



General Certificate of Education

AS History

Unit 2: HIS2G

The Forging of the Italian Nation, 1848–1871

Specimen Mark Scheme

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 first operational exams.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 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

GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change

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

Question 1

- (a) Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source A** differ from those in **Source B** in relation to Charles Albert's motives for the invasion of Lombardy in 1848. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

- 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. **0-2**
- 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 differ significantly about Charles Albert's motives for the invasion of Lombardy. Source A represents Charles Albert's official reasons for the invasion as the source is an extract from his proclamation to the people of Lombardy and Venice. In Source A, Charles Albert conveys that his overriding motive is one of Italian nationalism through phrases such as 'common race', 'Italian brotherhood' and through the use of the flag of Italy. A secondary motive can be seen to be supporting the groundswell of popular opinion, e.g. 'supported by popular opinion', 'overwhelming support which Italy gives you'. This motive can of course be called into question as Charles Albert may have feared revolutionary discontent within Piedmont if the stronger state had not been seen to support her neighbouring state of Lombardy against the Austrians.

Source B, by the Mayor of Milan, contrasts sharply with Charles Albert's own account and claims that his primary motive for the invasion of Lombardy was Piedmontese aggrandisement, the expansion of Piedmont's territory and influence through 'holding a plebiscite to ensure the political union of Lombardy and Venetia with Piedmont'. Therefore according to Count Casati, Charles Albert was not acting upon a desire to further Italian nationalism, but to increase his own personal power as King of Piedmont. To some extent this can also be seen in Source A as the Piedmontese troops carried 'the Cross of Savoy imposed on the flag of Italy', thus

suggesting that the House of Savoy was forcing its will on the rest of the Italian states. Count Casati calls into question Charles Albert's desire to uphold popular opinion, stating that 'Charles Albert preferred the aristocracy of Lombardy.' Thus Charles Albert was not supporting the motives of workers and peasants who rebelled in 1848, but was moving to secure the position of the noble, conservative elements in society. Finally Source B also calls into question Source A's claim that 'We...hurry to associate ourselves', by stating that 'Four days were wasted at Turin'. Both sources agree that a motive was to expel Austria from the northern Italian states, however Source A claims that Charles Albert was willing and ready to fight, whereas Source B explains that he was more hesitant and unprepared for such a conflict.

(b) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How far were divisions amongst the Italian revolutionaries responsible for the failure of the 1848–1849 revolutions in the Italian States? (24 marks)

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

- 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. **0-6**
- 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

There were a number of internal and external factors that led to the failure of the 1848–1849 revolutions in the Italian States. Responses need to discuss the extent to which the revolutionaries were divided and connect these divisions to a lack of decisive action. External factors were also very important and balanced responses will consider the impact of the recovery of conservatism in the form of Austrian and French military power on the defeat of the revolutionaries.

Evidence from the sources:

The actions of Charles Albert and his impact on the course of the revolution may also be discussed.

Source B: Internal factors include the lack of military strength and organisation. Most importantly the source refers to internal divisions ‘republicans and federalists gradually broke away from what looked to them like a royalist anti-revolutionary war’.

Source C: External factors, ‘the reassertion of Austria’s military power was the key factor’.

Revolutionary divisions

Divisions within the ranks of the Italian revolutionaries include the ideological/political due to the influence of the nationalist writers Mazzini, Balbo and Gioberti. Gioberti and the neo-Guelphs of a united Italy led by the Pope were killed by the refusal of Pius IX to put himself at the head of the nationalist cause. The radical republicanism of Mazzini and the Roman Republic, Daniel Manin and the Republic of Venice, lacked support from other regions of Italy. Geographical divisions ranged from inter-state rivalry which prevented co-ordination, different aims for different states’ uprisings (e.g. Milan and Venetia wanted to overthrow Austrian rule, Sicily wanted independence from Naples and Bourbon rule, whilst the revolutionaries in Naples, Tuscany, Piedmont and the Papal States wanted to secure a more representative and liberal government). The revolutionaries were also divided socially and culturally as they were mainly driven by the middle classes who feared a social revolution and ‘mob rule’ (illustrated by Ferdinand II staging a successful counter-revolution in Naples) and who had little mass support due to their lack of understanding of the plight of the peasantry. There was a lack of awareness about national identity due to overwhelming illiteracy and scores of local dialects. Although Charles Albert had the superficial appearance of leading the Italian nation in its bid for freedom against Austria as in Source A, in reality his requirement for allies to submit to Piedmontese control intensified political divisions (Source B). Therefore the revolutionaries differed in aims, lacked cohesion and co-ordination.

