



**General Certificate of Education
June 2010**

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 meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting 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 candidates' 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

Copyright © 2010 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

June 2010

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 Cavour's response to Garibaldi. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels mark Scheme

	Nothing written worthy of credit.	0
L1:	Answers will either briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources or identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak.	1-2
L2:	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed.	3-6
L3:	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences and similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed.	7-9
L4	Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication.	10-12

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

One difference is in the nature of the sources: Source A is **by** Cavour, while Source B is a balanced historian's overview. The Cavour source is naturally full of self-justification and takes a negative view of Garibaldi – 'I tried conciliation'; 'imprudence'; 'hotheads' etc. Header in Source B gives a more favourable view of Garibaldi as having influenced Cavour's thinking and made Cavour 'realise the extent of his achievement'.

In terms of Cavour's response (attitude and actions) to Garibaldi, there are similarities. Almost everything in Source A fits in with the line about 'his considerable arts of manipulation' in Source B. Nothing in Source A directly contradicts Source B about the mixture of Garibaldi's ideals and

Cavour's ambition and political skill. The reference in Source B to Cavour believing Italy 'would not be ready' and that Garibaldi might cause a war with France and Austria' is a perfect match for a lot of Cavour's arguments in Source A.

Question 1

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

How important was nationalism in advancing the cause of Italian unification in 1860 and 1861?
(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 candidates 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.

The focus of the question is on nationalism as one of a range of factors contributing to unification in 1860–61. The balance of evidence will vary according to the relative importance accorded to nationalism. Some answers may relegate nationalism to a subsidiary role, seeing Cavour, or foreign intervention as the driving force – even so, nationalism must be addressed adequately.

Arguments about the importance of nationalism might include:

- long-term factors arising from 1848
- the formation of the National Society in 1857
- the motives and actions of Garibaldi
- the mass popular support for Garibaldi from several parts of Italy – there is a lot of evidence of this in Source A and Source B
- the evidence of Source C that nationalism was ‘unstoppable’ and that nationalism caused events to run away from people like Cavour and Mazzini.

Arguments about other factors might include:

- in all the sources there is a lot about Cavour’s role in manipulating events
- the political development and the economic power gained in the 1850s made Piedmont the natural leader of the Risorgimento
- the weaknesses of Garibaldi (‘too far, too fast’)
- the role of the Great Powers (much evidence in Source C)
- the weaknesses of Austria by 1859.

Question 2

- 03** Explain why King Charles Albert of Piedmont sent his army into Lombardy in March 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 candidates 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.

There will probably be a mixture of short-term and longer-term factors here. There had been risings in Sicily and Naples from January 1848; various Italian rulers, including Charles Albert, had been pressured into declaring liberal constitutions; the Austrians had imposed martial law on Lombardy and Venetia. On 13 March there was revolution in Vienna and Metternich was pushed out of power – this was the opportunity for liberal revolts in Milan and Venetia. All this provided the context for Charles Albert's decision to go to war on 24 March 1848.

The immediate cause of the Piedmontese invasion was the fact that Charles Albert was asked to intervene by moderates in Lombardy who were afraid of the 'democrats' and republicans taking over the rebellion; they also knew that the Austrians would fight back and they needed Piedmont's army to defend against this. The key factor is not the opportunity but the reason **why** Charles Albert sent in the troops. The public reasons were to help Milan against the Austrians, to proclaim a liberal constitution and to stop dangerous revolutionaries. His real reason was to annex Lombardy to the Piedmont monarchy – though his action was approved in a plebiscite. One big motive was nationalism. Charles Albert claimed to be acting on behalf of

all Italy. This may have been window-dressing but it could also be argued that Charles Albert was going along with nationalist feeling because it was so strong he had no option. Note that answers cannot be expected to be comprehensive; three factors with appropriate explanation would provide the basis of an effective answer.

Question 2

04 'Pope Pius IX was the most important reason for the failure of the revolutions in Italy in 1848 and 1849.'

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 candidates 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 the question is on Pius IX as one of a range of factors explaining the failure of the revolutions in Italy. Many answers will see other factors as more important – but the role of the papacy must be addressed adequately.

Arguments supporting the key quotation might include:

- the papacy was the only institution that was central to all regions of Italy and the influence of the Catholic Church over the people was massive – this included the special factor of the communication with people at local level through priests and sermons
- the flipside of the size of papal influence was that it made it very hard for any other form of national political influence to gain legitimacy
- Pius IX was a key factor in the early rise of nationalist revolts; his reversal of attitude in the Allocution had a devastating effect
- Pius IX was a key factor in the backlash against republicanism; he helped to divide the nationalist movement.

Arguments supporting other factors might include:

- military weakness – there was no regular army capable of standing up to the Austrians in battle, as shown at Custozza
- internal divisions between different states
- internal differences of aims and ideology
- the conservative aims of rulers who had brought in liberal constitutions against their will and were quick to return to conservative policies
- Charles Albert didn't want to fight a real war with Austria – he hoped pressure from Britain and France would force Austria to give in; but most foreign powers were more interested in putting rebellions down.

Question 3**05** Explain why Italian troops occupied Rome in 1870. (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 candidates 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 may make reference to wider context issues here but the main thrust of the answer should be on specific events in 1870. Rome had been a problem for the cause of unification for a long time – Pius IX represented a barrier to liberalism through the 1864 Syllabus of Errors and the 1870 pronouncement of Papal Infallibility. Previous attempts to seize Rome had failed in 1862 and 1867. Napoleon III had stationed French troops in Rome to protect the papacy. So, **wanting** to occupy Rome was not new – the new factor was French weakness, caused by the Franco-Prussian War.

In September 1870, French troops were pulled out of Rome to strengthen defences on the Rhine; this left only a token force of papal troops to defend the city. Mazzini and others tried to whip up popular revolt, to take Rome in a ‘democratic’ fashion but this did not arouse much enthusiasm; the occupation of Rome was carried out by regular forces sent in by the Italian government, not by an uprising. Rome became the capital of the new Italy; this could be used to suggest a motive.

Question 3

- 06** 'The completion of territorial unification after 1866 failed to overcome the deep divisions within Italy by 1871.'
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 candidates 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 the question is on the extent to which Italy did (or did not) overcome internal divisions by 1871. Many answers are likely to agree with the key quotation, with forceful views about the 'North-South divide', the Pope as the 'prisoner in the Vatican'; the fact that Italian unification had been so dependent on foreign powers; the disillusionment of the Mazzinians and so on.

Other answers may see a considerable degree of unity already achieved by the Liberal Italy – a constitutional system backed by growing economic development.

The key date 1866 should bring explanation and assessment of the war of 1866 and the incorporation of Venetia – followed by the tortuous process of settling the Roman Question between 1867 and 1870.

The most effective answers will use 1871 as a standpoint for a retrospective evaluation. Note that some answers, often good ones, will look into the future from 1871, seeing later developments as proof of the degree of unity or disunity that was there from the beginning of the new state. Such material could indeed be used effectively – but it should not be description for its own sake, it should not unbalance the answer and it is **not** an essential requirement.