



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 2: HIS2G

The Forging of the Italian Nation, 1848–1871

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

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 Garibaldi's abilities as a leader. (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 sources clearly differ. Source B is highly critical whereas Source A is very supportive of Garibaldi's abilities as leader.

- Garibaldi's abilities as a political leader – Source A states he 'loved liberty and democracy', yet at certain times it was necessary to impose a dictatorship (own knowledge could include how Garibaldi appointed himself as dictator of Sicily and Naples). Source B: his lack 'of a basic education' meant that he had a very simplistic and 'jumbled' understanding of political ideas such as democracy and communism. Own knowledge could refer to how Garibaldi had claimed to be a Republican in 1848, yet by 1860 he was a monarchist handing over his invaded lands to Victor Emmanuel
- his decision making ability – Source B criticises Garibaldi's decision making ability claiming he 'rushed to conclusions' whereas Source A claims that 'his rapid, firm

decision making' was the foundation of his victories. Own knowledge could refer to how, on many occasions, Garibaldi acted first and thought later

- his military leadership – Source B refers to his failed attempts to capture Rome. Source A claims that Garibaldi was 'always calm' whatever the danger in battle.

However, the two sources do agree on one issue:

- the ability of Garibaldi to inspire passion and loyalty amongst his followers – Source A refers to their 'blind faith and devotion', Source B claims 'his followers worshipped him'.

The contrast in these sources – judgement about Garibaldi's abilities as a leader – is clearly due to the nature of their authorship. Source A is taken from one of Garibaldi's loyal 'Thousand', a man who was blind to Garibaldi's personal shortcomings as a political leader and who is writing about the successful military expedition to Sicily in 1860. Source B is from a British newspaper obituary of Garibaldi, therefore it is looking retrospectively and to some extent more objectively at his lifetime achievements.

Question 1

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

How far was Garibaldi's contribution the major reason for the unification of Italy in the years 1860 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

This question requires an assessment of Garibaldi's contribution to the process of Italian unification in the years 1860 to 1871. To establish Garibaldi's importance a range of factors should be considered. These could include the role of foreign intervention and the strengths of Piedmont.

Evidence from the sources:

- Source A – establishes Garibaldi as a great political leader
- Source B – states that Garibaldi failed to capture Rome in 1862 and 1867 and argues that he was a man of action who did not think about the consequences of his actions
- Source C – recognises that Garibaldi's military seizure of Sicily and Naples and his subsequent handing of these states over to the king was central to the 'creation of a united Italy'. However, this source also argues that the actions of Cavour were important as he took the 'Papal States without diplomatic uproar'. This source also highlights the military importance of France.

Evidence to support the importance of Garibaldi's military contribution to the unification of Italy:

- Garibaldi's seizure of Sicily and Naples were crucial military victories which forced Cavour and Victor Emmanuel to change policy from the annexation of central Italy to the unification of the whole peninsula. Therefore Garibaldi's military conquests were important in shaping the unification of Italy as one whole peninsula, not just the north.

Evidence against the importance of Garibaldi's military contribution:

- as stated in Sources B and C, Garibaldi's determination to take Rome by military force was to the detriment of the process of unification. He gave little thought to the diplomatic repercussions of his military adventures. His second attack on Rome in 1867 resulted in French troops returning to their occupation in order to protect the pope
- the success of Garibaldi's military expedition in Sicily was to some extent due to luck rather than good management as the local commander of the British Navy thought Garibaldi was under British protection and so refrained from attacking.

Other factors:

- the role of the foreign powers in the period 1860–1871, in particular Prussia and France, were key to the unification process. Without Prussian military victories against Austria,

(1866) and France (1871), Venice and Rome would not have become part of the unified Italy. Louis Napoleon's help was vital in securing Venetia for Italy

- Piedmont's strength was also important in the unification process. It can be argued that the era post-1861 was a process of Piedmontisation. Cavour despatched Farini to the south with orders to crush opposition militarily. During the ensuing Brigands War the Piedmontese deployed an army 120,000 strong to crush the internal threats to unity. Piedmont's constitution was extended throughout the peninsula, laws were codified, etc.

Question 2

03 Explain why the 1848 Revolutions in the Italian states were initially successful.

(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 nature of the economic crisis; the failure of the harvest in 1846 and 1847 created mass unrest amongst the peasantry in the Italian countryside which led to revolutionary uprisings, shaking the foundations of the old order
- in Sicily the uprising was initially successful as the revolutionaries were united in their desperation to overthrow the King of Naples. Ironically, the granting of a constitution in Naples raised the expectations and revolutionary fervour of liberals throughout the Italian states
- the Revolution in Milan (the Tobacco Riots) and Venice was initially successful because they were united in determination to expel the Austrians
- Charles Albert gave the support of Piedmont to the revolutionaries and declared war on Austria

- ultimately the revolutions in the Italian states were initially successful because they gained strength and inspiration from the revolutions in France and Austria. Austria's domestic problems and the overthrow of Metternich meant that the restored, conservative monarchs of the Italian state were not supported as readily as they had been in 1820 and 1830.

Question 2

- 04** 'The 1848–1849 Revolutions in Italy failed because Mazzini's ideas were too radical.'
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

The impact of Mazzini's ideas on the Revolutions:

- Mazzini believed in the creation of a nation state – a union for all Italian speaking provinces – built by 'the people', democracy and republicanism. His view was shared by

a very small minority, most of whom belonged to the middle and upper classes. Thus the appeal of Mazzinian democracy was limited and failed to inspire the mass of peasantry

- Mazzinian nationalism was considered radical and revolutionary by conservative politicians such as Cavour and D’Azeglio, and had to be eradicated as it posed a real threat to the dominance of High Politics. The creation of the Rome Republic in February 1849 threatened to overturn the social and political order. As part of the triumvirate, Mazzini ordered the redistribution of some of the Church land, abolished censorship of the press and Church control of education. This displeased Catholic opinion throughout the Italian States and Europe, resulting in the Rome Republic being crushed by forces of the French Second Republic
- 1848–1849 revealed the weakness of Mazzinian tactics, the limited support for revolution, the unlikelihood of ‘Italians’ to liberate themselves and the need to suppress Mazzinianism in order to gain vital outside support if Italy was ever to be united.

Disagreement with the view

There were many factors which contributed to the failure of the 1848–1849 revolutions in Italy:

- Charles Albert was an incompetent general and poor leader, more concerned about extending Piedmont and preserving his own autocratic power – it could be argued that his role created as much division within the ranks of the revolutionaries. Mazzinian democracy was only one of the many conflicting aims and divisions within the Italian nationalists and revolutionaries
- the leaders of the revolts in Milan and Venice mistrusted Piedmont and the Rome Republic
- prior to the declaration of the Rome Republic in February 1849, Austrian forces had re-gathered and reasserted their military dominance over the Italian states. The return of European stability and the swift recovery of the Austrian government ensured the decisive defeat of the Italian Revolutionaries. Within a month conservative forces led by Radetzky claimed victory at Custoza, thus subduing all of Lombardy and Venetia (with the exception of Venice). Piedmont was defeated again in 1849 at Novara; and the Austrian Navy destroyed the Republic declared in Venice
- the French forces of Louis Napoleon defeated the Roman Republic in June 1849
- it is therefore arguable that the key factor in the collapse of the revolutions was the reassertion of conservative military might.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why the Pact of Plombières was signed between Piedmont and France in 1858. (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

Plombières was the secret meeting which took place between Cavour and Louis Napoleon where it was agreed that France and Piedmont would support each other in a war against Austria, as long as Austria appeared to be the aggressor.

- The main reason why this Pact was signed was due to the attitude of Louis Napoleon to the cause of Italian unification. Louis Napoleon was to some extent a romantic who wished 'to do something for Italy'. Inspired by the work of his uncle, he wanted to be seen carrying on the Napoleonic tradition of exporting nationalism to the Italian States. To some extent he was also motivated by his dislike of Austria, since Austria had taken the lead at the Congress of Vienna and in undoing the work of Napoleon I
- Plombières was also signed due to Louis Napoleon's self-interests. He wished to create a sufficiently large and strong Piedmontese State indebted to France for removing the Austrians from the North, thereby creating a useful ally
- Louis Napoleon was galvanised into action by the Orsini Affair. Count Felice Orsini attempted to assassinate Louis Napoleon, believing that if he killed Napoleon a new republican government in France would come to the aid of Italy. A letter produced at Orsini's trial appealed to Napoleon to help Italy achieve independence.

Question 3

- 06** 'The economic policies of Cavour were the main reason for the rise of Piedmont in the years 1848 to 1858.'
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 should be able to make an overall judgement about the reasons for the rise of Piedmont during this ten year period. In 1848, Piedmont was merely one of several Italian states in rebellion against Austrian rule – by 1858, Piedmont was already in a position to take the leading role in the *Risorgimento*, though it was only later in 1860–1861 that the extent of Piedmontese dominance became clear.

There are several possible approaches:

- yes, it was the economic policies of Cavour
- yes, it was the economic power of Piedmont that made the difference – but Cavour's policies were of lesser significance because Piedmont's economic dominance was based on long-term structural factors. It would have happened whoever was in charge
- yes, Cavour was the key – but not through his economic policies but through political manipulation and by securing backing from foreign powers, especially Great Britain
- no, it was not the economy, nor was it down to Cavour. Other factors were decisive; Cavour's contribution has been overrated by many historians. (This last view is unlikely to be put forward often.)

Cavour's economic policies, therefore, form a central aspect of the question and they must be addressed – but the amount of depth and detail offered may be more or less extensive according to the argument being put forward. If 'other factors' are given most prominence, the material on Cavour's policies may be relatively slight; if the key quotation is accepted, much more substantial evidence would be required.

Cavour's economic policies:

- using his contact with bankers and businessmen abroad
- pushing for rapid expansion of the railway system – Piedmont had half the total track mileage of all Italy by 1858
- promoting free trade as much as possible, including commercial treaties with Austria and the *Zollverein* – rapid development of trade in textiles, silk, wine etc.
- increasing taxes on land and subsidising banks, rail companies and shipping lines
- government spending on infrastructure projects such as tunnels and irrigation schemes
- encouraging foreign investment, especially from France
- borrowing, especially from Britain, even though this increased the public debt.

Cavour's other policies:

- making a deal with the 'left' liberals in parliament in 1852 (the *connubio*)
- muzzling the republican press and bribing other newspapers to consolidate power
- pushing anticlericalism to weaken the influence of the Church
- encouraging the formation of the Italian National Society
- using the Crimean War as a way of gaining support from Britain and France
- stressing the liberal democratic principles of Piedmont to seem more modern and progressive than other parts of Italy.

Factors other than Cavour:

- other governments were conservative and undemocratic after the 1849 restoration – only Piedmont had a parliament capable of modern political development
- Austrian troops were stationed in most of Italy apart from Piedmont – it was only Piedmont that had the basis of a modern army for any future conflict
- it was easier for Piedmont to challenge the papacy than it was for other states
- lessons learned from failure in 1848–1849 weakened Mazzinians and other alternatives to Piedmont as leader of the *Risorgimento*.

As usual, the key requirement is a relevant and balanced answer, supported by selected evidence. Note that a balanced answer need not be even-handed – as long as there is awareness of alternative views, a decisive, even partisan argument could be very effective. Nor should we expect answers to be comprehensive. There is much material here, covering a period of ten years – many good answers will apply a selective range of evidence to support their case. There is plenty of evidence here to justify answers focusing on Cavour's economic policies – but just as much in the 'other factors' above.