

AS
HISTORY
7041/2L

Italy and Fascism, c1900–1945

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

Mark scheme

June 2019

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

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

Italy and Fascism, c1900–1945

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

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining Mussolini's response to the murder of Matteotti? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

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

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

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

Provenance and tone

- this is the official transcript of Mussolini's speech to the Chamber of Deputies. The date is significant because Mussolini was coming under intense pressure due to revelations about the murder of Matteotti, linking it to the Fascist Party and even to Mussolini directly
- the audience is both inside the Chamber and the Italian people and the outside world more broadly. The atmosphere is very supportive of Mussolini. This was partly because the opposition deputies had left the Chamber to form the Aventine Secession
- the tone is bombastic and it emphasises resolve and that Mussolini is now taking charge. For example, he says 'the problem will be resolved'. The oratory contains exaggeration, for example, 'in all areas', 'Everyone must realise', and 'my unlimited and mighty love'.

Content and argument

- Mussolini argues that stronger government is necessary to bring peace to Italy. He suggests that he would not necessarily have chosen this route but it was being forced on him. This could be contextually supported with the Matteotti Crisis, the revelations about Fascist involvement and the attitude of the more radical fascists
- Mussolini assumes responsibility for what has happened, without actually mentioning Matteotti or apologising. It was a bold move which both overcame the threat to his premiership, by reassuring Liberals and Conservatives that Mussolini was in charge and not the thugs, and moved Italy towards dictatorship ('by force if necessary')
- the value of the source lies not in the content at face value; Mussolini is justifying himself and certainly did have a 'lust for power'. It does show us that Mussolini could command with his oratory, used effective propaganda, and, due to the withdrawal of the opposition, had considerable support in the Chamber for stronger government.

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

Provenance and tone

- The Times is an independent newspaper published in a democratic state. The writer was a specialist correspondent who can be assumed to be informed about Italian politics. It is likely to be against the move towards dictatorship taken by Mussolini
- the date is significant, it comments on the measures taken after Mussolini's speech (Source A), calling it Mussolini's 'New Policy'
- the tone is severely critical of Mussolini, stressing that the changes are not necessary and amount to a sudden U-turn from previous policy. It refers to the 'unhappy country of Italy' with a 'complicated political system', and Mussolini imposing 'martial law' and taking 'drastic control' over the press.

Content and argument

- the argument of the source is that Mussolini responded by imposing a dictatorship in order to save himself. Contextual support could be offered on the Matteotti murder, the opposition to Mussolini, the pressure from the party and Mussolini's vulnerable position as PM
- it also argues that this is a sudden change of policy. Up until January 1925, Mussolini had condemned the Matteotti murder. He was abandoning his 'twin-track' approach, which had offered perhaps a route back to democracy ('normalisation'). Instead, Mussolini restricted the press, banned other political parties and freedom of association by the end of 1925
- the value of this source is in giving an independent and informed view which can be corroborated with knowledge of Mussolini's vulnerability at the time. It suggests that at least some foreign correspondents were aware of what Mussolini was up to and that the foreign press took a close interest in Italian politics.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might consider that Source B contains the more reliable information at face value, although the journalist would be likely to be a supporter of democracy. It could be concluded that Mussolini's response was in order to save Mussolini's regime, not for the good of the nation. On the other hand, Source A is valuable in showing how Mussolini operated as a politician and how much support he had in the Chamber of Deputies. We might conclude that Mussolini's survival was assisted by the withdrawal of the opposition.

Section B

02 'The divisions between the North and the South were Italy's most significant weakness in 1900.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Arguments suggesting that the divisions between the North and the South were Italy's most significant weakness in 1900 might include:

- the South was very poor and industrialisation was making the North richer. The South was dominated by inefficient agriculture and large estates and also suffered natural disasters. The significance of this was that the burden of taxation fell on the South and the government relied on deputies elected in the South who had little interest in further economic development
- there were significant cultural variations between North and South, for example levels of illiteracy, number of children in education and even dialect differences. The country did not appear unified
- the roads and railways in the North encouraged further economic development, which increased the gap between the regions, and the abolition of internal tariffs put the industry in the South in direct competition with the North and so reinforced the economic divide. The country was pulling apart
- the unification of Italy had been based on the northern states and the South did not feel a national identity.

