

A-LEVEL HISTORY

Unit HIS2K: A New Roman Empire? Mussolini's Italy, 1922–1945
Mark scheme

1041
June 2014

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

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

HIS2K: A New Roman Empire? Mussolini's Italy, 1922–1945

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 reasons for Italy's invasion of Abyssinia in 1935. **[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.

Students will need to identify differences between the views of the two sources. For example:

- Source A stresses that Italy invaded Abyssinia because of restored pride and vitality through the 'efforts of Fascism and the Duce', whereas Source B stresses the economic reasons for the invasion, 'economic perception of the war' and the propaganda generated by the regime about 'fighting for its share of territory and resources'

- Source A does put forward a range of reasons for the invasion from population growth desire for territory, raw materials, greater confidence due to Fascist policies, whilst Source B just focuses on the economic dimension for the invasion.

Students will need to apply their own knowledge of context to explain these differences. They might, for example, refer to:

- Source A is a contemporary source published in 1937, clearly designed for the purposes of indoctrinating Italian school children. Therefore as it is written from a Fascist perspective it emphasises the transformation of Italy into a nation able to 'compete with the Great Nations of Europe and the world'
- Source B is written by a historian in 2004 who has the benefit of hindsight, not taken in by the Fascist regime's attempts to justify the invasion of Abyssinia through a sense of moral justice against the 'richer imperialist powers'
- the impact of World War One on Italian foreign policy, the 'mutilated victory' which Fascist propaganda used to justify imperialist aggression and the Allies denying Italy promised colonies
- Italy's lack of an empire due to it being a newly formed nation and 'losing' out to nations like Britain, France and Germany in the Scramble for Africa.

To address 'how far', students should also indicate some similarity between the sources. For example:

- Whilst Source B does stress the economic motives for the invasion it also stresses that the Fascist regime had enabled the recovery of the Italian economy. Source A also looks at the positive impact of Fascist policies, in a much more exaggerated way, 'emboldened by ten years of stern Fascist discipline'
- Source A agrees to some extent that there was an economic motive behind the invasion of Ethiopia as it mentions 'lack of raw materials to advance industries'
- Sources A and B agree that the Fascist justification for the invasion was one driven by a sense of correcting an historical unfairness; that Italy was just fighting for her due entitlement from the Allied powers. As Source A states 'What did the Italian people ask? Nothing more than they are owed', whilst Source B agrees that 'Italy was fighting for its share of territory and resources'.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may conclude that the provenance of Source A is key, as it attempts to justify Italy's invasion of Abyssinia through historical grievances and a glorification of the Fascist regime.

Question 1

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

How important was the invasion of Abyssinia in shaping Italian foreign policy in the years 1935 to 1940? **[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.

Students should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Students should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A** refers to the long term factors which shaped Italian foreign policy including the, 'profound sense of injustice towards the Allies after the Great War'. There is also reference to the 'tradition of Rome', i.e. Italian foreign policy was driven by a Fascist desire to recreate the glory of the Roman Empire. However, another key factor is revealed, the self confidence embedded by the Fascist regime, Italy was 'emboldened' and had undergone a 'spiritual rebirth' due to Fascism. Therefore Abyssinia was important in illustrating Italy's new confidence and drive to be a European/world power.
- **Source B** explains how the Fascist regime itself saw Italy 'fighting for its share of territory and resource at the expense of the richer imperialist powers,' re-emphasising the long standing discontent with Britain and France. However, B's core argument is that Fascist foreign policy was shaped by economic considerations, that an expansionist foreign policy, through the invasion of Abyssinia could stimulate the domestic economy fuelling economic recovery post the Great Depression.
- **Source C** illustrates how Abyssinia 'worsened relations with Britain and France.' This source sees Abyssinia as a major turning point in Italy's foreign policy as it 'left Mussolini at a diplomatic crossroads.'

From students' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting the invasion of Abyssinia was the most important factor in shaping Italy's foreign policy might include:

- Mussolini increasingly saw the democratic powers of Britain and France as weak. The Stresa Front of 1935 encouraged Mussolini to believe he would get away with further aggression. The weakness of Britain and France was further revealed in their lack of action against German expansion into the Rhineland. His decision to invade Abyssinia (1935) Albania (1939) was a typical example of this
- British and French reactions to the Italian invasion of Abyssinia, which included putting pressure on the League of Nations to impose economic sanctions and numerous public statements condemning Italian aggression, soured the previous working relationship between the nations. Consequently Italy sought an alternative ally in the form of Nazi Germany
- Mussolini saw Fascist intervention in Spain (1936 to 1939) as a way to prove ideological superiority over the democratic powers, particularly France who had just elected a Socialist Popular Front government

- Mussolini held long-term grievances with Britain and France for curtailing Italy's ambitions for empire
- Mussolini saw France as Italy's major rival to control of the Mediterranean Sea which was fundamental to Italy's expansionist foreign policy, as shown in the signing of the Axis in 1936 which defined Italy's sphere of influence. A way to secure Italy's superiority over its British and French rivals was to find an alternative alliance with fellow Fascist powers.

