



# **Examiners' Report June 2024**

**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 [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### 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 [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://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: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2024

Publications Code 9HI0\_2G\_2406\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

## 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, eg 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.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

## 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 reasons why Italy remained neutral in 1914. The most successful answers were able to use their contextual knowledge of the issues surrounding intervention crisis to assess the validity of the claims made in the sources. In general, Source 2 was tackled more confidently than Source 1 with candidates being able to address issues of provenance more securely. Content was in greater depth on issues such as the Treaty of London and the interventionist crisis than it was for the Triple Alliance. The best responses were able to confidently tease out common themes such as territorial gains and grapple with both sources to debate these issues. There were some issues with a lack of precise knowledge. Many candidates believed that Giolitti was still Prime Minister and others strayed into issues and events of World War I itself, and the subsequent 'Mutilated Victory'.

Most candidates were able to make some assessment of the provenance of the sources. Many were able to contrast the official nature of the telegram in Source 1 with the retrospective views given by Giolitti in Source 2 and draw out judgements about their use and reliability and use that to reach judgements. 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 . 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

Both source 1 and 2 can be analysed together and are useful in investigating why Italy remained neutral in 1914. Both sources suggest how Italy wasn't ready to join a war and to join the triple alliance would be a terrible decision. Italy was not as powerful compared to other nations such as Britain and especially Austria, therefore by Italy staying neutral she would be in no position to loose due to the war. Additionally, both sources suggest how joining the war on the side of the triple alliance wouldn't get Italy the territory she wanted but only through negotiations it could be achieved. The sources are also looking at the situations from different perspectives one from the interest of the triple alliance and the other from the perspective of Italy and why she wanted to stay neutral. Therefore, both sources are clearly useful in understanding why Italy wanted to stay neutral in 1914.

Source 1 was ~~was~~ a telegram which was sent by a German ambassador to Germany. This telegram was from 1914 therefore was Germany's true reaction to Italy deciding to stay neutral during the war rather than joining the fight. The telegram was a discussion between the Italian foreign minister and the German ambassador as to why Italy didn't join the war. The German ambassador is going to want to try and persuade Italy to join the war on the side of the triple alliance, he won't be understanding as to why they have decided to sit out

of the war no matter what excuse is given. ~~The~~ The fact that the source was written in 1914 means that the threat of war was true and the pressure for making Italy contribute to the war with her allies was heightened. Germany expected Italy to join the war and was disappointed when it didn't happen. Source 2 is written by Giovanni Giolitti who was the former prime minister of Italy, it was published in 'memories of my life, the living age' in 1923. Giolitti is talking about when war broke out in Italy and his reaction, he tried to persuade the country to remain neutral which at first worked. However, there were many pushing for intervention for Italy's sake. It was written in 1923 meaning that Giolitti had hindsight into the situation and knew that Italy remaining neutral would help Italy the most. He also wanted to be the Prime Minister again, so therefore this suggested how he knew what was best for Italy and her policies. Lastly, Giolitti was publishing it in a American magazine so he could speak freely due to Mussolini controlling all press.

~~The~~ Source 1 is by a German ambassador and he is stating the "question of Italy's attitude to the war", from the outbreak of the war Italy had declared herself neutral due to her state and not made any attempts at joining the war. Italy was part of the triple alliance which was Austria, Germany and Italy, this meant that if any of them went to war or were at war then they would each have to help out one another. However, Italy stated that "according to the terms of the triple alliance, there is no reason for Italy to support Austria". It was clear that Italy felt like

all the events which had taken place didn't push Italy into the war, the ~~the~~ alliance didn't stand in this situation. The treaty stated that all countries had to be aware and informed if war was going to break but but Italy wasn't, so there was no reason for Italy to join the war. Italy also viewed the actions against Serbia as aggressive and a crime of war which Italy didn't want to be part of. It was also known that Italy was a very weak nation compared to all the other countries fighting, Italy's economy was nowhere ready for war and if she joins it could mean terrible things for the Italians and their future. It was also known that the triple alliance wasn't promising the Italians any of their territory which they felt was theirs due to the majority of the population speaking Italian, such as ~~the~~ Fiume or the Brenner pass. If the triple alliance was going to refuse then why would ~~they~~ they want to help their allies in achieving more land and territory. "The German minister thought Italy would eventually intervene "but on the side of the Triple Entente", the triple entente was France, Britain and Russia and Italy had been in secret negotiations with them about joining the war. The Italian prime minister Salandra had been leading these secret negotiations and the Treaty of London was established if Italy would join the triple entente. This treaty promised Italy all her irredentist land which the triple alliance had refused to give over. The German minister states how Austria's actions "had gone against the terms of the triple alliance", meaning that it was clear as to why Italy was reacting this way. However, the Germans did think that Italians could still help the triple

