

Teacher Resource Bank

GCE History

Candidate Exemplar Work (June 2009):

- HIS2G: The Forging of the Italian Nation,
1848–1871



The following responses are not 'model' answers, nor are they indicative of specific overall grades, but are intended to illustrate the application of the mark scheme for this unit. These responses should be read in conjunction with the HIS2G Question Paper, Sources Booklet and Mark Scheme.

Copies of the paper and are available from e-AQA or the AQA History Department.

E-mail: history@aqa.org.uk

AQA GCE History Teacher Resource Bank Commentaries on June 2009 AS answers

General Introduction by the Chief Examiner

The first June examination series for the new AS specification saw some excellent examples of well prepared candidates who were able to demonstrate their breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding by addressing the questions set directly and efficiently. Sadly, it also suggested that, whilst some candidates knew the material quite well, they struggled to apply it successfully to the questions asked. At the lowest end, there were, of course, some candidates whose knowledge let them down, but even these might have been able to achieve more highly had they thought more carefully about each question's demands.

The importance of timing for both Units needs to be stressed. In Unit 1 candidates should allow themselves approximately 12 minutes for the first part question and 25 minutes for the second. In Unit 2, they could spend 15 minutes on the first part question and 30 minutes on the second, but they are likely to need slightly longer for the source question. Good time keeping is essential in any examination. No matter how successful the answer to the first part question, an incomplete second part question will always mean a loss of marks (notes receive limited credit).

These commentaries are intended to help teachers and candidates to understand the demands of each question type and consequently to encourage students to perform at the highest level of which they are capable. Please note that errors relating to Quality of Written Communication (of spelling, syntax, etc.) have been reproduced without correction. Please note that the AQA convention for question numbering will be changing as from the June 2010 examination papers. Examples of the new format for question papers can be found elsewhere in the Teacher Resource Bank.

Unit 1

The first part of each question in Unit 1 (those questions labelled 01, 03 and 05 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks candidates to 'explain why' an event, issue or development came about. The best candidates answered this question, not only with a selection of reasons (and a minimum of three well-explained reasons was expected for Level 3/4), but also by showing how those reasons linked together. This is essential to meet Level 4 criteria and can be achieved by prioritising, differentiating between the long and short-term factors, or showing how different categories of reasons, such as political, social and religious inter-link. It is not, however, enough to simply assert that the links exist – they also needed explaining.

Candidates who only performed at Level 2 often wrote too descriptively, whilst many achieved a good Level 3 by offering a range of relevant and clearly explained reasons but failing to make any links between them. As the exemplars demonstrate, answers did not need to be long but they had to be effectively focused and directed to achieve good marks.

The second part of each question (those questions labelled 02, 04 and 06 in the new numbering style) asked for a response to a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful'. Each question stem invited candidates to offer a balanced response and this was the key to an award at high Level 3, 4 or 5. Most answers which achieved only a Level 2 or a low/mid-Level 3 mark contained too much description, were excessively one-sided or lacked depth and precision in their use of examples. Some candidates also failed to address the full question set, often

by ignoring starting or finishing dates. To achieve the higher levels, candidates needed to balance one side against another. For example, a question asking how far 'X' contributed to 'Y' demanded a consideration of the importance of other factors which also contributed to 'Y'. Sometimes questions, particularly 'how important' questions (e.g. how important was 'X' in bringing about 'Y?'), could be balanced by considering the ways in which 'X' was important as opposed to the ways in which it was not, rather than introducing 'other factors'; either approach was equally legitimate. The crucial test of an answer was, therefore, the degree to which the candidate was able to argue the issue and how well that argument was supported by accurate and precise evidence. The best answers at Level 5 managed to sustain a focus and convey convincing individual judgement.

Unit 2

The first part of question 1 (labelled 01 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks students how far the views in two given sources (A and B) differ, in relation to a given topic. Perhaps the most common error was to waste time writing a paragraph or more about the source content before addressing differences. Levels were awarded according to how well candidates identified and explained differences of **view**. This was not simply an exercise in source comprehension, so such answers received an award of only Level 1/2. Contrasting 'views' required students to go beyond the mere words of the sources or their omissions, and to assess 'how far' the sources differed required some awareness of the degree of **similarity** they contained. To meet the full demands of the question and obtain an award at high level 3/4, candidates also needed to introduce some contextual own knowledge to explain the differences and similarities identified – possibly (but not necessarily) referring to provenance when it helped the explanation, and, more often, explaining references in the sources and drawing on their contextual knowledge to account for differing views.

