

AS-LEVEL

History

Unit HIS2G: The Forging of the Italian Nation, 1848–1871

Mark scheme

1041

June 2015

V1 Final Mark Scheme

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

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level students. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Students who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which students meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a student performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that students might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other students' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a student with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

June 2015

GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change

HIS2G: The Forging of the Italian Nation, 1848–1871

Question 1

01 Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to Garibaldi. **[12 marks]**

Target: A02(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will **either** briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources **or** identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed. **3-6**
- L3:** Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences **and** similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed. **7-9**
- L4:** Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication. **10-12**

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 levels scheme.

This question is focused on contrasting views of Garibaldi as hero of the Risorgimento. Effective answers to this question will make a direct comparison of the two sources in the light of own knowledge of the context. Less successful answers will provide a literal account of the evidence of each source in turn, followed by a limited comparison.

Students will need to identify differences between the views of the two sources. Such evidence might include:

- the view in Source A is that it was 'through Garibaldi alone' that the revolution succeeded. Garibaldi is the true hero, far superior to the unrealistic Mazzini and the 'deceitful' Cavour. The view in Source B is very different, taking a negative stance against Garibaldi's 'arrogant', 'insolent' personality
- Source A admires, not only Garibaldi's ideals and courage but also his effectiveness. He is the 'only one who understood the real situation', 'brave' and a man of action. Source B is much less admiring. He is 'unpopular' and 'dangerous'
- the attitudes to Piedmont are different. In Source A, Piedmont is deceitful but Source B regards Garibaldi as 'dangerous' and argues that Piedmont was justified in opposing Garibaldi.

To address 'how far' they should also indicate some similarity between the sources, for example:

- although the sources are written from opposite standpoints, both agree Garibaldi was a mighty man of action and that he was seen as a hero in the eyes of many people
- implicitly, they both agree there were reasons for tension between Garibaldi and Piedmont.

Students may use own knowledge to develop their comparison of the sources. This might include:

- knowledge of the conflicts between key personalities and the underlying reasons for these conflicts
- assessment of which source is more 'correct' in its views and why.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may comment on the differences in the nature of the sources, with Source A written by an Italian a century after the contemporary account by a French diplomat in Source B – but this must be **used** as exemplified comparison, not merely literal stock speculation.

Question 1

02 Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How important was Piedmont to the achievement of Italian unification in the years 1849 to 1861? **[24 marks]**

Target: AO1(b), AO2(a), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may comprise an undeveloped mixture of the two. They may contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**

L2: Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may contain a mixture of the two. They may be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the focus of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**

L3: Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question using evidence from **both** the sources **and** own knowledge. They will provide some assessment backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

L4: Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

L5: Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

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.

The focus of this question is on the reasons why the cause of Italian unification advanced so successfully between defeat in 1848–1849 and the triumphs of 1860–1861. Good answers will address the start and end dates. The wording of the question (how important) allows for answers that focus entirely on Cavour and the Piedmont monarchy but many students may also discuss the relative importance of Garibaldi, Mazzini or a range of other factors.

The key dates of the question should be addressed. The starting date of 1849 opens up the idea of lessons learned about the senselessness of revolutionary schemes in the first wave of revolutions. The end date of 1861 marks the successful completion (at least partially) of unification according to Cavour's policies).

The sources provide much evidence, both explicit and implicit:

- **Source A** – Piedmont is 'deceitful' and a hindrance to the great work of Garibaldi. Garibaldi is the 'only one who understood' – by firm implication Cavour and Piedmont did not.
- **Source B** – admits that Garibaldi was extremely important but ends up being fiercely critical of his arrogance and 'boundless pride'. The French diplomat clearly sides with the parliament in Turin and the King – and implies that Piedmont was successful and (right) in sidelining Garibaldi and relying on the political realism of Cavour.
- **Source C** – suggests Cavour was all-important because he was 'the genius of the period' who 'carried out the most amazing miracle' – and, implicitly, credits Cavour for the fact that the monarchy made 'republican heroism' (ie Garibaldi) unnecessary. On the other hand, Source C also offers evidence about other factors, such as 'foreign events and coincidences' – and the clever tactics of a small minority might well be expanded to include more than Cavour.

