

Script C

Centre Mark 23/40



Coursework authentication sheet

Pearson Edexcel Level 3 Advanced GCE in History

Assignment title: Historians have not agreed about the extent to which nationalist strengths were more important than republican weaknesses for the outcome of the Spanish Civil War

Have you received advice on the title from the Assignment guidance service? Y/N

Centre name:

Centre number:

Candidate name:

Candidate number:

State the examined options that are being taken:

Paper 1: Route A The Crusades, 1095-1204

Paper 2: Route A 2.1 Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman kingdom, c1053-1106

Paper 3: Civil Rights and race relations in the USA, 1850-2009

Mark awarded	Comments [Comment box expands as you start entering text]
23/40	This response meets L3 in all BPs. There is an understanding of the contrasting views, although weaker on Preston, and separating historians and context is used to explore views. Judgements are made but the substantiation is often weak.

Teacher declaration

I declare that the work submitted for assessment has been carried out without assistance other than that which is acceptable according to the rules of the specification.

Assessor name			
Assessor signature		Date	

Candidate declaration

I certify that the work submitted for this assignment is my own. I have clearly referenced any materials used in the work. I understand that false declaration is a form of malpractice.

Candidate signature		Date	
---------------------	--	------	--

Additional Candidate declaration

By signing this additional declaration, you agree to your work being used to support Professional Development, Online Support and Training of Centre-Assessors and Pearson Moderators.

Candidate signature		Date	
---------------------	--	------	--

Historians have disagreed about the extent to which Nationalist Strengths were more important than Republican Weaknesses for the outcome of the Spanish civil war.

What is your view about the extent to which Nationalist Strengths were more important than Republican Weaknesses for the outcome of the Spanish civil war?

- ☐ Analyze the ways in which interpretations of the question, problem or issue differ.
- ☐ Explain the differences you have identified.
- ☐ Evaluate the arguments, indicating which you found the most persuasive and explain your judgments.

Introduction

The extent to which Nationalist Strengths were more important than Republican Weaknesses for the outcome of the Spanish civil war has been a bone of contention among historians due to the varying factors that affected both the Republicans and the Nationalists during the conflict. Stanley G Payne¹ interpretation claims that it was Nationalist strengths, largely due to the overall professionalism of the Nationalist Army and its many leaders with extensive support from the Axis, Portugal. In differing opinion Antony Beevor's² view that it was Republican weakness because of the ill-equipped Republicans and poorly trained International brigades that led to the outcome of the war. Both of these interpretations are contrasted by Paul Preston's³ Interpretation which has a greater emphasis on the political rivalry and split in the Republic overall leading to its weakness.

3 contrasting interpret

Nationalist Strengths

One of constituent of the differing opinion is the strength of the Nationalists rather than weakness of Republicans while Payne argues that it's the Strengths, both Beevor and Preston argue it was Republican Weaknesses. According to Payne, the Nationalist Strengths came from their "superior military leadership, organization and quality"⁴ this arguably can be seen as a greater advantage for the Nationalists and this can be supported by the fact the Nationalist army was comprised of regular troops with military leadership but also the irregular troops were voluntary and choose to fight for the Nationalists because of their belief in the traditionalist and conservative Ideals of Franco. These irregulars would be trained and drilled by the regulars and leaders creating a professional and semi-professional standard among the Nationalist ranks. Furthermore, Payne argues that not only was the overall troop quality better but the Nationalists held another advantage within the ranks of the army; this lay in their complete control of the elite sector of the Spanish army - the well trained and equipped units of mostly volunteers stationed in Morocco. They numbered 47,000 on paper (33,000 Spanish 14,00 Moroccans)⁵. These Elite

context providing support

¹ Stanley G Payne (1987) The Franco Regime 1936-75

² Antony Beevor (1982) The Battle for Spain -The Spanish Civil War 1936-1939

³ Paul Preston (1986) The Spanish Civil War :Reaction, Revolution and Revenge

⁴ Stanley G Payne (1987) The Franco Regime ,The Nationalist War Effort ,chapter 8, page 122