alliance if "some reward could be offered to the Italians", one of the main reasons for no Italian intervention was their refusing to give Italy what she wanted so some reward could persuade her. Italy was now very set on accepting Britain as their allies compared to their previous ones. Therefore, it is evident that source 1 clearly demonstrates why Italy remained neutral, the triple alliance hadn't met their terms meaning Italy had no obligation to join the war on their side or at all. Additionally, the alliance was refusing to give Italy any of the land which they desired meaning that Italy had no desire to join the war and support them in their efforts to fight.

In contrast

Source 2 is by Giolitti a Italian politician who was always set on Italy being neutral through the whole war. The nationalists and eventually the army pushed and pushed for Italy to intervene in war, they were convinced "because it would be short." Many in Italy thought that the war would be a great moment to make Italy a great power and show the world their force. Italy had always been a smaller and weaker country due to lack of territories and her geographical position, so this is the opportunity to change it all. Giolitti clearly stated how Austria and Germany "had been preparing for war for forty years", they had always been set on invading Serbia and had had enough time to plan out their war and were completely prepared in every way. Unlike Italy who were nowhere near ready for war, especially because they had just gone through the Libyan war. This meant their economy was drained

as well as the army, and many of their best soldiers were still in Libya. Giolitti clearly pointed out that "skillful negotiations" with Austria could get them their territory which they all desired, he stated that when the empire breaks up Italy could easily and peaceably achieve their territorial aims. Giolitti was a very successful ~~and~~ and experienced politician so he therefore, urged people to listen to him and what he had to say, he knew there was a better way to get the territories. It was also pointed out how the country already had many troubles and challenges like "already imposing taxes as high as the people could bear", this war would only mean that Italy's issues would only increase and worsen. Therefore, it is evident that Italy remained neutral because Giolitti clearly pointed out many issues which Italy was already facing and how they could increase if intervention happened in Italy. Additionally, Giolitti also pointed out how Italy could still achieve her aims by negotiations rather than fighting a war which could be lost.

\* Giolitti also had others in the country supporting him and backing his ideas of neutrality such as the PSI and the Catholics.

Therefore, it is evident that both sources are useful in understanding why Italy stayed neutral in 1914. Both sources look at the situation of Italy staying neutral from different sides, source 1 looks at it from the German and triple alliance side while source 2 looks at it from an Italian perspective. Therefore, it ~~the~~ suggests as to why Italy remained neutral at the start of the war due to their economy and the

alliance going against its terms. Both sources also clearly state how Italy stayed neutral due to the alliance refusing to give them their land and that staying neutral means that effective negotiations could take place for the Italian irredente to be achieved.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This enters level 5 response. It works the two sources together effectively and has a clear understanding of the values and concerns of the society from which they are drawn. It develops and supports a number of reasoned inferences.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

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 several decades after the end of the Civil War by a volunteer who had fought with the Republicans and was clearly disillusioned with the leadership of the left, and the speech made by the former Republican leader in the immediate aftermath of the Republican defeat. 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. Some candidates made some questionable assumptions about the sources and presented them in a very stereotypical way, eg source is valuable because he was there or lacking in value because of bias. Where candidates identify bias or subjective views, it is important that they refer to them specifically in their answer to support their evaluation.

The best responses demonstrated a clear and precise contextual knowledge with references to the non-intervention pact, the civil war that broke out within the left wing, the mistakes made by the republican leadership in contrast to the strong leadership demonstrated by Franco and the significant advantage foreign support gave to the nationalist side. 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 suggests that the Republicans were defeated in the Spanish Civil War because they were simply not strong enough militarily, compared to the Nationalists led by Franco and because of poor decision making at the top of the Republican government. Source 4 also suggests that the Republicans were not strong enough militarily speaking but this was because they didn't have enough supplies, due to the non-intervention pact, rather than because Franco was simply higher skilled or the Republican government being indecisive. When used together, the historian could make great use of sources 3 and 4 to a great extent to investigate why the Republicans were defeated in the Civil War.

Source 3 suggests that "Militarily, the Republicans were outgunned and outmanoeuvred. Franco's army had professional soldiers and an overwhelming superiority of technical equipment". This suggests that the Republicans lost because they were simply a weaker military force and were therefore unable to win against the Nationalists in battle. There is certainly some truth to this. For example, the Nationalists had around 600,000 men to fight, while the Republicans had just 400,000. Source 3 also alludes to Republican forces being unprofessional (because Gurney explicitly refers to the Nationalists as "professional soldiers"). This would suggest that the Republicans lost because their soldiers were untrained and therefore unable to understand or have the tactical awareness needed to defeat such a strong military opponent in Franco. This is supported by the fact

that the vast majority of Republican soldiers were ordinary people serving in workers' militias, as up to 2/3 of the army's junior officers had joined the Nationalists. This explains why the Nationalist army seemed so professional and makes the source useful for understanding just how outclassed and outperformed the Republican army truly was, explaining why they lost. The references to the Republicans being "outmanoeuvred" in source 3 is evidenced by battles such as the Ebro Offensive in 1938, which started out well for the Republicans but ended in a full scale retreat to the Mediterranean coast after Franco quickly reorganised his forces. This highlights how pivotal Franco himself was, as the Spanish army's youngest ever general, in defeating the Republicans, giving the source value for understanding how the Republicans lost because they themselves had a weakened army, while their opponents, the Nationalists, had a strong one. Gurney goes on to discuss other reasons for the Republican defeat, including the fact that "President Azaña had been indecisive". This immediately gives the source value for understanding how it was a variety of factors that led to Republican defeat as opposed to just an ~~an~~ <sup>ineffective</sup> military. As to how credible the claim is about Azaña, that is debatable. Made President in 1936, replacing the more conservative Marcelo Azaola Zamora, Azaña was a pivotal Republican figure but it wasn't necessarily him that was making military decisions. The Republicans' 'Popular Army' <sup>formed at the end of 1936</sup> was largely the result of the socialist PSOE, led by Caballero, and the communists working together to create a centralised army, instead of the anarchistic CNT's workers' militias. As a result, Azaña wasn't necessarily involved in this type of decision making because he wasn't a military leader, just a good politician. For this reason, source 3 perhaps overstates the role Azaña played in the

Republican defeat, reducing its usefulness slightly if used in isolation. It does however reference the "Republican Government in Valencia". The government moved from ~~Madrid~~ <sup>Madrid</sup> to Valencia in November 1936, when it seemed plausible that Madrid would fall. The government's lack of faith in Madrid's defences gives source 3 use for seeing how Republican defeat was caused by both military inferiority to Franco's Nationalists and poor decision-making by the government. This is especially interesting considering this comes from a left-wing British man who, based on the content, was evidently one of the 35,000 international brigades helping fight in Spain. This gives him the unique insight of fighting and so understanding the failures of the Republican military and how that led to defeat but perhaps limits the usefulness with regards ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> the political reasons for defeat because he wasn't in those circles when the decisions were being made. Coming from the last two years of the war though does prove useful in seeing how likely a prospect defeat seemed for the Republicans by the end.

Source 4 is slightly different as it comes from Negrín, a former Prime Minister of Republican Spain. This immediately gives source 4 use because it comes from the very top tiers of decision making and therefore gives a better insight into what part government decision making played in the Republican defeat. In this way, the source is limited as it is unlikely a senior government official would wish to place the blame for defeat on the heads of the government, especially because source 4 comes from May 1939, which is after the war was declared over by Franco on 1st April 1939. This perhaps explains why Negrín suggests the Republicans lost because they weren't receiving enough military supplies from other countries. In source 4,

Negrín suggests the Republicans were "unable to obtain sufficient resources because of the non-intervention agreement". This is in reference to the Non-Intervention Pact agreed in late 1936 by 27 countries to not send arms to Spain. This had been proposed by French politician Leon Blum <sup>with</sup> the support of the British, but Italian, German and Russian arms continued to flood into Spain, despite these countries being signatories. Because Italy and Germany sent so many arms, for example 6,000 rifles, 10,000 grenades, the Condor Legion of planes and 75,000 Corpo Truppar Volontarie volunteers to fight, to the Nationalists, it is clear that the Republicans were at a major military disadvantage, perhaps explaining why they were defeated. Indeed Negrín suggests that the Republicans "were never able to achieve even equality in resources with the Nationalist rebels". This suggests that the Nationalists <sup>simply</sup> had a stronger military presence with help from abroad, explaining why the Republicans lost and giving the source use for this reason. It is true though that the Republicans received aid from Russia, including 500 engineers and 1,500 planes and while Negrín suggests the Republicans were grateful, he also highlights how the supplies reached them "in October 1936", which was later than German and Italian arms" and how they "were grateful to receive Russian pilots but that was months after German and Italian pilots had been decimating Spain". This suggests that aid simply didn't arrive fast enough for the Republicans, suggesting they were on the backfoot from the start and giving the source use for understanding how the Republicans lost because they were fighting a losing battle. It is also worth noting that this aid from Russia came at a huge cost of 2/3 of Spain's gold, worth \$500 million, and was often of a poor quality, this highlights how the Republicans lost because of the inferiority

