

AS

History

Paper 2L Italy & Fascism, c1900–1926
Additional Specimen Mark Scheme

Version: 1.0

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer 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 associates 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 associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate 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, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

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 from aqa.org.uk

AS History Unit 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

2L Italy and Fascism, c1900–1945

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the political situation in Italy following Mussolini's appointment as Prime Minister? | [25 marks] |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| L5: | Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. | 21-25 |
| L4: | Answers will provide a range of relevant of well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | 16-20 |
| L3: | The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. | 11-15 |
| L2: | The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. | 6-10 |
| L1: | The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. | 1-5 |
| | Nothing worthy of credit. | 0 |

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.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid: what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- This source is from Mussolini himself, making a very public impression on the Italian parliament immediately after coming to power.
- Its intention is partly to persuade but mostly to intimidate the delegates in the audience; it is also intended to be heard more widely outside parliament.

Content and argument

- The speech, outwardly, presents Mussolini as statesmanlike and reasonable ('I imposed limits on myself').
- There is also a not-so-veiled threat expressed in the references to the 300 000 armed youths and the radical actions, 'I could have done'.

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- the immediate background of the March on Rome and Mussolini's appointment by the King
- the extent to which the parliament had already given in to Mussolini by the political compromises made by the party leaders.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- The source is from the leader of the Popolari (PPI) a Catholic party opposed both to Mussolini and to the traditional liberal, anticlerical elites.
- There is an element of self-justification in Sturzo's version of events.

-
- The timing is important, coming from 1926, when Sturzo was on the sidelines and Mussolini was firmly established in power.

Content and argument

- Sturzo outlines the dilemma facing non-Fascists in 1922: caught between the dangers of helping Mussolini by collaboration and the opposite dangers of provoking Fascist violence by opposition.
- Sturzo makes clear the division between himself and his party but shows sympathy with those he disagreed with.

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- the extent to which the Italian political system had broken down by late 1922
- Mussolini's tactics in exploiting doubts and divisions among his opponents.

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude that they offer matching, complementary views of political opponents. However, neither is objective. Source A clearly has a particular purpose, which may be less so in the case of Source B, although there is an element of self-justification in this account. Any supported argument should be fully rewarded.

Section B

0 2 'Italy was a politically stable state during the years of Giolitti, 1903 to 1914.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

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.

Arguments supporting the view that Italy was a politically stable state during the years of Giolitti, 1903 to 1914 might include:

- the ‘Giolittian’ political system provided Italy with continuity and stability because of the prestige and influence of Giolitti himself; even when he was not prime minister, the ruling oligarchy held power and followed consistent liberal policies
- the strength of the ruling oligarchy meant that opposition was limited
- there was a constitutional monarchy and representative democracy on modern European lines
- Northern Italy, in the triangle between Turin, Milan and Venice, was industrialising rapidly; this ensured stable support from the middle classes
- Italy was being taken seriously by other powers as a potential military power and valuable ally.

Arguments challenging the view that Italy was a politically stable state during the years of Giolitti, 1903 to 1914 might include:

- the political system was run by a narrow unrepresentative oligarchy; it had only the outward show of democracy
- dependence on Giolitti and the absence of alternatives, blocked change and reform
- the legacy of unification meant that Italy was still a badly divided nation; especially between Church and State. This problem had existed since 1861 and would never be solved until 1929
- Italy was weakened by the North-South divide. The South was: economically backward and politically alienated; instability would have been even worse but for mass emigration
- the rising tide of socialism, through support for the PSI and the regular occurrence of violent strikes, showed how unstable the situation was.

Effective answers will show the ability to define ‘Giolittianism’ and make a balanced assessment of its strengths and weaknesses.

0 3 'Fear of Communism was the main factor in the collapse of Italian democracy in the years 1919 to 1922.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| L5: | Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. | 21-25 |
| L4: | Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. | 16-20 |
| L3: | The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. | 11-15 |
| L2: | The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. | 6-10 |
| L1: | The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. | 1-5 |
| | Nothing worthy of credit. | 0 |

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.

Arguments supporting the view that fear of Communism was the main factor in the collapse of Italian democracy in the years 1919 to 1922 might include:

- Anti-Communism was a key theme of Fascist ideology
- the rise of Communist movements elsewhere in Europe was very frightening to the conservative elites, including the army
- there was extensive violence between the Fascists and the left-wing militias, especially in 1921
- the breakdown of the political system by 1922 convinced many politicians (and the King) that the only alternative to socialist revolution was the Fascists.
- Mussolini was skilful in playing on fear of Communism: this was shown in his propaganda and in the way he presented Fascist violence as justified and necessary to stop the spread of Communism.

Arguments challenging the view that fear of Communism was the main factor in the collapse of Italian democracy in the years 1919 to 1922 might include:

- the reason why Italian democracy collapsed was that it was inherently unstable long before 1914
- the reason why Italian democracy collapsed was the strain of the First World War
- fear of Communism was an excuse for cooperating with Mussolini, not the cause
- the PSI was a responsible, relatively moderate party
- the real fear was fear of Fascist violence
- the political system had irretrievably broken down by 1922 and the conservative elites saw Mussolini as the only way they could keep themselves in power.

Answers should provide a balanced assessment of the importance of the core issue, fears of Communism and of a range of other factors. Note that the depth of supporting evidence relating to these factors will vary according to the case being argued.