

A-LEVEL HISTORY

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

1041
June 2014

Version V1.0 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

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 2014

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 the King's entry into Rome. **[12 marks]**

Target: AO2(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 a direct comparison of two views of Victor Emmanuel's rather belated first visit to Rome, his new capital, in December 1870, three months after Italian troops seized control there. Effective answers will be enhanced by the use of own knowledge of the context. Weaker responses will make literal use of the sources, with only limited comparison.

Evidence to explain the differences between the views of the sources might include:

- the view in **Source A** is from an admiring contemporary biography of the King. It has a gushing and uncritical tone: 'no Roman Emperor ever made...'; the King's words revealed

‘his great spirit’. The view in **Source B**, from a historian writing slightly later, is negative and more cynical: ‘in the fashion of a traveller after a boring journey’; ‘muttered in Piedmontese’

- **Source A** claims ‘the whole city was excited’; ‘expressed enthusiasm in a thousand ways’. **Source B** talks about ‘so little attention’; ‘hardly anybody’; ‘poor wretches’.

To address ‘how far’ that should also indicate some similarity between the sources, for example:

- although the sources are written from opposite standpoints, both agree the event was ‘momentous’
- they both agree the King said ‘we are finally here’.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may address the contrast in mood, tone and emphasis, not just the literal meaning of specific words and phrases. Others may comment in the light of own knowledge, perhaps suggesting that Source B is more convincing because it reflects how Victor Emmanuel was so slow to visit his new capital and treated it as part of a foreign country (he had, after all, opposed Garibaldi’s earlier efforts to win the city); or perhaps evaluating the nature of the sources, with Source A a blatant piece of hagiography compared with the more critical approach in Source B.

Question 1

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

How successful were the leaders of the Risorgimento in completing the process of Italian unification in the years 1861 to 1871? **[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 degree of success that was achieved in completing the process of unification after the unfinished victories of 1858–61. The key dates of the question should be addressed. Source C makes links back to 1861 and the ‘constructive acts’ of Cavour and others; but narrative description of the events in 1858–1860 will be of little relevance or value. The end date of 1871 allows for at least a short retrospective view of the consequences of unification after 1870.

*Some students may use later developments in Italian history to back up their assessments of the degree of success gained by 1871. If this is argued effectively, it should be rewarded appropriately – but it is **not** a requirement.

The sources provide much evidence, both explicit and implicit:

- **Source A** is focused rather narrowly on the issue of Rome in 1870 but provides implicit evidence in favour of real success having been achieved – links made to the great past history of the Roman Empire; ‘whole city’; ‘enthusiasm and gratitude’; ‘long been my heartfelt desire’.
- **Source B** admits that the acquisition of Rome was an important event but refutes the idea of true unity having been achieved – ‘hardly anybody turned up’; ‘poor wretches’ not ‘respectable citizens’; the King speaks privately in Piedmontese, not Italian.
N.B. Many of the pieces of evidence in these two sources will be more effective if used in conjunction with own knowledge, not merely by literal extrapolation.
- **Source C** has much to support the idea of success – it states flatly that the Risorgimento ‘was completed’; Rome is ‘the capital of united Italy’; Italy is ‘resurgent’; Mazzini’s dream ‘had been realised in his lifetime’; Cavour’s principles had been ‘put into practice’. On the other hand, Source C points out significant shortfalls – Tyrol and Venezia Giulia remain outside the new state; the attitude of the Pope and the Church is going to be hostile and divisive far into the future.

Students should use the source-evidence in the context of own knowledge of the process of unification from 1861 to 1871.

Plainly, considerable success **was** achieved – Venetia in 1866, the Papal States in 1870, the departure of French occupying troops and the incorporation of Rome as historic capital (and thus the defeat of the Papacy). On the other hand, success was far from total. Italia Irredenta still remained outside the new state; there were significant internal divisions in geography, politics, economics and religion such as the deep divisions between North and South, the narrow and unrepresentative nature of the political system; the lingering rivalries and resentments affecting former leaders such as Mazzini and Garibaldi.

Question 2

03 Explain why revolutions spread rapidly across Italy in 1848. **[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.

Answers should be able to present a range of reasons why the 1848 revolutions in Italy spread so quickly after the original outbreak in Sicily. The initial successes of 1848 included revolts against Bourbon rule in Two Sicilies, republican movements in Rome and Venice, the Five Days in Milan and Charles Albert's invasion of Lombardy. One feature of good answers may be sound knowledge of these events but this is not a requirement – the main focus of the question is on the **reasons why** the revolutions were successful in the early stages.

Possible reasons might include longer term issues such as:

- Austrian weakness
- the unpopularity of Bourbon rule
- the influence of Young Italy and Mazzinian ideas of a national uprising
- the desire for constitutional change
- the (mistaken) belief from 1846 that Pope Pius IX was a liberal

Short-term local factors might include:

- the Five Days in Milan
- Piedmont being invited to intervene in Lombardy
- the devious personal motives of rulers such as Charles Albert of Piedmont, supporting moderate revolution because they were afraid of radical republicanism
- economic problems.