Effective answers will **use** the source-evidence in the context of own knowledge to provide a clear argument and assessment in response to the question, rather than simply assembling relevant material in a literal, second-hand fashion.

Points from own knowledge to support the view Piedmont was important might include:

- Cavour was the key political influence and his role as prime minister of Piedmont was vital, especially in diplomacy
- Piedmont's economic modernisation made it the natural base for the advancement of unification (such as the founding of the Italian National Society in Turin)
- the Piedmont monarchy was essential for the political moves towards unification
- Piedmont was the only Italian state with a significant army
- the actions of Cavour in 1858 to 1860 were decisive.

Points suggesting other factors were important might include:

- the role of Mazzini in fostering the ideals of unity
- the role of Garibaldi, the man of action who made events happen and pushed Cavour much further than he wanted to go
- the importance of foreign support, without which Cavour could not have achieved anything

- the weaknesses of the old regimes (especially in the South) that provided the essential opportunity for unification to be pushed through.

One feature of high-quality answers may be differentiated judgment – for example of the degree to which Cavour's importance stemmed from his own personal skills and contribution rather than from the strengths of Piedmont as a state.

Question 2

03 Explain why revolution spread across Italy in 1848–1849. **[12 marks]**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

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.

The focus of the question is on the **spread across Italy** of revolution, not just its outbreak. Answers should be able to present a range of reasons for the spread of revolution across Italy in 1848. This may include a focus on Mazzini or on the wider context – why specific circumstances in 1848 made people receptive to ideas of revolution.

Possible reasons might include:

- the personal role and charisma of Mazzini – Mazzini was famous by 1848 as a hero in exile. He had founded ‘Young Italy’ in 1831 and encouraged numerous revolts and acts of protest. He gathered a lot of international support while in exile in London and Paris and his letters and writings were widely circulated (such as his open letter to Pius IX)
- the ‘chain reaction’ of events in 1848 – how and why local revolts in the South became linked to developments in Milan, Piedmont, Rome and Venice

- longer-term and more general reasons: the development of liberal, nationalist and revolutionary ideals in Italy and the rest of Europe by 1848 made people receptive
- short-term local factors: the opportunity offered by Bourbon weakness in the South and Austrian weakness further north meant that revolution spread because government authority was weak.

One feature of higher-level answers may be the ability to make links between the various factors involved, perhaps explaining how national feeling since 1831 connected with the events of 1848; perhaps analysing in depth the weaknesses of conservative regimes.

Question 2

- 04** 'The 1848–1849 revolutions in Italy failed because they lacked a single unifying leader.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. **[24 marks]**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

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.

The focus of this question is on the factors causing the failure of the revolutions across Italy in 1848–1849, as the original high hopes aroused by the uprisings were crushed by the forces of reaction. Many students will largely agree with the key quotation; but others may argue that although disunity among the leaders was important, other factors were more significant.

Evidence in support of the lack of a unifying leader might include:

- Pius IX's allocution deprived the revolution of its one genuinely national leader
- Italy (and the course of the revolutions) was so geographically disparate that a unifying leader was really needed
- the aims of the leaders were badly split between moderates and radicals
- personal and regional rivalries were never subordinated to a single national movement.

Evidence to challenge the importance of divided leadership and to point towards other, more significant factors might include:

- Austrian military power was too great – the early success of the revolutions depended on a temporary moment of crisis for Austria and once Radetsky organised his counter-measures there was only one outcome
- the fact that the revolutions could not rely on an effective armed force – Charles Albert, although he did have the Piedmontese army, was a poor commander
- many elements within the Risorgimento were unrealistic and too extreme – even if someone like Mazzini **had** become a unifying leader there was no practical political plan
- the influence of foreign powers (such as the French actions in Rome) would have crushed the revolutions anyway – unification was only achieved in 1859–1861 with foreign backing that did not exist in 1848–1849
- the fact there was no mass popular support that any 'unifying leader' could have mobilised – the revolution only involved a narrow educated elite.

Question 3

05 Explain why Piedmont made an alliance with Prussia in 1866. **[12 marks]**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

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.

The alliance between Prussia and Italy was completed in April 1866. Answers will need to identify and explain a range of reasons why the new Italian state decided to make this alliance, such as:

- Italy was very eager to make further progress in ‘completing’ Italian unification – deemed unfinished in 1861. An alliance with Prussia was aimed at gaining diplomatic and military support for the incorporation of Venetia into the kingdom of Italy
- Bismarck was very willing to make allies ahead of his planned war against Austria
- Napoleon III gave strong encouragement to Italy signing the treaty. Napoleon’s diplomacy ‘brokered’ the deal after a meeting with Bismarck in October 1865; he also promised Italy that he would make an agreement with Austria by which Venetia would be given to France (and then handed over to Italy)
- it can be argued that Bismarck’s Prussia was a natural ally for Italy; they were the two ‘unification states’ of Europe in the 1860s (many historians have regarded Cavour as ‘Italy’s Bismarck’).

To reach the higher levels, answers will need to show how different factors were interrelated (for example how the European diplomatic situation provided an ideal opportunity for Italy) or by differentiated assessment.

Question 3

- 06** 'In the years 1866 to 1871, Italy gained merely the outward appearance of national unity.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. **[24 marks]**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

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.

The key quotation says firmly that the new Italy did not achieve true national unity by 1871. Many students are likely to agree with this proposition, claiming that many outstanding issues remained unsolved, with serious internal divisions between North and South and between Church and State. Some answers will challenge the key quotation, arguing that the territorial acquisitions of Venetia in

1866 and perhaps especially the incorporation of Rome as capital in 1870 really **did** complete the process of unification, building on the legacy left by Cavour and Garibaldi. There are many possibilities here and supporting evidence may be selective rather than comprehensive.

(NB It is likely that many answers will look back to 1860–1861, or even earlier – this can be a valid approach but the main focus must be on 1866 to 1871.)

Possible arguments in favour of the view that unification **was** successfully completed might include:

- gaining Venetia was a success – it had long been a goal of Italian nationalists – the events of 1866 expanded the borders of Italy and brought one of the historic cultural Italian cities into the new state
- gaining Rome and the Papal States was a major territorial success, ‘filling the geographical gap’ between North and South
- the King of Piedmont was confirmed as the national leader of all Italy, giving political unity
- in 1870–1871, important steps were taken to establish the national constitution and to ‘Piedmontise’ the government and administration in the South
- Rome was incorporated as, the ‘natural’ capital of the nation – Garibaldi had failed to win Rome in 1860, 1862 and 1867 but now it had been successfully achieved
- the capture of Rome in 1870 removed two major obstacles to a unified state – the French troops garrisoned in Rome since 1849 were finally gone and the Papacy had been defeated in his power struggle against the new liberal, anticlerical government. The state had won; the Church had lost.

Evidence supporting the view that unification was **not** complete and that real unity was still a long way off might include:

- Venetia was only gained in 1866 through the power and diplomacy of foreign powers – the Italian state was shown to be militarily and politically weak
- the way Garibaldi was blocked in his attempt to seize Rome in 1867 showed the continuing internal divisions in Italy
- the ‘Brigands War’ of the 1860s showed how alienated the South was and how much Piedmontese domination was resented – the gap between North and South remained wide by 1871, in the economy, the class structure and even in language
- many people outside Piedmont felt little loyalty to Victor Emmanuel as King
- there were still divisions between the leaders of the Risorgimento – for example Mazzini was deeply disappointed by the failure to live up to nationalist and republican ideals
- the Pope may have been defeated but retained great influence – Pius IX ensured that the divisions between Church and State remained deep and hostile from 1870 onwards, down to 1929.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion