



Examiners' Report **June 2025**

GCE History 9HI0 2G

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at <https://www.edexcel.com> or <https://www.btec.co.uk>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2025

Publications Code 9HI0_2G_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range with A Level paper Option 2G.1: The rise and fall of fascism in Italy, c1911–46 and Option 2G.2: Spain, 1930–78: republicanism, Francoism and the re-establishment of democracy. The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory question that is based on two linked sources. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance.

Candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was very little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. There continues to be an increase this year in the number of scripts that were seen that posed problems for examiners with a lack of legibility of handwriting, some of which were almost entirely indecipherable. Examiners are only able to give credit for what they can read. There did seem this summer to be evidence of a greater number of candidates using the language of the mark scheme in their responses. However, many of these responses were not doing what they claimed to be doing and it was felt that generally this was not a very helpful approach. There was also some evidence this summer of a number of candidates abbreviating words that should not be abbreviated in formal written English, e.g. the use of gov instead of government. This is not a development that is welcomed.

In Section A, the strongest answers were able to develop reasoned and supported inferences based on the sources. Such responses evaluated the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the enquiry on the basis of both the contextual knowledge that was on offer and through an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It continues to be disappointing to have to note that a number of candidates do not explicitly address the focus of the enquiry, but rather discuss issues arising from the sources in general terms. This question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and most candidates are now able to deal with this reasonably well. Approaches to how it is approached do vary, but that is perfectly acceptable, as long as it is present. Some candidates still continue to use their contextual knowledge to describe events in great detail, rather than using it to illuminate and to discuss the sources. This sometimes resulted in candidates not dealing with the sources adequately. In other cases, candidates might offer up little or, on occasion, no contextual knowledge to support their arguments and analysis. These were not always weaker candidates; some answers were seen that were strong in bullet points 1 and 3 of the mark scheme, but had very little that could be credited for bullet point 2. The impact of this was to hold down the marks that were achievable in this question.

In section B, it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. Weaker candidates either engaged in a narrative approach that made links to the question in the conclusion or alternatively shaped their responses analytically but lacked sufficient substance and accurate contextual knowledge to support the arguments that they were making. It continues to be the case that there are a number of responses that have a tendency to only deal with one side of an argument; some of these were a sophisticated analysis of that one side, showing the links between the issues that were raised, but it is essential

that candidates acknowledge the existence of a counter argument, where appropriate. Candidates are encouraged to ensure that they take the most appropriate approach to answering a question. Candidates should always aim to show the links between the issues raised, not merely to present a list of factors. Candidates continue to need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology. Equally, the evidence that is presented should come from within the timeframe of the chronology of the question.

Question 1

Option 2G.1 has a larger entry than option 2G.2 and hence the majority of candidates answered this question. Most candidates were able to interrogate the sources and in addressing this question very many used the sources in combination which allowed access to level 4 and above. The question attracted a wide range of answers. There were many well focused answers which interrogated the sources effectively and were able to address the nature of fascism in the years 1919-21. The most successful answers demonstrated contextual knowledge of the development of fascism from a movement with socialist leanings to a right wing movement that favoured business over the worker, landlord over the peasant and dropped anti-clerical ideas in the hope of appealing to Catholics and the papacy. Typically candidates made more of Source 1 in which they identified the socialist origins and context in shaping the wording of the source. For the most part Matteotti's source was identified only with violence of the PNF and the lurch to the right of Fascism. The best responses were able to explain the reasons for the development, demonstrating through their contextual knowledge a secure understanding of the values of a section of Italian society in the early 1920s. Lower level responses relied wholly on the sources and critiquing bias and summarising source content. In particular they did not make use of the difference in date to understand a fundamental shift in fascist ideology and thus tended to write off Source 1 as lies. In dealing with provenance, Source 2 was tackled more confidently than Source 1 with candidates being able to address issues more securely. Many were able to consider the position of Matteotti as an opponent of fascism and the nature of the source as a speech in which he would be seeking to persuade the Chamber of the dangers of fascism, and interrogate this with their knowledge of actions of the squads to consider how far Matteotti's claims about fascist violence stood up to scrutiny. Although many candidates were able to make perceptive comments about the nature of Source 1 as an election manifesto in which the fascists were seeking to persuade the electorate to vote for them, too many candidates simply claimed it was biased and not reliable and tended to test with evidence of what the fascists did when they were in power which was not focused very effectively on the task set. There were also issues of chronology where some answers were undermined by the belief that the fascists were in power when these sources were produced.

Some use of provenance was stereotypical and added little to the evaluation. In levels 4 and 5, it is important that candidates take note of the requirement that evaluation should use criteria that are 'justified and applied'. Therefore, candidates must go beyond asserting bias or impartiality and demonstrate this with reference to evidence within the sources.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

Source 1 and Source 2 could be used together to investigate the nature of fascism in the years 1919-21, Source 2 more so than Source 1. This is because Source 1 is just months after the fascio di combattimento was formed in March 1919 and it is before the huge changes made to the nature of fascism in the New Programme of 1920; it is still of use though as it is a list of demands from Mussolini's personal fascist newspaper. Source 2 can be used in conjunction to Source 1 as it outlines how the fascist squads actually operated and their brutal ways. Source 1 can be used to understand what fascism was before the New Programme and Source 2 can be used to understand how the squads of 'sometimes a hundred fascists operated' as operated from a renowned antifascist in Giacomo Matteotti.

Source 1 is useful to an extent for investigating the nature of fascism in 1919, however it cannot be used to understand the nature of fascism 1920-21 because of the huge shift right in political ideology in 1920. The Source is useful

for the purpose of understanding the nature of the very early fascist movement; it is from *Il popolo d'Italia* and it is a list of demands that the fascists stood by and they are ~~not~~ socialist in their outlook. The fascists 'DEMAND' ~~not~~ ^{socialist} ~~being~~ legislation such as 'a minimum wage law', 'an eight-hour workday' and even the confiscation of 'uncultivated lands' that ^{will be} ~~are~~ given to 'farmers cooperatives' - the first programme of the fascists was very much a socialist one and this explains the little traction they got from the middle ~~and~~ ^{class} and upper class voters early on. ~~It~~ You can also recognise the anticlerical nature of the Early Fascio di ~~Combat~~ Combattimento with the 'provision and maintenance of secular schools' on the list too, whilst under their taxation properties the fascists also called for the taxation of church property. The problem with Source 1 is that the nature of fascism radically changed with the new programme in 1920s and the majority of these social policies were dropped in favour of policies that favoured the middle classes, the industrialists and landowners and the party turned on its socialist outlook and became radically right-wing as the party was not gaining traction and they were just seen as a radical socialist group of soldiers - Mussolini needed the movement to become more mainstream and

popular with anti-socialists to gain political legitimacy. Source 1 does not highlight the ~~changes~~ great changes seen by Mussolini, but it gives a sense of the Fascists' violent streak as the article is published. The "Programme of the Armed Fascist Squads" and since *Il Popolo d'Italia* was Mussolini's own paper, ~~you can see~~ ~~use~~ this ~~source~~ because the source has higher value as it is his message to the Fascists and what they stood for and though the use of violence is not detailed, ~~the~~ ^{fact that} ~~this is for the 'Armed Fascist sq'~~ source 2 is useful for this. Source 1 is useful to understand the nature of fascism during 1919 and what they ^{the movements} ~~stood for~~ stood for before the 1919 election but after the dismal results where the Fascists won just 2% of the vote in just Milan, the source does not have much use because the New Programme of 1920 saw radical change in what the Fascio Di combattimento stood for and the source does not explicitly detail the nature of violence the Fascists were using.

This is where Source 2 can be used, as Matteotti goes into detail about the nature of fascist violence and their actions across 'northeast Italy' by 1921, the Fascists were rampaging across Italy in their war against socialists and 'trade unionists' and their use of brutality is ~~for~~ explained in explicit detail by Matteotti about the 'Fascists, armed with rifles

and richers' terrorised union leaders and in this case 'they torture him in a horrible way and pretend to murder him. Then he is abandoned in the middle of the countryside'. This can be corroborated by the fact that 1918-21 2000 were killed in the fascist - Socialist civil war and in the run up to the 1921 election in the first 5 months of 1921 they squads killed 200 socialists and Trade Unionists and injured a further 1000 more - Mussolini knew the power of violence and that there were no repercussions for it as those who despised socialists were those in power. Even the police supplied weapons and the fascists were known for their brutal methods of torture. Source 2 also shows the nature of support for Fascism by 1921 with the 'local landowners' being those who wanted the fascists to target the socialists and there is evidence for this too as 36% of the newly formed PNF's members at the end of 1921 were small landowners. The fact that the source is written by Giacomo Matteotti, the man who the fascists despised and was later murdered becoming a symbol of a national crisis, has both uses and drawbacks. The ^{value} ~~use~~ of the source is improved because it is a speech by someone who had been targeted by threats as a PSU member; ~~and~~ however there are drawbacks to this as it is both an opposition party deputy

and it is a speech in parliament meaning that it would be likely to ~~be~~ exaggerated to cause the ~~people~~ ^{deputies} of parliament against the fascists. Source 2 is useful for investigating the nature of the fascist violence and the nature of support of the fascist movement as Matteotti details the people who called the fascists in and who they were targeting.

The problem with both sources, even when used together, is they do not highlight ~~how~~ the nature of fascism and its political legitimacy after the 1921 elections as neither is written late enough for this purpose. The fascists gained genuine political backing and rapidly grew. In 1921 they gained 35 seats in Italian parliament whilst Mussolini also formed a formal political party, the PNF, for the fascists. Matteotti just believes that the fascists are a violent group of thugs overrunning Italy, though this was the case for the squads the fascists, especially with the formation of the PNF, were a legitimate political party that even gained 200,000 members by the end of 1921. Source 1 cannot highlight this either as it was written in 1919 and it was also showing the opposite of the base in which the fascists increased their popularity on. Sources 1 and 2 are not useful, even when combined, to explain the nature

and legitimacy of fascism by 1921.

