



**General Certificate of Education
January 2013**

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 students' 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 students' 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 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2013 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 students. 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 students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students 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. Students 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 students 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 student 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 students 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 students' 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*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student 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 student 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

January 2013

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 the role of Piedmont in Italian unification. (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 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 levels scheme.

Students will need to identify differences between the views of the two sources. For example:

- Source A portrays Piedmont as being vital for success – ‘it has a powerful army, money, reputation and an organised government’; Mazzini in Source B speaks grudgingly of Piedmont as ‘one corner of the country’
- Source A speaks admiringly of ‘new markets’ and stresses the need to ‘suppress internal obstacles to the free flow of commerce’, which is implicitly pro-Piedmont; Mazzini says directly it ‘is *not* a question of improving commerce and administrative efficiency’

-
- there is a sharp difference in tone and emphasis. Source A focuses on prosperity and political unity; Source B focuses on the 'whole of Italy' and 'a national call to arms'.

Students will need to apply their own knowledge of context to explain these differences. They might, for example, comment on the fact that the National Society was based in Turin and strongly supported by Cavour. Own knowledge could also be used to develop the point that Cavour and Mazzini represented very different ideologies and strongly disagreed about the role of foreign powers (Mazzini, for example, was later very hostile to the Plombières agreement) – a theme which is illustrated by several references in the sources.

To address 'how far', students should also indicate some similarity between the sources. For example:

- both sources emphasise that Piedmont should have a role but should not dominate to the exclusion of other factors. Source A stresses Piedmont 'must be ready to work with the Italian people; Source B 'is not opposed' to Piedmont as part of a 'national struggle'
- both sources show support for 'revolutionary enthusiasm' and a true 'national struggle' (** Note that this same evidence could also be used to show the differences of tone and emphasis noted above).

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may show differentiation in explaining the extent the two sources differ or agree about Piedmont – perhaps in explaining where the sources *seem* to agree but are actually sending out very different messages. They may also show skilful use of own knowledge in discussing the way Mazzini's attack on foreign powers at the end of Source B is actually a coded attack on Cavour and Piedmont for being too ready to collaborate with the European powers.

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 the years 1857 to 1860?

(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 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 should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Students should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources supporting the idea that nationalism was important to the cause of Italian unification in the years 1857 to 1860 might include:

- Source A comes directly from the National Society, formed in 1857 precisely for the purpose of harnessing nationalism. It wants Italy to become 'independent but politically united' and praises the 'revolutionary enthusiasm' of the Italian people and their 'right to override any treaty'
- Source B is entirely based on an emotional appeal to nationalism. National revolution can **only** be achieved through a national 'call to arms' and 'national struggle. Foreign help is viewed as positively undesirable and harmful
- although Source C says flatly 'nationalist movements did not create a united Italy; Piedmont did', it has a lot of evidence about nationalism mobilising 'public opinion in favour of Piedmont' and Riall even claims it would have been 'impossible' for Cavour to succeed without the support of nationalism.

Evidence in the sources that challenges the importance of nationalism might include:

- the strong statement in the first line of Source C, as noted above
- the explicit and implicit evidence in Source A about the importance of the modernisation of Piedmont and the 'free flow of commerce'.

From students' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting that nationalism was important might include:

- the role of nationalists such as Mazzini and Manin in continuing to promote the Italian republican cause ever since 1848
- the significance of Garibaldi's leadership and his actions in Naples and Sicily that forced Cavour to go further than he wanted (this might be linked to the evidence at the end of Source C).

Factors suggesting that, Cavour and Piedmont especially, were more important might include:

- Piedmont was the only truly Italian state after the failure of the 1848 revolts and had preserved its liberal constitution when all other states had failed to do so
- the fact that Piedmont began to flourish economically and politically during the 1850s and had maintained a military force able to fight in the Crimea and against Austria was vital
- Piedmont provided a focus for Italian unity because of all the exiles who arrived in Turin from other states and gave backing to the Italian National Society
- the personality and achievements of Cavour as prime minister of Piedmont were crucial to the success of unification in these years
- little could have been achieved without backing from Britain and, especially, France.

Good answers may conclude that in the years 1857 to 1860 lessons were learned about the limitations of nationalism and its failure to carry the masses along – that nationalism appealed

only to certain sections of society – but nationalism was a vital influence creating the conditions for political action to be effective.

Question 2**03** Explain why the Roman Republic was proclaimed in 1849. (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 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.

This question is firmly about the reasons why the Roman Republic was established in 1849. There is no scope here for material about later events and the eventual crushing of the republic by Pius IX with foreign help. Students might include some of the following factors:

- the proclamation of the Roman Republic in February 1849 was a reaction against Pius IX and his shift towards a reactionary, anti-revolutionary attitude
- when he became Pope in 1846, Pius IX seemed to be in sympathy with liberal ideals. There was a strong reformist movement in Rome for which Pius IX could have been a focal point – he introduced some liberal reforms in the Papal States and even Mazzini hoped to collaborate with him, but there was a lot of hostility to his Allocution of April 1848
- Pius IX was forced to flee from Rome in November 1848 after the assassination of his prime minister, Rossi
- there was strong support for democratic rule in Rome and Mazzini's ideas were very influential. Mazzini formed part of the 'Triumvirate' to rule Rome alongside Carlo Armellini and Aurelio Saffi.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might comment on the links between different elements of society in Rome – the ‘moderates’ who dreamed of a constitutional monarchy as opposed to the ‘democrats’ motivated by republican ideals.

Question 2

- 04** 'The failure of the revolutions in Italy in 1848–1849 was mainly due to the unrealistic aims of the revolutionaries.'
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 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 should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not.

Evidence supporting the idea that failure was due to 'unrealistic aims' might include:

- nationalism was strong among the educated elites but the masses were indifferent – hopes that there would be an unstoppable outpouring of national feeling were completely unrealistic. Mazzini, in particular, was both unrealistic and divisive
- although Pius IX originally appeared to be in favour of constitutional reform, there was no realistic chance of Pius IX providing the unifying leadership the revolutionaries hoped for
- Charles Albert's invasion of Lombardy was bound to fail because Piedmont's military strength was inadequate to take on the Austrians; it was unrealistic to imagine that Italy could throw off Austrian rule without the help of foreign powers
- there was no real chance of effective co-ordination among the leaders of revolts in different individual states.

Many answers will focus on other factors they consider to have been far more important than any issues of 'unrealistic aims'. Such other reasons for failure might include:

- lack of unity among the different classes
- reasons for revolt varied from place to place, e.g. economic unrest in Sicily, political agitation in Milan
- the Pope's Allocution in 1848 deprived the revolutions of the one chance of a unifying leader
- the Quadrilateral fortresses gave Austrian troops a secure base in Italy in which to regroup and launch counter-attacks
- once Austria had regrouped its forces and sorted out its internal problems it crushed the Italian revolts individually
- French intervention led to the fall of the Roman republic despite good leadership by Mazzini and Garibaldi.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that to an extent unrealistic aims did contribute to the failure of the 1848–1849 revolts, particularly in relation to Mazzini and Charles Albert, but that this was of limited importance compared to deeper, structural weaknesses in the revolutions behind the eventual failure of the 1848–1849 revolts. The Austrians were never fully expelled from Italy but consolidated their positions within the safety of the Quadrilateral forts. The Austrians defeated Charles Albert's forces at Custoza and Novara. They also put down revolts in the Central states. Ferdinand of Naples was able to crush Sicily's new constitution. The fact that the revolts operated in isolation meant that they could eventually be dealt with one at a time. The geography of the country along with poor communications added to this problem. The rebels consisted of Italians with no foreign military alliances to assist them whereas the conservative states' rulers were able to call upon Austria and France for support.

