

AS

History

Italy and Fascism, c1900–1945

7041/2L The crisis of Liberal Italy and the Rise of Mussolini, c1900–1926

Mark scheme

June 2016

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

June 2016

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 system in Italy before 1922?
[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 speech is by a member of the Italian senate since 1910 and therefore an insider who is in a position to know about the workings of democracy in central government
- the speech is by a philosopher, an educated man who would be expected to understand liberal/democratic values. The speaker is anti-Fascist so exaggerates the degree of democracy that existed in Italy before 1922 in order to make the comparison with Fascism stronger
- the speaker is a leading opponent of Mussolini and is speaking in 1945 about the 'rapid ascent toward democracy' before 1922, with the obvious implications that he wants those better times to return (purpose). The tone is positive.

Content and argument

- the overall contention of the source is that before 1922 Italy had made great strides along the path of becoming a democratic country; knowledge of the development of democracy/liberal reform in Italy – particularly the franchise extension of 1912 supports these arguments
- the source contrasts the misery and illiteracy of 'past times' with the new characteristics of Italy's 'free citizens' that were apparent before 1922. Knowledge of the Party disputes and corruptions could be used to challenge this
- the speaker cites, as examples of change which reflected the spread of more liberal values in Italy, the right to form trade unions, and go on strike, labour legislation and the expansion of the franchise leading to universal suffrage (votes for all) to corroborate his argument
- knowledge of the rise of Fascist extremism from 1919 and the formation of the Communist Party (1921) could be used to challenge this.

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

Provenance and tone

- the extract is by a socialist member of the (elected) Chamber of Deputies 1919–1922 and therefore an 'insider' who will have a good understanding of Giolitti's handling of debates and management of politics
- the writer is a historian who might be expected to have a developed sense of criticism and balanced judgement; but is also from the left-wing of politics and therefore more likely to be critical of corruption, and of politicians' failure to understand the 'country as a whole'
- The tone is largely critical of parliamentary politics under Giolitti.

Content and argument

- the overall contention of the source is that Giolitti's style of rule was undemocratic – ignoring the views of the people, managing elections and resorting to violence to get his own way. Knowledge of Giolitti's mastery of *trasformismo* could be used to explain why parliamentary politics might be seen as corrupt (The essay argues that parliamentary tactics weakened Italian democracy pre-fascism)
- the source suggests that despite his ability in managing the Chamber of Deputies, Giolitti paid little heed to what was going on in Italy itself and failed to appreciate the dissatisfaction his 'management' of elections was causing. Knowledge of Giolitti's valuable work in reforming Italy (e.g. agrarian reforms and provision of welfare benefits) which could be used to show a more positive side of development of politics in this period
- it suggests that universal suffrage (voting) was not the step towards democracy it might have been; Giolitti continued to control who was elected in order to win victories
- the source suggests there was 'bitter indignation' everywhere; knowledge could be used to show that Giolitti was successful in winning wide support.

Students are likely to suggest that Source B is the more convincing. This is partly because it can be seen as more balanced and also because it shows a number of problems with the development of the political system in Italy that can be corroborated from contextual own knowledge. Source A, on the other hand, is clearly more idealistic, seeking to inspire Italy to return to democracy after the aberration that was Fascism. Nevertheless, both authors have their own agenda and any well-supported response should be rewarded.

Section B**02** 'Italy was not a united country in 1900.'

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.

Students will need to consider the ways in which Italy was not a united country in 1900 and balance these against the ways in which it did display signs of unity. The most successful answers will probably look at this issue thematically although any valid and supported approach is acceptable.

Arguments suggesting that Italy was not a united country in 1900 might include:

- the geographical/economic division between north and south and between the industrialising areas and the agricultural regions
- the social division between the wealthy/poor which partly mirrored geographical division; the particular issue of poverty/illiteracy in the south and the perpetuation of a powerful landowning élite which brought unrest; activities of mafia in the south were also divisive
- religious division – the Pope was anti-State; loyal Catholics refused to participate in State; priests encouraged unrest
- political division between groupings/allegiances; division between the élites (wealthy/educated) and masses who did not identify with the State; ‘legal Italy’ and ‘real Italy’. the challenge of socialism; 1900 anarchists assassinated King Umberto.

Arguments challenging the view that Italy was not a united country in 1900 might include:

- Italy had been united politically as a single state since 1870
- it had a single monarch and constitution which protected rights of all (e.g. free speech and religious freedom) without discrimination
- uniform and centralised government – 25% males had vote; local government functioned through State-appointed prefects. Some social reform under Crispi
- largely united in faith, language and cultural heritage (despite some variation in dialect); and economically united (no internal tariffs); uniformity of taxation.
Growing economy 1890s- 1900s GDP. Increase in primary education.

Students are likely to conclude that Italy was not a fully united country in 1900, for the reasons set out above. However they may make a distinction between a reasonable degree of political/constitutional unity and economic and social division. They might also highlight the ambiguous position of the Catholic Church as an institution which brought unity among peoples but division between people and State. Whatever view students choose to advance, reward any well-supported argument.

- 03** ‘Mussolini consolidated his power in Italy between 1922 and 1926 through violence and intimidation.’

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.

Students will need to assess whether Mussolini consolidated his power in Italy through violence and intimidation between 1922 and 1926 or whether other factors were equally, or perhaps more, responsible.

Arguments suggesting that Mussolini consolidated his power in Italy between 1922 and 1926 through violence and intimidation might include:

- the squadristi were transformed in 1922 into a paramilitary political police force (the MSVN); and violence and intimidation were used to influence elections; violent incidents in 1923 and 1924 influenced the political outcomes
- the Matteotti affair showed violence in action; intimidation of opposition by MSVN caused the Aventine Secession
- Farinacci's 'reign of terror' in 1925 – closure of newspapers, harassment of opponents, attacks on freedom of speech and association – showed how central violence was
- the formation of OVRA in 1926 and banning of other political parties, again showed how important violent repressions was for consolidations.

Arguments challenging the view that Mussolini consolidated his power in Italy between 1922 and 1926 through violence and intimidation might include:

- Mussolini was initially conciliatory towards other political parties; liberals gave support at times of crisis; the Acerbo law was passed legally. Belief in 'Normalisation'. Fascism a temporary phase he had support from the King; this was significant because the King refused to act in 1925; likewise the Senate. Economic recovery under De Stefani, lower taxes.
- support from Pius XI (and in particular papal pressure forcing the leader of the PPI – a Sicilian priest – to resign) was important. Mussolini's courting of the Catholic Church, including increases in priests' salaries, also was an effective use of compromise
- the 'glory' appertaining to Lausanne Conference and Corfu in 1923, won popular support and showed that the illusion of success was more important than violence. Also Fiume acquired 1924

Students are likely to conclude that Mussolini had to use a variety of methods to consolidate his power, but that terror and intimidation were certainly of importance in this regard. For some, the support of the élites may appear the main reason, for others, Mussolini's propaganda and popularity with the Italian people as a whole may be seen as more important than terror tactics. Whatever weight students give to terror and intimidation, reward those who are able to justify their choice with well-selected evidence and argument.