Overall, Source 1 and 2 can be used to both explain the nature of the fascist movement of 1919 and to highlight the nature of fascist violence 1919-21, however, neither source can be utilised to show the nature of the fascist movement after the shift to the right with the movement gaining genuine political traction and legitimacy with their performance in the 1921 elections and later the formation of the BUF in October of 1921.



This is a Level 5 response. It is stronger in BPs 1 and 2. It does what L5 work frequently does – it integrates the bullet points in the analysis provided. BP1 and 2: Level 5 skills are demonstrated on pages 1-3 where the response considers how far Source 1 can be used, as it is early in the fascist bid for power, and its limitations based upon that date. It makes skilful use of contextual knowledge to discuss the rapidly changing nature of fascism and in doing so demonstrates a real understanding of the values and concerns of the period from which the Source originates. Similar skills are demonstrated using considering Source 2 on pages 3-5. [BP1 L5; BP2 L5] BP3: The strengths and limitations of the two sources are weighed up on page 5 and the weight they bear together is considered. There is a little too much reliance on what they cannot do based on their dates. However, there is a consideration of how far they can go and a sense of 'degrees of certainty' demonstrated. [L5-] Level 5: 19 marks [L5 L5 L5-]



Remember to ensure that you make a secure judgement on 'how far' when weighing up the sources.

Question 2

A much smaller number of candidates are entered for 2G.2. The best responses to this question demonstrated that candidates possessed the ability to interrogate the sources effectively, identifying the differences between Source 3 that was written a couple of years after the outbreak of the civil war by a foreign journalist with a clear partiality for the republican side and Source 4 which was a rallying cry to the Nationalists at the start of the war. In the most effective answers, candidates were able to use the provenance of the sources in conjunction with their content of the source to develop criteria to judge the weight of the sources and test the claims in the sources. Although some candidates made some questionable assumptions about the sources and presented them in a very stereotypical way, e.g. the source is valuable because he was there or lacking in value because of bias, many were able to point out the subjectivity in Cockburn's account where the assassination of Castillo was the murder of a 'defenceless man' by the right, whereas the assassination of Sotelo by the left-wing Assault Guard was accidental. Similarly at the higher levels Franco's Manifesto was clearly seen as a means to attract support to the Nationalist side and inspire his troops to fight. Where candidates identify bias or subjective views, it is important that they refer to them specifically in their answer to support their evaluation rather than simply assert it.

The best responses demonstrated a clear and precise contextual knowledge with references to the rising tensions in Spain, particularly since the election of the Popular Front, the significance of the assassinations as the catalyst for the outbreak of war, and General Mola's planned coup. In level 4 and level 5 responses, this contextual knowledge was applied to the source material to interrogate it and reach supported judgements. Some candidates did not use contextual knowledge and this limited their achievement.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

Source 3 is very useful to a historian investigating the reasons for the outbreak of war 1936. This report taken from a 'British journalist' raises the source's use as it provides a more objective, external perspective. The reliability of the source's detail is increased as Cockburn had 'access to inside information' therefore being able to present a more accurate account into the outbreak of war. Cockburn's report is free from Spanish censorship, published 1938 the same year Franco imposed censorship of the press, and is therefore able to inform the historian honestly. He focuses on the 'trigger for the Spanish civil war', being the 1936 assassinations of Castillo and Sotelo. Cockburn highlights the brutal, merciless tactics used - 'machine gun at the defenceless back of a man' suggesting war broke out due to increased violence in Spain. The source also implicitly states political divisions being a cause for war. Castillo, 'feared a defender of the Republic' on the left wing, in contrast to Sotelo, the prominent right wing monarchist leader, emphasises how polarisation across Spain escalated tensions leading to war. The source describes how Sotelo's arrest and murder was in retaliation.

to the attack on Castillo, Sotelo being 'the man who had ordered Castillo's assassination'. This wider focus on political motivations for the outbreak of war provides the historian with a broader lens to investigate the enquiry, adding to Source 3's use. Cockburn recognises alternative proposals to Sotelo's assassination, 'I have heard several conflicting versions', suggesting ~~his~~ that his more objective perspective is reliable as he can identify multiple readings into the causes of war, and is not subjective to one source. However the historian must consider Cockburn's use of secondary sources as we cannot fully trust their reliability. This does not detract from the use of the source, as it is overall very useful for analysing how the trigger causes were a result of political tensions in Spain 1936, following right wing opposition to the new Popular Front government. Therefore Cockburn's analysis report that the assassinations of Sotelo and Castillo is very useful for investigating causes of civil war.
to the historian