External factors

The return of European stability and the swift recovery of the Austrian government ensured the decisive defeat of the Italian revolutionaries (Source C). 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 2

- (a) Explain why war between Piedmont and Austria broke out in 1859. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

- 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. **0-2**
- 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

Piedmont's war with Austria was a result of Cavour's foreign policy and the relationship that he developed with Louis Napoleon of France. Cavour's overriding objective was to extend Piedmont's political influence throughout the northern part of the Italian peninsula, but in order to do this foreign support was needed in order to overcome Austrian opposition. Therefore a longer term cause of the war with Austria in 1859 can be seen to be Piedmont's involvement in the Crimean War in 1855 and the subsequent peace negotiations at the Congress of Paris in 1856. Through involvement in the Crimean War, Piedmont won the respect and gratitude of her allies, France and Britain, and the recognition that Austrian domination of northern Italy was a diplomatic issue. Following the Congress of Paris, Cavour realised that Louis Napoleon was interested in Italian nationalism and might be induced to support Piedmont. Cavour was determined to secure Napoleon as an ally and the Orsini plot of 1858 gave him the opportunity. At his trial, Orsini appealed to Napoleon to actively support the cause of Italian unity and it has been assumed that Napoleon acted upon this and subsequently arranged the meeting at Plombieres with Cavour on 20 July 1858. It was agreed at the secret meeting at Plombieres that France would join Piedmont in a war against Austria, if war could be provoked in a way acceptable to opinion in the two countries, i.e. by making Austria appear to be the aggressor. The immediate causes of the war between Piedmont and Austria thus followed. The first attempt by Cavour was Victor Emmanuel's deliberately provocative speech at the opening of Parliament on 12 December 1858. The second attempt in March 1859 was to mobilise Piedmontese troops on the border with Lombardy. Austria responded by mobilising her troops in April. The problem for the Austrians was that having mobilised they now needed to use their army or demobilise which was costly. On 23 April the Austrians demanded Piedmontese demobilisation within three days. When it was not forthcoming the Austrians declared war and on 29 April 1859 the invasion of Piedmont began.

(b) 'The actions of Louis Napoleon III hindered the Italian unification process.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

(24 marks)

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

- 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. **0-6**
- 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

Louis Napoleon is often cited as a critical influence on the course of Italian unification and there is little doubt that he was keen to help Piedmont in its struggle against Austria. However the statement requires some consideration of the ways in which Louis Napoleon hindered the process of Italian unification.

Evidence to support the argument that Louis Napoleon hindered Italian unification

Ultimately Louis Napoleon was concerned only with the issue of Italian unification as long as it would serve the needs of France diplomatically and politically. A successful foreign policy in Italy would increase Louis Napoleon's domestic popularity. Elections in France in May 1857 showed that his imperial regime was becoming increasingly unpopular and it is this factor, more than the Orsini assassination attempt, that can account for Napoleon's desire to involve France in a successful war against Austria. At Plombieres Napoleon was concerned with the dynastic ambitions of his family and negotiated the marriage of his cousin Prince Jerome to Victor Emmanuel's daughter Clotilde. Louis Napoleon's contribution to the cause of Italian unification

was limited by the support of French Catholics who wished to protect the position of the papacy and Rome. The demands of French Catholics led to Napoleon's betrayal of Cavour and the peace at Villafranca. At Villafranca, Piedmont's ambitions were forced into compromise by the diplomacy of Napoleon. France was given control of Lombardy and Austria remained in control of Venetia, whilst the rulers of the central Italian states were to be restored. Piedmont was forbidden to annex Mantua and Peschiera and did not gain control of Modena and Parma. In 1860 France also gained control of Savoy and Nice. French intervention over the issue of Rome also prevented the full unification process after 1861. A French garrison remained until 1866 to protect Rome and returned in 1867 to prevent a revolutionary army led by Garibaldi from taking Rome. Rome eventually became part of Italy in 1870 when French troops left the city to defend French borders from Prussian troops.

