



# Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel  
In GCE History (9HI0/2G)  
Advanced

Paper 2: Depth study

Option 2G.1: The rise and fall of fascism in  
Italy, c1911–46

Option 2G.2: Spain, 1930–78: republicanism,  
Francoism and the re-establishment of  
democracy

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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).

## **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)

Summer 2024

Question Paper P75766A

Publications Code 9HI0\_2G\_2406\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

## General Marking Guidance

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

## How to award marks when level descriptions are used

### 1. Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use the guidance below and their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

For example, one stronger passage at L4 would not by itself merit a L4 mark, but it might be evidence to support a high L3 mark, unless there are substantial weaknesses in other areas. Similarly, an answer that fits best in L3 but which has some characteristics of L2 might be placed at the bottom of L3. An answer displaying some characteristics of L3 and some of L1 might be placed in L2.

### 2. Finding a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

#### Levels containing two marks only

Start with the presumption that the work will be at the top of the level. Move down to the lower mark if the work only just meets the requirements of the level.

#### Levels containing three or more marks

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements *fully*, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- If it only *barely* meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a *reasonable* match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

### Indicative content

Examiners are reminded that indicative content is provided as an illustration to markers of some of the material that may be offered by students. It does not show required content and alternatives should be credited where valid.

## Generic Level Descriptors: Section A

**Target:** AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li> <li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question.</li> <li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria but with limited justification.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>13–16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<b>17–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/ or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.</li> </ul>

## Section B

**Target:** AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li><li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li><li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li><li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li></ul>
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li><li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li><li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li><li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li></ul>
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included.</li><li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li><li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li><li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.</li></ul>
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li><li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li><li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.</li></ul>
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li><li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li><li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li></ul>

## Section A: indicative content

### Option 2G.1: The rise and fall of fascism in Italy, c1911–46

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them investigate the reasons why Italy remained neutral in 1914.</p> <p><b>Source 1</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The telegram was an official communication between the German ambassador and the German Foreign Office and was therefore intended to give an accurate account of Italy's attitude to the outbreak of war</li><li>• The content of the telegram makes it clear that the ambassador had met with the Italian Foreign Minister and was summarising the views of the Italian government as recounted directly by the Italian Foreign Minister</li><li>• The tone and content of the telegram reveal both a realistic appraisal of the current situation and a rather pessimistic outlook for the future.</li></ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons why Italy remained neutral in 1914:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It claims that Italy did not need to join the war because Austria had violated the terms of the Triple Alliance ('Austria's actions ... act of aggression. ... no reason for Italy to support Austria')</li><li>• It implies that Italy remained neutral because Austria was more of an enemy than an ally ('not been informed in advance of Austria's action', 'Italian interests were being directly damaged by the Austrian action.')</li><li>• It provides evidence that Italy was considering swapping to an alliance with the Entente powers ('reserved the right to decide whether it might be possible for Italy to intervene later... the side of the Triple Entente.')</li><li>• It suggests that Italy intended to remain neutral until it could make territorial gains ('if... Italian interests were satisfactorily protected.', 'if some reward could be offered').</li></ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Italy had joined the Triple Alliance in 1882, but long-standing enmity with Austria, including territorial claims, meant that the Triple Alliance did not secure Italy's unqualified support</li><li>• Austria's decision to declare war on Serbia in late July 1914, without consulting Italy, meant that Italy was not bound under the terms of the Triple Alliance to join the war. Hence Italy declared its neutrality</li><li>• Opinion in the Italian government was split when war broke out in 1914. This led to the interventionist crisis</li><li>• Italy had ambitions to annex territory, including Trentino and Trieste, and began secret negotiations with both sides to ascertain which would be prepared to enable Italy's acquisition of territory.</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p><b>Source 2</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Giolitti had opposed entering the war in 1914 and would naturally argue his own opinion from that time that the supporters of war were in the wrong and that Italy was right to remain neutral</li> <li>• Giolitti wrote this account nearly a decade after the outbreak of war, and was able to draw upon his knowledge and experience of events to justify his view</li> <li>• The account was published in an American magazine in 1923. There was no censorship in American publishing and Giolitti would have been free to express his views</li> <li>• Giolitti was a major Italian statesman, and his views would have carried weight in 1914 and in 1923.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons why Italy remained neutral in 1914:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It claims that those believing the war would be short were wrong and that Italy should remain neutral because the war would be of long duration ('the war would be a very prolonged one. ...at least three years')</li> <li>• It suggests that Italy was militarily too weak to be involved in a war with the Great Powers ('be necessary to crush the best-organised military powers in the world...preparing for war for forty years.')</li> <li>• It argues that Italy would gain more by remaining neutral ('It was highly probable that we could get what we wanted from Austria by skilful negotiation.')</li> <li>• It indicates that Italy was too weak economically to join the war ('colossal financial sacrifices...particularly burdensome ... already imposing taxes as high as the people could bear.').</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Giolitti was the leading member of the liberals who supported neutrality in 1914 and gained the support of many Italians for his stance against war</li> <li>• Neutrality was economically and militarily favourable to Italy. The army was still engaged in Libya and was not equipped for a large European conflict</li> <li>• There was strong support across Italian society for neutrality. Industrialists depended on imported coal from Britain and thus opposed war. The Church did not want war with Catholic Austria.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources 1 and 2</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources refer to possible territorial gains in the consideration of neutrality</li> <li>• The sources represent different perspectives. Whilst Source 1 came from the German ambassador and wants Italy to join the war, Source 2 came from Giolitti, the leading proponent for neutrality</li> <li>• The sources focus on different aspects of the outbreak of war. The author of Source 2 is reflecting on the Great War, whilst Source 1 refers to a limited Balkan War that broke out on 28 July</li> <li>• The sources provide insights from different time periods. Whilst Source 1 examines Italy's position at the outbreak of war in 1914, Source 2 reflects on the issues with the benefit of hindsight nearly a decade later.</li> </ul>



**Option 2G.2: Spain, 1930–78: republicanism, Francoism and the re-establishment of democracy**

Question	Indicative content
<b>2</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate reasons why the Republicans were defeated in the Spanish Civil War.</p> <p><b>Source 3</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a volunteer, Gurney had first-hand experience of the Civil War and could thus speak with authority about the weaknesses of the Republican side that contributed to its defeat</li> <li>• As a man who held left-wing views and who fought in Spain, Gurney was clearly committed to the Republic but was still able to give a relatively objective assessment of the reasons for defeat</li> <li>• Reflecting in 1974 on the Republican defeat, Gurney was able to draw upon the benefit of hindsight to look at both the military and political weaknesses that led to defeat</li> <li>• The tone of the account indicates Gurney's bitterness towards the Western governments and left-wing parties and the Republican leadership in Spain.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about reasons why the Republicans were defeated in the Spanish Civil War:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It implies that non-intervention contributed to the defeat ('left wingers in Europe and America could demand ...fight to the last man, but this was irresponsible.' 'totally dependent on Russia')</li> <li>• It claims that shortages of military equipment led to defeat ('we Republicans were outgunned')</li> <li>• It claims that the Nationalists had superiority in leadership, men and material ('outmanoeuvred. ... professional soldiers ... superiority of technical equipment.', 'Franco's infantry, ... German artillery')</li> <li>• It claims that the decisions by politicians led to the defeat ('Azaña ... indecisive. ... Caballero ... would not agree ... destruction of the POUM').</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a result of the Non-intervention Pact, Republican Spain had to rely on untrained volunteers to boost their fighting force. They were often poorly equipped, and numbers never exceeded 16,000</li> <li>• A civil war broke out within the Republican side between the Communists and CNT and POUM. Negrín, heavily dependent on the Communists, banned POUM. This infighting sapped the strength of the Republicans</li> <li>• From 1937, the Nationalists advanced in the north, taking Santander in August 1937, Asturias in September 1937, and Barcelona in January 1939. The Republicans were forced back to the southeast coast</li> <li>• Azaña fled to France after the fall of Barcelona. Negrín's attempt to assume dictatorial powers increased the infighting on the Republican side, and he fled to France in March before the fall of Madrid.</li> </ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p><b>Source 4</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As the Prime Minister of Republican Spain from 1937-39, Negrín was clearly an authority on the issues that confronted the Republican side and in an excellent position to comment on the reasons for its defeat</li> <li>• As the Prime Minister that presided over the Republican defeat, Negrín clearly had an incentive to apportion the blame for defeat elsewhere</li> <li>• The purpose of the speech was to provide an account to the Council on Foreign Relations that it could use to advise US government organisations and thus it should be accurate</li> <li>• The speech, made in May 1939, gave an immediate account of the reasons for defeat.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about reasons why Republicans were defeated in the Spanish Civil War:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It claims that the Republicans were defeated because of insufficient armaments ('We lost the war because of our great inferiority in military resources.')</li> <li>• It claims that non-intervention was the cause of defeat ('We were unable to obtain sufficient resources because of the non-intervention agreement. Our opponents were able to receive all they wanted')</li> <li>• It suggests that German/Italian bombing campaigns played a significant role in the defeat of the Republicans ('German and Italian pilots had been devastating Spain.')</li> <li>• It suggests that the west forced Republican Spain into dependency on Russia ('non-intervention agreement had denied us our right to buy arms for the defence of democracy. Russia restored that right to us.').</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fearing war in Europe, Britain and France signed the Non-intervention Pact in August 1936. In total, 27 countries signed, although Germany and Italy ignored it and continued to send equipment to Franco</li> <li>• In the first months, Italy sent 2500 tonnes of bombs, 500 artillery pieces, 12000 machine guns and 4000 vehicles. Over the course of the War, Germany and Italy sent Franco 1300 aeroplanes</li> <li>• Stalin sent humanitarian aid to the Republicans, and military equipment in secret. However, the Russians demanded payment in gold for their equipment. Two-thirds of Spain's gold (\$500million) was shipped to Russia</li> <li>• Negrín organised the departure of the International Brigades in November 1938 to encourage full support from Britain and France for the Republicans in the increasing possibility of a fascist victory in Spain.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources 3 and 4</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources agree that the Nationalist side was considerably advantaged by the supply of military materials from Germany and Italy and that the Republicans lost because they had insufficient military resources</li> <li>• Whilst Source 4 acknowledges the importance of Russian supplies to the Republican side, Source 3 places considerable blame on the Russians for undermining the Republican side and contributing to its defeat</li> <li>• Whilst Source 4 places considerable blame on the policy of non-intervention by the western democracies, Source 3 emphasises the considerable political weaknesses in the Republican leadership.</li> </ul>

## Section B: indicative content

### Option 2G.1: The rise and fall of fascism in Italy, c1911–46

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the adoption of the 'New Programme' was the main reason for the growth in support for fascism in the years 1919-22.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the adoption of the 'New Programme' was the main reason for the growth in support for fascism in the years 1919-22 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The 1919 programme was socialist, anti-clerical and republican. It attracted little support and the fascists failed to win any seats in 1919. By contrast, under the 'New Programme', the fascists won 35 seats in 1921</li><li>• The 'New Programme' removed calls for a republic and ceased attacks on the Church. It attracted support of conservatives and Catholics. It enabled Victor Emmanuel to accept Mussolini in October 1922</li><li>• The 'New Programme' removed all references to the nationalisation of industry and seizure of war profits. It promised the sale of state industries to private owners. It attracted businessmen to support fascism</li><li>• The 'New Programme' called for compulsory military service and for Italy to reclaim its <i>irredente</i> lands. It attracted the support of nationalists and militarists.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that that the adoption of the 'New Programme' was not the main reason/there were other more important reasons for the growth in support for fascism in the years 1919-22 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The 'mutilated victory' led many ex-soldiers and students to turn to fascism as early as 1919, as they sought a dynamic movement to provide an outlet for their frustrations over the failure of the liberal government</li><li>• The growth of socialism and the post-war economic and social unrest convinced many middle-class Italians that a Bolshevik revolution was imminent. Mussolini persuaded them that fascism was the antidote</li><li>• The formation of the squads was a key reason in the growth of support for fascism. The squads attracted ex-soldiers. Squad violence created the myth that fascism was saving Italy and was attractive to the middle class</li><li>• Police and military tolerance or support legitimised fascist violence and enabled fascism to attract support from landowners who opposed the socialist land leagues and businessmen who opposed trades unions</li><li>• Mussolini's leadership encouraged the growth of support for fascism. His charismatic figure persuaded people from across the social divide that he could sweep away Italy's weak government and revitalise Italy</li><li>• Mussolini's electoral pact with Giolitti, the Dual Policy and the Pact of Pacification encouraged conservatives to believe that Mussolini was a traditional statesman and to give fascism their support.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that the Stresa Front had only limited significance in the development of Italian foreign policy in the years 1935-40.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the Stresa Front had only limited significance/there were other more significant factors in the development of Italian foreign policy in the years 1935-40 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relationship forged between Italy, Britain and France proved very short-lived and of little significance. Mussolini abandoned the agreement in June 1935 when Britain signed the Anglo-German Naval Agreement</li> <li>• The refusal of Britain and France to intervene over the Anschluß demonstrated that the Stresa Front did not protect Italy from German expansion. Italy was now forced to accept that it bordered Nazi Germany</li> <li>• The determination to expand the Italian empire in Africa was of greater significance than the Stresa Front. Mussolini launched the invasion despite opposition, including the imposition of sanctions, by Britain and France</li> <li>• Mussolini's ambitions for Italy to dominate the Mediterranean were significant in developing Italian foreign policy. It was a key factor in intervention in the Spanish Civil War and in forging the Rome-Berlin Axis</li> <li>• Ideology was significant in the development of Italian foreign policy. The relationship between Italy and Germany was based on shared ideological values, including authoritarianism, nationalism, and expansionism</li> <li>• Economic factors were of great significance in the development of Italian foreign policy. Shortages of raw material and the cost of maintaining the empire played a key role in neutrality in 1939.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the Stresa Front was significant in the development of Italian foreign policy in the years 1935-40 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Stresa Front was significant in that it enabled Mussolini to fulfil his ambition to be treated as the leader of a Great Power. In the declaration of the Stresa Front, Italy was presented as an equal of Britain and France</li> <li>• The Stresa Front was significant to Mussolini. He believed, albeit erroneously, that it would endorse Italian expansion in Northeast Africa. Foreign policy planning in 1935 concentrated on invading Abyssinia</li> <li>• The Stresa Front marked the high point of Italy's co-operation with Britain and France. It held continued significance in Italy's foreign policy in that it enabled Mussolini to play a role in curbing Germany at Munich in 1938</li> <li>• The significance of the relationship forged with Britain and France allowed Italy to remain neutral in 1939. Mussolini was able to play on the previous relationship to provide time to consider which side to support</li> <li>• Some within the government, e.g. Ciano, took the Stresa Front more seriously and regarded it as a vital element in resisting the drift towards Germany.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