Arguments challenging the view that the divisions between the North and the South were Italy's most significant weakness in 1900 might include:

- the more significant division was that between the Church and the State after unification. The South was more religious. The Pope instructed Catholics not to vote in elections, which weakened the democracy
- the limited electorate was more significant. Only 25% of adult males could vote and the government was dominated by the liberal (northern) elite. Corruption in elections was more common in the poor South, helping politicians such as Giolitti to manage 'trasformismo'. The political system was being challenged by the rise of socialism, based in the industrial North
- social divisions, between rich and poor, industrialist, landowner and industrial worker or rural peasant, were more important and cut across the North/South divide. There were two Italys: 'real' and 'legal' and the political class (legal Italy) imposed high taxes on the poor (real Italy)
- Italy's fundamental weakness was economic, in particular the lack of raw materials and the poor communication links. As the economy began to develop in the 1900s, the division between North and South became wider.

It could be concluded that the legacy of unification included a number of inter-related weaknesses. The North South divide is important as it relates to other factors. Equally it could be argued that there were other more significant divisions left by unification. Good understanding of key features will be reflected in the links made between the different factors, leading to a substantiated judgement.

03 'Italy's involvement in the First World War was a failure.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Arguments suggesting that Italy's involvement in the First World War was a failure might include:

- Italy's military record was a failure. It suffered a humiliating defeat to the Austrian army at Caporetto in 1917, after two years of stalemate. At Caporetto, 300 000 Italians were taken prisoner. Overall there were 600 000 war dead, with more than a million casualties
- the liberal government failed to organise Italy for war. There was a shortage of arms. There was no propaganda to raise morale at home or at the front. Little attention was paid to the welfare of the soldiers. Italy became more divided because of the war as the army was largely conscripted from the poor South
- the army leadership was a failure up to 1917. General Cadorna continued a policy of mass attacks of the trenches despite heavy losses. He blamed the troops for military failures. Thousands of soldiers were sentenced for desertion. This created resentment
- the aims of the war effort, as detailed in the Treaty of London 1915, were not fulfilled. The final victory only raised expectations which were then dashed. It was a 'mutilated victory'. The failure to gain African colonies and the control of Fiume were particularly resented.

Arguments challenging the view that Italy's involvement in the First World War was a failure might include:

- the Italian army gained a victory over the Austrians at Vittorio Veneto in 1918, taking 500 000 prisoners. This led to the Austrian armistice, so ultimately Italy was victorious
- after the defeat at Caporetto the government made changes and was more successful. General Diaz replaced Cadorna, morale was raised with the introduction of trench newspapers, and more leave for the soldiers. By 1918, the Italian army was much better supplied, for example they had more cannons than Britain
- victory was celebrated, at least in the short-term. The war brought more unity to Italy, for example the use of a common national language
- Italy made significant gains in the peace treaty, ultimately. The acquisition of Fiume was not in the Treaty of London. Italy gained Trentino, Trieste, Istria and the Brenner Pass. As a victorious power, Italy had access to reparations and a permanent place in the League of Nations.

Effective answers will relate Italy's war aims and expectations to the events and outcome of the war. It could be argued that the war showed that the Liberal government was weak and unable to create a unified and strong nation. It left Italy in a post-war crisis that was economic as well as political. Alternatively, that Italy was victorious in the war but this raised expectations of the peace to an unrealistic level, which was then exploited by the nationalists. The explicit linking of Italy's aims and expectations with the events of the war and its immediate consequences will demonstrate good understanding of key features and some conceptual awareness.