Source 4 is likewise very useful for investigating causes of civil war. A 'manifesto' directly from Franco is extremely useful as a piece of primary evidence. As Franco became leader of the Nationalist cause, referred to as 'Generalissimo' the historian can gain a very valuable insight into Franco's aims for going to war, as he is representative of the Nationalist

forces. A historian must recognise the propaganda tone of this speech, 'Spaniards: Long live Spain', whilst Franco aims to boost morale, the manifesto may be more to bolster support by over-emphasising Republican terror, partially limiting the use of the source. Despite this, being issued July 1936, in Morocco the historian can gain insight into the initial stages of civil war and identify the causes at the relevant time period. Franco aims to gain support for his cause in this manifesto, 'the Nation calls you to its defence'. Franco himself regarded ~~himself~~^{him} as the 'saviour of Spain' and this source suggests the war broke out due to Nationalist desire to unite Spain against the Republic. The source details the increased levels of violence in Spain, implicitly arguing this instability meant civil war was largely inevitable. This is shown through the left wing governments willingness to overlook left wing agitation, 'government appointed authorities manage revolts when they are not actually provoking them'. This may refer to the 60,000 peasants taking over 3000 farmers in Extremadura and the popular front legalising their actions. The lack of law enforcement and increased workers' 'revolutionary strikes' implies Franco believed he has a duty to restore order and that's why war broke out. This source presents the outbreak of war as

being a moral crusade against communism, 'authorities have joined the Soviet agents', as seen through the creation of POUM in 1935 under Neguin wanting increased workers revolution. ~~The message~~ This is very useful for a historian, to identify how political ideologies and rival factions played a highly significant role in the outbreak of civil war. Again the propagandistic tone is reinforced, 'we cannot act like cowards and traitors', Franco is addressing the 'Spanish troops', the elite army of Africa based in Morocco, implying how France is reliant on military strength. Therefore Source 4 is very useful to a historian for assessing how war broke out, from Franco's perspective, due to a desire to save Spain from left wing chaos.

When using Source 3 and 4 together, both are very useful for a historians investigation into the outbreak of civil war 1936. Source 3 is recorded 'From Spain in 1936' and source 4 'Manifesto... 18 July 1936'. Both sources therefore provide detail taken from the specific time of the outbreak of war and can hence identify the atmosphere in Spain and the causes that lead to war. The sources contrasting perspectives add to the use for a historian to identify a broader ~~to~~ outlook into the investigation. Source 3 taken from a 'British journalist' and member of the

'communist party' presents a more left wing standing. Whereas on the other hand source 4, from 'General Franco' shows a fiercely Nationalist, fascist perspective. This allows the historian to view a wider analysis of causes - source 3 emphasises the trigger factors of the two assassinations due to political tensions across left and right wing causing war. Source 4 suggests war broke out because of Nationalist desire to protect and defend Spain against 'enemies of the mother country'. Furthermore the sources differ in their aims. Source 3, a journalistic report had a more nuanced tone, clearly portraying sequence of events. In contrast source 4, was propaganda to raise support, showing clear emphasis on the Nationalist causes for war. On their own, the sources show a narrower perspective into the overall causes for war, however when used together, by recognising the trigger factors and above all political divisions motivating conflict, the sources are together very useful for a historian to investigate reasons for the outbreak of the Spanish civil war 1936.



This is a level 5 response. Valid criteria are used to evaluate the source and reach a judgment, e.g. Source 3 is external and was uncensored, thus offering a measure of objectivity. The sources are analysed but interrogation is more limited, hence impacting on achievement in bullet point 1. The use of contextual knowledge does demonstrate an awareness of the values and concerns of Spanish society at that time, e.g in the government attitude to left-wing agitation. [BP1 L4, BP2L5, BP3 L5]



Using contextual knowledge to interrogate the claims being made by the writer is an excellent way of developing evaluations.

Question 3

This question was by far the most popular in Section B for Option 2G.1. In general it was well answered. Many candidates scored highly on it, typically achieving mid- to high-level 4 with a significant section achieving level 5 for detailed analytical answers that were balanced and stayed focused on the main thrust of the question. Many candidates argued that the nature of the electoral reform that Giolitti implemented in direct reaction to the invasion of Libya had destabilised Italy and that led to the empowerment of PSI and the Catholics and the collapse of *trasformismo*. It also split the Liberals and saw Giolitti trying and failing to make new pacts with other parties. Most referred to the way in which the ANI destabilised the government, claiming the victory and blaming Giolitti for the high economic and human cost. Some of the best argued responses considered the way the empowered socialists contributed to the destabilisation with the launch of Red Week as well as the long term implications of the north-south divide and how the Libyan war had exacerbated all of the above. The lower level responses mentioned some of the above points but did so with little attempt at depth and often with a lack of precision.

The period 1912-14 was one of instability and political infighting within Italy. ~~The~~ Whilst the invasion of Libya created severe economic consequences, other factors such as the franchise extension 1912 and the growing divide between political parties further increased political instability. Arguably without these ~~poor~~ institutional and uncooperative political conditions, the invasion of Libya ~~may~~^{would} not have had such adverse effects. Therefore it can be argued that the invasion of Libya was not the main reason for the growing instability to a substantial extent.

The invasion of Libya in 1911 was carried out to try and expand Italy as a great power and provide it with colonies. Whilst it succeeded in doing so, and boosted the prestige of Italy it was far from an overall success. For

example not only ~~did~~ ^{was} the pacification of Libya only fully completed in 1932, but it created further economic and social divisions within Italy. This suggests therefore that it ~~also~~ contribute to the growing instability. For example, the cost of the war led to the production in the north increasing by 20%, whilst the south remained impoverished only gaining 27% of the wealth. ^{*} This suggests that whilst Libya was a foreign policy success, this was outweighed by the significant economic ^{and social} consequences. Furthermore, as a result of these economic consequences, political tensions grew with the ANI taking credit for the success whilst the PSI firmly opposed the policy. ~~That~~ Consequently, political tensions and divisions within Italy grew, leading to Adatti's policy of corporatism no longer being successful. Whilst the Libyan war increased support from the Church as the Banco di Roma was within Libya, this failed to provide a substantial level of support for the liberals to overcome the instability. Yet whilst it is therefore evident that the invasion of Libya increased the instability within Italy in the years 1912-14, it can be argued that without already divided parties and a fractured political system, then the economic consequences could have been overcome with cooperation and

Therefore ^{be} less damaging. As a result therefore, it can be argued that the invasion of Libya was not the main reason for instability to a substantial extent.

In contrast, the political system itself within Italy was very unstable with new political parties being increasingly divided. Whilst the PSI was formed in 1896, it ~~has~~ has now gaining significant support and threatening the previously supported liberals. Whilst Giolitti aimed within this period to continue his policy of trasformismo, this failed to have the same success as political parties were unwilling to compromise. For example, Giolitti introduced social reforms such as a maternity fund and arbitration courts to settle disputes & try and please the socialists, yet this failed to win over the more radical wings of the party. Furthermore, it can be argued that the nationalists further increased political instability in Italy. The ANI created in 1910 were completely anti-liberal, feeling that liberals were to blame for Italy's economic issues and lack of an empire. Furthermore their hatred of ~~the~~ ^{the} socialists ensured that no coalition could be created. This suggests therefore that regardless of the Libyan war contributing to Italy's instability, Italy itself was in a tumultuous and

instability period with a lack of strong ^{clear} political direction. Must one could argue that the inclusion of Libya exacerbated these tensions, especially between the socialist and opposed intervention and the nationalist and future if and argued they pressured the liberals into invading, these ideological divides would always have been present, the Libyan war simply gave the parties something to direct them towards.² Therefore it can be argued that political parties were more responsible for the instability in Italy than the inclusion of Libya to a substantial extent.

To further exacerbate the political tensions and instability within Italy, Cialini felt he was required to extend the franchise in 1912 to all men who had served in the army and any man over 30. Whilst Cialini believed this would break up socialist support it only further increased it and ensured completely that no political compromise would be found. Must the franchise extension increased the number of votes by 11 million, therefore creating a wider support base ~~that~~ than simply the liberal middle classes, it further impacted the 1913 election. These political changes provide

significant evidence for the argument that the political parties themselves and the weak political system created the instability in Italy. As a result of the franchise extension, the 1913 election was split quite evenly between the parties despite the PSI being most successful. As a result the liberals lost seats and had to rely on Catholic support for their success. Their Gentiloni pact through which ~~208~~ ²⁰⁸ liberals owed their seats to Catholic support signifies the extent of instability and volatility within Italy's political system. Arguably in the short term this had the greatest impact on instability as it led to the resignation of Giolitti in 1914, yet it can be argued that this further highlights the importance of party divides creating instability within Italy. Perhaps if the Catholics ~~hadn't~~ ^{didn't} withdraw their support based on party political divides, a compromise after the franchise extension and election could have been found. Therefore whilst the invasion of Libya was the initial reason for this franchise extension, the party political differences ensured it had such ~~other~~ ^{significant} effects. Consequently, the invasion of Libya was not the main reason for instability in the period 1912-14 to a substantial extent.

Overall it can be argued that the invasion of Libya was not the main reason for growing instability in Italy to a substantial extent. Whilst the invasion created political tensions and exacerbated economic divides and weaknesses, it can be questioned how far or for how long these issues would have persisted without the already weak political system, with parties completely opposed to working together. As a result, it can be argued that the invasion of Libya in itself was not the main reason for instability in Italy in the years 1912-14 to a substantial extent.



This is a Level 5 response that meets the level in all the bullet points. BP1: A very clear argument is set out in the introduction, and this is sustained throughout the response. [BP1 L5] BP2: The range and depth of knowledge is very good and is fully focused on addressing the conceptual focus throughout the response, e.g. on page 2, there is a discussion of the impact of the invasion on the Italian economy. [BP2 L5] BP3: Criteria for judgement are established throughout, e.g. on page 2, the relative importance of the invasion is discussed. [BP3 L5] BP4: The answer is well organised with a coherent argument and precise support. [BP4 L5] Level 5: 20 marks [L5 L5 L5 L5]



Top scoring answers require a tight focus on the wording of the question.

Question 4

There were a limited number of answers to this question and in general they were not well focused on the demands of the question. Many candidates had a very limited idea of what was meant by the Corporate State, some believing it was the Liberal State that preceded Mussolini's rule and others that it was merely another term for the fascist state. Consequently, the use of relevant knowledge was very variable with many answers simply writing about economic policy and the various 'battles'. The best answers to this question clearly understood that the Corporate State was Mussolini's attempt to introduce a 'third way' that had none of the disadvantages of capitalism and communism, but all of the advantages. These responses made reference to the control over workers through the Rocco Law, the favouring of business elites in the Palazzo Vidoni Pact, the effectiveness of the Corporate State in dealing with the consequences of the Depression, the relative ineffectiveness of the Corporations and the powerless nature of the Chamber of Corporations, whilst noting how Mussolini's personal power was enhanced.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

~~It is~~ ^{some what} ~~incredibly~~ ^{incredibly} accurate to say that the Corporate State was an economic failure but a political success, because the Corporate State had a positive effect on ~~got~~ Mussolini and the PNF's political success, but did not positively influence the economy and had irrelevant long term effect, meaning that other tactics had to be employed to support the economy.

In 1926 corporations were devised as part of the corporate state, ~~as~~ in an attempt to ~~foster~~ ^{to foster} better relationships between workers and employers which would in turn ~~have~~ result in economic success. However the corporate state did ~~not~~ not achieve economic success, ~~even~~ and even after the 1927 Charter of Labour that was meant to guarantee benefits ~~the~~ for workers very little positive change was seen as workers mostly

did not benefit, as in the 1930's workers' salaries were reduced on average of 12%. Moreover Italy's budget deficit reached 2.5 billion lire despite the efforts of the corporate state to help the economy. It could be argued that there was some level of economic success after the corporate state, ~~was also~~ however this was mostly the result of other factors such as Italy's attempt at autarky after 1936. However despite the economic failure of the ~~economic~~ corporate state to generate any real change, it was a political success. Schemes such as the National Council of Corporations in 1923, created the image of the PNF putting effort into listening to the needs of workers. It healed the Italian public's fears of a potential repeat of the 1919 to 1920 Biennio Rosso, that had scared many into supporting the fascists to begin with. The corporate state was a political success as it showed that ~~for~~ the fascists were in control.

and dissuaded fears of a Socialist uprising despite the corporatist state's inability to provide economic security ~~to~~ after the ~~long depress~~ Great Depression, it created a ~~po~~ long term positive political image ~~because~~ of the ~~based on~~ cooperation with workers, employees and the government.

The corporate state's long term economic failures can be ~~seen~~ seen in how 1927 the lire had to be artificially fixed at 90 to the pound by economic minister De' Stefani, ~~to~~ to stimulate the economy. While the corporate state did present a politically successful ~~thesis~~ front to the Italian public of cooperation, ~~the~~ and progress, it did not have a very large long term positive economic effect. When corporations failed ~~other~~ ~~eco~~ to be overtly economically successful other economic plans were made such as bilateral trade agreements, in an attempt to not drain

1907's gold supply. This shows that while the corporate state was politically successful, this success was based off on an illusion of prosperity and undermined by the economic failures it presented being so dire that alternate economic plans were ^{urgently} necessary.

~~In addition to~~ Additionally the extent of the economic failures of the corporate state and the lack of positive ^{long} term economic success as well as ~~long~~ ^{short} term, despite political success, can be seen through the 1933 FEA Scheme where the government bought shares in industry to support the economy. While it could be argued this was more a response to ~~the~~ the 1929 Great Depression, it still ~~to~~ shows the long term failures of the corporate state to be economically successful.

~~as it did not bring~~ However it did remain a successful political tactic as it could be used to find jobs in H.G. - electricity and public works by creating some minimal ^{short term} economic success, while primarily creating a positive political impression amid economic issues as the corporate state could not successfully prevent economic issues. The corporate state did create the image of the government supporting individuals and workers through encouraging support politically despite the need for alternate forms of economic support.

In conclusion the corporate state was an economic failure as it only had moderate ~~short~~ short term economic successes but was not economically successful long term, ^{shown through how} ~~meaning~~ alternate

forms of the economic
Success needed to be found.
Despite this the Corporate
State created the ~~polit~~
impression of a ~~political~~
a strong helpful government
resulting in political success.



This is a low level 5 response. It has a very clear focus on the question as demonstrated in its introduction. It provides detailed knowledge to assess the success and failure of the Corporate State. It is more limited in developing counter arguments which does impact on 'how far' and therefore limits achievement in level 5.



This question focuses on different consequences. To address it effectively, you need to establish criteria for judgement.

Question 5

This question was answered by far fewer candidates than Question 6. In general, it was answered well. Candidates tackling this question mostly stayed in high level 4. They were able to look at the impact of the war in terms of debt and destruction of infrastructure, death and emigration of the most skilled workers and the impact of diplomatic isolation. However most also were able to weigh the impact of policies of autarky and the negatives of the syndicates in the process of reaching a judgement.

The impact of the Spanish civil war had detrimental impact on Spain's economic development within the years 1938-56, & made it difficult to establish a smooth economy under Franco's new state. The Spanish civil war had caused significant damage to infrastructure, & law and order within Spain. Although factors such as how Franco used the economy after the war, can also be accounted as a significant reason for economic development within Spain; in a negative way after the war, ^{& worldwide} attributes are very important.