**Option 2G.2: Spain, 1930–78: republicanism, Francoism and the re-establishment of democracy**

Question	Indicative content
5	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether, in the years 1938-56, the development of corporatism was a complete failure.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1938-56, the development of corporatism was a complete failure should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instead of treating each side equally, Franco's government used corporatism to set up syndicates that imposed wage rates and employment conditions on workers that were unfavourable to them</li> <li>• Small businesses were undermined by corporatism that favoured big business. Small businesses were excluded from syndicates</li> <li>• Many workers, believing that corporatism favoured employers, established illegal syndicates, and participated in illegal strikes. The use of the <i>Falange</i> and Civil Guard to crush the strikes led to worsening industrial relations</li> <li>• Many employers found the regulations very restrictive and costly. Consequently, they grew to resent corporatism, which contributed to its failure, as it did not fulfil its aim of reconciling employers and workers</li> <li>• Corporatism failed to inspire economic innovation. It also led to the stagnation and underemployment in agriculture</li> <li>• Corporatism resulted in a decline in the standard of living for workers. Wage rises were suppressed, rising by only 30 per cent while prices rose by 600 per cent.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1938-56, the development of corporatism was not a complete failure should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corporatism helped to achieve a stable society in which employers and workers were committed to negotiate agreements over wages and working conditions and thus end class-based conflict</li> <li>• Corporatism was used as a method to control the workers by outlawing strikes. This fulfilled one of Franco's objectives to stamp out left-wing ideas and influence and strengthen his control</li> <li>• Corporatism enabled Franco to retain the support of the <i>Falange</i>. The <i>Falange</i> regarded corporatism as the first step towards a fascist economy</li> <li>• Corporatism facilitated the development of regional wages levels that reflected the different economic conditions across the country.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
6	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that there were significant developments in the political system in Spain in the years 1956-75.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that there were significant developments in the political system in Spain in the years 1956-75 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The political influence of the <i>Falange</i> declined in the late 1950s. Franco's reshuffle brought in new cabinet members with links to <i>Opus Dei</i> and members of the <i>Falange</i> were removed</li> <li>• The passing of the Law of Association in 1964 led to a growth in local and community activities that were primarily social but that laid foundations for the growth of political opposition in the early 1970s</li> <li>• Changes to censorship allowed for greater freedom of expression. The 1966 Press Act gave journalists greater freedom in what they reported. Self-censorship was a significant development from the previous system</li> <li>• The Organic Law, 1967, began the development towards democracy by beginning the separation of powers with the creation of a new 'chief of government' that was separate from the Head of State</li> <li>• The political participation of the population was increased by the Law on Family Representation, 1967, which allowed heads of families, including some women, to vote. The <i>Cortes</i> was expanded by 20 per cent</li> <li>• In 1969, Franco formally decided to return the monarchy to Spain. His chosen candidate, Juan Carlos, became king in 1975 on Franco's death.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that there were limited developments in the political system in Spain in the years 1956-75 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political parties, other than the <i>Falange</i>, remained outlawed throughout the period</li> <li>• Despite efforts to extend political influence into Europe, Spain's application to the EEC in 1962 was rejected, in part because it remained a one-party state</li> <li>• The changes to censorship under the 1966 Press Act were limited. Journalists still had to show respect for the Francoist system and the Church. This limited freedom of expression</li> <li>• Despite the passing of the Organic Law of 1967, little changed at the top. Franco continued to hold both positions of chief of government and Head of State until his death in 1975</li> <li>• The 1969 decision to return to the monarchy was little more than a reiteration of the 1947 Law of Leadership Succession that provided for the return of the monarchy. Franco remained in charge until his death.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>