⁵ Ibid

came from Italy and Germany"⁹This is true - they not only had singular support such as the Republicans with their Russian superpower but rather different types of support from Portugal, German and Italy which helped shape and consolidate Nationalist power in mainland Spain from the start to the end of the war. This not only stands as land and weapon leases but rather from allowing troops through border, supplying men and arms, or general advice and council, all covered by each intervening power differently. In contrast to Payne, Taylor claims that Foreign involvement did not help the Nationalists win the war because, "German Intervention was not a success even as a venture in 'economic imperialism' .As soon as Franco had won he cut down the German concessions and began to seek capital aid from the City of London."¹⁰ This claim that Franco received little help from Germany and brushed Germany away soon as he had won the war can be seen as true because Franco never wanted to be controlled or influenced by Hitler and felt he was strong enough by only using Hitler as a tool to gain more power and influence for himself. Furthermore Taylor claims that it was the Nationalist strengths without the foreign involvement that was the deciding factor the outcome of the war. This contrast to Payne and Beevor is not just in opinion but also in his sources, as Taylor uses both Spanish and German foreign policy archives to get these inferences.

*Spanish
history
used to
challenge*

*Does consider reasons for
difference, although not doing much with it.*

I am persuaded by Payne's argument that Mussolini wanted Franco's success to provide another Fascist nation to perhaps prove superiority to Hitler's Nazi Germany or maybe to further his political influence, but overall he consistently supported the Nationalists course from the beginning to the end unlike Hitler who would only commit limited resources and believed it to be a waste particularly after Franco declined the idea of joining a world war. Stanley Payne highlights that the Italian ambition would help Franco succeed, "Yet the Italians insisted that a large part of the nearly 49,000 troops being sent to Spain would be used first in a new offensive in the south"¹¹. Often overlooked is the smaller acts that Germany had done in the war; even with their minimal commitment after the initial airlift they continued to help the Nationalists with training and advisory roles. "Between the autumn of 1936 and 1937 hundred of German military specialist and instructors were sent to the Nationalist zone to provide training".¹² This training helped create a semi-professional army because as the war raged on the amount of regular soldiers had shrunk requiring new conscripts to be drilled and trained in military doctrine. Often being poorly trained for short periods of time the Nationalist conscripts still had high moral and Payne argues that this made them crucial as loyal troops. Payne argues that the moral of particular units helped make up for their poor training, "Probably the most important element of the new conscript army was the Alferes Provisionals. Through their military training was deficient it, they were enthusiastic for the Nationalist movement and of relatively advanced educational background. What they lacked in technical preparation they made up in courage and personal example"¹³ (This differs from Antony Beevor's argument of morale was superior factor for the Republicans and highlights it was also for the Nationalists). This later lack of sufficient training would still be greater than the Republicans and Stanley Payne Argues, "The Nationalist army never became a first-rate twentieth century military machine; it won because it

⁹ Stanley G Payne The Franco Regime, The Nationalist War Effort, chapter 8, page 127

¹⁰ A.J.P Taylor Europe Grandeur and Decline, 1967. Spain and the Axis, chapter 31, page 228

¹¹ Stanley G Payne The Franco Regime, The Nationalist War Effort, chapter 8, page 130

¹² Stanley G Payne The Franco Regime, The Nationalist War Effort, chapter 8, page 134