It is accurate to say the impact of the Spanish civil war, was one of the most significant factors that had impacted Spain's economic development. & The Spanish Civil

war had practically destroyed any positive economic developments previously within Spain. Production of Bread was 50% lower of what it had been pre-war, with meat having 50% reduction to that of in 1926. With Franco's new state money had to be used effectively to restructure society, fund the church, education & etc. The war had caused industrial output too significantly drop, & throughout 1938-56, wages had remained low throughout Spain. On top of this the Spanish Civil War had meant that Spain had very low arms, & would have to scrape money in order to become a stabilised economy again. ~~The Spanish civil war, had also led to Spain having~~

The Spanish civil war had led to condemnation from international countries such as US, Britain & France, from having support from Italy & Germany. This had ~~not~~ had negative impacts, as they were forced to be isolationist throughout 1940's, & was unable to receive help from Marshall Aid initially, being viewed as a fascist & dictatorial

country. On top of this, the Spanish civil war had impacted Spain's economic development ~~after~~ within 1938-56 as the ~~Spanish~~ Spain had lost many men, whom would of been used to rebuild economy, & Franco did not use availability of women to his advantage. Being viewed as a potential ally towards Hitler, with his involvement of planes & pilots within civil war, had made Spain unlikable, & not an individual of interest for foreign trade, therefore the Spanish civil war & the consequences following the nationalist victory play a significant factor in Spain's economic development 1938-1956. *

However, following the war, Franco had spent 50% of funding towards military, when this could have gone towards more prominent financial issues & living standards within Spain. Within the early stages following the Spanish civil war, Franco's failed attempt at autarky & implementation of corporatism can be associated with significant factor for Spain's chances of economic development. Franco's repressive policies may

have also hindered, better potential for economic development.

Although, I believe it is accurate to say that Spain's decision to remain neutral throughout WW2, had a positive impact on Spain's economic development. If Spain had entered WW2, 5 months after finishing their own war, this could have easily destroyed Spain. It is also important to consider although the Spanish Civil War being drawn out for over 3 years did negatively impact Spain's economic development throughout the 1940's, there was a change in 1950's. When Franco, had signed Pact with Madrid in 1953, this had opened more economic opportunities for trade & investment. This ~~allowed~~ allowed Spanish economy to begin to improve, and suggests war ^{wasn't most significant} factor in economic development.
↓ Gain.

Factor's such as the international great depression, worldwide oil crises & Spain suffering from a huge drought in 1944-5 had direct impacts on Spain's economic development in 1938-56, & this was not related to the outcomes & events or-

spanish civil war.

Overall, I believe that the Spanish Civil war had major implications towards Spain's economic development. Spain had been difficult to rebuild, & restructure after the war whilst also trying to instill law & order. The war had caused great economic grievances which would take a significant hurdle to get over. Without the Spanish civil war, the economy would have been more stable, & if the war wasn't also drawn out. The siege of Madrid, & attack of output areas of agriculture effects remained prominent, & difficult for Spain to overcome.



This is a mid-level 5 response. It develops a range of factors with detailed knowledge, including the impact of the civil war, emigration, diplomatic isolation, Franco's military expenditure and autarky. It has a clear focus on the question throughout and reaches a judgement.



This question focuses on significance. To address it effectively, candidates need to establish criteria for judgement and apply them to the given factor and the alternatives.

Question 6

This was the most popular question in Option 2G.2. Many candidates scored in mid to high level 4 with answers that considered the varying relations between Spain and Europe as well as Spain and the USA. For the most part, candidates were able to talk about the similarity in the isolation of Spain from the international community in both periods as a result of its association with fascism and dictatorship as well as sympathies for Spain and tentative contacts because of its anti-Communism that helped to bring it back closer to Europe. Some were able to refer to the similarity in generally good relations with the USA from the signing of the Madrid Treaty in the first period to the evidence of good relations in the second period as evidenced by Nixon's visit to Spain in 1970. Candidates referred to differences in terms of the economic ties that Spain sought to develop in the second period compared to its pursuit of autarky and economic isolation in the first period. Some candidates also noted that the reasons for European rejection differed from ideological opposition to Franco's regime in the first period to fear that Spanish produce would have a negative impact on the sale of Italian and French agricultural products. Some candidates had variable focus on the second order concept similarity/difference and strayed into change and continuity which did impact on the development of criteria and hence the judgement.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

An argument could be made that relations between Spain and other countries were ~~the same between 1956-75 and 19~~ completely different between 1956-75 and 1938-56 considering Spain's economy limiting foreign trade and investment or Spain's constant isolationist policies both during WW2 and after WW2. ~~However~~ However similarities can be seen in the relations with more consistently good relations with the USA and consistently poor relations with the west of Europe.

When considering the impact of the economy and its impact ~~on~~ on foreign trade and investment the removal of Autarky becomes significant. Between 1938-56 Spain's ~~autarky~~ economy attempted to accomplish that of Autarky conforming ~~to~~ to its fascist counterparts in Italy and Germany. But Autarky self

Successory goal would reduce the amount of foreign trade and foreign investment diminishing opportunities for positive foreign relations with France's rejection of a \$100 million loan from the USA as well as a general lack of foreign investment leaving no money to contribute to Spanish economy and no significant trading partners to make positive foreign relations with. This comes into contrast with ~~Spain's~~ Spain's economy between 1956-75 which saw a cabinet reshuffle removing the falange from the economy and the new technocrats 1959 Stabilisation plan removing Autarky as Spain's primary economic policy now allowed for trade with other countries and instead of rejecting investment from other countries now saw \$7.6 billion in foreign investment between 1960-75. The removal of Autarky and the promotion of foreign trade here shows a great contrast in the

economy's impact on foreign relations
~~the~~ with Spain and does imply
that relations between Spain and
other countries was completely different
between 1956-75 and 1938-56. However
However some consistency can be
seen between the two time periods
proving the ~~the~~ difference between
the two as hinted considering
Spain's rejection from the ~~EEC~~ in
European economic community in
1962 suggesting less change
between the two time periods than
initially stated. considering the
impact ~~on~~ of economic policies
like Autarky on foreign relations
its removal in 1959 does suggest
that between 1956-75 and 1938-56
saw very different relations between
Spain and other countries.

Another point of investigation
is Spain's relationship with America
~~the~~ which can be interpreted
as almost consistently positive ~~being~~
with good relations. With a
common ~~interest~~ dislike of communism

cold war america and fascist Spain saw a positive relationship between them with the pact of Madrid in 1953 placing 4 US military bases in Spain in return for economic aid making their relationship between 1938-56 seem very positive. Similarly to that between 1956-75 with Juan Carlos carrying out diplomatic missions meeting with american officials and that between 1960-74 40% ~~of~~ of Spain's foreign investment flows. Some similarities between the relations in the two periods with a continuously positive relations between Spain and America and implying that the Spanish relationships with other countries between 1956-75 and 1938-56 were not entirely different after all. However this positive relationship is not seen during WW2 ~~at~~ with Spain's pro axis non belligerent stance contrasting America joining of the allies after the attack ~~on~~ on pearl

harbour. This suggests some inconsistency suggesting that this positive Spain-American relationship can only be seen post WW2. ~~the~~ When considering the relationship between Spain and ~~the~~ America it can be suggested that post WW2 they saw a continuously positive relationship across both 1939-56 and 1956-75 which implies relations to not be completely different.

~~the~~ When investigating Spain's ~~relationship with~~ foreign relations with the west of the world outside of America Europe appears to consistently isolate Spain. Due to Spain's pro axis non belligerent stance during WW2 it shows not only ~~the~~ Spain's inaction and self isolation during the war with Franco's 1940 meeting with Hitler in Hendaye solidifying his practical absence in WW2. ~~the~~ However due to his ideological agreements

with the Axis the west of Europe still isolated Spain post ~~the~~ world war two showing a consistent isolation in foreign relations and diplomacy from Europe between 1938-56 which continued to 1956-75 with almost no foreign officials attending Franco's funeral in 1975 but attending Juan Carlos' coronation on the 22nd November 1975. This alongside Spain's rejection from the EEC in 1982 implies a continued European isolation between Spain and her allies implying that they remained the same over ~~both~~ both time periods rather than being different. However somewhat post the foreign relations can be observed with the west of the world between 1938-56 when observing the United Nations. Whilst the UN's 1949 Article 39 severed all diplomatic ties with Spain it later got overturned with the 1950 Article 38 which promoted more diplomacy

allowing them to join the UN but not be a full member until 1955 after Stalin's death. This improvement in foreign relations between Spain and ~~other~~ other countries contrasts the lack of progress in those foreign relations between ~~1938-56~~ 1956-74 and Sorenst suggests that relations between Spain and other countries were different between the two time periods. ~~the~~ When considering the West of the world a certain level of isolation of Spain can be observed and any change via the UN is limited and suggests little change between the two periods.

Overall, ~~when~~ ~~can~~ interpretations can suggest consistency in ~~relations~~ relations between Spain and other countries between 1938-56 and 1956-75 when looking at the ~~world~~ mostly continued good relations with America and continued isolation from the West of Europe. However due to the lack of Spain's relationship with America during WW2 and the positive relations with the UN these interpretations

have faults to them which only imply the opposite. However because of the massive impact the removal of Atorby had in relations with an improvement in foreign ~~relations~~ investment and trade and the economy and from America it can be suggested that ~~the~~ relations between Spain and other countries in the years 1956-75 was quite different from relations between Spain and other countries between 1936-75.



This is a level 5 response with sustained focus on the key issue - similarity/difference in foreign relations. The knowledge is sufficient and deployed effectively to address the question. Criteria are established and the extent of 'difference' is debated. There are occasional issues with the coherence of the argument which places this in level 4 for bullet point 4. [BP1 L5, BP2 L5, BP3 L5, BP4 L4]



This question focuses on similarity and difference. In similarity and difference questions, a brief plan helps you to focus on the second order concept and to organise your response so that you compare features for both similarity and difference.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should read the question carefully and ensure that they explicitly address the focus of the enquiry rather than merely discussing the issues raised by the sources in general terms
- Candidates should aim to go beyond comprehension and summary of the sources by developing reasoned inferences that are fully discussed
- Candidates should read the caption and make full use of it when evaluating the sources
- Contextual knowledge should be used to illuminate and discuss what is in the source, rather than provide an answer to the enquiry. Long descriptions of linked events are unlikely to gain much, if any, credit
- Candidates should ensure that their responses address the demands of all three bullet points that are assessed in this section of the paper.

Section B

- Candidates must provide precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses generally lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues rather than merely presenting a list of factors
- Candidates should ensure that they deal with both sides of an argument where the question requires this.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