of their military hardware, something suggested in Source 3.

In conclusion, sources 3 and 4 are extremely useful, or useful to a large extent, for the investigation. In isolation, they build up an image of <sup>different</sup> ways in which the Republicans lost, whether that be because of a weaker military, bad decision-making in government or a lack of international aid coming fast enough. Because this can be obtained from each source in isolation, they already have use too by pairing them together and using them in conjunction, this use is multiplied greatly. <sup>For example,</sup> the delay to military aid coming from Russia <sup>described</sup> in source 4 explains why source 3 suggests the ~~used~~ Republicans were "outgunned" and also perhaps ~~what~~ explains why source 3 criticise the government in Azana (as it would ultimately be up to Azana and other leaders to negotiate this aid). The links between these sources are only discovered by using them together, making the sources very useful for the investigation to see the intricacies of the Republican war effort and how different aspects all overlapped to result in defeat.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a top level 5 response. It builds from analysis to interrogation of the sources which it does very effectively (eg on p.2 where it discusses the credibility of Azana's claims). There is a securely argued judgement.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

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. However, in spite of its popularity, this question was the least well answered on Italy. The best responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the importance of the 'New Programme' in explaining the growth of support for fascism and contrasted its importance with alternative reasons, including Liberal weaknesses, issues that lingered from WW1 and the strength of Mussolini as a leader. These were tackled in a more confident fashion in comparison to the key issue in the question. Although most stayed focused on causation there were large numbers of candidates who seemed to not know what the 'New Programme' was or confused it with earlier Liberal social reforms. In some cases, candidates interpreted it as a description of a variety of tactics used by the fascists to garner support, such as the Dual Policy or squad violence. This limited analysis significantly. The 'New Programme' is specifically listed on the Specification and it is important that candidates make sure that they are familiar with the content and can write about it with confidence and precision.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . 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

The adoption of the 'New Programme' was the main reason for growth in support of fascism in the year 1919-22.

fascism in 1919 seemed on a course for failure: they won no seats in the 1919 election, and a coffin with fascist emblem was paraded around the streets of Milan.

However, by 1922 fascism was the largest party in Italy and in October, Mussolini became Prime Minister. This essay will examine the ~~change~~ reasons for the growth in support for fascism to determine whether the 'New Programme' was the greatest cause for increased support or whether it was due to the impact of the 1919 elections, appeal fear of socialism, or establishment of a dual policy.

The creation of a 'New Programme' in 1921 took the PNF from a left-wing ideology towards a right-wing, nationalist

stance. ~~Mussolini~~ The New Programme moved away from the anticlerical, socialist, and monarchist republican views it previously held and became less antagonistic to the church and state. Mussolini announced these changes together with the creation of a formal party, the PNF, which transformed fascism from a disorganised movement ~~party~~ into a formal party that attracted votes from more moderate, and right wing supporters. Previously, fascism had been indistinguishable from other left-wing groups and now, the PNF had a clear manifesto.

The effects of this change were evident immediately: support grew, and they won seats in government for the first time in the 1921 elections after the adoption of the 'New Programme.'

Arguably, however, it was the result of the previous election in 1919 that instigated the implementation of the New Programme and therefore caused the most growth in support. The ~~result~~ outcome of

the elections were clear: the PSI won three times the amount of seats they had previously held, ~~in a clear majority~~ becoming the largest party, followed by the PPI. However, neither party was able to agree and form a coalition and instead, the liberal government returned. This was a clear failure for democracy and many Italians began to wonder whether a more aggressive, authoritarian style government was the only solution to solve Italy's problems. Combined with the failure of the fascists to win any seats, the 1919 election influenced Mussolini's decision to create a new programme in the years following, increasing his support.

Additionally, the initial ideology of the party attracted a lot of support in the years immediately following the war. Fascist violence attracted a lot of support, for various reasons. Firstly, fascism was a popular movement for returning ex-soldiers, made up predominantly of men returning from war. Support

was generated by the creed of 'soldiers versus those who stayed at home.'

Mussolini wanted to create a new Italy based on the unity he had experienced on the battlefields. The movement was ~~so~~ dominated by violent 'Blackshirts' who formed squads across the countryside and intimidated people with their violence. They received a large amount of support from the rural landowners who were feeling the threat of communism that would detract from their influence. The years 1919-20 were known as the 'Biennio Rosso' for the constant strikes from the working class, and Italy seemed to be threatened by a socialist revolution as had happened in Russia. Mussolini and the PNF benefited immensely from the myth that they were saving Italy from a communist revolution by intimidating and torturing socialist leaders across Italy. Thus, the fascist violence and fear of socialism was a huge factor in the increase of fascist support between 1919 and 1922.

~~The last~~ Lastly, Mussolini's 'Dual Policy' of 1921 and 1922 brought him support from within government. He realised that his Squadristo violence was detracting from his popular support from those who supported moderate political means. Mussolini set about limiting the power of the PCs in the countryside, developing the political side of the party. In 1921 he signed the Pact of Pacification with the PSI but this was just a political manoeuvre which cemented his position as leader of the PNF (he disgruntled blackshirts had dismissed him, but reappointed him out of lack of leader) as well as affirming the political legitimacy of the PNF within government. Leading government officials now recognised Mussolini as a legitimate leader and were willing to work alongside him, increasing his support from the mainstream government.

Overall, it seems that many factors altogether

contributed to ~~Mussolini~~ the growth in support of fascism; a combination of fascist violence, the 1919 election, the Dual policy and creation of a 'New Programme,' ~~however~~ which all increased support for fascism until Mussolini became Prime Minister in 1922.

~~However~~, ~~keep~~ his Dual Policy cannot be ~~even~~ the most significant factor, for while it increased his political legitimacy and ~~governance~~ democratic support, his popularity in his own party and from the Squadristi decreased, and he lost support from the violent aspect of fascism. Instead, it was the impact of fascist violence on fascist ideology that caused the greatest increase in support. The popularity fascism received for allegedly saving Italy from a socialist revolution is what encouraged Mussolini to develop his New Programme, making fascism more rightwing and militaristic, ~~rather~~ significantly increasing his fascist support.



This is an entry level 5 response. It clearly addresses causation. It discusses a good range of reasons, including the given reason. It has a secure conclusion which considers relative significance and it is this that lifts the response into Level 5.



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

## Question 4

There were a very limited number of answers to this question but many managed to achieve level 4 marks with a number of level 5 answers. The best answers to this question were characterised mainly by clear analytical answers. Most students demonstrated an understanding of the Stresa Front and were able to explain its purpose. In effective responses, the question was addressed well with the issue being weighed up and pitted against other policies in the time frame; notable focuses were Abyssinia and pacts with Germany. Some stronger responses successfully drew links between the Stresa Front and Italy's invasion of Abyssinia due to Italy's perception of Britain and France's acceptance of their expansion in North Africa. However, many candidates were unable to develop their answers by explaining its role in the development in Italy's foreign policy. Many candidates discussed the invasion of Abyssinia in depth, not always linking their ideas back to the question. Some candidates encountered difficulties in establishing valid criteria to judge the significance of the Stresa Front.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . 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

The Stresa front formed in 1935 however it could be argued that the alliance played a very insignificant role in the overall story of Italy's foreign policy from 1925-40. It could be argued that other events such as the invasion of Abyssinia in 1935 and Mussolini's intervention into the Spanish civil war were arguably more important than the Stresa front. It will be made clear that the Stresa front was not the most significant <sup>development</sup> in ~~the~~ Italian foreign policy and instead the invasion of Abyssinia was the most important. I will be using the following criteria, how much did it change Italy's relationship with other powers and how much did it impact Italy as a country.

The Stresa front was a four power pact that formed in 1935 in order to check the aggressive moves of Nazi Germany. The alliance was quite important as it maintained and strengthened ties with Great Britain and France and guaranteed the independence of Austria, which Germany had attempted to annex in 1934, only prevented by Mussolini. The Stresa front only lasted a few months and fell apart due to Italy's invasion of Abyssinia in

October 1935. The Stresa front did initially strengthen Italy's ties with the west and keep Austria as a buffer zone against Germany, however it could be argued that in the long term, Italy had little to gain from it. Although to strengthen his relationship with Britain and France, a great change in Italy's relationship with foreign powers, it could be argued that Italy as a country gained almost nothing from it. No economic changes, no new territory, they were only able to check the spread of Nazi Germany. Therefore the Stresa front did have limited impact on Italy's foreign policy and other justifications, such as the invasion of Abyssinia, were much more important.

Italy launched an invasion of Abyssinia in October 1935 with 400,000 men. Mussolini had hoped to annex Abyssinia in order to avenge the battle of Adowa in 1896 and to gain extra colonies for Italian settlers. The invasion of Abyssinia saw immediate changes in Italy's relationship with foreign powers. Britain and France attempted to mediate in Abyssinia and divide the territory with the Hoare-Laval pact, but when this did not work it led to the dissolution of the Stresa front. The League of Nations also announced sanctions on Italy in response to invasion, which had the unintended effect of improving Mussolini's image as it appeared he was standing up to the League. The war had a dramatic impact on Italy as only 1/3 of the territory was conquered and 130,000 soldiers moved to Abyssinia, therefore the invasion could be

considered a great failure. The invasion of Abyssinia was a major ~~turning~~<sup>turning</sup> point in the development of Italian policy, as it completely transformed Italy's relationship with foreign powers by breaking down her relations with Britain, France and the League of Nations and it had a great impact on Italy as a country as Mussolini's image was improved ~~and~~ and the invasion was an immense success on the ground. Therefore this invasion was arguably the more important event as it broke down the Abyssinia pact (which might have been more significant) and led Italy on a path that would eventually lead her allied to Nazi Germany.

Italy intervened in the Spanish civil war in July 1936. Mussolini had hoped that by doing this he could contain communism and gain a new justified ally in the reletoritarianism, he would also want concessions in the Balearic Islands. Italy sent 400 fighters to Spain in 1936 as well as ~~the~~ 50,000 soldiers. This intervention came at a great cost of 14 billion Lira which greatly strained the country's finances. Nazi Germany had also been supporting the nationalists, and so Italy's intervention was able to strengthen the relationship between the two countries. This strengthening relationship would eventually result in the signing of the Rome Berlin Axis in 1936, the anti-communist pact in 1937 (a pact to contain communism aimed at Stalinist Russia) and the Pact of Steel on 22<sup>nd</sup> May 1939 (which was a firm

scale generic military alliance with Nazi Germany but forced Italy to join an aggressive war if Germany reached the Atlantic.  
2). Therefore, it could be argued that Italy's intervention in the Spanish Civil War set the stage for Italy's eventual entry into the war on June 10<sup>th</sup> 1940, as Italy's ties with Nazi Germany began to grow stronger through the involvement of Italy and fighting for the nationalists and warlike conditions to grow each year. ~~Therefore~~ This intervention was also very significant in showing Italy as a country as it meant Italy now 14 billion lira poorer and would need 50,000 new tanks would be needed in the upcoming war. Therefore it could be argued that the Italy's involvement in the Spanish Civil War was more significant than the Stresa grant was in the development of Italian foreign policy as it changed Italy more as a country a year. Italy longer looking ties to Germany than the Stresa grant did to Britain and France. However the intervention was more significant as the leader of Abyssinia as it did not want to deteriorate the breaking down of relations with other powers.

Overall it is clear that Italy's membership in the Stresa grants did not have limited significance in the development of Italian foreign policy from 1925-40. This is because the only crucial treaty was the Munich and France and had little impact on Italy as a nation. The invasion of Abyssinia was the most

significant developments as to why they changed Italy's ties to nation powers like the UK and France and broke their relationship with the League of Nations. It also used Italy as a country to be understood and of what Mussolini's propaganda. The Spanish Civil War was important as it showed the rise of Nazi Germany and how the League of Nations failed, but was not as significant as the rise of Hitler and the League of Nations. Italy's relations with the League of Nations or foreign powers, which gain from this the League of Nations did not have the same impact as the invasion of Abyssinia which was the most significant.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a top level 5 response. It has a very clear focus on significance with a sustained analysis that is supported by good knowledge and a secure conclusion.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

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

## Question 5

This question was answered by far fewer candidates than Question 6 and it was often answered rather poorly. Strong level 4 and 5 answers were characterised by a clear understanding of the nature of the corporate state and the extent to which it could be deemed a success or failure. Many candidates were able to comment on establishment of syndicates, keeping Falange happy and the role that autarky played in underpinning corporatism but most then veered away to write instead about international relations/Treaty of Madrid. Some candidates wrote everything they knew about economic policy under Franco and did not always pay attention to the dates specified in the question.

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

Corporatism refers to the creation of specialised groups of employers and workers in which they solve disputes and are able to decide and contribute to policies aimed at the economy and industry. Franco established this system in order to try and tackle Spain's decreasing economic value, as demonstrated by the peseta being worth approximately 29 sterling in 1929 to approximately 42 by the end of the civil war.

~~Corpor~~ Corporatism could be argued as a positive economic change for both the people and Franco himself. Firstly, it allowed for employers and workers to discuss issues together, meaning those who would be largely affected by economic policy change had a say in the matter, plus, ~~diffusing~~ opposing sides of the class and political spectrum were being represented. These groups often acted as councils ~~to~~ for ~~problems~~ solving disputes such as those around a worker's pay or hours. Another strength of the system was that it was regional. There were 30 of these specialised groups around Spain by the 1950s. This means that those involved would have a greater understanding of what is best for their local industry. For example, if a group in the industrialised north of Spain decided policy for agricultural industry, it would likely meet a lot of opposition, as seen with the Agrarian Law reforms. Corporatism

also benefited Franco as it allowed for him to have greater control ~~over~~ over the economy and the people who contributed most to it, ~~this control seems relatively useless~~ particularly due to him making trade unions and strikes illegal. This control seems relatively useless however when the weaknesses of the system are brought to light.

Firstly, the system felt weak to ~~workers~~ the workers involved as they believed that the employers held more power over them. The lack of input from workers felt further exacerbated as they lacked the right to strike, so it is likely that decisions were made mostly in favour of employers anyway. For example, rural workers had grueling days of up to 16 hours. Corporatism could be viewed as a complete failure also as it ~~led~~ led to the ~~or~~ creation of a black market. This market was a free market and followed demand, contradicting the system of corporatism. The black market emerged as a result of the prices being placed on resources by the corporatism groups often led to either shortages or surpluses of products, such as bread. This could be viewed as a complete failure as the implementation of one economic system led to the creation of a completely contradicting one, undermining Franco's decision of corporatism. It can also be argued as a complete failure due to its lack of fixing the economy. Unemployment between 1939 and ~~the~~ the 1950s rose from ~~the~~  $\approx 400,000$  to  $\approx 600,000$ , with underemployment becoming a big issue. The standard of living was also greatly affected.

as shown by the food consumption at the time: bread consumption was 50% of what it was in 1936 and meat consumption was 50% of what it was in 1926. The economic crash further lowered living standards by forcing people to move from the rural south ~~to the industrial~~ where jobs were scarce to the industrial north where housing was in shortage, leading to the creation of shanty towns which lacked electricity and sewage systems. All the while, ~~public~~ funding is largely being spent on the military and there is very little welfare.

Overall, I think it is ~~correctly~~ very accurate to say that the development of corporatism was a complete failure as not only did it fail the economy and the Spanish people, it ultimately failed Franco by separating him ~~for~~ from trade with other countries and the EEC, and causing opposition and resentment to him from Spanish workers, as shown through the illegal strikes that took place.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a level 4 response. It has clear arguments for and against the failure of the development of corporatism and in its conclusion it does provide criteria for judgement.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

The question includes a clear qualifying point 'complete'. To achieve level 5 you need to go beyond failure and success and consider whether the failure was 'complete'.

## Question 6

This was the most popular question in Option 2G.2. There was a wide range of answers to this question ranging from level 4 and level 5 answers that hit the balance between change and development and Franco's continuing hold on power with the best candidates also looking at the role of the US for example, to much weaker answers which tended to focus only on social developments such as tourism. At the higher levels, where the candidates were able to demonstrate good knowledge, most were able to discuss a range of examples to support both arguments, including Law of Association, press censorship, leadership succession. In the lower levels, candidates' focus on the time period specified was quite variable.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . 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**

When reviewing significant developments in the political system, it is important to discuss what would make something a significant political development. It would have to be a large scale change that moved away from the old totalitarian system of Francoist government to one which was more modern and perhaps heading towards some kind of liberalisation or reform. Upon reviewing the evidence, it is clear that there were significant developments, and so I largely agree.