¹³ Stanley G Payne The Franco Regime, The Nationalist War Effort, chapter 8, page 134

held certain advantage over the less effective contingent of popular front."¹⁴ Stanley Payne further supports this by saying, "The Popular Front passed from disorganized to organized militia but never altogether to a regular army, even though it had the look and structure of one. Units retained political identities and loyalties that were not overcome."¹⁵ This ultimately led to an army that was not fully professional but adequate to fight, other than the Political disunity the army held its own but was still lesser than The Nationalists. Overall I put considerable weight behind Payne's interpretation I find it to be convincing and fits with contextual knowledge from my research. I acknowledge that Payne is not a novice to Spanish History but rather a celebrated champion of it so I see no reason why I would find him unreliable other than his tendency to delve into internal politics of the Spanish civil war. This interpretation is supported by my contextual knowledge as I believe and presume the nationalists would have won the war even if the Republic was united because of the superior units and tactics used during the conflict. Furthermore I can support his claims with my contextual knowledge and understand that the troop quality and leadership of Franco and the Nationalist had led to creating a formidable fighting force that could ultimately fight effective even against the odds.

Context used as certain

Republican weakness

In contrast Paul Preston claims that the weakness of the Republicans were the main reason for the outcome of the Spanish civil war. Preston argues that the weakness of the Republicans was the many political rivalries and divisions in the Republic itself which was more important than the strength of the Nationalist army. This argument can be made simply by acknowledging that the Nationalists had a unified army that was united through discipline and a chain of command where loyalty and respect made the leaders untouchable and infallible. The Republicans had a disunited army and government made of many political parties that all had different views and rivalries ideologically and generally.

Preston claims that the Republicans suffered from numerous problems which were virtually unknown to the Nationalist. They were never able to achieve anything like the singleness of purpose enjoyed in Salamanca. Political rivalries in the loyalist zone were possible precisely because the Republicans remained a democracy even in wartime conditions. Such rivalries were exacerbated by and closely linked to the question of foreign aid and republican dependency on the Soviet Union.¹⁶ This Political disunity led to many issues and most notably was the distrust between the Anarchists and the Communists. Preston argues that the Anarchist feared the Communist because of their influence and is widely supported by other historians. "The position of communist posed a terrible dilemma for the anarchist. If the rebels should win the war the anarchists experiment would definitely be brought to an end. For the republic to win the active cooperation of the anarchists was essential"¹⁷ Preston argues that the Anarchists were overall reluctant to try and win the war because as soon as the war was won a power vacuum between anarchist communist and other syndicalist or left-wing ideologies would open up leading to another Civil War. Beevor directly supports Preston's claim that the anarchists were reluctant to win the war and feared the Communist were going to purge them, "Some anarchist who still controlled the Pyrenean frontier, wanted to turn them back. Their argument

Assented but not demonstrated were

Although Beevor is listed as a supporting historian

¹⁴ Stanley G Payne The Franco Regime, The Nationalist War Effort, chapter 8, page 136

¹⁵ ibid

¹⁶ Paul Preston (1986) The Spanish Civil War: Reaction, Revolution and Revenge, page 229

¹⁷ Paul Preston (1986) The Spanish Civil War: Reaction, Revolution and Revenge, page 247

was that weapons were needed not men ,but their main fear was that a Communist controlled foreign legion was being built up to crush them later"¹⁸ Preston argues that this sentiment is one that undermined the Republicans and made them weak as the larger parties in the Republic were mainly Communist and Anarchists and when they began to fight it would lead to an overall lack of traction in the Republican government. Preston illustrates his point that the division in government led to weakness. "Movements were an obstacle which not only hindered the central task of creating an efficient army to win the war but also threatened to bring down on the head of the republic an alliance of conservative western democracies with the Axis powers"¹⁹ Preston's opinion on the need to create an efficient army to win the war reflects the stance that the division between the Republicans would lead to its downfall and weakness. While Payne argues that the foreign intervention strengthen the Nationalist, Preston contrastingly argues that it weakened and damaged the Republicans.