Question 3

05 Explain why Garibaldi failed to seize Rome by force in the 1860s. (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 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 should focus on explaining the reasons *why* Garibaldi failed to seize Rome in the 1860s. There were three attempts, in 1860, 1862 and 1867, but it is not necessary to describe all of these separate events as long as some of the following common factors are included:

- Garibaldi needed 'official' government support and did not receive this. In 1860 he was held back by Cavour and Victor Emmanuel. In 1862 and even more so in 1867 he had no chance of success without the backing of the King, the government and the army
- Garibaldi voluntarily 'retired' to the political sidelines in 1860; afterwards it was very hard to regain his position and the mass support he had once been able to rely on
- the Papacy had considerable political power and influence as ruler of the Papal States
- Napoleon was determined to support the Papacy – French troops were stationed in Rome from 1848 until 1870.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given.

For example, they might differentiate between long-term factors such as:

- Garibaldi's personal style of leadership and his lack of a real political power-base
- the consistency of French political and military support for the Papacy.

and short-term or immediate factors such as:

- Cavour's manipulative policies in 1860 (and the influence of Victor Emmanuel when he met Garibaldi at Teano)
- the military outcome of the Battle of Aspromonte, when Garibaldi was confronted and defeated by Victor Emmanuel's army
- the role of the French army in defeating Garibaldi's forces at the Battle of Mentana in 1867.

It might be argued, for example, that each of Garibaldi's attempts had less chance of success than the one before – that he increasingly became marginalised after 1860.

Question 3

- 06** 'In the years 1861 to 1871, the rulers of the newly united Italy completely failed to overcome internal divisions.'
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 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 should be able to make a judgement by balancing a range of arguments for and against the view that the new united state 'completely failed' to deal with Italy's internal divisions.

There is a range of possible interpretations:

- that the completion of unification between 1862 and 1871 was actually a great success. Venetia and Rome were acquired and a new liberal democracy was established
- that Italy was badly divided beneath a surface impression of unity – virtual civil war in the South up to 1865, bitter resentment of Piedmontese rule in the rest of Italy, and disillusionment with a system of government that represented a narrow elite not the people as a whole
- that the final ‘compromise’ democracy was the best that could have been hoped for – deep divisions did indeed remain but that was the inevitable consequence of centuries of fragmentation before the Risorgimento. Italy’s rulers may have ‘failed’ to deal with this legacy but they did not fail ‘completely’. In the circumstances of the time they did not do badly at all.

Possible evidence in agreement with the quotation might include:

- there was a significant North-South divide. Southern Italy was very backward economically with a lot of rural poverty and very limited infrastructure. Poor peasants were controlled by the landlords of the big estates. Between 1861 and 1865, there was the so-called ‘Brigand’s War’ – with widespread violence close to civil war
- the economic divide between North and South was worsened by political divisions. The Piedmontese army, sent in to deal with the Brigands, often acted with great brutality and this caused bitterness against ‘northern rule’. In the South there was resentment of the imposition of the new forms of government; many people in the North regarded southerners as primitive and ‘barbaric’
- there were also class divisions. The political leaders of the new Italy came mostly from the northern business classes, who controlled the political parties. Power was in the hands of a liberal oligarchy that manipulated parliamentary politics in its own interests. The high hopes of the Mazzinians – for a genuine people’s democracy – were frustrated
- perhaps the biggest division of all was between Church and State. From 1848 to 1870, the Papacy became increasingly hostile to the liberals who dominated unification. Pius IX denounced liberalism in the 1864 Syllabus of Errors and bitterly resented the capture of Rome by the Italian army in 1870. On the other side, anticlerical liberals regarded the Church as a reactionary obstacle to modernity and progress. This ‘Roman Question’ (the hostility between Church and State) was not solved until 1929.

Evidence which could be used to disagree might include:

- the violent ‘Brigands War’ in the South was brought under control from 1865
- Local government was very strong and stable, providing a lot of continuity, even though it was often rather corrupt
- there was extensive economic development in northern Italy, with modern industries supported by a good system of railways
- by 1871 Italy was seen in the rest of Europe as a modern, liberal state with democratic institutions and a constitutional monarchy. Many Italians were confident that Italy was on its way to becoming one of the Great Powers.

Whatever view is put forward, the key requirement is for a balanced argument backed by precisely selected evidence.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion