



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 2: HIS2K

A New Roman Empire?

Mussolini's Italy, 1922–1945

Mark Scheme

2009 examination - June series

This mark scheme uses the [new numbering system](#) which is being introduced for examinations from June 2010

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the operational exams.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2009 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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 candidates. 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 candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates 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. Candidates 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 candidates 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 candidate 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 candidates 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 candidates' 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*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate 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 candidate 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

Specimen Mark Scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards
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 Matteotti Affair of 1924. (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

The views differ, though not entirely, over the Matteotti Affair. According to De Grand in Source A, the crisis 'almost toppled Mussolini's government', and an outraged anti-fascist opposition was a serious danger. Duggan in Source B agrees up to a point ('his government was in serious danger') but suggests that the opposition from the left was rather weak – 'almost no protests or strikes'; 'the country seemed willing to give Mussolini the benefit of the doubt' – and the tone and emphasis are very different. On the danger to Mussolini from his conservative allies, De Grand suggests they were frightened of the consequences of direct action. Duggan emphasises the degree to which 'mainstream conservative opinion was still behind' Mussolini. The references to the King and the Vatican also indicate much more positive support for Mussolini than is shown in Source A. There are a couple of other differences of emphasis. Duggan shows Mussolini taking action to save himself and his regime; De Grand does not. De Grand seems to think the Left opposition was potentially powerful and could have made a difference but for an unwise tactic in the Aventine Secession; Duggan appears to ignore this

and says the only real danger came from the press. Overall similarities, of course, are quite strong – both sources agree there was a serious political problem, at least briefly, and that the key factor in Mussolini's survival was the willingness of the conservative elites to keep on collaborating with Mussolini. Both sources are modern, retrospective historical interpretations.

Question 1

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

How important was the use of violence and intimidation in the consolidation of Mussolini's Fascist regime between 1922 and 1929? (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**From the sources:**

Candidates wanting to see Mussolini's use of violence and intimidation as the key factor can make effective points from the direct evidence in Source A about the 1924 elections, the murder of Matteotti, secret police, the unions 'forced' to amalgamate etc. Two sources also have strong hints – the 'helpless' elites standing by in Source A, the elites being 'wary' and 'frightened' in Source B. But there is also evidence in the sources pointing in the opposite direction – the quote from Pius XI in Source A, the emphasis on co-operation from the elites in both De Grand and Duggan clearly suggesting that this was the key factor.

From own knowledge:

Candidates will need to take account of Mussolini's overall consolidation of power in order to answer this question effectively. Candidates will need to show a judgement by balancing the ways in which the statement is true and untrue. Many, perhaps most answers will support the key quotation, arguing that the real story of 1922 to 1929 was violence and intimidation (with a vital ingredient of the intimidation being propaganda) – referring to such things as the March on Rome, the Squadristi; the Matteotti Affair, the OVRA and the ruthless use of police powers, etc. Against this, there might be convincing arguments based on either or both of the following themes: that everything depended on a political deal with the 'old guard' political establishment figures such as the political parties, the monarchy and the army (and thus that violence and intimidation was a problem for Mussolini, not an asset) – or that the key reason was Mussolini's success in winning positive support. In other words, the propaganda of violence and threat was less important than the positive propaganda promises to restore Italian greatness and to save the country from national humiliation, or communist revolution, or both. It can be argued that most Italians actually liked most of the new regime's ideas and promises. They really believed Mussolini would bring something better than the inflation and industrial unrest in the post-war crisis and were ready to give Mussolini a chance to sort out the problems. Like Hitler in Germany, Mussolini was a charismatic leader. He gave hope and enthusiasm to youth and ex-soldiers, and to the unemployed. As usual, the key requirement is for a balanced but not necessarily even-handed approach, supported by appropriate evidence.

**Note that the end date is 1929, and that Source A gives prominence to the Concordat with the papacy. Some candidates may choose to play this down, arguing that the consolidation of power was completed earlier than 1929. But the key date should be observed, at least briefly. It was an important event, because it helped Mussolini to gain legitimacy. Some answers may link the Concordat to Mussolini's success in exploiting anti-Communism. Others may point out that Mussolini was still weak, that, even in 1929 he had to offer a lot of concessions in return for papal recognition.

Question 2

03 Explain why Mussolini launched the ‘Battle for Grain’ in 1925. (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

The focus of this question is ‘why?’ – the motives for doing so. Reward those who also comment about the timing – why in 1925? Some answers will explain the wider context, others will give close analysis of the policy decision in 1925. Either approach is valid and can score well but the very best responses will do both.

Mussolini was fairly lucky in coming to power in 1922, when the prospects of economic recovery were better. At first he relied on Liberal economic policies – but he was attracted to the idea of ‘economic battles’ to dramatise the impact of his regime. The Battle for Grain went together with other battles – for the Lira, for the Marshes, for Births. The main economic aims were to:

- increase cereal production to make Italy self-sufficient
- reduce the deficit in the balance of payment.

The main propaganda aims were to:

- make Italy less dependent on imports
- for national pride
- to be ready for war
- prove to the world Italy was a major power.

Mussolini launched the Battle in 1925 by placing high tariffs on imported grain. The government gave grants and subsidies to farmers to buy machinery and fertilisers. Propaganda and government grants encouraged farmers to bring new land under cultivation.

Question 2

- 04** 'Mussolini's economic policies in the years 1925 to 1939 were very successful.'
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

Mussolini wanted to boost the Italian economy, to reduce industrial disputes and make Italy self-sufficient and ready to engage in war. His policies included the economic 'battles' and other propaganda campaigns to energise people and to boost his popularity, the Corporate State, and the campaign for 'autarky' (self-sufficiency). Answers setting out to challenge Mussolini's claims to success have a lot of good ammunition – a lot of Fascist economic policy was propaganda

hot air, a lot of it was inefficient and expensive. Many historians have claimed that the Corporate State did little or nothing to improve economic conditions – that ‘it never existed at all except on paper’, or that Italy became almost self-sufficient in wheat production only at the expense of the rest of her agriculture; that interference by the Fascist regime held back economic growth and modernisation by giving too much power to producer interests and wasting any economic gains on stupid military over-spending.

On the other hand, it can indeed be argued that the economic battles made serious gains in terms of wheat production and the stabilisation of the currency, that there was a growth in industry, and that Italy suffered less badly and for shorter time than many advanced economies in the 1930s – a large number of French, British and American observers were very admiring of Mussolini’s economic achievements at this time. And it can be argued quite convincingly that Mussolini did pretty well up to 1935, when Italy invaded Abyssinia. Perhaps it was only after 1935 that Mussolini threw away the benefits of his considerable economic policy successes by his self-destructive foreign policies. As usual, the key requirement is for a balanced argument, backed by selective and well-applied evidence.

Question 3

05 Explain why, in June 1940, Mussolini decided to take Italy into the Second World War.

(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

The usual date for the start of the ‘Second World War’, September 1939, does not mean much in relation to Mussolini. He knew Italy was not ready for a major war (which was a European

one until it became a true world war at the end of 1941) and carefully stayed on the sidelines. Despite the Pact of Steel, it is not right to argue that Mussolini went to war 'because he was allied to Nazi Germany' – because Italy stayed out of the conflict in spite of pressure from Hitler. So did Franco's Spain. So the key date, June 1940, is important – why did Mussolini go to war at all? And why did he decide then rather than earlier?

Candidates should be ready to focus on a range of motives in the specific context of June 1940. The German invasion of France began on 10 May and swept rapidly west towards the Channel coast. By late May the British armies were already preparing to evacuate via Dunkirk. Many answers will argue convincingly that it was the speed and success of the German advance that almost panicked Mussolini into intervening – he had to be fast or else he would miss out on the prestige and the land-grabbing of being a victorious ally. Others will emphasise not the speed but the delay. Mussolini knew his armies were nowhere near ready (and would not be until 1942–1943) and so he had to wait as long as possible until it was safe. By this logic, he did not really 'take Italy to war' at all. It cannot be expected that answers will be comprehensive, with developed arguments. The key requirement is for a concise, focused and selective explanation of some of the motives behind Italy's entry into the war.

Question 3

- 06** 'Throughout the years from 1923 to 1939, Mussolini's foreign policies were very successful.'
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

Candidates will need to show a judgement by balancing the ways in which the statement might be regarded as true and untrue.

Material that might be used to suggest it is true include:

- the rise of Italy's prestige as a result of Mussolini's first interventions abroad – Corfu and Fiume – and the favourable impression created by his self-promoting propaganda
- the prestige gained by acting as a mediator alongside Britain in the Locarno treaties of 1925
- the increasing faith in Mussolini among many Italians as his internal policies seemed to show greater success than those of other countries, especially in the early 1930s
- the fact that Mussolini looked firm and successful in standing up to the attempted Nazi coup in Austria in 1934
- the fact that Mussolini could claim to have wiped away the 'shame of Adowa' when he invaded Abyssinia in 1935; and that he 'got away' with his interventionist policies in Abyssinia and in Spain, because the western allies did not take action against him
- the fact that he was able to make an alliance with the rising power of Nazi Germany and yet avoided being dragged into Germany's war in 1939
- the example of Franco, who stayed neutral despite all Hitler's blandishments and ruled Spain until he died in his bed in 1975, shows how easily Mussolini might have done the same if he had not been so weak and stupid as to join the war in 1940.

Material that might be used to suggest it is untrue include:

- Mussolini's early foreign policy successes were small, cheap prestige victories with no real substance
- the efforts to make Italy into a major military power placed an impossible burden on the economy – and were never really successful in terms of military strength anyway
- the 'success' over Austria in 1934 was mostly illusory because Hitler's Germany was weak at that time – Mussolini's attempts to dominate Austria soon proved a flop, as was brutally demonstrated by the *Anschluss* in 1938
- the decision to invade Abyssinia in 1935 was a costly enterprise and threw away the chance Mussolini had of establishing secure relations with France and Britain
- intervention in Spain brought no benefits to Italy and led to economic problems at home and diplomatic isolation abroad
- drawing closer to Hitler from 1936 tied Mussolini into policies he did not want to follow, such as the 1938 race laws. The Pact of Steel in 1939 showed (and what happened from 1940 to 1943 proved) that Mussolini was simply Hitler's puppet
- Mussolini got plenty of sensible advice from people like Ciano but was too stupid to accept it.

The core of the question is on whether (and if so when) Mussolini's foreign policies were successful. There need not be lengthy detail on all his policies but the period as a whole should be addressed. Some answers may argue convincingly that Mussolini's policies were successful at first, perhaps as far as 1935–1936 but then fell apart after Abyssinia. As usual, the key requirement is for an argued case in response to the question, supported by selected specific evidence.