

---

AS

# History

Italy and Fascism, c1900–1945

Component 2L The crisis of Liberal Italy and the Rise of Mussolini, c1900–1926

Mark scheme

---

7041

June 2017

---

Version: 1.0 Final

---

---

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

June 2017

Italy and Fascism, c1900–1945

AS History Component 2L The crisis of Liberal Italy and the Rise of Mussolini, c1900–1926

### Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the political unrest in Italy in the years 1919 to 1921? **[25 marks]**

*Target: AO2*

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

### Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

## Indicative content

**Note:** This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

**Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.**

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

**Source A: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:**

### Provenance and tone

- the writer is an experienced, high level politician, in a good position to make retrospective comments on the context of the events he had witnessed
- the tone of his comments is objective and restrained; but it can be detected he is anti-Communist and therefore seems ready to give some approval to those who support ‘the Fatherland and victory’
- Bonomi, a moderate socialist who is not sympathetic to the Fascists: he does not side with the ‘men of order’; but is in agreement with them about anti-Communism and victory in the war.

### Content and argument

- the violence in Bologna in 1920 was part of widespread unrest and disorder in Italy during the post-war crisis of 1919–1921. The unrest reflected a serious economic crisis and accusations of weak central government. There was a particular fear of strikes and Communist agitation
- Bonomi’s argument is that there was a need to do something about violence and not just let the Communists act freely, without any response, that the socialists instigated a reaction from the propertied classes- implying perhaps that the government should have done more.
- Bonomi plainly believes in Italy’s war and the victory it achieved; there is an implicit argument against ‘those who opposed the war and rejected the victory’. Answers might well use own knowledge to show how effectively the Fascist squadristi exploited such patriotic attitudes to gain support as defenders of ‘order’.

**Source B: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:**

### Provenance and tone

- Seldes was a well-informed outside observer of events in Italy, who knew Mussolini personally, as a journalist. The detailed inside knowledge about the deal with the CGI also

---

reflects a degree of expert reporting; the date of publication (1936) shows that this is a retrospective view, informed by knowledge of Mussolini's rule after 1922

- the tone of the narrative description, and the title of the book, plainly indicates that Seldes was not an uncritical admirer of Mussolini.
- the overall tone is objective and balanced, not taking sides with the workers, the Fascists, or the bourgeoisie.

### **Content and argument**

- the main argument is that Mussolini was a cynical opportunist, ready to reverse his politics in return for money and support
- the reason why 'bloodshed increased throughout Italy' was that it was part of a political plan, not spontaneous violence
- if anything, Seldes apportions the greatest portion of blame to the industrialists for backing (and underrating) Mussolini
- answers might use own knowledge to show how the unrest was due to failures of the government; or the extent of Communist violence; or the exploitation of violence by the Fascists.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might argue that:

Bonomi can be seen as a reliable and convincing source; though only about one specific development in northern Italy. Many answers will see that Seldes in Source B is more convincing because of the range and depth of his explanation of the interaction between different factions. Judgements may vary according to opinion about the severity of the Communist threat; Bonomi sees this as very urgent, whereas Seldes tends to play it down.

**Section B**

**02** ‘Giolitti failed to overcome political instability in Italy in the years 1903 to 1914.’

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

**[25 marks]**

*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.*

**Generic Mark Scheme**

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

---

## Indicative content

**Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.**

Answers should be able to present a range of evidence and arguments to assess political stability, or otherwise, in Liberal Italy before the First World War. Material about long-term weaknesses before 1903 may be used to do this; but it should be directly applied to the question, and is not a requirement.

**Arguments suggesting that Giolitti failed to overcome political instability in Italy in the years 1903 to 1914 might include:**

- Giolitti was forced to resign in 1914, when Italy was very unstable and badly divided, especially on the issues of nationalism and war
- Giolitti's political dominance was founded on the manipulation of politics by a narrow liberal oligarchy; by 1914 this oligarchy was losing control
- 'Giolittianism' was based on corrupt 'management' of politics by patronage and bribery
- the widening of the franchise in 1912 was a desperate attempt to win over the working class; it completely failed to do this and made instability worse, not less
- Giolitti's encouragement of nationalism through the 1911/12 war in Libya, deepened political divisions.

**Arguments challenging the view that Giolitti failed to overcome political instability in Italy in the years 1903 to 1914 might include:**

- Giolitti's political dominance of Italy provided valuable continuity in government. Giolitti's system was flexible and secure. Giolitti himself was a skilled political operator pulling the strings
- the political system was flexible enough to adapt to social and economic change, this was demonstrated by the franchise reform in 1912
- Giolitti's corrupt 'management' of local politics was mostly in the South, it was not needed in the North where the liberal system had wide support
- Italy was rapidly modernising, with economic growth and urban development, backed by the rise of the middle classes; this was helped along by Giolitti's policies
- there was genuine social progress, with big reductions in illiteracy.

Effective answers will offer a balanced account, linking the support offered to the issue of political instability. They may conclude that Giolitti failed because of the tensions between liberalism, socialism, Catholicism and nationalism, or because of the long-standing weakness of the Italian political system (see note above), or perhaps because of his own misjudgements (Libyan War, Gentiloni Pact). On the other hand Giolitti could be said to have handled a difficult situation well and brought stability, social reform and an enlarged electorate. Answers might demonstrate the ability to differentiate between factors of different relative importance or by linking Giolitti's successes and failures to the wider causes of instability in Italy.

- 03** ‘The key to Mussolini’s successful consolidation of power in the years 1922 to 1926 was his personal popularity with the Italian people.’

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

**[25 marks]**

*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.*

### Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

---

## Indicative content

**Note:** This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

**Arguments suggesting that the key to Mussolini's successful consolidation of power in the years 1922 to 1926 was his personal popularity with the Italian people might include:**

- it can be argued that Mussolini's personality, and the presentation of it, was all-important for the cohesiveness of the Fascist movement, no other Fascist leader could have held the movement together and appealed to so many sectors of Italian society and policies
- the Fascist propaganda machine maximised the idea of 'Il Duce' as the strong leader who would save Italy from Communism and social breakdown
- aspects of Fascist ideology were genuinely popular; the appeal to youth, the focus on restoring national pride, overtures to the Catholic Church, and the emphasis on a 'third way' between capitalism and Communism
- between 1923 and 1926, Mussolini achieved a number of foreign policy successes (Corfu, Fiume, mediating Locarno etc) that enhanced his reputation.

**Arguments challenging the view that the key to Mussolini's successful consolidation of power in the years 1922 to 1926 was his personal popularity with the Italian people might include:**

- violence was more important than popularity; the use of Fascist squads, the Matteotti Affair and the beginnings of the police state all suppressed potentially powerful opposition to Mussolini and his regime
- Mazzini gained and kept power because he was allowed to by the King and the traditional ruling elites, who compromised with him, and badly underestimated him
- Mussolini's success was due to political skill, especially in using outwardly legal methods to subvert the constitution
- the key to Mussolini's success was fear; of Communist revolution, and of Fascist violence (which only he could control)
- Mussolini was lucky – he came to power at the right time, just as the recovery from the post-war economic crisis was beginning to become possible.

Effective answers will offer a balanced response, linking factors to the issues of consolidation of power 1922-26. They may conclude that Mussolini was an appealing alternative to the weak leadership of liberal Italy, or that the real strength of Fascism lay in the latent threat of violence and intimidation. Policies offering concessions may be used to support popularity or as an alternative factor, depending how they are argued. Whichever view is taken, reward those who are able to justify their choice with well- selected evidence and argument.