In the second part of question 1 (labelled 02 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to answer a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful' with reference to the sources as well as their own knowledge. The best answers to these questions maintained a balanced argument (as explained for Unit 1 above) and the information given in the sources was used in support of that argument. Poorer answers tried to address the sources separately – at the beginning or end of the answer, or sometimes as an asterisked afterthought. Those who omitted them altogether could not obtain more than top Level 2. Whilst the main criteria for the higher levels was the degree of argument, the precision of the evidence and the judgement conveyed, in addition to these, good source use could ensure that students were placed higher in a level than those who used the sources in a perfunctory way. Source use needed to be explicit, and the best candidates appreciated that Source C was provided to give further ideas and/or information that was of direct relevance to this question.

In questions 2 and 3 (03/04 and 05/06 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to respond to an 'explain why' question – on which comments will be found under the Unit 1 commentary above – and a short, provocative quotation about which they were invited to explain why they agreed or disagreed. The demands here were similar to those for the second part of Unit 1 (b) questions. In adopting a view about the quotation, candidates were expected to examine the opposing arguments in order to reach a balanced judgement on the extent of their agreement/disagreement.

Sally Waller Chief Examiner December 2009

GCE History HIS2G: The Forging of the Italian Nation, 1848–1871

Responses to June 2009 Questions

Candidate 1

- 1 (a) 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)

Source B says that although Garibaldi was a very popular figure and that although he was followed by many people he was too quick to make a decision – this is because he was uneducated – “Garibaldi's mind lacked the foundation of a basic education”. This refers to his little knowledge of politics, and this is true because Garibaldi trusted Cavour and believed everything that he said, and sadly this was not the case. Garibaldi was poorly educated and he had little knowledge of politics. This also was the reason why he failed to capture Rome in either 1862 or 1867, after raising irregular armies similar to the ones that he had captured Sicily with. However this is in a great contrast to source A, Source A says that Garibaldi was a great leader and his lack of education made him a better leader for it, because it allowed him to make snap decisions. “The major secret of his victories was his rapid, firm decision making”. This was also true because Garibaldi was a superb military genius, and this can best be seen during his campaign in Sicily where he managed to defeat the Neapolitan army with 1000 northern Italian volunteers and the squadere, this is a display of military force and leadership than has since not been equalled.

Both of these sources agree that Garibaldi inspired men and that that was one of the reasons he was able to perform the feats that he did, Source A – “the blind devotion of his followers”, Source B – “despite these apparent weaknesses his followers worshipped him.”. Source A says that Garibaldi was a great leader and that although he was not well educated this gave him less to think about. However Source B says that he was not a good leader he acted on impulse instead of thinking things through. This means that the sources differ quite a lot, however there is some common ground between them, namely the loyalty in the followers of Garibaldi.

Source A was written in 1860 during Garibaldi's campaign in Sicily by a member of the thousand, and although it will be biased towards Garibaldi, it was written at the time it is talking about by someone who served with Garibaldi, so it is likely to be quite accurate. Source B is an extract from Garibaldi's obituary that was written after his death and a long time after his military campaigns. However it is more likely to be impartial, so this source is less reliable.

Principal Examiner's Comments

The candidate starts by considering Source B with some relevant analysis of Garibaldi's political limitations. In addition to examining source references to Garibaldi's lack of education and his tendency to rush to conclusions, own knowledge is used to weigh the evidence such as the reference to Garibaldi's misplaced trust in Cavour. The candidate goes on to effectively contrast this view with the evidence in Source A which presents Garibaldi as an excellent military leader and tactician. Once again, knowledge is selectively used, with a reference to Garibaldi's successful campaign in Sicily to support the evidence in Source A. In the second paragraph the candidate continues to expand upon the comparison but also identifies common ground in the two sources, with selective quotations in

support. The final paragraph appropriately examines the provenance of each source, acknowledging the bias in favour of Garibaldi in Source A, but also appreciating the impartial nature of Garibaldi's obituary in Source B. The candidate has produced a developed and balanced treatment of the two sources with a limited but effective amount of own knowledge in support of the case. Good skills in written communication are in evidence throughout. Level 4 – 10 marks.

Candidate 2

- 1 (a) 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)

Garibaldi, as one of the greatest character in the history of Italian unification, was extremely popular and worshipped especially by his followers, one of whom was the author of the extract in source A.

As one of 'the Thousand' who sailed with Garibaldi himself to Sicily in 1860 and began the northward expedition of unifying Italy, Giuseppe Bandi used all the greatest words to praise his leader, in terms of military leadership. Bandi stated that Garibaldi's personalities and devotion, as well as the love for liberty and democracy had led to his great success in unifying Italy. This source, however, does not mention Garibaldi's two failed attempts to capture Rome as source B did.

Source B, in contrast, which was written by a British newspaper 20 years after the unification, had a much more critical view of Garibaldi and his expedition in the 1860s. It was mentioned there how Garibaldi lacked education therefore he just followed his heart recklessly instead of his mind. The two attempts on Rome showed how determined yet rushed and unprepared he was. His successes in southern Italy (Sicily and Naples) were more because of the incompetence of his enemies (the Neapolitan armies) than because of his own 'the Thousand' and leadership.

It could be easily seen how source A over praised Garibaldi as it was written by one of his followers while source B by a British newspaper had a critical view of this character and leadership.

Principal Examiner's Comments

The candidate describes in outline the contents of source A as written by one of the Thousand. Similar treatment is given to the more critical view of Garibaldi in source B where an element of own knowledge is in evidence as the candidate proposes that Garibaldi's success was due more to the failings of Neapolitan forces, but is not developed further. In concluding, the candidate makes some attempt at provenance of the sources. The evaluation of the pro-Garibaldi author in source A is more effective than the treatment of Source B, where the value of the obituary is not addressed but rather some focus is placed upon Garibaldi as viewed by a foreign newspaper. The candidate has identified some differences between the sources with limited knowledge applied in source B. Some valid points have been made but not with sustained and sufficient clarity. Level 2 – 6 marks.

Candidate 3

- 1 (b) How far was Garibaldi's contribution the major reason for the unification of Italy in the years 1860 to 1871? (24 marks)

The annexing of Nice to France spurred Garibaldi into action, resulting in near complete unification by 1860. Source A puts this down to his 'rapid decision making,' and source C claims it was down to 'unofficial, initiative & brilliant tactical generalship', Garibaldi won Sicily and the South for his king! But there were other factors that led to this, such as Austria being preoccupied with war against France and Piedmont in the North. The Thousand were poorly armed, and as Source B says 'he rushed to conclusions.' Whilst Garibaldi liberated the South in the name of Italy and Victor Emmanuel in 1860, 1860-71 resulted in failure – he didn't capture Rome in 1862 & 67 and didn't free Venice at all, as he had promised. In the end in 1871, it is a mixture of foreign powers, the role of Cavour and chance which resulted in unification in 1871.

Source C supports this view, 'the real winner was Cavour.' He 'outmanoeuvred the French.' This is certainly true of the Plombieres agreement of 1858 where Cavour secured the help of 200,000 French troops. Cavour did prevent Garibaldi from taking Rome because he realised that this would upset Catholic powers who supported the war – avoiding the bloodshed and possible death of Garibaldi. However Cavour died in 1861 leaving a rapid rate of successors. These successors were more sympathetic to Garibaldi but still the new PM had to stop him invading Rome by sending troops – again. This is supported by Source B 'rushing to conclusions without thinking of arguments.' and other Historians who say he 'thought with his heart and not his head.' Garibaldi's continual persistence kept the spark of unification alive. However in 1867 Garibaldi may have hindered unification because the French troops which had withdrawn in 1866 headed back to Rome to protect the Pope and defeated Garibaldi. He had no popular support from the Catholics after the Pope's threat of excommunication and his syllabus of errors.

It was the foreign powers, not Garibaldi which contributed to the full unification of Italy, French troops withdrawing because of war with Prussia. Even Venice was given to Italy by France. The power of Austria also declined. I think that whilst Garibaldi kept the spark of unification alive, and as Source C says 'their handshake symbolised creation of a united Italy,' in 1860, I think that collection of the South for Emmanuel was Garibaldi's greatest contribution. However, French troops back in Rome in 1867 did lead to a fortunate chain of events – but this was down to chance and foreign powers, who I think played a larger part in the unification of Italy through intervention, like France in Rome, and through non intervention, like the Navy watching with sympathetic eye as Garibaldi crossed the Straits of Messina.

Principal Examiner's Comments

The candidate starts confidently with references to sources A and C as reasons for Garibaldi's successes in respect of Sicily and Naples. This is then competently counterbalanced with reference to source B's criticisms of the man and then proceeds to identify other factors that contributed to unification such as the role of Cavour. Particular emphasis is placed upon the contribution of foreign powers. Despite the detailed evidence of these other factors, the candidate goes on to accept that Garibaldi kept the flame of the unification cause burning regardless of his failed attempts to take Rome after 1860. The candidate keeps good focus on

the question throughout, with selective use of the three sources in support. The candidate has also deployed some own knowledge in considering the evidence and making a case. A well organized and developed debate has been produced overall. Level 5 – 22 marks.

Candidate 4

- 1 (b) How far was Garibaldi's contribution the major reason for the unification of Italy in the years 1860 to 1871? (24 marks)

Garibaldi had a large contribution to the unification of Italy during this eleven year period, alongside his dedicated volunteers. In April 1860 Garibaldi set sail from Genoa to Sicily, and in May he had defeated the Spanish Bourbons at Calatafimi. By June Palermo had fallen and in July Garibaldi was in control. In August Garibaldi set sail for Naples and in September he defeated resistance at Volturno. After hearing of Garibaldi's plans Victor Emmanuel II had become increasingly worried. If he let Garibaldi continue his dominance of the South and eventually reach Rome Napoleon III was sure to intervene as the French Garrison remained there defending the Pope. Therefore, as Garibaldi made his way to Rome, Victor Emmanuel II sent his troops and defeated the Papal army in September at Castelfidardo. In October, Garibaldi, refusing to be crushed, defeated the remaining Neapolitan troops at Volturno and he met with Victor Emmanuel at Teano in October. After discussions it was agreed that Garibaldi would give his achievements to Victor Emmanuel and plebiscites to legitimise the fusion of the states to Victor Emmanuel's recently expanded Piedmont were held in November, and as expected they all voted overwhelmingly in favour of union. Conclusively, in March 1861 the kingdom of Italy was declared.

Although Garibaldi was largely responsible for this union, many of his followers were left wondering what they had been fighting for when Garibaldi so readily handed over his achievements.

Garibaldi appeared to try and rectify himself though, as now a united Italy had been formed but the Roman question and the position of the papacy still remained. Parma, Modena, Tuscany and Lombardy had all been received through plebiscites and international war and diplomacy, largely due to Cavour's negotiations with France during the exchange of Nice and Savoy in 1861 after his return to power in January and his organisation of a compromise after the Franco-Austrian war left both Piedmont and France victorious but disturbed at the situation.

With the Pope's refusal to recognise the new Italian state and anti-clerical law spread from Turin Victor Emmanuel remained unsure with how to deal with this problem. Garibaldi, however, tried to take Rome again but was defeated in 1862, and after negotiations with France in 1864 in which an agreement was made to rename the garrison by 1866 Garibaldi saw this as an open opportunity but he was defeated again in 1867 and Napoleon III re-installed his troops in Rome due to the high level of Catholic support there was at home and they remained there until 1870, when they were removed to fight the war against Prussia that they had been skillfully pushed into by Bismarck. This time Victor Emmanuel made the decision to take Rome and after plebiscites it was declared the new capital of Italy. This decision did not please the Pope who had already called a Vatican Council in 1869 and declared Papal infallibility in 1870, although this inclusion of Rome caused him to declare himself a 'prisoner of Rome'.

Principal Examiner's Comments

The candidate begins by acknowledging Garibaldi's successes through a predominantly descriptive account of the man's campaigns and expeditions. The account goes on to cover his failures over Rome but also makes a direct reference to the role of Cavour in gaining Lombardy and the central states. This key point however is not further developed. Similarly, the contributions of foreign powers are mentioned in passing but not given the appropriate level of treatment required by the question. A greater degree of detail is given to the Pope's circumstances but with less relevance to the question. There are no direct references to sources A, B and C, which the question also requires, although some of the material is alluded to in the candidate's description. The answer demonstrates some organization of the facts but with limited structure and focus on the question. Level 2 – 11 marks.

Candidate 5

- 2 (a) Explain why the 1848 Revolutions in the Italian states were initially successful. (12 marks)

The 1848 revolutions had initial momentum for several reasons. The 'liberal pope' had inspired thousands towards the call for the removal of Austria. Pius IX had successfully united the classes towards a common goal which is nearly achieved in a revolution. The radical writings and speeches of Mazzini had also stimulated thousands for the cause of unification. His liberal writings suggesting a republic and free trade aroused the interest of the middle and upper classes.

Furthermore the initial success of the revolutions can be contributed to lower class support because of the poor harvest of 1845. Food had become scarce and risings in the south were not uncommon, many of the peasants blamed the Austrians for the lack of support and the harvest itself. This angered many and can be attributed to the initial success of the revolution.

Austrian rule in Italy was despised. The country was economically backwards and had been ever since the Vienna peace treaty of 1815 where French control of Italy had been removed. Under French rule Italy had prospered and living standards had greatly improved with better communications, railways and improved culture. Austrian rule had taken all this away and the memories of a better Italy angered the Italians.

Principal Examiner's Comments

The candidate examines several reasons why the 1848 revolts were initially successful, beginning with the liberal effects of Pope Pius IX. Further development of this point is required however. The political influence of Mazzini's teachings are also considered to an extent but the candidate does not look at the actual role of Mazzini or his followers during the revolts. The role of the economic crisis and its revolutionary impact, particularly on the peasantry, is quite well covered as is the key point about the unpopularity of Austrian rule. The response contains some well organized points but lacks more specific details such as the inspiration given by the granting of a constitution in Naples, the riots in Milan and Venice, and Charles Albert's initial support from Turin. The candidate's views however, have been clearly expressed in the presentation of the material. Level 3 – 8 marks.

Candidate 6

- 3 (b) '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)

The economic policies of Cavour were instrumental in the rise of Piedmont 1848-58. The growth of the economy led to Piedmont having greater power internationally through tourism, loans and trade agreements. It also improved Piedmont militarily and put them ahead of other powers. Although the Statuto was also very important, economic policies of Cavour were the main reason for the rise of Piedmont.

Cavour's major economic policy was railway building. By 1860 Piedmont had over 850 km of railway track, which was half of the total of the entire Italian peninsula. This led to increased tourism and thus increased Piedmont's international standing. The railways also, as Cavour had hoped, led to a slight development of a 'national consciousness' which was associated with Piedmont. Thus Piedmont was in an extremely advantageous place to lead unification. Railways also increased trade and boosted Piedmont's economy.

Piedmont's economy was further boosted by Cavour's policies including foreign powers. The loans from France stabilised the economy whilst trade treaties with France, Britain, Portugal and Belgium increased trade and thus stimulated the economy further. The contribution of foreign help again placed Piedmont in a stronger position internationally than any other Italian states. Foreign powers that had invested in Piedmont now had a vested interest in the well-being of the state. This led to Piedmont having greater international importance, vital in ensuring it was the leader of unification, as well as a strong economy, again vital in becoming the strongest state.

Not only did Cavour's economic policies have an impact on Piedmont economically and politically but they enabled her to develop militarily which proved extremely important in the Crimean war, which was vital in securing France as an ally. Although historians have debated how significant Piedmontese military aid was to France, Britain and Turkey in the Crimean war it is undoubtable that the Paris Peace conference was extremely important in contributing to the rise of Piedmont internationally.

However, it is questionable whether such progressive economic policies would have been possible had it not been for the Statuto, granted on the 8th February 1848. This granted a parliament which, especially after Cavour's connubio, was reasonably powerful. If the Statuto had not been granted, or kept, it is arguable whether Cavour would have been able to implement his economic policies. The Statuto also ensured that Piedmont was a liberal state, which encouraged a huge influx of exiles and revolutionaries. These people were vital in making Piedmont such a progressive state and one so different from other backward, repressive states such as the kingdom of two Sicilies. Thus the Statuto played a huge role in the rise of Piedmont. However, without Cavour's economic policies Piedmont, even with a Statuto, would not have been as powerful in 1858. Thus the economic policies were essential to the rise of Piedmont.

Cavour's economic policies were crucial in the rise of Piedmont from 1845 to 1858. Not only did they boost the economy but most importantly they improved Piedmont's standing internationally. They also improved Piedmont's military. All of

these effects of the economic policies were vital in the rise of Piedmont 1848-58 and although the Statuto and political reforms was also important, the most important factors for Piedmont becoming so powerful by 1858 were Cavour's economic policies.

Principal Examiner's Comments

The candidate begins confidently by examining Piedmont's economic and to a lesser extent, military growth between 1848 and 1858. The political importance of the survival of the Statuto is also well considered. The answer is then counterbalanced by an acknowledgement and examination of Cavour's role with particular reference to his economic and foreign policies during this period. Some specific examples are given such as the beneficial growth of railways in Piedmont as well as Piedmont's role in the Crimean war and its increased status on the European political stage. Although there is some repetition of facts towards the end, the candidate works to highlight Cavour's work and contribution towards Piedmont's development as the key factor with a reasonable range of evidence. The answer for the most part, shows organization and good skills of written communication. Level 4 – 21 marks.