
look forward to better exam results
www.resultsplus.org.uk

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

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

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

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

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

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



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit

<http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

January 2010

Publications Code US022875

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

6HI01 General comments

Once again most candidates for each option in Unit 1 appear to have been well prepared for the examination. There was, as is to be expected, a wide variety of responses but, as indicated in the Reports for 2009, most candidates approach the questions with some attempt to focus on the question set and to attempt an analytical response. Considering the time limit for the examination it is commendable that candidates can produce two well structured answers, with little evidence of mismanagement of their time. Interestingly, most candidates answer the questions in the order in which they appear on the question paper even if they are less confident with the first topic covered. However, there are some areas (discussed below) that centres should consider when preparing their candidates for the Unit 1 examination.

The first two examination sessions of this new unit were complicated by the fact that a minority of students did not write their answers on the pages allocated in the answer booklet. A minor redesign of the booklet has, thankfully, eliminated this problem completely.

It is perhaps worth reminding centres that Unit 1 tests AO1(a) and AO1(b). AO1(a) is concerned with the recall, selection and deployment of historical knowledge, and the communication of knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner. AO1(b) tests the ability to demonstrate an understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and making judgements (the objectives are printed in full on page 10 of the specification). Examiners reported that candidates are becoming increasingly expert in developing some form of explanation or analysis and can, with varying degrees of effectiveness, frame their answer on the question. This skill alone, however, is not in itself sufficient to allow access to Levels 3 and above. The explanation must be supported and developed with a **range of relevant and accurate material** which allows the points made to stand up effectively. While some candidates still rely on extended passages of free-standing narrative, there were many whose limited or generalised knowledge, or even a considerable amount of incorrect information, affected the quality of their answers overall.

A welcome development is that planning of answers was much more apparent during this session than previously. Candidates should be encouraged to write brief but focused plans; some covered two pages and reduced the amount of time available for the answer itself. Planning will not be effective, however, unless candidates have studied the question and have understood precisely what is being asked of them. Answers at Level 4 require the response to relate well to the focus of the question and to show understanding of the key issues, and must be supported with a range of accurate relevant information. Once again, an appreciation of the time span set in the question is vital, but this links with an understanding of the whole question. This matter will be dealt with in greater detail in the reports on each question, but three examples highlight this point. Question D6 asked 'How far was Lenin responsible for the Bolsheviks' growing hold on power in the years 1917-24?' The phrase 'growing hold on power' suggests that the period under discussion is from the October/November coup of 1917 to Lenin's death in January 1924, since Lenin and the Bolsheviks did not exercise state power before this time. Several candidates, however, apparently saw the key words 'Lenin' and '1917' and wrote extensively on the Provisional Government before ending up, briefly, on the years to 1924. A few did not get beyond October/November. Many of the answers to C6 selected supporting evidence more relevant to the abolition of the slave trade in 1807 than the abolition of slavery in 1833. As indicated in 2009 there are also still many answers to F7 that confuse the hyper-inflation of 1923 with the Wall St. Crash of 1929.

Some of the most effective answers are those which produce a succinct introduction clearly focused on the question asked and four or more well focused, analytical and evaluative paragraphs, with a clear conclusion answering the question asked. The long contextual introduction of the 45 minute essay is not necessary for the extended answers of a 35-40 minute response. Introductions which show an understanding of the contribution of the highlighted factor/event/individual/concept and refer to its relative importance compared to other factors or relative success/significance give some indication as to whether the candidate

has understood the focus of the question; as does some indication of the time span involved. The questions require a judgement to be made but it is important that the conclusion sums up the argument made in the body of the essay.

Several questions invited a consideration of economic factors in determining an outcome. It was clear, across all six options, that many candidates are not comfortable addressing economic issues, and seemed uncertain of just what constituted an economic factor or economic conditions. In some cases, notably Questions B1 and C6, many simply ignored the given factor in the question in favour of other material with which they were familiar.

As always, the quality of written communication can have a marginal effect on candidates' attainment. Written communication is an assessed element of Unit 1 and this is clearly outlined in the mark schemes. Effective communication depends on a number of skills being deployed, and it is regrettable to record once again that very many candidates do not use capital letters appropriately, fail to spell common historical terms correctly, and do not shape their answer into appropriate and coherent paragraphs. Some only use capitals for inappropriate abbreviations. Naturally, developed literacy skills are a whole centre issue, but it might be worth pointing out to candidates that their communication will be taken into account, however marginally, in determining their final mark.

Option E/F – Comments

There were over 1300 candidates entered for the combined E/F options in the January exam. The candidates were generally well prepared and there were some excellent answers showing clear understanding with the use of relevant and appropriate supporting evidence. However, many well-focused analytical responses showed a lack of chronological awareness and factual accuracy which prevented access to the higher bands within levels. Some examiners also commented the some potentially very good responses lacked the broad balance of discussion required at the higher levels.

Please note: further general comments are made below in reference to specific questions. It is suggested that centres read all the feedback below, not just those which refer to those topics being taught.

E/F1 – The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815–70

This topic is popular, particularly with centres entering in Option E, and the candidates are generally very well prepared.

Q1. Most answers to this question showed some understanding of the progress made towards closer unity in Italy by 1849 and there were a variety of approaches to producing an effective answer. Some candidates analysed the long-term effectiveness of the supporters of closer unity whilst others concentrated more on the situation in 1849 itself. There were some particularly effective answers which argued against the suggestion of 'no progress' by referring to aspects of the later unification which were already apparent by 1849. Many responses which achieved Level 3 tended to describe the attempts to bring Italy closer to unification in the period before 1849 and achievement within the Level depended upon accuracy and chronological security. This also affected some answers in Level 4 which attempted to analyse the extent of progress but were unable to select consistently sound factual supporting evidence. The best answers were able to evaluate directly the suggestion of 'no progress'.

At the turn of the 19th century, ideas regarding the unification of Italy were developing and becoming much more sophisticated, however by 1848-9, very little had actually been achieved by nationalists. The waves of revolution from 1815-49 demonstrated the increasing desire for independence and unification, however many obstacles remained prominent.

Following the war which ended in 1815, the congress of Vienna took place which restored Italy to how it had been prior to French occupation, and this signifies a ~~u~~ u-turn in unification events. Under French rule, the country had been split into 3 kingdoms: the kingdom of Upper Italy, Central Italy and Lower Italy. ~~Less~~ internal divisions

(This page is for your first answer.) resulted in ~~the~~ increased trade between states, and ensured that communication between states was at its optimum. ~~By this time~~ The 1815 congress resulted in Italy being redivided into 8 states, 7 of which had foreign leaders, ~~and~~ under regressive regimes. This was especially prominent in the Papal states, where the Pope was extremely regressive, restricted construction of railways and roads, limiting communication, travel and trade. As well as this, the common factor uniting

Italians, their hatred for the French was taken away, restoring campanilismo (small town mentality) and a one dimensional view of Italy being no more than the state in which an individual lived. This coupled with the backwards nature of Italy with limited roads, hindered the progress of ~~support~~ supporters of unification.

~~The North-South divide~~, and Division within society stunted the progress of nationalists in favour of a united Italian state. Language was a key barrier, and one which remained prominent long into the unification campaign, and in the years of liberal government. Throughout the country, different dialects were spoken, so much so that it prevented inter-state communication, as well as this illiteracy was a problem, particularly in the south, illustrating an evident north-south divide. This almost physical division was reflected in the nature of the north, prosperous and industrial ~~at~~, while the south was backwards and agricultural. There ~~was~~ were also conflicting interests between north and south; nationalists (mainly middle classes in the north) were fighting for unification while in the 1820 and 1848-9 revolutions in Italy, the

(This page is for your first answer.)

were campaigning for independence from Naples. Other divisions such as no standardised weights and measures, law or currency, were physical barriers to the development of a unified kingdom of Italy.

Perhaps a more significant indicator of the struggles ~~between~~ of nationalists not being particularly successful was the failure of the attempted revolutions themselves. Both the 1820-1, ~~and~~ 1830 and 1848-9 revolutions failed, achieved very little in enhancing nationalist demands. The fact that revolutions were local ~~affair~~ affairs with no communication between revolutionary groups demonstrates that campanilismo was still an issue, and that people were fighting against ~~the~~ their leaders or situation, rather than fighting for unification. This was demonstrated in Lombardy, which was campaigning against their Austrian government in the 1848-9 revolutions and also by launching the '5 days' attacks in ~~the~~ 1848. After Austrian withdrawal

(This page is for your first answer.) however, they chose independence rather than joining with Piedmont. This shows the ~~the~~ conflicts of interests around the state, and this lack of union prevented unification.