One feature of good answers may be explaining how the various factors were interconnected; or perhaps by analysing the mixed motives of people such as Pius IX and Charles Albert; or showing how revolution was pushed forward by idealism that was powerful, if short-term.

Question 2

- 04** 'The 1848–49 revolutions in Italy failed because they lacked popular support.'
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 1848–49, 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 lack of popular support was important, other factors were more significant.

Evidence in support of the lack of mass popular support might include:

- the leaders of Risorgimento (apart from Garibaldi perhaps) were from a narrow, privileged elite, with little understanding of what the masses wanted
- Italy had little geographical, political or linguistic unity, so most ordinary people were either indifferent to the revolutions or motivated by purely local grievances – so that personal and regional rivalries were never subordinated to a single national movement
- the Pope's allocution of April 1848 was a barrier holding back mass Catholic support.

Evidence to emphasise the greater significance of other 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 regular army – most of the rebels were ill-equipped volunteers and 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 Mazzini inspired nationalist ideals there was no credible plan of action
- the influence of foreign powers (such as the French actions in Rome) would have crushed the revolutions anyway – unification was only achieved by 1860 through foreign support that did not exist in 1848–49.

One feature of high-quality answers may be in differentiation: between times and places where there **was** popular support, at least initially, as against general indifference from the masses elsewhere: or between the relative importance of key factors other than popular support. Less effective answers will provide more of a catalogue of a range of causes of failure, without precise links to the core issue.

Question 3

05 Explain why Garibaldi invaded Naples and Sicily in 1860. **[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.

Garibaldi invaded Sicily in 1860 and then moved on to invade the mainland kingdom of Naples. This risky gamble seemed unlikely to succeed but Garibaldi's stunning victories made him a national hero. This question is focused on the reasons why Garibaldi acted as he did, **not** on the reasons why he succeeded, or on the consequences that followed.

Possibilities include:

- longer-term factors such as memories of the dreams of 1848; or the weaknesses and unpopularity of Bourbon rule
- Garibaldi was a romantic revolutionary with prior experience of guerrilla warfare in South America – he loved the idea of leading idealistic volunteers in a battle against the odds
- Garibaldi was a radical republican and was suspicious of the intentions of Cavour and Victor Emmanuel (he was also a bitter rival of Mazzini) – he wanted to push events along so that Cavour and the King could be 'bounced' into supporting the cause of unification of all Italy, not just the North

- Garibaldi did not like the prominent role of foreign powers in 1858–60 and wanted to take direct action so Italy would be ‘made by Italians’.

To reach the higher levels, answers will need to make links and add depth of comment – perhaps balancing Garibaldi’s idealism against his desire for glory and political power.

Question 3

- 06** 'By his actions in the years 1858 to 1861 Cavour betrayed the nationalist ideals of the Risorgimento.'
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 states firmly the view that Cavour manipulated the course of unification to suit Piedmont rather than Italy, thus betraying the ideals of Italian nationalism represented above all by Garibaldi. Many students are likely to agree, focusing their arguments on Cavour's secret

diplomacy with Napoleon III and his actions to block Garibaldi in 1860. There are strong arguments that Cavour did not want a unification of the whole of Italy, only an expanded North Italy dominated by Piedmont. On the other hand, many answers will challenge the thrust and tone of the quotation, taking a more benign view of Cavour's motives as a skilful political realist. As usual, the requirement is balanced argument, supported by precisely selected evidence.

Possible arguments in favour of the quotation might include:

- Cavour's secret diplomacy with the French Emperor involved giving away Nice and Savoy, which infuriated nationalists like Mazzini
- Cavour only ever pretended, in public, to support Garibaldi's conquests in the South. Behind the scenes he sent numerous agents to try to undermine Garibaldi (this is what provoked Garibaldi to make a furious attack on Cavour in Parliament in April 1861)
- Cavour even kept Victor Emmanuel, the King of Piedmont, in the dark about his plans
- Cavour was interested in Piedmontese domination, politically and economically. He only reluctantly supported unification of North and South after Garibaldi forced him into it by his successful invasion
- many people outside Piedmont felt little loyalty to Victor Emmanuel as King (or were republicans) but Cavour manipulated the situation to ensure Victor Emmanuel was crowned King of Italy.

Evidence supporting an opposing view might include:

- Cavour was not motivated by 'narrow self-interest' but by hard-headed realism about what was practical and achievable
- he did not 'betray the ideals' of the Risorgimento – those ideals were contradictory and unrealistic anyway
- without Cavour's skilled diplomacy, unification would have been impossible
- the political and economic domination of united Italy by Piedmont was inevitable because there was no plausible alternative
- Cavour really believed in liberal democracy, economic modernisation and a 'free Church in a free state'. His ideals were as much the 'ideals of the Risorgimento' as anyone else's.

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