Preston's strong opinion of Republican Weakness further differs to Payne's argument of military superiority of the Nationalists, "However the balance of military advantage still lay decisively with the Nationalists apart from total control of the best operationalize unit the army of Africa, they had a clear majority of field officers major captains and lieutenants and an adequate numbers of the best general to command them."²⁰ This is supported by the fact the military leaders were members of the aristocracy or "bourgeoisie" so when the Republicans first took over they did a mass purge of the "bourgeoisie" leaving many of the military leaders with vendettas against the Republicans and often would lead Republican army's poorly to cause inconvenience and sabotage "Another acute problem which afflicted the Republic and not the Nationalists was the questionable loyalty of its military personnel estimate of how many army officers remained loyal to the republic vary,"²¹ This notable was because the better leaders escaped to join the Nationalist to remove the Republicans that sought to destroy traditionalism and conservatism. Preston believes that disloyal leaders would purposely sabotage the Republicans to try weakening it "They were numerous examples in the republican zone of treachery sabotage deliberate incompetence and desertion. Artillery officers had their batteries aimed to miss their targets or accidentally to rain shells on republican troops .At the first opportunity others crossed the lines with their units taking with them Republican battle plans"²² these direct attacks on the Republic shows that the division argument that Preston claims is not only convincing but potentially outweighs Payne's argument of Nationalist strength. I find that a divided Republic could never have won the war even if the Nationalists were weaker because it would have still been united and organized compared to the split Republic .This is because if you cannot lead a unified army then you stand very little chance of fighting and winning the war especially if your leaders have a symphyses for the Nationalist and are willing to switch sides., This overall lack of loyalty and disunity within the Republican ranks can be seen as a major weakness as not only did military and its leaders have an overall breakdown in command and loyalty but as well as this the Government did little other than argue over issues and this led to an inefficient chain of command .

¹⁸ Antony Beevor (1982) The Battle for Spain -The Spanish Civil War 1936-1939 ,International Brigades and soviet Advisers ,page 179-180

¹⁹ Paul Preston (1986) The Spanish Civil War :Reaction, Revolution and Revenge ,page 238

²⁰ Paul Preston (1986) The Spanish Civil War :Reaction, Revolution and Revenge ,page 229

²¹ Paul Preston (1986) The Spanish Civil War :Reaction, Revolution and Revenge ,page 229

²² Paul Preston (1986) The Spanish Civil War :Reaction, Revolution and Revenge ,page 230

Antony Beevor supports the claim of Republican weakness militarily but differs as Beevor claims that a lot of the International Brigades were poorly trained and in many instances received very little of the general firearm training meaning that often they would reach the front and have not had real experience. Beevor claims that it was mainly the training of the men that let them down not overall their division. "The old sweats from the Great War, were bitterly critical of the training. Most of the volunteers were very unfit as well as ignorant of the most elementary military skills. As one of the veterans remarked 'they were not preparing to go over the top with das kapital in their hands' "²³ This idea that there were often poorly taught to fight but rather would be ideologically indoctrinated into the army than taught to fight and often would carry party ideals rather than rifles. Hugh Thomas supports this with his narrative of inexperienced volunteers that were ill equipped to fight. "The day after arrival at Albacete, all volunteers would be registered. A clerk would ask if they was officers, non-commissioned officers, cooks, typists, artillerymen, riders or machine gunners present. Many foolishly replied according to their ambitions rather than to their abilities "²⁴. This lends further weight to Beevor's argument and makes it more convincing. The inexperienced volunteers were not only poorly trained but hardly trained. I find this to be a very credible claim by Thomas as it can be supported contextual. Having read accounts to which the volunteers as new combatants would say a role they would like to be in rather than one they would know resulting in them not been trained or prepared for combat. Hugh Thomas comments about how the commanders were mainly from civilian roles or simply of communist origin "The first infantry training commander at Albacete was a German journalist, Ernst Adam -not a communist-who afterwards moved to the front. "²⁵

Thomas's argument of inexperienced leaders is clear as not only were they selected based on loyalty but had no rudimentary experience at commanding an army they were usually middle class and educated allowing them to read and write making them capable of reading orders. The volunteers from the International Brigades, as Beevor argues, were not formally trained but fronted to look trained so if they were to be shown off to Militias and Partisans they would look the part but overall held very little military power "Sheer courage, bolstered by the belief that the world depended on them had to make up for appalling deficiencies in the brigades basic training. Men who were to be sent against the army of Africa had to project the aura of experts to impress the militias but they could do little except form ranks, march and turn. many of them had never even handle a rifle until they were on the way to the front and the few great war veteran had to show them how to load their obsolete weapons of varied caliber's. from a box of assorted ammunition inexperienced soldiers had to find the right bullets to fit their rifles. The number of jammed weapons through wedged and separated castings were predictably high "²⁶.

Antony Beevor's claim that the International Brigades were poorly trained and led making them weak and mainly ineffective in the conflict making the Republican forces weak and overall lacked true military power. This is supported by Hugh Thomas but furthermore the argument is credible and does not lack cohesion thus been persuasive. Overall because of Beevor specializes in modern military history it would make sense for Beevor to lack plenty detail he does not specialize primarily as an Spanish Historian but been supported by Thomas a deeply

²³ Antony Beevor (1982) The Battle for Spain -The Spanish Civil War 1936-1939, International Brigades and soviet Advisers page 181-182

²⁴ Hugh Thomas, The Spanish Civil War, Rising And Revolution, Chapter 17, page 443

²⁵ Hugh Thomas, The Spanish Civil War, Rising And Revolution, Chapter 17, page 444

²⁶ Antony Beevor (1982) The Battle for Spain -The Spanish Civil War 1936-1939, International Brigades and soviet Advisers page 182

Attempts to draw out a difference - not fully explained

supporting Thomas

long rotation

at a entrance

? Argument unclear

Trying to use historians' credentials to establish authority for judgement

credited Spanish Historian whose books predate many others so much so it was written and published even before the end of Franco's regime often his works come from letters, reports and even from other historians interpretations for example his footnotes about Alexander Orlov speaks about how he defected to the us and told Stanley G Payne about his role in the war and how he was responsible for intelligence counterintelligence and guerilla fighting. Although this account occurred in the 90s, it is clear that Hugh Thomas' Revisionism and constant updating of his book allows him to update and revise; this means that his arguments and overall credibility are convincing thus allowing me to also claim that Antony Beevor's claims must also be credible if supported by Hugh Thomas.

Conclusion

seeking opinion
nothing we hear
When considering the persuasiveness of my chosen historians interpretations of about the extent to which Nationalist strengths were more important than Republican weaknesses for the outcome of the Spanish civil war, I find Stanley G Payne's interpretation to be the most convincing. This is because He specialises in Modern Spanish History and European Fascism. In comparison Paul Preston only specialises in Spanish Contemporary studies. Similar to Antony Beevor who does not specialise in the Spanish Civil war but rather is modern military historian has written a few fiction novels on the side this lowers the credibility of the him but an aspect that significantly makes him more trustworthy and credible is that he is often supported by Hugh Thomas with his claims and knowledge. Hugh Thomas's interpretation was Highly persuasive and credible but I felt it often lacked the finer details because Hugh Thomas studies the breadth of Spanish history from an, Hugh Thomas is very close to Stanley G Payne in Sourcing and referencing I feel that the fact Hugh Thomas actually References Stanley G Payne's work "The NKVD in Spain"²⁷ (this work was asking questions to Alexander Orlov after he defected to the USA) this shows how Payne is an accurate and credible. Furthermore Stanley G Payne's Interoperations carries further weight by using accounts from Secretaries and emissary of the Nationalists such as mole and other leaders these accounts and letters are first hand sources of information which are very reliable. Though A.J.P Taylor lacks the knowledge on the Spanish Civil war he does use detailed sources such as foreign policy archives from Germany and Spain increasing his Credibility But lowers credibility of Stanley G Payne as they argue about the extent of foreign involvement for the nationalists. However Both Antony Beevor and Hugh Thomas do clearly use detailed endnotes making them credible even if Hugh Thomas is more so credible then Antony Beevor. I found Preston's argument limited because of his Lack of Reference and sources making it high detailed but meaning I couldn't place weight behind it his argument making it an excellent piece of knowledge but the credibility was lacking. Antony Beevor Had a Supported argument with Hugh Thomas and some from Paul Preston leading to an excellent and fairly persuasive argument however because of the nature of his Expertise as a modern military historian rather than a Spanish focuses one it was not overly appropriate to have him as one of the more substantial interpretations.

The differing opinion between the Historians was hard as obviously they had used different source but an overall consensus of Nationalist strength could be found in every argument just as it was that republican weakness was equally pushed. The aspects in which they differed was

²⁷ Stanley G Payne The NKVD in Spain. Questions by Stanley Payne, answers by Alexander Orlov. With an introduction by Frank Schauff, 2000

in areas such as politics, Foreign influence and troop quality it's obvious that if historians choose to ignore other sources in favor for more favorable ones it will lead to their spaced opinion. But I found that Hugh Thomas and Stanley G Payne were more solid in their arguments and was quite impartial to both arguments allowing great flexibility and lacked Overall I found That the Limitations of Antony Beevor's, Hugh Thomas and Paul Preston to push me to the more than capable Interpretation of Stanley G Payne . Thus I am More than convinced that Payne's interpretation that it was the Strengths of the Nationalists that led to the Outcome of the Spanish Civil War because of the Overall Professionalism and superior leadership of the nationalists and Because of the persuasiveness of his claims and his credibility I have complete faith in his interpretation.

words 3967

BP1 A range of material has been selected - contrasting + supporting historians. The subtle nuances between Beevor's and Preston's argument are not really made clear. There is an overall understanding of the issues

L3

BP2 There is an attempt to give a judgement. In the main body this is mostly using contextual knowledge but Taylor and Thomas are both brought in to develop the argument. Substantiation is ~~then~~ limited.

L3

BP3 The 3 views are analysed - stronger between Payne + the other 2 rather than really drawing out the difference between Beevor + Preston. The response does get rather bogged down in the conclusion where the candidate attempts to use contrasting sources / research interests for certain but does not really develop a logical argument.

L3

P4 Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement. This is much more effective when used. The ...

L3

Word count: 4064 - includes question

than when evaluating news using historians' research. Supporting historians used to a limited degree here.

BP5

Knowledge is accurate and sufficient to

show some understanding of the enquiry.

L3

No reference to events during the war which might have been expected. There is a clear organisation to the response & the argument is clear but lacks coherence in the conclusion

23/
40

Coursework resource record

Pearson Edexcel Level 3 Advanced GCE in History				
Centre name:				
Candidate name:				
Resources used. The three works chosen for the assignment must be asterisked.	Page/web reference	Student comments	Student date(s) when accessed	Teacher initials and date resource record checked
* Hugh Thomas The Spanish civil war 1961, published Great Britain	Chapter 27 Page 427 - 450	Republican Support from Russia	11.6.18	
* Antony Beevor The Battle for Spain The Spanish civil war - 1936-1939 1982 - Great Britain.	Chapter 16 Page 177 - 185	ill equipped Republican troops	13.6.18	
* The Franco Regime 1936-1975 Stanley G. Payne 1987 University of Wisconsin Press	Chapter 8 120 - 162	Nationalist Strengths due to overall Professionalism.	26.9.18	

Pearson Edexcel Level 3 Advanced GCE in History

Centre name:

Candidate name:

Resources used. The three works chosen for the assignment must be asterisked.	Page/web reference	Student comments	Student date(s) when accessed
* The Spanish Civil War : Reaction, Revolution and 1986 Paul Preston Great Britain	Chapter 8 229-265	The weakness of Republicans because of Political Rivalry,	10.10.18
Europe Grower and Decline A.J.P. Taylor 1967 Great Britain	Chapter 31 224-228	failure of Axis support to the nationalists	24.2.19