On the other hand however, between 1815 and 1849, there were a series of changes which improved

Italy, and it could be argued enhanced nationalist views. An example of this was the election of Pope ~~Pius~~ IX in 1846, who ~~had~~ launched a series of reforms between 1846 and 1848, demonstrating the change in views throughout Italy. As well as this the Congress of Science which took place in Italy, was held ~~at~~ ^{for} the first time in Italian. Perhaps the ~~most~~ most significant changes were regarding politics. People were becoming more and more disillusioned with foreign ~~intervention~~ presence in Italy, and this led to the formation of "Young Italy" following the failings of the 1820-1 & 1830 revolutions. This was set up by ~~Mazzini~~ Mazzini, one of a number of individuals such as Balbo and Gioberto who ~~had~~ published ideas about unification at this time. The movement ~~was~~ was national which demonstrates new views in Italy regarding the importance of unification, and people were given uniforms to demonstrate this union. He had a key role model for nationalists, such as Garibaldi ~~who~~ who aided the process of unification in subsequent years.

Overall, ~~while~~ while the ideology of a united kingdom of Italy was spreading, and there was increasing support for this movement, it is accurate to suggest

that the supporters of closer ~~united~~ unity ~~had~~ in Italy had made no progress 1849. This is because territorially they hadn't, and they faced the same problems as they had ~~done~~ in 1815: dominant foreign powers, conflicting interests and lack of support from all areas of society.

⊛ secret societies, including the Italian Federation. These were often located in regions around the country, each with their separate ideologies regarding unification. These were the forces behind the 1820-1 and 30 elections, and at this time were the driving force of nationalism in Italy. Perhaps more significantly was the funding of.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is a Level 5 answer. The candidate has chosen to approach the question by addressing the issue of no unity across the period from 1815-1849. Throughout the essay the issue of no progress is approached directly although this becomes clearer as the answer progresses. The discussion interlinks issues such as the progress of supporters of unity with the forces of Papal conservatism and foreign intervention. This is a good example of an analytical response being created through an essentially chronological approach. The essay suggests that although there was essentially no progress territorially there were indications of possible future unity by 1849.

Q2. Although some answers produced a description of either Garibaldi's intervention or the process of Italian unification, there were many good attempts to determine whether events in Sicily and Naples were the decisive turning point in the process. Most candidates were able to explain the significance of Garibaldi's actions and to compare this with events before and after. The concept of a 'turning point' in the process was handled well by the majority of candidates and there were some very interesting answers produced with discussions as to whether Garibaldi's actions speeded up an inevitable outcome or whether unification was not guaranteed until the decline of Austria or the withdrawal of the French from Rome. A few answers saw the question as a discussion of the role of Garibaldi as an individual rather than focusing on the significance of the intervention itself whilst others wrote almost wholly on the role of Cavour. There were, however, some outstanding responses which were able to evaluate the role of a variety of potential turning points, such as the meeting at Plombières, by succinct selection of appropriate relevant material.

(This page is for your first answer.) Garibaldi took advantage of revolts in Sicily and Naples to sweep through the South heroically, his band of ^{some 2000} volunteers defeating a Neapolitan army of 20,000 in Palermo before marching on, virtually unopposed, to take Naples. His conquest of the Southern states was undeniably significant in the cause of unification, especially when the attitudes of Piedmontese ~~the~~ Prime Minister Cavour towards Naples and Sicily are considered. ~~From this~~ Cavour viewed the South as too poor and ~~even~~ backward to be of any interest to Piedmont, and indeed resented Garibaldi's "mad scheme", saying in 1860 that "I regret Garibaldi's expedition as much as anyone." In this respect Garibaldi's intervention ~~was essential~~ could be seen as crucial to unification as it included the two states which could easily otherwise have been left

alone by the enlarging North - Cavour certainly seems to have been content with the idea of a larger Piedmont simply enjoying unchallenged hegemony over the Northern Italian states.

~~Furthermore~~ Furthermore, as it became clear that Garibaldi intended to complete his campaign by attacking Rome, Cavour was forced to act

(This page is for your first answer.) preventatively, invading the Papal States ^{in October 1860,} in order to stop Garibaldi from

reaching Rome and thus provoking the

~~French~~ French occupying army. In a complicated

way, ^{it was} Garibaldi's ~~ill-advised~~ decision at this

point (however ill-advised it may have been)

which prompted the ^{further} progression of Italian

unification.

Yet ~~Garibaldi's~~ the very fact that Garibaldi was able to aggressively invade ^{the} ~~the~~

Sicily then Naples without major international repercussions is significant. From 1815,

Austria had dominated the Italian peninsula

~~its influence extending to the~~ ~~the~~ ~~of~~ Its sheer

military might prevented any attempts at

unification or even constitutional change until

1859 - the failure of the revolutions of 1820,

1830-31 and 1848, as well as Charles Albert of Piedmont's humiliating defeat at Novara ~~in~~ ~~1848~~ are all stark evidence of this. It had become inescapably clear that Italy was not strong enough militarily or economically to defeat Austria, and ~~therefore~~ that foreign intervention ~~was~~ ^{would be} essential to achieving unification of any sort. It is therefore clear that the role of France ^{was} ~~is~~ hugely important.

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~Napoleon~~ By providing 200,000 French troops to Piedmont in the Second War of Unification in 1859, Napoleon crucially altered the international situation in favour of a united Italy. ~~The French army was not~~ ~~only~~ Not only did the French army win the battle of Magenta on the 4th June single-handedly, ~~but~~ ~~but~~ the presence of French support for Piedmont against Austria was vital, ~~Napoleon III~~ in that ~~it~~ ~~was~~ ~~it~~ ~~was~~ France could easily have squashed ~~Piedmont's~~ attempts at unification just as they had in 1849, by sending 20,000 troops to destroy the Roman Republic. In addition, Napoleon III conveniently made no real

~~diplomatic~~ protest at the degree of unity proclaimed in 1861, as well as facilitating the transfer of Venetia to Italy in 1866. However, France's role in unification is ~~double~~ rather contradictory, ~~with~~ ^{having} ~~also~~ ~~hindered~~ the process significantly. ~~As~~ Napoleon selfishly organised an armistice at Villafranca on the 11th July 1859 without consulting Cavour; he objected to Piedmontese annexation of the Central States until he had been pleased with Savoy and Nice; and most significantly, his army

This page is for your first answer.) Remained in Rome to support the Pope until 1870, preventing the natural capital of ~~the~~ a united Italy from being included in it for ~~the~~ ^{nine} years longer than was necessary.

Arguably another potential turning point in the unification process was Cavour's decision to enter Piedmont into the Crimean War ~~in 1854~~. This decision led to Cavour's being able to attend the Paris Peace Conference ~~in~~ in 1856, conversing with such international giants as France and Russia on an almost ~~an~~ equal footing. It was this which led to Cavour's ~~close~~ connection with

Napoleon III and ~~the~~ the French leader's decision to initiate ^{secret} talks about driving Austria out of Italy at Plombières in 1859. Piedmont's role itself cannot be overlooked; it was frequently Piedmont which provided the army or the diplomatic manoeuvres in the unification process, ~~although although it does not~~ and it is worth noting that ~~the~~ Victor Emmanuel II ~~of~~ of Piedmont became Victor Emmanuel II of Italy, despite being the first Italian king. ~~It is~~ However, it seems reasonable to conclude that the true turning point in Italian

(This page is for your first answer.) unification was French intervention in ~~the~~ 1859. The attempts of several revolutionaries and a Piedmontese-led war had all failed to secure the defeat of Austria which was so essential to any sort of unification in Italy. Garibaldi's contribution was undeniably significant, ~~but not the point at around which the future of Italy as a united whole hung~~ ~~to achieving the unification of the entire Italian peninsula, but in that the South was added to the~~ ~~but not so~~ but ultimately not the

key point at which the fortunes of the ^{previously hopeless} Italian unification movement ~~turned towards the~~ ^{dramatically} ~~hope~~ of ~~it~~ improved.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a good example of an evaluative answer at Level 5. It gained a lower Level 5 due to its lack of coverage across the whole period. The response begins by directly focusing on Garibaldi's intervention as a turning point and then developing the importance of this event further using secure and detailed supporting evidence. Whilst developing the significance of the intervention other influencing factors such as the role of Cavour are interlinked. In order, to determine the intervention as a turning point the events before this date are skilfully referred to in terms of foreign intervention and then other possible turning points are introduced. The whole timescale of the question was not covered leading to the lower level but the main body of the answer clearly supported the alternative turning point in comparison to Garibaldi's intervention which is suggested in the conclusion.

E/F2 – The Unification of Germany, 1848–90

This topic is popular, particularly with centres entering in Option E, and the candidates are generally very well prepared. However, evidence from both questions suggests that there are a significant number of candidates who believe that Bismarck became Chancellor of Germany in 1852.

