



**General Certificate of Education
June 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 events which all examiners 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 examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner 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, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 schools/colleges 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 schools/colleges 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

June 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 Italian unity by 1871. (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 generic levels scheme.

This question is focused on the extent to which Italian unity had been achieved by 1871. Effective answers to this question will make a direct comparison of the two sources in the light of own knowledge of the context. Less successful answers will provide a literal account of the evidence of each source in turn, followed by a limited comparison; or will be very generalised.

Students will need to identify differences between the views of the two sources. Such evidence might include:

- the view in **Source A** is from a legendary nationalist idealist, Mazzini, reflecting the feelings of disillusionment following the romantic optimism felt before reality hit home. The new Italy is 'a living lie' and a 'dead corpse'. It is a 'lifeless piece of mosaic' and its 'true soul is missing'. 'Ordinary people are disillusioned' and see only 'the ghost of Italy'. But the view in **Source B** has a completely different flavour. Luigi Settembrini believes the new Italy has unified 'many different ideals'; that there has been a 'sacred light of freedom' and a dawn 'after the terrible darkness'.

In addition to the many specific differences in the actual words and phrases, students may also address the stark contrast in mood, tone and emphasis. Another difference is in the dates of issue: writing five years later, in 1876, Settembrini is still rhapsodising about the 'new dawn'; writing in 1871, Mazzini is already emphasising 'disillusionment'.

To address 'how far' they should also indicate some similarity between the sources, for example:

- although the sources are written from opposite standpoints, there are elements of agreement. Both are passionate nationalists who *want* Italy to be a united nation
- they also agree about the starry-eyed optimism that existed at first. Mazzini says 'at first they dreamed of great things to come as Italy began to rise' – this chimes in with the 'sun of unity' rising in Source B.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may conclude that Source A overstates the pessimism of the immediate moment in 1871 and that such disillusioned feelings may have cooled down by 1876; or they may argue that Mazzini is just as much an idealist as Settembrini is and that they agree totally on what *should* have happened; they just disagree about the results. Another differentiated judgement could be that both sources are over-stated and the true situation was more nuanced.

Question 1**02** Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How important were the actions of foreign powers in the later stages of Italian unification in the years 1861 to 1870? (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.

The focus of this question is on the reasons why the process of Italian unification was completed between 1861 and 1870 and in particular how much of that process was shaped by the actions of foreign powers. Source C takes it for granted that foreign influences were massively important and gives several reasons why this was so. Some answers may challenge this view, arguing that unity was largely by Italian nationalism – or that the most important influence was the obstructiveness of the Papacy.

The sources provide plentiful evidence about foreign influences, both explicit and implicit:

Source A: ‘foreigners own our territory’; ‘battles that were fought by foreign rulers we should have hated’.

Source B: flatly denies the importance of foreigners – it is all about a ‘generation of giants’ (i.e. Italians) who carried out an impossible task and gathered ‘under a single flag’.

Source C: suggests foreign actions were all-important – ‘no final military effort’ at ‘Italian control’; no crucial Italian initiative; Prussia forcing Austria to cede Venetia in 1866; the Franco-Prussian War decisive in making Rome the capital in 1870.

Effective answers will use own knowledge to provide a clear argument and assessment in response to the question ‘how important?’ Many answers will focus almost entirely on foreign involvement and assessing its impact; but many answers will consider a range of other factors, including Garibaldi, the legacy of Cavour, and perhaps especially the role of Pius IX.

One feature of high-quality answers may be differentiated judgement – for example the view that a key factor *holding back* the completion of true unification in the 1860s was France – Napoleon III and French policies are not much mentioned in the sources but many answers will focus own knowledge on this contradictory aspect.

Key issues relevant to the years from 1861 to 1870 might include:

- longer term issues leading to divisions in Italy such as the ‘Roman Question’ and the role of Pius IX (also the anticlericalism among Italian liberals and republicans)
- specific events between 1861 and 1870, such as Garibaldi’s failed attempts to seize Rome in 1862 and 1867
- the failings of Italian armed forces in 1866
- the rise of Prussia and its impact in 1866 and 1870
- the role of northern armies in suppressing unrest in the South in the ‘Brigands War’.

NB Some answers may focus very directly on 1870–1871, neglecting developments from 1871; others may try to use evidence from 1858–1860. If **used** to support a relevant argument, these approaches can be valid – but narrative description of developments before 1861 will have little value.

Question 2

03 Explain why Piedmont declared war on Austria in March 1848. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and 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.

Answers should be able to present a range of reasons for the outbreak of Piedmont's war. One feature of good answers may be explanation of why it was in March 1848, rather than at some other date – but this is not a requirement.

Possible reasons might include:

- the longer-term and more general causes of instability: Austrian weakness; the spread of revolution from the South; Mazzinian ideas of a national uprising; the desire for constitutional change and the reforms of Pius IX after 1846
- short-term local factors affecting Piedmont, such as the fact that only Piedmont had the military power to launch a 'real' war; or the pressures of events 'inviting' Piedmont to intervene in Lombardy
- the specific motives of Charles Albert – his ambitions for territorial aggrandisement, his desire to appear as a great military leader, the way he was swept along on the tide of events. (***) NB these motives might well involve several factors, not just one.)

One feature of good answers may be the ability to make links between the various factors involved, perhaps by explaining how Charles Albert's original actions came from very mixed motives; or prioritising the relative importance of various factors that pushed Piedmont to act.

Question 2

- 04** 'The fight for Italian unification in 1848–1849 failed because of the military strength of Austria.'
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.

The focus of this question is on the factors causing the failure of the revolutions across Italy in 1848–49, as the original high hopes aroused by the uprisings were crushed by the forces of reaction. Many students will largely agree with the key quotation; but others may argue that although Austrian military strength had a powerful impact, other factors were more significant.

Evidence in support of the central importance of Austrian military power might include:

- the fact that there was a temporary political collapse in 1848 but then a rapid political recovery; and that Austria's military power was far greater than its opponents
- the importance of the Quadrilateral forts
- the strength of Austria's conservative allies
- the skilful generalship of Radetsky.

Evidence to challenge the importance of Austrian military strength and to point towards other, more significant factors might include:

- the fact that many elements within the *risorgimento* were unrealistic and too extreme – there were many personal conflicts between Mazzinians and other revolutionary leaders
- the fact that the various uprisings had very diverse causes and were not a united outburst of nationalism and idealism
- the fact that the revolutions could not rely on an effective armed force – Charles Albert, although he did have the Piedmontese army, was a poor commander
- the view that the most important reason for the failure of the revolutions was Pius IX and his reversal of attitude, depriving the revolutions of national unity and legitimacy.

Question 3

05 Explain why the Italian National Society was formed in 1857. (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.

Answers should provide an argued explanation of a range of factors perhaps with an evaluation of relative importance.

Possibilities include:

- the influence of key individuals, such as Pallavicino, La Farina and Daniel Manin
- general, longer-term factors relating to lessons learned from the failures of 1848–49
- the role of Turin as a magnet for nationalists and liberals from other parts of Italy
- the scheming of Cavour who wanted to use the National Society to promote his policies and influence.

To reach the higher levels, answers will need to make links and add depth of comment – perhaps showing how various factors were interrelated (such as Garibaldi's relationship with Victor Emmanuel) or explaining the relationship between Piedmont and Italian nationalism, or differentiating between factors of more or lesser significance.

Question 3

- 06** 'The strength of Piedmont was the main reason why most of Italy was united by 1861.'
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.

The key quotation says firmly that Piedmont was the key to the achievement of the new Italy by 1861. Many students will see Piedmont and Cavour as one and the same thing but others will differentiate between the strengths of the Piedmontese state and the role of Cavour as a master architect achieving his political ends through brilliant, devious diplomatic skill. Many answers will agree with the view that Piedmont and Cavour were all-important but there is a range of other factors that might be put forward, above all Garibaldi and the role of foreign powers.

There are many possibilities here and supporting evidence may be selective rather than comprehensive.

(*** NB It is likely that many answers will look at back to 1852, if not even earlier – this is a valid approach but other answers will focus more closely on 1858–61, which is an equally appropriate way of addressing the question.)

Possible arguments in favour of the quotation might include:

- Piedmont was the only Italian state with the economic and military strength to challenge Austria. It was the success of Cavour in building up Piedmont in the 1850s that enabled Piedmont to dominate the key decisions about the new state and its constitution
- only Piedmont was in a position to make an alliance with France in 1858–59
- the King of Piedmont was the only credible national leader of a unified Italy
- Cavour's skill in manipulating developments such as the plebiscites in the Papal States, showed he was a political genius, deserving the title 'father of the nation'
- other leading figures in the Risorgimento had been weakened and divided by the events of 1848–49. The Italian National Society could never have been effective without the capital of Piedmont as its base.

Evidence supporting the opposite view might include:

- Piedmontese domination was what Cavour aimed at all along – but it was Garibaldi who forced the pace and ensured the inclusion of the South in the new Italy. Garibaldi can be seen as the driving force, both militarily and through his meeting with the King at Teano
- Cavour's 'moderate', northern, anti-clerical approach to unification was not enough – success also required the nationalist fervour of what Cavour called 'senseless dreamers'
- Cavour's skill in manipulating the alliance with France was less important than the raw facts of French military power – the *only* way Austria could be defeated.