Factors suggesting Abyssinia was not the most important factor in shaping Italian foreign policy might include:

- the Stresa Front (1935), Anglo-Italian talks of March 1938 and the Four Power Conference of 1938 are examples of Mussolini keeping his diplomatic options open. It can be argued that it was the attitude of statesmen in Britain and France which intensified rivalry between the countries, particularly the attitude of Anthony Eden
- Mussolini's ideology shaped Italian foreign policy; he increasingly marginalised Italian diplomats and took personal responsibility for international affairs
- Mussolini was increasingly seduced by Nazi Germany's increasing power, strength and expansionist aims, from the invasion of the Rhineland to his visit to Munich in September 1937. Italy's eventual entry into the war in May 1940 was spurred on by Germany's successful invasion of France and the Low countries
- alternatively it can be seen that rather than being in awe of Nazi Germany, Mussolini was frightened of German expansionism, signified by his acceptance of the Anschluss in 1938, delaying of a formal alliance until the Pact of Steel in May 1939 and shock at the August 1939 Nazi-Soviet Pact.

Good answers are likely to conclude that Italian foreign policy was shaped by a number of different factors; primarily by Mussolini's ambition and expansionist aims which led to the invasion of Abyssinia.

Question 2

03 Explain why the Fascists restricted female employment in the 1930s. **[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 include a range of reasons as to why the Fascist regime imposed a quota system restricting female employment in the 1930s.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- there was clear ideological hostility to female employment within the Fascist regime. For the Fascists, a woman's place was in the home as a submissive wife and mother, not in the work place
- economic reasons were also key to the timing of the restrictions placed upon female employment. The Great Depression increased pressure on the regime to provide jobs for men. Men were viewed as the main breadwinners. Therefore in 1933 the state imposed a 10% maximum employment quota on women in all State business and economic enterprises
- in the short term the increasing radicalisation of the regime from 1936 saw the extension of the employment restrictions on women to include private enterprise by 1938

- the restrictions on female employment was an accepted practice throughout Europe in the 1920s and 1930s which tapped into existing norms of patriarchy
- during the 1930s the relationship between the Catholic Church and the regime had become rocky with disputes over youth groups in 1931 and the Race Laws in 1938. By reiterating the traditional Catholic perspective on female employment, the regime was hoping to maintain the influential support from the Catholic Church which was essential for control of the Italian population.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might explain how Fascist ideology with regards to female employment was a crucial factor in securing the support of the Catholic Church, whilst restricting women in employment during a time of economic crisis was a practical necessity to maintain more influential male support for the regime.

Question 2

- 04** 'Mussolini's social policies successfully created a nation of loyal Fascists.'
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.

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not.

Evidence which agree(s) might include:

- an evaluation of the following: the Dopolavoro (OND), the Balilla and other youth organisations, Art and Culture (including cinema, radio and sport), propaganda and indoctrination (including the cult of the Duce), race policies from 1938
- 1929 plebiscite in Italy saw 90% of the population vote for Fascism following Mussolini's successful negotiation with the Catholic Church in the Lateran Treaties. Mussolini was hailed as the man who brought Italy back to God
- membership of the PNF increased from 300,000 in 1921 to 1.5 million in 1933, 2.5 million in 1939 suggesting support
- Mussolini was hailed as a new Roman Emperor following the conquest of Ethiopia in 1936, arguably he was at the peak of his popular support
- support was strong at first but declined from the Abyssinian war onwards
- Dopolavoro was one of the big successes of the regime because of its growth in membership to over 4 million by 1939
- ONB had a membership of 8.5 million by 1939
- cinema was highly popular; 2 million regularly listened to the radio
- there was no widespread resistance or opposition to the regime or Mussolini in the 1920s and 1930s.

Evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- there were 4 assassination attempts on Mussolini between 1925 and 1926
- the failure of the battle for births as the number of births per 1,000 population fell from 26.7 in 1930 to 23.5 in 1940. In general the regime's policies towards women were unpopular with Italian females
- many industrial workers were dissatisfied with conditions, strikes were organised during the depths of the Depression in the industrialised North
- the need for repression by the heavy hand of the secret police showed people were not really loyal in their support (this is also indicated by obsessively worried in-house police reports)
- many Italians disliked Mussolini accepting German-style race laws in 1938
- whilst many Italians outwardly conformed with fascist social policies there was little inner conviction as demonstrated by the populations reluctance to go to war with Ethiopia in 1935, resistance to the Spanish Civil War and growing close relationship with Nazi Germany.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that in reality there was widespread passive acceptance of the regime in the 1920s and 1930s. However, support for Mussolini through the cult of Il Duce was largely unwavering until 1938. The more defined the response is in terms of the different sections of Italian society i.e. youth, women, working class, middle class etc the higher the level to be rewarded.