Evidence to support the argument that Louis Napoleon helped Italian unification

Napoleon proved to be a useful ally to Cavour and Piedmont in breaking Austria's political and military control over the Northern Italian states. Napoleon was enthusiastic about the romantic notion of Italian liberty and nationalism and as a 22 year-old had taken part in the 1831 uprising in Rome and conspiracies in Modena and the papal states. This enthusiasm was reignited during the trial following Orsini's failed assassination attempt. It was Napoleon's agreement at Plombieres in 1858 that France would join Piedmont in a war against Austria that was important in weakening Austrian control of the Northern Italian States. More crucially, following the peace at Villafranca, Napoleon accepted that the decline in the Pope's temporal power was inevitable and that papal control of the Legations should end. This resulted in Napoleon's acceptance of Piedmontese annexation of the central Italian duchies following plebiscites, in return for Nice and Savoy. It was the fear of the French reaction to Garibaldi's invasion of Naples and possible attack on Rome that forced Cavour to order the Piedmontese army to invade the papal states, which resulted in the unification of the peninsula.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why Rome did not become part of the united Italy until 1870. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

- 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. **0-2**
- 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

In 1860 Rome remained under the protection of the French as Louis Napoleon wished to maintain the popular support of French Catholics. Pope Pius IX refused to negotiate, recognise or refer to Italy and referred only to Piedmont. Therefore the key to integrating Rome into the new Italy was through the removal of French military support by diplomatic means. Garibaldi attempted to march on Rome in 1862, but was stopped by the Piedmontese army who feared French retaliation. In 1864 the Italian Prime Minister, Minghette, through the September Convention, was able to persuade Napoleon to evacuate his troops from Rome by 1866, on the understanding that the capital of Italy would be moved from Turin to Florence, not Rome. In accordance with the September Convention, French troops left Rome in December 1866. The following autumn, Garibaldi attempted to seize Rome once again which led to Napoleon to reinstate French troops. Rome was finally occupied due to European developments, the deterioration of Franco-Prussian relations resulted in war in 1870. Italy declared neutrality and in August Napoleon withdrew his troops from Rome to reinforce French borders. The defeat of France in September saw Victor Emmanuel take action, Pius XI refused to negotiate and on 11 September 50,000 Italian troops crossed the border into Rome. In a plebiscite held on 2 October 133,681 citizens of Rome approved of annexation to Italy while 1,570 objected. Rome was immediately proclaimed the capital of the new Italy and the Law of Papal Guarantees passed in May 1871 reassured the international community that the Pope would maintain his diplomatic and spiritual independence within the Vatican.

- (b) 'The greatest weakness of the newly created Italian nation was lack of acceptance by the Catholic Church.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

(24 marks)

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

- 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. **0-6**
- 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 attitude of the Catholic Church did create political and social problems for the new Italian state. However, economic differences between the industrial north and agricultural south and the regional resentment of Piedmontisation contributed significantly to the weakness of Italy. There must be some focus on religious issues, economic and regional divisions (however brief) for answers to be credited as balanced.

In September 1870 Italian troops occupied Rome and transferred the government of the unified state to the capital, marking an intensification in the animosity that the Church felt towards the state. Alienation of the Catholic Church began in earnest in 1861 when Turin's anti-clerical laws were extended throughout the whole of Italy. The Syllabus of Errors (1864) was in essence a manifesto of Church opposition to the liberal ways of the new state. Priests throughout Italy preached the Pope's opposition and reminded good Catholics that they were forbidden from holding public office and from voting in elections (restricting the limited franchise further). Papal Infallibility was declared (July 1870) and non-recognition of the state continued despite the Law of Guarantees (1871) which virtually gave the Pope power as a separate head of state within Italy, and an income equivalent to what he had received from his territories. Thus in a country as loyally Catholic as Italy the newly unified state faced constant and influential opposition.

Economic divisions were also an important contributing factor to Italy's weaknesses. Unification left a huge debt, which could only be removed by huge taxes. Indirect taxes caused peasant revolts, the most serious occurring in January 1869 where 250 people were killed and over 4,000 imprisoned. The introduction of free trade throughout Italy lowered the price of the South's agricultural products and restricted investment in industry. The economy became increasingly dualist, with a poverty-stricken agricultural south and a rich industrial north.

Regional divisions prevented widespread acceptance of unification due to the lack of a common language. Southern states in particular felt that they were being treated as conquered territories and resented Piedmont's attempts to centralise the state. The 'Brigands War' lasted for many years and required a northern army of occupation to keep the peace.

The process of Piedmontisation intensified the economic and cultural problems of the newly unified Italy. The Statuto ensured that the model of strong central government and weak local government prevailed, exacerbating local issues. Only 2% of the population had the vote and only 1% of the population spoke Italian.