One of these developments was the erosion of the traditional power of the Falange and replacing them with more technocratic individuals, who were more focused on policy than ideological influences. The Falange were a right wing, fascist organisation originally led by José Antonio Primo de Rivera, the son of the 1923 dictator Miguel Antonio Primo de Rivera. While Falange membership had peaked at around 40,000 in 1936 by 1956, it was in decline, with people beginning to move away from their ideology and practices. Franco was aware of the disconnect between the Falange and the contemporary Spanish population so did a cabinet reshuffle in February 1937, demoting Falange ministers to junior positions, in areas such as housing, and promoting more pragmatic, technocratic people, some of whom were members of the secret Catholic organisation Opus Dei. This marked a significant development in the political system because the Falange had held so much traditional power for so long and it was now

being taken away by the key men who had given it to them in the first place. For example, the Falange had been able to have monopoly over youth groups, excluding the Catholic Church, but this was no longer a benefit they were granted. This erosion of the traditional Falangist power was clearly an attempt to modernise Spain as their replacements, the technocrats, started to introduce new economic policies that moved away from the Falange's autarky and corporatism. Because these new policies would affect the whole country, they were clearly had the large scale needed to be a significant change to the political system. The willingness of Franco to listen to those who had helped him into power in favour of his future survival highlights how Franco believed the political system needed changes, affirming the idea that there were indeed significant developments to go.

Other changes were made however, including plans regarding the succession. Back in 1947, Franco had taken the step to introduce the Law of Leadership Succession to make Spain a monarchy. However, at the time, this made very few changes to the political system as Franco decided who would be his successor and when they would be appointed. However, in 1967 he took this further by introducing the Organic Law which created a 'Chief of Government' position which was separate from the head of state. Franco remained in both roles but this created the prospects that Spain would in the near future ~~become~~ have a monarch and even opened the door to the creation of a democracy. This was very clearly a major transition and change from the early totalitarian nature of Franco's Spain, suggesting the authoritarian grip was loosening and the move towards liberalisation, which would be associated with significant developments to the political system, was

occurring. This was furthered when Franco casually named a successor in 1969 as Juan Carlos. Juan Carlos was known as a conservative as he had served in the army but he had also spoken about the need to modernise Spain. As a result people believed he would bring about a shift towards democracy and as a democratic election hadn't happened in Spain for 40 years, it was evidently a majorly significant development in the political system to pass the Organic Law in 1967 and then name a successor two years later. Because an issue such as succession is seen as a large scale factor, it was clearly significant.

Francisco also made other changes in the 1960s that suggest he was modernising Spain and therefore, that there were significant developments in the political system. For example, in 1964 he passed the Law on Associations which allowed small social gatherings for community events or projects. While this didn't overturn the 1937 ban on all political parties other than FET-JONS, it marked a moment at which it could be realistically be agreed that the dominance of FET-JONS was being allowed to erode. It was by no means a guarantee of democracy and was perhaps too small scale to be totally significant, but it was a glimpse into what the future could hold and the glimpse certainly suggested a modernisation of the political system. This was supported by the introduction of the Law on Family Representation. This permitted the heads of families to vote in Cortes elections, although there was only one party to vote for. The fact people were even being allowed to vote was a significant development and reform for the political system. This is further supported by the fact that it applied to both men and women, although women were rarely heads of households in Franco's Spain, marking the start of a shift away from the patriarchal

penal system which operated under Franco. This modernisation was  
therefore a significant development.

In conclusion, I largely agree that there were significant developments to  
the penal system in Spain in the years 1956-75. While Franco never  
completely overhauled the system through the creation of a ministry, he  
took enough of the foundations, particularly through the Organic Law and  
Law on Family Representation, than Juan Carlos was able to hold democratic  
elections as soon as 1977, <sup>under</sup> just 2 years after Franco's death. This is  
particularly significant of a development because of how totalitarian Franco  
had been in the 40s and even early 50s. Finally, his willingness to <sup>and overrule</sup> excede  
the power of some of his closest allies in the Falange shows he knew  
how the penal system was changing and the Falange didn't fit so,  
suggesting there was a <sup>large scale</sup> modernisation of the penal system and therefore there  
most certainly were significant developments.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a secure level 5 response. It has explicit focus on the question and is supported by secure knowledge. It demonstrates a clear need to consider change/continuity and significance.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

This question focuses on the significance of developments. You need to be able to identify the developments, what remained unchanged and consider if, overall, the change was significant.

## Paper Summary

### 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>