Question 3

05 Explain why the Fascist state finally collapsed in April 1945. **[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 include a range of reasons as to why the Fascist state finally collapsed in April 1945.

Students might include some of the following long term-factors:

- the failure to create a nation of loyal Fascists through propaganda and social policies meant that there was very little popular support for the Salo Republic and Mussolini. Defeats in Greece and North Africa ensured Italians had lost faith in Mussolini's abilities as a war leader.
- the Fascist regime failed to crush opposition to the regime, forcing opposition groups underground into hiding and into exile. Communist cells operated in Northern Italian cities during the 1930s. When Mussolini was dismissed in July 1943 opposition re-emerged to battle against the remnants of the Fascist regime. The Communist partisans in particular were key to the removal of Mussolini in April 1945.

And some of the following short-term/immediate factors:

- Mussolini's failing health meant that he no longer lived up to the mythical prowess of Il Duce. Many Italians were loyal to him in the 1920s and 1930s, not the Fascist regime. His failing health meant that he was rarely seen in public as head of the Salo Republic and most importantly he failed to curb Nazi atrocities against Italians, losing him critical popular support
- Mussolini was the 'puppet' leader of the Salo Republic propped up by the Nazis, all confidence in him as an independent arbiter of Italian interests was lost
- the Allied and partisan campaigns to defeat the German occupation of Italy, led to the retreat of Nazi forces and the collapse of military support for the Salo Republic and hence the safety of Mussolini's position.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given.

Question 3

- 06** 'Italy's poor war effort in the years 1940 to 1943 was because of economic factors.'
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.

Students should be able to make a judgement about the impact of Italy's economy on her war effort.

Points/factors/evidence which agree(s) might include:

- Italy's economy had lagged behind the major European powers of Britain, France and Germany since the 19th century. Mussolini had made some ground up, but Italy's industrial capabilities and her ability to feed the nation was by no means on a par with the rest of Europe in 1940
- the Italian economy had been drained by several small wars of conflict (Abyssinia, Spain, Albania) which took its toll on Italian readiness for war in 1940
- Plans for Autarky had failed and Italy was reliant on Germany for supplies of iron and coal which impacted on the effectiveness of Italian industry and war preparations. Therefore Italy was not ready for the 'total' nature of the Second World War
- Despite the propaganda message, the Corporate State failed to reinvigorate and centralise the Italian economy so that it would be ready for mass industrial output necessary for war.
- lack of industrial capability meant that Italy did not have a stockpile of weaponry and resources necessary for Total War. Italy's armed forces were poorly equipped in comparison the Allies; a lack of right equipment often led to military disaster and defeat e.g. lack of sand filters in the North African desert and summer uniforms to march to Moscow in winter.

Points/factors/evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- it can be argued that Italy's economy had made significant improvements in the 1930s. However, these improvements in terms of modernisation and industrialisation had been wasted by Mussolini's over ambitious foreign policy, particularly the gruelling war of occupation in Abyssinia and the Spanish Civil War which 'bled Italy white'
- the poor war effort was not just caused by a lack of equipment. Italy's armed forces were uncoordinated and institutional rivalry between the army, air force and navy had led to a lack of planning and consolidation. For example, Italy did not develop aircraft carriers as the navy and air force would not work together, essential equipment in modern warfare centred around the Mediterranean
- the poor war effort was also caused by Mussolini's poor leadership. He failed to enforce cooperation between the armed services. He failed to recognise the strategic importance of Malta. He demobilised troops in October 1940 then a week later ordered an attack on Greece. Italy fought on too many fronts, the Mediterranean, North Africa and Russia; her inadequate forces were spread too thinly
- Allied bombing raids on Italian cities were seriously detrimental to Italy's war production and cut it by 20%. Therefore Allied tactics exacerbated Italy's economic problems
- Fascist propaganda proved ineffective at boosting morale, moreover Mussolini only made four big speeches during the course of the war. Failure of propaganda was symptomatic of a Fascist regime in crisis, national morale crumbled from 1942
- Italy's fortunes in war were tied closely to her ally, Nazi Germany. 1942 saw the tide of the war turn against the Axis powers after El Alamein in North Africa. Whilst surrender at Stalingrad in February 1943 saw the Axis in retreat
- the Americans entering the war in December 1941 and Mussolini's declaration of war upon them proved fatal to Italy as it was American and British troops who invaded Italy during Operation Husky.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that Italy was economically unprepared for total war. The weak economy impacted upon Italy's armed forces. However, there is evidence that the armed forces fought bravely with the limited resources they had, what was lacking was a lack of co-ordinated military command structure and that was the direct responsibility of Mussolini as

Commander-in-Chief on all fronts. Moreover, Mussolini's quest for military and imperial greatness was unrealistic and severely damaged Italy's readiness for war (a fact he recognised in 1939 when he declared Italy 'non-belligerent'). Ultimately it can be convincingly argued that Italy's poor war effort was the sole responsibility of Il Duce, not economic factors.

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