Q3. This was the least popular of the two questions with its focus on the consequences of the 1848 revolutions on Austrian power within Germany to 1862. Some responses described the failures of the 1848 revolutions or outlined Austria's position in Germany up to 1862 but most did attempt to explain the reasons why Austria appeared to remain the dominant power in Germany. Many answers were able to identify aspects of the failures of 1848, such as the weakness of the liberal-nationalists, which enabled Austria to continue to dominate Germany and to compare these with other factors. Some excellent answers were able to show change over time suggesting that although the failures of 1848 enabled Austria to maintain its dominant position in the early part of the period by 1862 Austrian power was in decline.

Q4. This was by far the most popular question and most candidates were able to discuss the contribution of Bismarck to the process of unification well. However, many responses although clearly focused on the role of Bismarck tended to give prepared answers concerning Bismarck as 'master planner' or 'opportunist' rather than concentrating on whether Bismarck was 'wholly responsible'. Many answers suggested that Bismarck's diplomatic manoeuvres would not have been possible without underlying economic and military developments in Prussia or the decline in Austria power in general. Some answers with well balanced discussions were undermined by a lack of chronological security and, in particular, a lack of understanding of the role of the Franco-Prussian War. In order to achieve the higher Levels it is important that candidates focus on the wording and the time-span of the question asked.

(This page is for your second answer.) It is certain that the role played by Bismarck in the Unification of Germany was ^{crucial}. From the moment of his appointment in 1862 as Minister - President, Bismarck assumed the role of ~~the~~ the helmsman of German unification. Despite the period of 1862 - 71 is characterised by Bismarck's brilliance as a diplomat ^{on} in the international stage, both strengthening Prussia and weakening the positions of his ^{opponents} ~~adversaries~~, Austria and France. However, the mistakes of Bismarck's opponents should ^{also be} be recognised as ^{crucial} ~~key~~ in paving the way for German Unification in 1871.

The early years of Bismarck's reign were ^{dominated} ~~marked~~ by his relations with Austria. The ~~reasons~~ ^{reasons} Bismarck recognised that Austrian Authority ^{in Germany} could only be superseded by Prussian authority were Prussia to be victorious in a war with Austria. From the moment of his ~~present~~ selection as Minister President in 1862, Bismarck looked to ^{transform} ~~prepare~~ Prussia into a state that would be capable of defeating Austria. His Realpolitik in the Reichstag split the National Liberals, and secured his personal authority when he pushed the Army Bill through without their support, allowing the ~~Austrian~~ Prussian army to modernise after the debacle of mobilisation in 1859. As relations with Austria steadily declined

(This page is for your second answer.) In the 1860s, war seemed inevitable, for Austria would never accept Prussian dominance of Germany, ^{a concept} an idea that was central to Bismarck's ambitions. Unsurprisingly war came in 1866, and though Prussian victory made it Prussian domination, and unification more likely, it is difficult to assess Bismarck's responsibility for the victory. Bismarck had modernised the Prussian army, yet Prussian victory was gifted through the mistakes and weaknesses of Austria rather than the huge superiority of Prussian forces. Austria had, prior to 1866, been torn by internal disputes. Discontent in the Hapsburg lands forced them to deploy 1000's of troops in Hungary, rather than at Königgrätz. The Army too was weak, officers were picked by their families ~~on~~ rather than their skill, and economic shortcomings meant they had poor quality weaponry. Austria had also alienated herself by internationally by appearing the aggressor in the war. She had mobilised first and had breached the Gastein convention, ~~and~~ ^{and} a meaning she was related in 1866. It is difficult however, to downplay the role of Bismarck. His secret diplomacy had ensured the support of Italy, and France's neutrality. The War of 1866 was one of the key steps on the road to unification; and Bismarck can be considered partially, not fully, responsible for its


ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a Level 4 answer. The candidate clearly understands the focus of the question and has produced a narrative analysis of the role of Bismarck along with other factors. There is a clear understanding of Bismarck's role in comparison with the roles of Austria and France and with reference to underlying Prussian strengths. The supporting evidence is secure but lacking in some detail at times. The narrative nature of the answer keeps this in Level 4 but in the higher band.

E/F3 – The Collapse of the Liberal State and the Triumph of Fascism in Italy, 1896–1943

This is a very popular topic for centres entering for both Options but there is much variability in the extent to which candidates are prepared to answer questions. Although there were some excellent responses many candidates find it difficult to establish chronological security. There are still a few but significant number of candidates who identify Mussolini with the pre-war Liberal State. It is very important that candidates are introduced to the significance of key dates such as 1896, 1914–15, 1918–19, 1922, 1929, 1939–40 and 1943.

Q5. Many candidates who answered this question were clearly aware of the North-South divide and the weaknesses of the Liberal State but there were many generalised answers with little specific reference to the period 1896–1914. Although there are generalisations which can be made about the weaknesses of the Liberal State with reference to geographical disunity, social tensions, political weaknesses and foreign policy failures after 1870 it is vital that the candidates are given specific examples from the period 1896–1914 with which to substantiate statements. Although many textbooks refer to the Liberal State since 1870 events specific to the period from 1896 are easily found. There were also many examples of imbalanced answers with responses which either concentrated wholly on the North-South divide or ignored the given factor in favour of other explanations. The best answers were able to show how the North-South divide contributed to the weaknesses of the Liberal State during the period in comparison to other factors or showed clearly how the given factor integrated with other factors to create the weaknesses.

(This page is for your second answer.) *The Liberal State of 1896*
 to 1914 had many issues which contributed
 to its overall weakness as a ruling body.
 However, was the North-South divide a ~~weak~~
 central factor leading to its downfall?
 The geography of Italy is partly responsible
 for the issue of the North-South divide. Northern
 Italy was green, minerally wealthy and industrialised,
 with large industrial cities such as Milan and

regions such as Piedmont displaying this, with large, profitable textile industries. However, the South had very little mineral wealth, with a dry and arid environment. The only profitable industry was sulphur extraction, which very few could partake in.

Socially, the two were very different with the Northern wealthy cities being democratic and fair. However, in the South many were extremely poor peasants who worked for the large land

(This page is for your second answer.) owners. The land owners, or oligarchs, acted effectively as regional rulers, with many being powerful enough to ignore the government. There was also a strong Mafia presence, which led to much corruption in the South.

Transport and communication were also bad between the North and South - modern roads were still to be built, and no rivers were fully utilizable for trade. The railway system was also in its infancy, not being able to sustain large scale trade and communication.

Disease was also an issue for the South, with bad Malaria being reported in Sicily at the time.

due to stagnant swamps that needed draining.

The state of the South meant that Italy could not function fully as a whole country, and the Liberals had many problems in dealing with this disunification.

However, there are other factors which can be seen as contributing factors to the weakness of the Liberal State. An increased size of the left wing parties, both Communist and Anarchist can be held responsible for weakness. The Liberal state was nearly brought down with the King's assassination by an Anarchist in 1898.

(This page is for your second answer.) The two parties were also responsible for much industrial action within the time period, calling strikes that choked Italy's economy. The failure of the Liberal State in not doing more to try and appease or suppress these parties meant that they had significantly more issues than they needed.

The weakness of the army may have also contributed to the weakness of the Liberal State. The colonial episode in Abyssinia in 1896 disgraced the army, being the only power to have been defeated when colonizing. Returning

to Italy empty handed, navy lost faith in the Liberal state, with her being the aggressor in the first place.

However, the army did prove itself with the colonial campaign into Libya in 1911, being successful. While many were pleased with the state by its expansionist views, the left were strongly opposed, and felt alienated by being ignored by the Liberals.

The weakness of the Liberal state can also be acknowledged to a general drop in Liberalism throughout Europe, with England having really dropped it. The changing of peoples social and economic statuses meant that Liberalism no

(This page is for your second answer.) longer stood for what they believed or wanted.

Another weakness may also have been Crispien. While he did much to bring on economic progress which was successful, his political tactic of transgression meant that the party was often without potency, since all argumentative and intellectual people had been bought out. It is also said that Crispien had a personal file on all politicians, meaning blackmail was almost certainly a feature of his governing.

The Liberal State also created further weakness by passing universal suffrage in 1912, allowing the electorate to jump from $2\frac{1}{2}$ to $8\frac{1}{2}$ million. This suffrage meant many industrial workers could now vote, and thus the membership and support of the socialist parties swelled significantly.

In analysis of these factors we can see that the North-South divide was a significant factor to the Liberal state's weakness, but that it was also weakened by internal issues.

The internal political opposition of the Communists and Anarchists meant the state often appeared discredited, and to go against the majority of the people's requests. The people of Italy would also ~~the Liberal~~ have seen Liberalism as outdated,

(This page is for your second answer.) since it was ignored in other countries. The state of the armed forces also would have added discreditation. But the North-South divide acted as a barrier to any simple method of opposing the state.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This lower Level 4 answer has a greater awareness of the Liberal State 1896-1914 than many of the answers for Q5. There is an understanding of the focus of the question and an analysis of the weaknesses of the Liberal State although at times generalised and not always secure. The discussion of the north-south divide suggests but does not show how it may have affected the Liberal State and there are a range of other factors such as political division, Giolitti's policies and the weakness of military actions.

Q.6. Many of the responses to this question were able to describe some of the key features of Mussolini's economic policies with many references to the 'battles' for grain and the lira and to attempts to establish autarky. Most answers also made some attempt to establish whether the standard of living for ordinary Italians improved but often this focus was lost as responses tended to evaluate the success of Mussolini's economic policies instead. Other responses also lost focus in an attempt to discuss other factors such as social policies, foreign policy and propaganda in determining standard of living. However, the best answers were able to take advantage of the wide time-span of the question to determine how standards of living changed over time with reference to initial policies to solve unemployment, the introduction of corporatism, responses to the Great Depression, attempts to create self-sufficiency and the effects of wartime economic policies. There were also some effective answers which referred to differences between the north and south and between urban and agricultural workers.

One of the main surprises about the fascist regime was the apparent successes made economically by Benito Mussolini, despite the fact that he had no economic expertise, and, when he first came to power, no policies of any form as far as the economy was concerned. However, despite the supposed

(This page is for your second answer.) success of fascist economic policy, policies, after they did very little to benefit the Italians themselves.

A key example of this was in 1926, when Mussolini ~~revalued~~ revalued the Lira from 150 Lira to the pound sterling to 90 Lira to the pound. This was purely for propaganda purposes and had no economic benefit other than making the Italian economy appear stronger. In fact, it crippled Italian exports, as it

meant foreign buyers found Italy's products were now much more expensive, and so they became much less popular. Similar to this was how the 'Battle for Grain' affected the economy. This was Mussolini's attempt to achieve Italian ~~the~~ autarky in terms of ~~get~~ grain and wheat imports. Although by the beginning of ~~world~~ World War Two, Italy was almost completely self-sufficient in wheat, the average Italian was actually worse off. This is because the land previously ~~is~~ used to grow citrus fruits and olives was now used to produce wheat, a crop unsuitable for the soil. Therefore the cost of producing the wheat rose, as did bread prices. ~~Further~~ Furthermore, ~~the~~ Italian exports were again damaged, as citrus fruits and olives were (This page is for your second answer.) increasingly short supply, and so more expensive and therefore less popular.

However, not all of Mussolini's policies damaged the economy. The Great Depression ~~is~~ after the 1928 hit Italy much less than other European countries in ~~no~~ no small way due to the fascists. Unlike many governments, the fascists intervened to protect the banks and

large businesses, providing loans to keep them afloat. The problem of unemployment was solved by the implementation of government work schemes, building motorways and public buildings. The jobs provided meant that there was less social tension, and the fact that workers' hours were limited meant more people were able to work, and so more money was in circulation, keeping the Italian economy from collapsing. Furthermore, despite Mussolini's economic blunder when he revalued the lira, these measures meant that the lira remained relatively stable, and hyperinflation was avoided, so that Italy came out of the Depression much better than Germany and even the U.S.A.

Despite this, Mussolini's economic policies were over-all a failure, and the most damaging one for the Italian people was the Corporative State. This was Mussolini's economic brainchild and was intended to solve social conflict in the work place, allowing both employers and employees to work together more efficiently towards fascist goals. However, it was

is reality little more than a means towards the mass-exploitation of the working classes. One Italian politician summed up the corporative state in that way:

"Have you ever tried looking in a darkened room for a black cat that isn't there?"

The main reason for the failure of the corporative state was that the main representatives of the workers were fascist deputies, who invariably supported the ~~best~~ best business men and factory owners, who as a result of the support they gave to the Italian government. Therefore, the Italian people were ~~are~~ merely abused by fascism's key economic principal principle.

In conclusion, ~~Mussolini's~~ the majority of Mussolini's policies to a ~~wide~~ very wide extent in no way improved the standard of living for the ordinary Italian. ~~And~~ For example, the

(This page is for your second answer.) Corporative state was nothing more than a way of mass-exploitation of the working classes, while the revaluing of the lira effectively crippled Italian exports and the 'Battle for

grain' caused the price of bread to soar, as well as ~~the~~ further damaging exports. However, ~~the~~ during the Depression, ~~the~~ Mussolini's ~~po~~ policies saved the Italian economy from collapse and provided thousands of jobs. Therefore, ~~during~~ ^{during} this period, the Italian standard of life was maintained, however for the rest of the fascist regime the quality of life fell, ~~as a~~ result of especially for the ~~work~~ working classes.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is a low Level 5 answer. This response directly addresses the focus of the question and has an explicit understanding of the key issues of the question. Although perhaps not quite so clear at the beginning of the essay the answer becomes more explicit as it continues. There is a clear attempt to show both the effect of individual policies on the standard of living of ordinary Italians but also an evaluation of change over time. The response is at low Level 5 because it is not wholly consistent and there is a lack of breadth across the whole time period to 1943.

E/F4 – Republicanism, Civil War and Francoism in Spain, 1931–75

There are a pleasing number of centres beginning to enter candidates for this topic in both Options and most candidates appear to be well prepared to answer questions on the Civil War in particular. However, despite the complexities of many of the events and issues of republican government in Spain from 1931, it is important that candidates feel confident to be able to answer questions on Republican Spain and Francoism as well as the Civil War.

Q7. This question was answered by very few candidates. There was a clear distinction between those candidates who understood the issues surrounding attempts to limit the powers of conservative forces such as the monarchists, the church and the army by radical republicans and those who produced weak descriptions of the events between 1931–36. The best answers were those which suggested that the initial gains made by early reforms to land ownership, military power and church control of education were increasingly challenged were increasingly challenged by a combination of resurgent conservatism and weaknesses within radical republicanism itself.

Q8. This was by far the most popular question in F4 and most candidates were aware of the different factors determining the outcome of the Civil War. This question required the consideration of the responsibility of General Franco in the Nationalist victory and, although most candidates had some understanding of his role as a military leader, many answers only briefly mentioned leadership skills before discussing other 'more important' factors particularly the contribution of foreign powers. Answers which only briefly mention the given factor can only access lower Level 4 at best as in order to establish General Franco's responsibility his role needed to be evaluated in relation to other possible factors. The best answers were able to refer to Franco's standing before the civil war, his decision to support the army revolt in Morocco, his ability to unite Nationalist forces, his tactics during the war and his relationship with foreign powers. At Level 5 candidates were able to integrate Franco's contribution with other factors suggesting, for example, that his ability to unite the Nationalist forces and have some control over the nature of foreign sponsorship were in stark contrast to the divisions of the Republicans and the interference of the Soviets.

(This page is for your second answer.) In 1939 the Nationalists led by General Franco won the Spanish Civil War, with the Republican forces attempting to surrender Madrid. It could be asserted that General Franco was completely responsible for the Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War, but it can also be argued that other factors also contributed to the Nationalist victory.

It could be argued that General Franco was responsible for the Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War. General Franco used tactics that meant every piece of land was slowly brought under Nationalist control. This was slow, but very safe and ~~proved~~ successful. General Franco was a good leader, who led & united the Nationalists well and ensured they remained focused and united. Franco also made good use of the Army of Africa to crush the Republican forces. Franco also refused to negotiate with the Republicans, forcing them to surrender. Franco's tactics and leadership

(This page is for your second answer.) united the Nationalist forces, and this contributed to the Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War.

However, it can also be asserted that other factors were responsible for the Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War. One of these factors is the huge role of foreign intervention. The Nationalists received aid from both Italy and Germany as well as support from Portugal. Germany provided the Nationalists with the Condor Legion, which was composed of 10,000 skilled soldiers and also artillery and tanks. This played a crucial role in the Nationalist's northern offensives. Italy provided the Nationalists with 45,000 troops and 12 bombers. The troops greatly helped the Nationalists, and the bombers were used to transport the Army of Africa from Morocco to mainland Spain. The aid provided by Italy and Germany was unconditional and good quality. In comparison, the Republicans only had one source of aid (although Mexico gave some), and that was the USSR. The USSR provided rifles to the Republicans, but these were poor quality as they had been used in previous conflicts (some were even taken from museums in the USSR). In addition the USSR also provided 5000 advisors. In return for this aid, Stalin & the USSR received all of the Bank of Spain's gold reserves, and this affected the Republicans as it was the only way they

(This page is for your second answer.) Could purchase arms from abroad.

The USSR also tried to restrict the aid only to Communist militia's. The good quality aid received by the Nationalists compared with the poor quality and conditional aid received by the ~~the~~ Republicans is another ~~reason~~ factor responsible for the Nationalists' victory in the Spanish Civil War.

Another factor responsible for the Nationalists' victory in the Spanish Civil War is the poor state of the Republican army. The Republicans had poor equipment, and troops were poorly trained. The state didn't trust the 7,300 officers who ~~was~~ didn't join the Nationalists. Also, there was no one Republican army, only different militia's. ~~There was~~ The attempts by Largo Caballero

in creating ~~from~~ one army failed, and P.O.U.M. and anarchist militia's ~~refused~~ didn't recognise ranks and elected their own officers. The ill disciplined and poorly trained Republican ~~army~~ army is another factor responsible for the Nationalists' victory in the Spanish Civil War.

Another factor responsible for the Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War is* the Nationalist army itself. The Nationalists were well trained, better ~~equipped~~ equipped and disciplined. They were united and coordinated by 1. ~~lead~~ leader, and this is another factor responsible for the Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War.

(This page is for your second answer.) Another factor responsible for the Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War is the divisions that existed in the Republican government. The communists, anarchists, and socialists all had different ideas about what to do and constantly argued. There was no one leader unlike the Nationalists. The Battle of Madrid between the communists and anarchists clearly shows this. The divisions in the ~~the~~ Republicans is another factor responsible for the Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War.

Another factor responsible for the Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War is the terror the Nationalists use. The bombing of Guernica killed 1654 people and was the first ever carpet bombing and alarmed the Republicans. The Lascares Concentration Camp resulted in 12,000 deaths. These atrocities greatly demoralised the Republicans, and is another factor responsible for the Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War.

~~A final factor~~ In conclusion, I believe General Franco was partially responsible for the Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War, but other factors played a more important role. I accept that Franco united ~~the~~ the Nationalists and led them skillfully, but I believe the foreign aid received by the Nationalists was the main factor in

(This page is for your second answer.) ~~How~~ their victory in the Spanish Civil War. It allowed the Army of Africa to be transported to mainland Spain, and played a critical role in the northern offensives. It provided Franco with two key allies and I believe was responsible for ~~the victory in the Spanish~~ the Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is an example of a competent Level 4 answer which needed a more secure discussion of the given factor in order to achieve higher. The answer is clearly well focused on the question with a brief discussion of the role of Franco counter-balanced with more detailed development of other factors. The response required a more detailed discussion of Franco's role with clear supporting evidence in order to access the top of Level 4 or to become a Level 5 answer. The conclusion does suggest that other factors were more important but the lack of explicit and sustained reference to Franco's role means that this evaluation was not substantiated in the body of the essay.

E/F5 – Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945–91

Q.9. This was by far the most popular question in E/F6. Most candidates had a good knowledge of the events leading to the creation of separate states in Germany in 1949. Many answers at Level 3 and low Level 4 produced descriptions or narrative analysis showing the chain of events from the end of World War II to the creation of the FRG with some reference to the actions of the western Allies. However, the chronology of these events was often insecure resulting in inaccurate and confused answers. The best answers were able to evaluate the extent to which the actions of the western Allies created the circumstances in which Germany was divided into two separate states with reference to the increasing unity of western zones, the creation of Bizonia and the introduction of a new currency compared to underlying influence of Cold War ideology, events within the Soviet sector and the ambitions of German politicians such as Adenauer. It is obvious that although candidates felt confident in their understanding and knowledge of the events leading to separation, failure to concentrate on the focus of the question meant that many candidates ended up producing a well reasoned narrative rather than an analysis of the contribution of the given factor.

(This page is for your first answer.) In 1949 the FRG and GDR had been born out of the divided ruins of Nazi Germany. During the time elapsed between this point an ideological protectionism had fallen over both zones of occupation East and West. The actions of the western allies in particular led to a the formation of the FRG but it was universal suspicion of both sides motives from the former allies and down to the German leaders Adenauer and Ulbricht that was responsible for the formation of two separate Germanys.

The Western Allies ~~at~~ France, Britain and America had in the years prior to 1945 been unsure on how to deal with Germany after the war. The initial idea of the Morgenthau plan was eventually rejected and the Yalta and Potsdam conferences led

(This page is for your first answer.) to little definite ideas on the eventual landscape of a unified Germany. As relations between the two emerging superpowers worsened and the lines of the cold war were drawn there was little will

to offer ~~much~~ opportunities for the Soviets. In early 1946 the US cut off all reparations in coal to the Eastern zone this was the first of many dividing points that would cut the country in two. ~~The~~ The formation of Bizonia in January 1947 was seen^a as ~~an~~ unilateral attempt by the Americans and British to kick start the unification of Germany. Yet it is clear that protecting this proto state was already a priority with the Baran plan (creating strong local government to avoid a soviet takeover) clearly aimed at the USSR in the Eastern zone. The ambiguity of such an action led the Soviets to react by forming an Economic Council in their zone thus furthering the slide towards two States. This though was not the intention but more the effect of a lack of communication in the early cold war climate causing protectionism of what they had.

The currency reform in both halves of Germany in 1948 is often seen as the catalytic moment for the split. The Western allies' implementation

(This page is for your first answer.)

(This page is for your first answer.) halves of Germany in 1948 is often seen as the catalytic moment for the split. The Western allies implementation of the new currency was an action that severely pushed both sides in to becoming separate states. Yet the Soviet overreaction led to a further polarisation of the Germans. The ~~in~~ rushed introduction of the East Mark was merely symbolic and led to the physical view of Germany being divided. But Stalin's blockade of West Berlin drove the future FRG further in to the western bloc. The suspicion in the western zone that this action created meant that there was no trust to continue to unification. Thus partition became more likely due to the Soviets reaction but their action only added to the universal suspicion.

The actions of the USSR elsewhere in Europe in this period also had an impact on the suspicion of both sides towards each other. The spreading of communism in Eastern Europe did nothing to alleviate the fears of the west. Protecting what they had become the main concern with Churchill's iron curtain speech

Insert here

(This page is for your first answer.) and Truman's idea of Containment in 1947 showing no will on the part of the West to risk West Germany. This further shows that suspicion was pulling Germany apart.

The powers had a great impact on the sort of politicians that emerged. It was these embodiments of opposing ideologies that took the suspicion and twisted it in to the division of Germany. Ulbricht, a stalinist, had early on called for the formation of a communist state. Yet repeatedly Stalin had refused Ulbricht though removed several obstacles such as the SPD (that at the time was a universal party across Germany and thus could have reunified it) by forming the SED that made the Soviet zone a single party state. This led to further division. Adenauer in the FRG on the other hand had used his Western partners' fears and created a conservative political force embodied by the Basic Law (the FRG constitution). It was in no way compatible with East Germany and thus further divided

(This page is for your first answer.) Germany
The formation of two Germanies in 1949 was born out of the suspicion held by both sides actions and the ambiguity left at the end of the war. But Ulbricht and Adenauer both victims of Hitler did not wish to risk their territory to fall to the other in unification and thus made their eventual states totally incompatible and thus are responsible for the eventual partition.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is a high Level 4 answer. It is an analytical response which is well focused on the question but is not always explicit in its discussion of the key factor in the question. The answer interlinks several different factors creating a clear discussion but in doing so loses its evaluation of the role of the western Allies. This can be seen from the conclusion.

Q10. Very few candidates answered this question but most were able to refer to changes over time with the best answers showing not only improving relations over time but variations in relations within the time period itself. Some answers suggested that after the increasingly difficult relations of the early 1960s the relative stability of East Germany after the building of the Berlin Wall allowed greater communication between the two states while despite apparent improving relations in the 1970s a resurgence of Cold War attitudes towards the end of the 1970s saw increasing suspicion.

E/F6 – The Middle East, 1945–2001: The State of Israel and Arab Nationalism

There are a pleasing number of centres beginning to enter candidates for this topic in both Options.

Q11. Responses to this question were very similar to those found in Q9. Candidates were obviously confident in their knowledge and understanding of the emergence of an independent Israel during the years 1945-48 but answers were often in the form of weak narrative accounts with confused chronology. There was also a tendency towards a lack of balance with many answers only briefly referring to British policy before suggesting other more important factors. Some of the best answers were able to show how British policies on Jewish immigration, reactions to terrorist activity, relations with the UN and ultimate withdrawal in 1948 were connected to other factors such as post-World War II politics and the historic issues of nationalism in Palestine.

(This page is for your first answer.)

* British Mandate * Immigration limits — White Paper
 * Fall of Ottoman Empire * Based to Zionist Pressure in US. — CIA Pressure
 * Balfour Declaration * Terrorism * The media * NP - New Paragraph
 * Holocaust.

~~But~~ British Policy in Palestine was a significant factor in the ~~the~~ emergence of an independent Israel between 1945 & 1948. For many years there had been confusion in the ~~middle east~~ ^{Palestine} Palestine under the British mandate, that the UN had given ^{it} after WWI. ^{NP} Under the Mandate Britain was supposed to help establish Palestine ^{as} a self governing state, yet ^{in the} Balfour Declaration it promised land in Palestine to the Zionists; who's influential leaders had been ~~applying~~ applying pressure to the British Government.

British Policy on Immigration after this never seemed to ~~please~~ ^{effective} both Sides. The Zionists, who were determined to have an independent Jewish state were outraged

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~By the~~ Plan laid out in the White Paper ~~to limit immigration numbers~~ of 1939 to limit Jewish immigration to Palestine to only 75,000 per year for 5 years with no more after this. Though agreeable to the ~~Arabs~~ ^{Palestinian} Arabs; events in Europe through out the ~~1940's~~ 1st half of the 1940's meant that public opinion was also against the Plan.

With many Jews fleeing Europe at the Nazis' holocaust there was much pressure to let Jews into Palestine ~~and~~ and the policy of turning shiploads of illegal immigrants back - often to displaced persons camps on Nazi occupied Europe - provided international outrage & Eisenhower in the States demanded that 100,000 Jews be let into Palestine immediately placing further pressure on the British Government.

~~Another factor in the establishment of ~~Israel~~~~ was the ~~UN Partition Plan~~ which divided up

The Jews also used Terrorism against the British Control in Palestine. The ever growing numbers of Jews caused fighting between Palestinians & Jews which the British put down by force. This ~~resulted in~~ resulted in many terrorist attacks on British troops and convoys in Palestine by groups by such as the Irgun and Lehi. The blowing of The King David Hotel, the British headquarters in

(This page is for your first answer.) Palestine by the Irgun and the Assassination of Lord Moyne by the Irgun in revenge for the police shooting of their leader Abraham Stern in London would have placed great pressure on the British to leave Palestine.

The UN Partition Plan was also a major factor in the creation of Israel. The Plan, designed to split the region into two self-governing states (against Palestinian wishes - they wanted a peaceful co-existence with the Jews) unfairly gave the greater percentage of, and better land - to the minority Jewish population and less and worse land to the native larger Palestinian war. Accepted by the Jews & rejected by the Palestinians it created a civil war.

The British refused to do anything having given up their mandate to the UN and really had only 6 weeks left in the region as the fighting began.

Arab divisions could also be seen as a factor in the foundation of Israel. At the beginning of the civil war, the Palestinians requested help from the Arab League; year old Arab League; beset by much infighting the Arab League wasn't best able to help them; in the end only providing a few troops & rifles.

^m
(This page is for your first answer.) By the time the British left Israel declared itself a nation state May '48 the Arabs in Jordan, Syrian & Egypt were far too interested in Annexing Palestine for themselves they were ineffective against Israel's well trained well equipped force.

In conclusion, I would say that the policies of Great Britain had an ~~effect~~ significant effect for instance the Balfour declaration gave land of one country to another people but the pressures they faced from the situation in Europe to the pressure of the American President's support for the Zionists meant that diplomatically the British were in a very difficult situation.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is a Level 4 answer. It relates well to the focus of the question with opening statements referring to British policy in Palestine and moving on to suggest other reasons for the emergence of Israel. The supporting evidence is not always detailed but is generally secure. The analysis and linkage between factors is often more implicit and explicit but there is a clear attempt to determine the role of British policy in relation to other factors. In the conclusion there is an attempt to show that British policies were linked to other factors.

Q12. This was a popular question and most candidates were aware of Nasser's belief in Arab nationalism and some of the controversy surrounding his motivations. However, many answers were less confident in providing specific examples of Nasser's actions and policies and tended to concentrate on the earlier period with descriptions of the Suez Crisis and vague references to the creation of the UAR without reference to other factors or establishing the extent of unity. This resulted in many Level 3 and low Level 4 answers. Candidates who attempted to show change over time with Nasser becoming less influential over time or who were able to suggest other influences such as Arab-Israeli hostility, Syria and the Cold War using well-selected accurate information were able to access the higher Levels. The mark scheme allowed for answers which challenged the extent of Arab unity during the period.

(This page is for your second answer.) It could be argued that the rise of Nasser & his emergence as a leader in the Arab world played great importance in the development of Arab unity. The fact that Egypt under Nasser was at the forefront in every major war with Israel rallied the Arab states to the Palestinian's cause & the development of the United Arab Republic (UAR) in 1958 between Egypt & Syria is a great example in showing what lengths the Arabs were willing to co-operate when presented with an enemy - Israel.

Nasser refused in 1956 to renew a deal with Britain for military bases in Egypt & the nationalisation of the Suez Canal both 'shouted out' to the Arab world that here was a man who did not want foreign influences & desires dictating his country's future. The subsequent Suez Crisis showed that Nasser was willing to stand up to Israel & foreign power, turning him into a hero in the

(This page is for your second answer.) Arab world despite the fact that the Egyptian forces were soundly defeated. This resulted in the general viewpoint that Nasser was the figurehead of the Arab world, with states such as Syria, Lebanon, Iraq & Jordan firmly behind him. This shows that he could be considered the most important factor in encouraging Arab unity during this period.

Furthermore, the creation of the United Arab Republic in 1958 to counter Israel shows that despite earlier infighting, ^{or backstabbing} between various states during the 1948 war - Egypt, Jordan & Syria betraying the Palestinian's cause for land - there was within the Arab world the resolve necessary to 'wipe Israel off the map', & who better to unite behind than Colonel Nasser?

On the other hand however, an equally important reason for Arab unity would be the existence of Israel itself. If this had not been the case then the three wars that took place after 1948 - Suez war, 1967 war & the Yom Kippur war - would never have taken place. On almost every occasion, the various Arab states, which usually worked together to the best of their ability to fight Israel. Despite the near hopelessness of the situation, Israel had the backing of one of the superpowers of the world.

(This page is for your second answer.) The USA, the majority of Arab states fought until ^{the} various peace settlements. Not until the end of national hostilities did the Arabs discover a better weapon - the price of oil.

Another factor ^{that} encouraged Arab unity would be the interference of foreign powers in their affairs. The desire of many Arab states to remain unaligned during the Cold War resulted in frustration ~~by~~ on behalf of the US who wanted the main source of their oil to be secured. The purchase of Russian armaments by Egypt in the 50s resulted in the loss of US funding for the Aswan Dam, ~~so~~ which was desperately needed to modernise Egypt. The USSR were happy to fund it themselves & curry favour with the Arabs. Though this may have pushed Egypt closer to the Soviet Union, Egypt held onto its neutral stance & was prepared to deal with both East & West so long as they did not try to dictate policy as the US had done.

Finally, the plight of the Palestinian people is another important factor when considering Arab unity as that is what Arab foreign policy focused in (in theory) during this period. The liberation of the Palestinian state did not come from a sense of Arab 'brotherhood', but from a united desire ~~of~~ from Arab countries to get rid of the hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees living

(This page is for your second answer.) ... in their respective countries. This unified drive to send those refugees home came from the prevailing feeling of Arab countries with refugees that they were unwanted & more often than not they caused political turmoil or even civil-war in the case of Lebanon.

To conclude, though Nasser was a powerful & unifying leader in the Arab world, his encouragement towards Arab unity was small in comparison to the existence of an alien state which threatened many Arab countries & the possibility of basing ~~the~~ unwanted refugees. The fact that wherever the PLO went, political turmoil followed, & because of these Arab countries strived to liberate Palestine, can be considered quite cynical, however evidence has shown that each state was only looking out for itself & cared nothing for the sufferings of an innocent people.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is an example of a mid-Level 4 answer. It is an analytical response to the question, addressing the role of Nasser in developing Arab unity and suggesting other factors. The supporting evidence is generally secure and sufficient though not necessarily detailed. Nasser's role in becoming a figure-head for Arab unity and his involvement in the UAR is shown whilst other factors such as the presence of Israel and the situation of Palestinian refugees are adequately developed. There is an attempt at judgement in the conclusion but the evaluation of Nasser's importance is implicit rather than explicit.

F7 – From Second Reich to Third Reich: Germany, 1918–45

Most centres entered for Option F combine F7 with another topic. As a result there is a wide variety of responses and approaches to question. Although most candidates are very well prepared there are a significant number of candidates who have very weak chronological awareness of the events of the period leading to confused and inaccurate answers. Many of the factual inaccuracies are those which are often found at GCSE and centres that are introducing candidates to AS level process by using familiar content do need to ensure that candidates are aware of the key dates. Centres might also consider progression to AS level with reference to a more nuanced understanding of change over time.

Q13. This was the most popular question in F7. Most candidates were able to show the relationship between the Treaty of Versailles and the economic and political stability of the period 1919-23. However, many responses were weak narratives of the events of 1919-23 with implied connection to the consequences of the Treaty. A significant minority of candidates wrote little more than simple statements which suggested economic problems and political revolts with few specific accurate examples and a confused chronology. In particular, there were many candidates who assumed that the Wall St. Crash occurred in 1923 and that hyper-inflation led to widespread unemployment. Many well-reasoned responses also confused the armistice of 1918 with the Treaty of Versailles and assumed that the Spartacist Rising was a direct result of the terms of the Treaty including it in a list of revolts caused by the Treaty. There were some excellent answers which suggested that although the Treaty was the cause of many of the problems during this period the consequences of German policies during the War, the nature of the armistice and the creation of the Weimar Republic were also contributory (although many references to the weaknesses of Weimar referred to events after 1924).

(This page is for your second answer.)

How accurate is it to suggest that the Treaty of Versailles was mainly responsible for the political & economic instability in G in 1919-23?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p><u>TGV</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disarmament - Ruhr ✓ - Alsace Lorraine, Saar, Czech - ships Army, Navy. - Reparations | <p><u>art</u> -Steelman</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dawes plan - better of that in 1924 - War reparations - social welfare - financial support & passive resistance |
|---|---|

It can be argued During 1919-23 Germany is described as facing political and economic difficulties it can be suggested that this was mainly down to the Treaty of Versailles (or 'Diktat') ~~but~~.

However it can be argued that other factors were to blame such as the ; the cost of WWI, the cost of keeping up social welfare & the financial strains on an already inflated economy of the period occupying the Ruhr. It can also be suggested that the First Treaty of Versailles.

It can be argued that the Treaty of Versailles is responsible for political & economic instability because many Nationalists in Germany felt unhappy with the way Germans Army & Navy force was treated as their Navy was reduced to 6 battle ships & they were only allowed 100,000 foot soldiers this ~~was~~ helped to build up resentment in this political sector especially amongst the Freikorps.

It can also be suggested that the ~~the~~ reduction of the size of Germany due to ~~its~~ ~~loss~~ with the Saar & Alsace Lorraine & ~~the~~ what is now Czechoslovakia being taken away German people felt as if they were ^{excluded} ~~excluded~~. Their German speaking neighbors build up discontent but not only this whilst ridding Czechoslovakia from Germany it also took the Sudetenland & one of

Germany ~~became~~ a source of income as it was industrialised reducing Germany's money intake.

Finally it can be suggested that the reparations made to be paid by Germany cause great economic hardship & hyper inflation as they had to pay back a large 9.9 million marks this causing a strain on an already inflated economy.

However it can be argued that other factors were the reason as to why Germany went through social & economic hardship such as the war debts German had chattered up as they ~~were~~ ~~not prepared~~ made no war provisions & at a point in WWI were stuck at a stalemate this boosting the deficit of the German economy.

Another factor is the fact that the Weimer government made social welfare provisions due to the increased inflation and lack of stability for the ~~working class~~ German people to be able to buy essential items as the mark became ~~less~~ ~~or~~ more & more worthless.

It can also be claimed that hyperinflation was a bigger problem for Germany due to the fact it caused mass poverty to a country that already had socio-economic issues, such as gas & fuel shortages, Influenza & infant deaths.

Finally it can be claimed that the problems due to the French occupying the Ruhr caused large-scale economic problems for Germany as the Weimar government in reaction to this adopted the policy of passive resistance, halting production in the Ruhr and taking away another one of Germany's economic resources.

On another note it can also be argued that Stresemann's Dawes plan allowed Germany to regulate its war payments to how much they could pay putting Germans in a better place in 1929 than it was in 1919.

In conclusion it can be claimed that the Treaty of Versailles had a ^{to} negative effect on the political & economic climate of post-war Germany. Its issues can however be placed elsewhere as the Treaty only had an effect

(This page is for your second answer.) because there were underlying issues problem such as, war ~~costs~~ costs, health issues, social welfare & Inflation. The ~~best~~ Treaty of Versailles only worsened the problems already faced by Germany and therefore was partly a cause for the political and social instability of Germany in between 1919 - 23.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a typical low-mid Level 3 answer. The response is aware of the political and economic consequences of the Treaty of Versailles and some other influences as well. There are a series of relevant statements often lacking in security of supporting evidence or making generalisations. Some of the material concerning Stresemann is irrelevant. This answer attempts analysis through limited explanation and has weak understanding and supporting evidence.

The years 1919-23 in Germany saw many crisis from Hyperinflation, coups, reparations ^{and} invasions. However, ~~how~~ whether the ~~economic & political~~ instability was economic, political or both can be debated.

In 1919, the German people were faced with the humiliation of the Treaty of Versailles. This 'Diktat' (dictated peace) made the ex-army's blood boil as it ~~was~~ ~~for~~ ~~the~~

(This page is for your second answer.) Germany had lost its pride, and was faced with the 'war-guilt' clause, accepting the blame for world war one.

However, the treaty of Versailles was a bigger humiliation because of the restrictions it placed on Germany. Germany had lost territory to Poland, reduce it army to 100,000 men, lose all its foreign colonies, not build its navy, planes or tanks. The most humiliating part was the reparations Germany had to pay to the allies. This was a fixed sum of billions of dollars. When the treaty was accepted, financial and political meltdown took place.

The immediate effect of ^{the treaty} Germany ^{was not} able to pay back the reparations. In retaliation, in 1923, the French invaded ^{the Ruhr} ^{hoping to take produce from Germany}. This loss of Germany's industrial province, the government resorted to printing money which ^{also} led to ^{the} financial crisis of ^{hyper} hyperinflation. ⁽¹⁹²³⁾ The German mark had lost its value and the German people faced very difficult times ^{where things such as bread cost billions of marks}. Therefore, the treaty of Versailles was the major cause of political but mostly financial instability in Germany.

(This page is for your second answer.) Before the failure to pay reparations however, ~~at that~~ Germany was in political turmoil. Immediately after the war, the Right wing Kapp putsch took place in 1920, where Army generals, ^{including Wolfgang Kapp} attempted to take control of Germany through an uprising. The failure of general support brought the coup down, and the Weimar Republic remained.

Similarly, in 1923, the leader of the NSDAP, Hitler thought the time was right to lead a coup in the state of Bavaria, hoping it would spread through Germany like the Kiel mutiny. ~~This~~ Hitler's attempt to seize power failed as he had no general support, and was crushed by the general army. These two examples of political coups depict Germany's political instability throughout the period of 1918-23.

However, the ~~at~~ coup attempts were not the only political instabilities of the new Republic. The system of proportional representation in the Reichstag meant that no one party could have the overall majority and instead each government had to serve as a coalition.

(This page is for your second answer.) These governments, ^{unlike} the effective decision making ~~like~~ the British 'first past the post system'. The indecisiveness and failure to make overall judgements weakened each government. Throughout the period of 1919-24, 20 government coalitions were formed, showing ~~this~~ the inability for nominated parties to cooperate and govern Germany. This again is an example of the political crisis in Germany, where even those in power, were not able to agree or make appropriate decisions.

Therefore, Germany ^{from} 1919-23 saw predominantly economic and political issues which occurred for the entire time period. Whilst the beginning saw a lot of political unrest, the year 1923 saw a major financial crisis with the failure to pay reparations, and the invasion of the Ruhr. These issues would have weakened Germany throughout as, because it always was victim to either economic or political problems throughout the period.

(This page is for your second answer.)

In conclusion, whilst the treaty of Versailles in 1919 foreshadowed Germany's unlucky fate, politically and economically it did not immediately cripple Germany, although it began a tide of political instability with ^{right-wing} anti-republicans blaming those 'November criminals' for signing it. The treaty gave rise to ~~some~~ political instability throughout the years, but resulted in the final economic instability in 1923 with the Ruhr & coal hyperinflation. Therefore to a great extent, the treaty of Versailles 1919 ~~is~~ ~~it~~ was what ~~ma-~~ forced the economic & coal political instability upon Germany, ~~it~~ and made both economic and political instability unavoidable, ~~not~~ as predominantly as each other.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a lower Level 4 answer. The introduction is weak and does not clearly indicate the Level of response. This is followed by a series of paragraphs which relate well to the focus of the question and attempts to establish the role of the Versailles Treaty. Political and economic instability are dealt with separately and there is a good indication of change over time. There is reference to other factors such as the weak Weimar Democracy but the relative importance tends to be implicit rather than explicit. The conclusion is more of a summary of the instability present during the period than an evaluation of the role of the Treaty of Versailles.

(This page is for your second answer.) It could be argued that the Treaty of Versailles was mainly responsible for the political and economic instability in Germany ~~in Germany~~, 1919-23. The treaty, which became known as 'Diktat', set reparation payments for Germany at 132 billion Marks, the strains of paying installments on the economy led to economic instability as well as discontent with the regime. It can also be seen that the treaty led to the Ruhr Crisis when Germany failed to pay its reparations, causing the hyperinflation crisis of 1923. However, an alternative, more accurate interpretation is that problems inherent in the Weimar regime were more crucial, particularly in causing political instability.

Firstly, the Versailles Treaty was a key factor in Germany's political and economic instability. The extremely high reparation payments placed a huge strain on the German economy, leading to a total loss of confidence in the economy and a withdrawal of almost all inward investment. Economic distress inevitably led to political problems, as the German public became increasingly

(This page is for your second answer.) angry ~~and~~ the new Weimar Government's inability to manage the economy and provide solutions. The Versailles Treaty was also significant in creating political instability as when it was signed in June 1919, masses of German people were instantly turned against the Weimar politicians, incensed that they were willing to sign to this Schmachfrieden (a shameful and humiliating peace). It only

reinforced the 'stab in the back' myth and the idea of the Weimar politicians as 'November Criminals', weak and unpatriotic. This was key in creating instability because the new regime faced a country of people who had given up on democracy almost from the outset; the German people had been used to autocracy, and thus could only ~~accept~~ ^{look at} such weak decisions as the signing of the treaty as a symptom of democracy. Masses of people already began looking for alternatives, and throughout 1919-23 refused to accept Weimar.

In 1922, Weimar Germany simply could not afford another reparations installment, but was accused of lying. In this way the Versailles Treaty and its excessive demands led to the Ruhr Crisis in 1923, where French and Belgian troops invaded and took over iron and steel factories in the key industrial area of the Ruhr. This, in turn, led to severe economic instability when the Weimar Government called for passive resistance and printed money to cover the costs, causing a hyperinflation crisis - prices increased by 2,500% in one (This page is for your second answer.) month. The hard-earned savings of thousands of Germans were wiped out instantly and many were cast into extreme poverty. Thus the Versailles Treaty was evidently responsible for economic problems in Germany, due to excessive reparations demands.

However, it could be argued that ~~other~~ other factors were more significant. Indeed, it was Government mismanagement that led to such instability, for example hyperinflation could have been avoided if money had not been printed. As Chancellor in 1923, Stresemann's quick solutions emphasise this. Also inherent problems in the regime were more crucial. Proportional representation led to inevitable instability, as it meant that coalitions had to form. Political instability was also created simply because Weimar was a democracy, which key groups in Germany totally opposed. For example, the Kapp Putsch of 1920 and Munich Putsch of 1923 were attempted coups due to a desire for a return to autocracy. Thus Versailles was less responsible here.

To conclude, it is not accurate to say that Versailles was mainly responsible for instability. Masses of Germans were simply unwilling to accept Germany as a democracy, and 1919-23 saw attempts to reverse this, meaning instability.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is a Low Level 5 answer. Although the supporting evidence is not always detailed the response is directly focused on the question asks and is an evaluative answer. Supporting evidence is secure and there is clear understanding with some good examples of succinct explanation; the reference to Stresemann here is relevant and to the point. The candidate is also clearly aware of the chronology of events especially in the earlier part of the period with a clear understanding that the creation of the republic and the signing of the armistice occur before the signing of the Treaty. Although not always successful there is an attempt to integrate different factors with evaluative commentary.

Q14. This was the less popular of the two questions. Candidates appear to be less confident of answering questions which involve economic policy and some candidates seemed to struggle with the concept of prosperity. A few candidates wrote exclusively about the effect of social policies on the German people. It is important that candidates are introduced to the different economic, social and political issues in all the topics covered. Most candidates were aware of general Nazi economic policies and the extent to which these were successful over the period to 1933 but many candidates were focused on detailing the aims of the policies and the extent to which they were successful. There were a significant minority of candidates who were unaware of changes over time and who confused the chronology with autarky being discussed before policies to counteract the Depression. The best answers were those which addressed whether Germany was more prosperous by 1939 than it had been in 1933 with reference to employment, trade and, in particular, the 'guns or butter' debate and/or addressed the prosperity of ordinary Germans.

PLAN: HOW SUCCESSFUL WAS NAZI ECONOMIC POLICY
in achieving prosperity up to 1939.

- YES:**
- 1933-36 Hjalmar Schacht's New Plan
 - 1936-40 → Göring's 4 year plan
 - unemployment miracle 1932 → 5.6 million
 - 1936 → 1.6 million
 - Trade ↑ by 60% since 1933
 - Import value ↑ by 40% since 1933 -
Mefo Bills, taxes on foreign products
 - Autarky → grain + potatoes
 - Public work schemes → autobahn
 - Expansion of party + state bureaucracy
- NO:**
- Jews, women, 16-25 yr olds
 - Artificially lowered unemployment register
 - only temporary → not lasting
 - Deficit financing pushing economy into debt
 - Autarky failed → many workers, wartime
1939. still relied on foreign 1/3 of raw materials.
economy not achieved.

(This page is for your second answer.) The Nazi economic policy in Germany was both successful and unsuccessful in achieving prosperity up to 1939. The majority of Nazi economic policy fell under the category of the New Plan 1933-1936, or Göring's Four Year Plan 1936-1940. Each "plan" had ~~some~~ individual successes in achieving prosperity, with the New Plan seeing trade increase by 60% in 1933, and the Four Year Plan ~~was~~ achieving autarky in some areas, by making Germany self-sufficient in grain and potatoes. However, the plans did not fully achieve prosperity in Germany and often harmed the German economy. The New Plan continued the policy of deficit finance, which pushed the country into debt and the Four Year Plans failed to achieve the bulk of its two main aims - autarky and an economy geared up for the demands of total war.

Some aspects of Nazi economic policy were highly successful in achieving prosperity up to 1939. Hjalmar Schacht's New Plan from 1933 to 1936 saw unemployment decrease from 5.6 million in 1932, to just 1.6 million by 1936. State funded public work schemes were established, such as the building of the autobahn (motorway) and

(This page is for your second answer.) construction of important public buildings. Under Schacht's New Plan, import ~~value~~ value increased by 40% since 1933. Mefo Bills were introduced, allowing Germany to buy goods, without having actual money to pay for them, acting as credit notes. These policies helped to achieve prosperity as they built up the German workforce through public work schemes, increasing goods production. Schemes such as Mefo Bills helped contribute to Germany's prosperity as they allowed them to trade with other countries and obtain vital goods, without actually requiring money to do so.

Additionally, tariffs were put on foreign products to make them more expensive. This ensured that German people would continue to buy German products. This helped to ~~also~~ achieve prosperity as it increased the amount of money circulating in the German economy, which would help contribute to long term prosperity. There was an expansion of state and party bureaucracy which created thousands of jobs. This helped to aid prosperity both of individual German people as it provided many with ~~unskilled~~ unskilled jobs, as well as increasing the workforce and ability to manage the country better, helping to achieve prosperity in Germany up to 1939.

In addition, aspects of Goering's four year plans

(This page is for your second answer.) of 1936-1940 also helped to achieve prosperity in Germany up to 1939. The Four Year Plans aimed for autarky and an economy to be ready for total war. Autarky would allow Germany to be self-sufficient, no longer having to rely on foreign imports. Under the Four Year Plan, Germany became self-sufficient in grain and potatoes, and manufactured alternative products such as synthetic ~~oil~~ ~~and~~ coal and rubber. This achievement of autarky in these areas helped to achieve prosperity in Germany up to 1939 as it meant that Germany could be more independent and self-reliant, which was especially important after the allied blockade into the First World War, which blockaded important products, leading to the starvation of hundreds of thousands of Germans.

However, Nazi economic policies did not always achieve prosperity within Germany.

The unemployment figure reduction of 6 million to 1.6 million in just four years was very much down to artificially lowering the unemployment register. Jews were dismissed from the workforce, women encouraged to leave through marriage loans and 18-25 year old males were conscripted into the armed forces. This did not help to achieve prosperity as unemployment was reduced illegitimately.

(This page is for your second answer.) making the successes of Nazi economic policies more apparent than real. In addition, Schacht's continuation of Papen's earlier policy of deficit financing pushed the German economy deeper into the red and caused huge debts. This did not achieve prosperity for Germany and caused economic instability and a volatile and unstable future for the German economy.

To add to this, many of the targets for autarky in the four year plan were not achieved.

Germany produced half of the intended coal stated by the four year plans, and she was also not self-sufficient in oil and many other products. By 1939, Germany relied on foreign supplies for 1/3 of its raw materials. This shows the Nazi economic policy, especially the four year plans did not achieve prosperity in Germany up to 1939 as in most cases they failed, putting Germany back in the situation it was in before, reliant very much on foreign imports.

In conclusion, the Nazi economic policies were successful in achieving prosperity in some respects, but unsuccessful in others.

(This page is for your second answer.) Although the New Plan hugely reduced unemployment, allowed initiatives to get more money in the German ~~economy~~ economy and increased trade by 60% since 1933, it also saw the economy being pushed drastically into debt, and many job creation schemes were temporary, providing indefinite prosperity.

~~As for the four year plan, more of there~~
As for the four year plan under Göring, there were more failures than successes in achieving prosperity for Germany.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is an example of a high Level 4 answer. The response clearly links economic policy to prosperity and the supporting evidence is generally secure. There is an attempt to evaluate the success of different economic policies over time with reference to successes and failures. Despite this the answer is more balanced towards a discussion of economic policies and so relates well to the focus of the question rather than an explicit discussion of prosperity.

6HI01/E Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
60	32.9	11.4

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	43	38	33	28	23
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40
% Candidates		21.2	36	52.6	69.1	82.5

6HI01/F Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
60	30.4	11.2

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	43	38	33	28	23
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40
% Candidates		14.3	25.8	43.8	62.4	77

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code US022875 January 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

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

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

