



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2012**

**AS History 1041**

**HIS2G**

**Unit 2G**

**The Forging of the Italian Nation, 1848–1871**

**Final**

***Mark Scheme***

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner 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 examiners 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 examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner 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, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

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 to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools and colleges 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 schools and colleges 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 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 2012

**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 Rome becoming part of the united Italy in 1870. (12 marks)

*Target: AO2(a)*

**Levels Mark Scheme**

- |   |              |
|---|--------------|
| Nothing written worthy of credit.   | <b>0</b>     |
| <b>L1:</b> Answers will <b>either</b> briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources <b>or</b> identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak.   | <b>1-2</b>   |
| <b>L2:</b> 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.   | <b>3-6</b>   |
| <b>L3:</b> Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences <b>and</b> similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed.                                       | <b>7-9</b>   |
| <b>L4:</b> 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. | <b>10-12</b> |

**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 the incorporation of Rome into the united Italy through the ‘sad drama’ of annexation, confirmed by the plebiscite. Effective answers to this question will make a direct comparison of the two sources in the light of own knowledge of the context. Less successful answers will provide a literal account of the evidence of each source in turn, followed by a limited comparison.

---

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

- the view in Source A is from a soldier taking part in the capture of Rome, reflecting the feelings of romantic optimism felt at the time by the invaders and the mass popular support from the people of Rome; Source B has a completely different view in words and mood, Count Beauffort is a French Catholic conservative who gives strong and emotionally committed backing to the Papacy
- the tone and emphasis of the sources offers plentiful evidence about these different views. In Source A: 'shouting and applauding' crowds, the 'houses covered in flags', the soldiers 'moved to tears'; and the cries of 'Our brothers!' – in Source B, the incorporation of Rome into Italy is a 'sad drama'; a 'ridiculous comedy'; and a 'pretence'
- Source A suggests a wave of mass popular support for annexation; in Source B Beauffort admits that a majority of the people voted yes in the plebiscite but claims that this was not due to popular support but to 'injustice' and 'illegality'. He also claims the fact that the Pope, in protest, ordered Catholics in Rome not to vote prevented the true scale of opposition against the annexation from being seen.

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

- both sources suggest that there was a lot of support for the annexation – 'workers, women, old men and boys' welcome the liberators in Source A, while a majority of the people vote yes in Source B – they just disagree about whether this was due to popular support
- both sources regard the Pope as having central importance
- both sources are from partisan contemporary observers.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may conclude that Source A overstates the patriotism of the immediate moment in September 1870 and that feelings may have cooled down by the time of the plebiscite; or that the blatantly partisan attitude and the wishful thinking displayed by Beauffort means that his assessment of the degree of popular support has little or no credibility.

---

**Question 1****02** Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How far was Pope Pius IX responsible for the lack of unity in Italy in the years 1862 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 reasons why it was difficult for the new Italian state to achieve true national unity by 1871; and in particular how much of the difficulty was due to the obstructive attitude and actions of Pius IX. Source C takes it for granted that there was a serious lack of unity and gives several reasons why this was so. Some answers may challenge this view, arguing that unity *was* largely achieved – this can be credited well done but is not really part of the question, which is concerned with reasons for disunity.

The sources provide plentiful evidence about divisions – with explicit as well as implicit explanations of what the reasons for disunity were:

- **Source A** shows papal forces fighting against the Italian army – clear evidence of disunity *within* Rome between ordinary people and the papacy
- **Source B** shows the divisions over the plebiscite; the hostile attitude towards Piedmont; the stubborn refusal of the Pope to accept the legitimacy of the new state and its claim to Rome as a capital
- **Source C** indicates the Pope was a vital factor ('without the backing of the Catholic Church, the new government had few sources of moral authority') – but also provides a wide range of other factors such as: 'centuries of economic fragmentation'; 'lack of unifying symbols'; new government 'destroyed the goodwill' previously built up; 'unresolved identity'.

Effective answers will use own knowledge to provide a clear argument and assessment in response to the question 'how far?' Pius IX was to blame. Key aspects of own knowledge relevant to the years from 1862 to 1871 might include:

- longer-term issues in the 'Roman Question' and the role of Pius IX since 1848 (also the importance of anticlericalism among Italian liberals and republicans)
- specific events between 1862 and 1870, such as the Syllabus of Errors & Doctrine of Papal Infallibility; or Garibaldi's failed attempts to seize Rome in 1862 and 1867; or the failings of Italian armed forces in 1866
- contextual own knowledge about the events of 1870–71 and the Pope's self-proclaimed status as 'Prisoner in the Vatican'
- retrospective judgement on the extent of unity by 1871, matching or commenting on Duggan's view at the end of Source C.

\*\*\* NB One key factor holding back the completion of true unification in the 1860s was France – Napoleon III and French policies are not mentioned in the sources but many answers will focus own knowledge on this aspect. It is likely that many good answers will make links between the role and influence of the Papacy and these other factors.

Students may well refer to the attitudes of Pius IX from the 1840s – this can be made relevant but the focus of answers should be 1862–1871.



---

**Question 2**

**03** Explain why revolution broke out in Sicily 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 for the first outbreak of revolution, in Sicily, in 1848.

Possible reasons might include: longer-term and more general causes of unrest, such as:

- Mazzinian ideas of national revolution
- the desire for Sicily to have greater freedom from Naples.

Possible short-term local factors affecting Sicily in 1848 might include:

- the impact of the widespread economic crisis sweeping across Europe in 1846–47
- the way the reforms of Pius IX after 1846 raised hopes and encouraged direct action
- the violent response to land enclosures and resentment of the recent actions by the repressive regime of King Ferdinand II
- the personal leadership of the Sicilian nobility, headed by Rosalino Pilo
- the elections of March 1848 and the impact of the new Sicilian constitution.

One feature of good answers may be the ability to make links between the various factors involved, perhaps by explaining how the original driving forces were very local and much more social in character but then became more and more political as events developed

---

**Question 2**

- 04** 'The main reason why revolutions spread rapidly across Italy in 1848 was the nationalist idealism inspired by Mazzini.'  
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 rapid spread of revolutions across Italy in 1848, as the original uprisings in the South were followed by many others, often with specific local characteristics but becoming part of the national aims of the Risorgimento – with a particular focus on the relative importance of Mazzini and the ideals he represented. Mazzini had great prestige, influence and personal involvement before 1848 (through the Carbonari, Young Italy and his links to other nationalists such as Gioberti) and during the events of the

1848–49 revolutions (especially in Milan in April 1848, joining with Garibaldi in exile, and then becoming a hero of the Roman Republic).

Many students will largely agree with the key quotation; but others may argue that although Mazzinian ideas had a powerful impact, other factors were more significant.

Evidence in support of the central importance of Mazzinian ideas might include:

- the importance of demands for democratic reform – the uprisings in Naples forced Ferdinand II to grant a constitution; the Pope came under pressure to grant similar democratic rights in Rome and the Papal States
- the revolt in Milan was led by radicals like Cattaneo, heavily influenced by Mazzini
- Charles Albert of Piedmont invaded Lombardy because he was terrified of radicalism spreading into his kingdom
- the demonstrations in Venice were led by Daniel Manin, a disciple of Mazzinian ideas
- the Pope's reaction against the spread of revolution (by his Allocution of April 1848 was caused by his recognition of how powerful (in his eyes dangerous) radicalism was
- Mazzini personally embodied the ideals of the Roman Republic when he reached Rome in March 1849 – he was also a key ally of Garibaldi.

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

- the fact that many moderate elements in the Risorgimento regarded Mazzini as unrealistic and too extreme – there were many personal conflicts between Mazzinians and other revolutionary leaders
- the fact that the various uprisings had very diverse causes and were not a united outburst of nationalism and idealism
- the fact that Mazzini could not rely on any effective armed force – Charles Albert, who did have the Piedmontese army, was more important than Mazzini
- the view that the most important reason for the spread of revolution was the temporary weakness and vulnerability of Austrian rule.

---

**Question 3**

**05** Explain why Cavour attended the Paris Peace Conference in 1856. (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 provide an argued explanation of a range of factors; perhaps with an evaluation of relative importance. Possibilities include general, longer-term factors in Cavour's foreign policy, such as:

- lessons learned from 1848–49 and the realisation Piedmont needed foreign help
- the modernisation of Piedmont, especially in economy and trade, enabling Cavour to gain respect abroad, notably from Britain.

Short-term factors concerning the Crimean War and its consequences might include:

- Cavour decided to join the war on the side of Britain and France (and Austria) in 1854, sending 15 000 troops – giving Piedmont the right to attend the 1856 peace conference
- Cavour and the King wanted Piedmont to be at the 'top table' of European diplomacy
- Cavour wanted the 'Italian Question' to be recognised by the Great Powers – even though he knew there was not much chance of gaining specific rewards because this would be opposed by Austria, who had greater influence with Britain and France

- Cavour had a close relationship with the British foreign secretary, Clarendon, and wanted to make the most of it.

Many students will be tempted into explaining **what happened** at the Paris conference. This can have no relevance to the question.

---

**Question 3**

- 06** 'The achievement of Italian unification in the years 1857 to 1861 was due to the actions of foreign powers.'  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

**Levels Mark Scheme**

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

**Indicative content**

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

The key quotation says unification was only achieved as a result of foreign powers. This may be agreed with; or challenged as being an unbalanced or partial explanation, with 'other factors' having more significance. Supporting evidence may be selective rather than comprehensive.

Evidence to support the view ‘foreign actions’ were decisive might include:

- the weaknesses and vulnerability of Austria (including diplomatic isolation after the Crimean War) and British support for Cavour, including diplomacy and naval power
- Austria’s demand that Piedmont demobilize her army – providing the excuse for Piedmont to refuse and to push Austria into declaring war
- the impact of the Orsini assassination and the diplomatic agreement between Cavour and Napoleon III at Plombières – leading to the pre-planned French action in 1858–59, before war with Austria actually began
- the role of the French army (200 000, backed by railways and modern equipment) in victories at Magenta & Solferino
- the role of Napoleon III in negotiations leading to the Treaty of Turin in 1860
- the role of France in preventing Rome from being taken over by the new united Italy showed how decisive foreign influence was.

Possible other factors include:

- the success of Cavour in building up Piedmont and manipulating politics
- greater unity and purpose of Italian nationalists after the National Society was formed in 1857
- the growth of anti-Austrian feeling in Italy, played upon by the National Society
- the ‘all-important’ contribution of Garibaldi, including victories at Como & Varese and the agreement with Victor Emmanuel at Teano
- popular rebellions in Tuscany and central Italy; and the arrival of 20 000 volunteers from other parts of Italy to strengthen the Piedmontese army.

\*\*\* NB The timescale of this question should be addressed – the start date of 1857 marks the formation of the Italian National Society; the end date of 1861 marks the situation of Italy after Victor Emmanuel became King of Italy.

### **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](http://www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion)