



**General Certificate of Education
June 2013**

AS History 1041

HIS2K

Unit 2K

A New Roman Empire?

Mussolini's Italy, 1922–1945

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 and 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 and 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

HIS2K: A New Roman Empire? Mussolini's Italy, 1922–1945

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 prisoners' experiences of *confino* in Fascist Italy. (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.

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.

Source differences:

- the tone of the sources are completely different. Source A does not portray any of the cruelty and terror experienced by prisoners in Source B. The local official in Source A 'relished poking fun' at the Fascist government's attempts to impose strict prison like conditions on the 70 prisoners in Ospedaletto, whereas Source B states that 'prisoners were subject to the tyranny and the cruelty of a Fascist Militia officer'

-
- the sources refer to the different conditions experienced by different kinds of prisoners. The prisoners in Source A are Jews, victims of the Race Laws, whereas in Source B they are political prisoners and anti-Fascist militants. This is clearly a reason for the differences in the conditions experienced by the prisoners. In Source A the official in charge of the prisoners is not a Fascist, he is referred to as a 'local official', hence his disparaging attitude to the Fascist regime and sympathy towards the prisoners, whereas in Source B, those punishing prisoners were Fascist Militia officers, the hard core supporters of the regime and therefore those most willing to discipline prisoners
 - Source A portrays the experience of *confino* much closer to Mussolini's intention of the punishment, as stated in Source B, 'kind and humane deportation'.

There are elements of agreement, however:

- both sources agree that prisoners in *confino* would be closely supervised by the regime and lost their freedom of movement
- both sources agree that prisoners in *confino* lived in local communities.

Own knowledge could include:

- students can use their own knowledge to explain how the Race Laws were unpopular in Italy and how this may explain Don Pepe's sympathetic attitude to the prisoners in Source A
- an understanding of how different types of prisoners were treated
- an understanding of the patchy control of the regime over the South, resulting in different prisoner experiences.

One feature of high-level responses may be the understanding that the patchy nature of the Fascist regime's control over the South meant that prisoner experiences of *confino* did vary considerably. In an area controlled by a loyal Fascist Militia officer, prisoner experiences were ones of cruelty and repression, whilst in a region which was controlled by local government officials, the experiences were much less harsh. Conditions also varied depending upon the "crime" victims were imprisoned for. Political opponents of the regime were viewed as a serious threat and suffered much more repression than Jewish prisoners incarcerated in the South.

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

How successful was Mussolini's regime in destroying opposition to the Fascist state in the years 1926 to 1939? (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 degree to which Mussolini's regime was successful in destroying opposition to the Fascist state. Descriptions of anti-Fascist groups are not in themselves useful.

Evidence from the sources:

Source A: Reveals important information about the inconsistency of the control the Fascist regime was able to impose throughout Italy, particularly the South. This suggests that although the regime had systems in place to remove opposition, the punishment of opponents was by no means brutal.

Source B: Illustrates the effective nature with which the Fascist regime was able to round up and imprison political prisoners and anti-Fascist militants.

Source C: States that opposition was driven out of Italy, but continued in exile. Opponents of the regime were active inside Italy, but ineffective, primarily due to the use and enforcement of the law.

Effective answers will provide a clear argument and assessment in response to the question 'how successful?' Own knowledge and understanding will inform answers with a reasoned argument about the degree of success.

Evidence from own knowledge that Mussolini's regime was successful in destroying opposition:

- the creation of a one party state and personal dictatorship by January 1926
- Fascist terror and violence forced opposition to flee from Italy (Source C). The Communists and Socialists fled to Moscow, whilst democratic opposition fled to France
- the creation of the legal system to remove potential opponents to the regime, 1926 saw the creation of the Law for the Defence of the State which enabled the state to impose the death penalty for political crimes (Source C)
- the regime's Battle against the Mafia was hailed as a great success
- the effectiveness of the systems of repression imposed, such as the OVRA (1927) to systematically remove political opponents of the regime and the implementation of *confino*
- there was the lack of any significant uprising against the regime and the majority of Italians conformed to the Fascist regime. This was due to Mussolini using both the 'carrot and the stick' methods of control. Evidence of Mussolini's methods to control the population and reduce the potential to oppose the regime includes: the success of propaganda, the cult of Il Duce and the ties of personal loyalty, indoctrination through education reforms, youth groups, Fascist organisations such as Corporations, the OND
- Mussolini's compromise with the Catholic Church, in the form of the 1929 Lateran Agreement, ensured that the majority of Italians who were Catholic did not oppose the regime. Catholic anti-Fascist opposition group Movimento Guelfo d'Azione was destroyed in 1933.

Evidence from own knowledge that Mussolini was not successful in destroying opposition:

- opposition to the regime did exist through numerous groups. Examples which may be given include: Justice and Liberty (GL) – founded in 1929 by the Rosselli brothers in Paris, the creation of the Catholic anti-Fascist organisation in 1928 in Milan – Movimento Guelfo d'Azione, and the Communist cells which had between 2,000 and 8,000 members which were able to publish the opposition newspaper *Unita*

-
- brave individuals opposed the regime also. Both Bassanesi (in 1930) and De Bosis (in 1931) were able to distribute anti-Fascist propaganda
 - during the 1930s, particularly in the depths of the Great Depression, there were protests and strikes against the regime in the Northern cities
 - opponents of Mussolini's regime, who formed the Garibaldi Legion, were successful in defeating Italian Fascist forces at the battle of Guadalajara in 1937 during the Spanish Civil War
 - from 1936, there was increasing non-conformity within the population towards the regime's attempts to radicalise. The Reform of Customs and the Race Laws were widely ignored by Italians
 - more importantly the Catholic Church remained as an important moral critic of the regime, despite the Lateran Agreement. In 1931 the Church spoke out against the Fascist persecution of the Catholic Action youth groups. Again in 1938, the Church spoke openly against the Race Laws. Therefore, Mussolini was not able to silence all opposition to the Fascist regime.

Mussolini's regime was very successful in neutralising opposition through a combination of repressive policing, propaganda and bribery. Anti-Fascist groups in exile were relatively impotent and were only marginally successful in demonstrating against the regime during the economic crisis of the Great Depression. Ultimately, looking towards Mussolini's downfall, internal resistance was limited in its impact and only emerged after Il Duce had been removed by a palace coup, which was triggered by the Allied invasion. Therefore, Mussolini's regime was effective in preventing effective opposition to Fascism within Italy in the period in question, but failed to remove all opposition to the regime.

Question 2

03 Explain why there was a Fascist March on Rome in October 1922. (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 Fascist March on Rome In October 1922; the best responses will differentiate according to relative importance of particular factors. Reasons might include:

- the March on Rome was part of Mussolini's 'twin track' policy to secure power, the threat of violence twinned with negotiations with the holders of power
- the March on Rome was planned as a means of bringing Mussolini into power. The Fascists won only 7% of the vote in the 1921 elections, Mussolini refused anything less than the Prime Minister's post. His radical followers (the Ras) demanded a takeover of local and central government. Mussolini used the threat of the Ras to reinforce his claims and on 29 October King Victor Emmanuel invited him to Rome to form a government
- the March on Rome was necessary to quell growing unrest within the radical elements of the Fascist Party who resented Mussolini's talks with the political Establishment. The Fascist Ras wanted an immediate seizure of power and revolution
- the March was timed to exploit the weaknesses within the Liberal government, therefore it was a reaction to the weak leadership of Facta, Prime Minister from February–October 1922, who failed to act against Fascist threats and violence and Salandra, who

took over in October, who was unable to persuade Mussolini to join his government and so advised his appointment as Prime Minister.

Ultimately, the March on Rome was designed to secure Mussolini as Prime Minister and his position as leader of the Fascist Party. Answers which lapse into a narrative of the events of the March on Rome will be limited. What is required is an understanding of why the March on Rome took place.

Question 2

- 04** 'King Victor Emmanuel III was responsible for Mussolini's consolidation of power in the years 1922 to 1926.'

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 extent to which the king was responsible for Mussolini's rise to power. Many factors enabled Mussolini's rise to power. Victor Emmanuel's influence was only one aspect. Other factors included the ineffectiveness of the parliamentary opposition, the mistakes of the political left, Mussolini's image, strategy and appeal. The balance of evidence in answers will depend on what factors are argued to hold the most importance.

Evidence that the king was responsible might include:

- the king's refusal to impose martial law in October 1922 and his not signing Facta's decree. This was because the king feared a potential army coup and the loss of his own position. Consequently, by failing to take the initiative to stop the Fascists by force, the king was left with little alternative but to appoint Mussolini as prime minister
- without the king's backing it was difficult for other politicians to oppose Mussolini and the Fascists. The king saw Mussolini and the Fascists as the only credible political force against the rise of socialism in Italy. A socialist revolution had to be stopped; otherwise the monarchy would be forced to abdicate as in Russia in 1917
- the king granted Mussolini the power of Emergency laws for one year at the end of 1922; this enabled Mussolini to introduce the Acerbo Law in 1923, to ensure a Fascist majority in the Chamber
- following the Matteotti Crisis in the summer of 1924, the king refused to dismiss Mussolini, again because of fears of socialism and Mussolini's threat to replace Victor Emmanuel with his pro-Fascist cousin Duke Aosta.

Counter argument

However, whilst the king's role was important up until 1924, Victor Emmanuel was manipulated by the contextual circumstances in post-war Italy and by Mussolini's actions.

Therefore it can be argued that other factors were important:

- the king's fear of socialism in 1922 was manipulated by Mussolini in order to achieve power. The Fascists deliberately stirred up anti-socialist feelings through violent attacks on the left during 1922. In the summer of 1922 fascist violence enhanced Mussolini's chances of being appointed into power through decisively crushing the General Strike
- the weakness of the left wing opposition enabled the Fascists to over-exaggerate fears of a socialist revolution. The left was divided and limited in its ability to resist a Fascist take over
- the indecisiveness of the parliamentary opposition left a political power vacuum, which Mussolini was able to fill, particularly following the Matteotti Affair
- the rebranding of the core Fascist ideology in 1921 widened the appeal of the PNF by 1922. Republicanism was dropped, as was anti-clericalism. Consequently the Fascist takeover of northern cities prior to October 1922 gave Mussolini a power base from which to launch his quest for national power. In addition, the Fascist merger with the Nationalists in 1923 made the Fascists and Mussolini appear to be more respectable
- Mussolini's strategy was to use the psychological threat of terror to encourage the political elite to give him power, such as through the March on Rome. Terror was also used to great effect to pass the Acerbo Law in 1923, to manipulate the election result of 1924 and in the post Matteotti period to remove opposition from Italy
- Mussolini's compromises with the elite after October 1922 helped to secure his parliamentary position, e.g. the merger with the Nationalists in 1923, the taming of the PNF Ras, the appointment of De Stefani to head the economy
- Mussolini used the law to create a legal, personal dictatorship by 1926.

Therefore, as prime minister, Mussolini's power was granted by the authority of the king. The king appointed Mussolini into power and could dismiss Mussolini. The king's decision was to use Mussolini and the Fascists for his own ends, to prevent a potential left wing uprising, which would ultimately have led to the removal of the monarchy in Italy. Thus, the king must bear some of the responsibility for Mussolini being appointed power in 1922 and his subsequent ability to consolidate his position after 1924. However, following 1924 it can be argued that it

was Mussolini's own actions which helped to secure his power, through compromises with the elite, manipulation of the law and the sanctioning of violence and terror.

Question 3

05 Explain why Italy did not enter the War in September 1939. (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 a range of reasons as to why Italy did not enter the war in September 1939.

Students may refer to some of the following long-term factors:

- constant warfare, since the invasion of Abyssinia in 1935, had seriously weakened Italy's economic and military capability for war in 1939. This was symbolised by Italy's 'shopping list' to Nazi Germany in September 1939
- weaknesses in Italy's economic capability and psychological preparedness for war in September 1939 can be blamed on the long-term failings of the regime to create a totalitarian regime

and some of the following short-term/immediate factors:

- despite signing the Pact of Steel with Germany Mussolini still wanted to keep his options open for a diplomatic agreement with Britain and France. Mussolini did not trust Hitler

and abhorred the Nazi-Soviet Pact of August 1939. Declaring war in September 1939 would have limited Mussolini's ability to negotiate with the democratic powers

- Mussolini had signed the Pact of Steel in 1939 under the impression that war would not be declared until 1943 at the earliest
- popular opinion within Italy was against the alliance with Germany and was anti-war (as illustrated by the heroic welcome Mussolini received after he secured peace in Europe through the Munich Agreement of 1938). To declare war in September 1939 would have seriously undermined Mussolini's position within Italy
- Hitler did not insist that Italy adhered to the Pact of Steel in September 1939; therefore Mussolini was able to negotiate a position of 'non-belligerence' for Italy.

Ultimately, non-belligerence was a necessary strategic decision to keep Italy out of the war in September 1939 as the country was ill-prepared for conflict.

Question 3

- 06** 'The impact of War in the years 1940 to 1945 was the main reason for the collapse of Fascism in Italy.'
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 to effective answers is an understanding of the reasons why Mussolini was finally removed from power in 1945. The impact of the War was important but needs to be balanced by a range of other factors, such as Mussolini's mistakes, the long-term failures of Fascism, and the role of internal resistance to Mussolini.

Evidence that the War was the crucial factor in Mussolini's removal from power might include:

- allied defeats of Italian forces throughout the war were crucial in exposing the ineptness of Mussolini's position as a war leader and the inability of the Italian war machine to live up to Fascist propaganda
- the Italian disastrous record in World War Two was due to Mussolini's poor leadership as head of the armed forces
- allied blockade of Italian ports left Italy short of essential food and materials. As early as December 1940 there were food shortages. In addition, Allied bombing campaigns had a devastating impact on Italian wartime production and by 1942 the regime could no longer hide the truth that Italy was failing to win the war. This increased general discontent and resentment of the Fascist regime
- the War led to the Allied invasion of Sicily in 1943 and triggered the palace coup and removal of Mussolini from power for the first time in July 1943
- the continuation of the War after Mussolini's dismissal in July 1943 led to the Allies who liberated Rome in 1944 and pushing the Nazi forces back they broke through the Comacchio Line and Argento Gap in April 1945 forcing SS General Wolff to surrender and Mussolini to flee from the Salò Republic.

However, the War was not solely responsible for the removal of Mussolini from power. The war merely exposed the long term shortcomings of the Fascist regime. Moreover It can be argued that Mussolini undermined his own position through poor decision making and that his power base in the Salò Republic from September 1943 was completely reliant on Nazi Germany. The Partisan resistance within Italy also played a part in Mussolini's downfall in April 1945.

- the long term shortcomings of Fascism included the failure of autarky, which impacted on the war effort, a nation far removed from the Italian warriors Mussolini's propaganda portrayed and a dictator who was not the highest form of political authority in Italy. Mussolini compromised with the Italian elite to secure his position of power and it was the elite and the King who dismissed Mussolini in July 1943
- Mussolini himself was ultimately responsible for his own downfall. He increasingly believed his own propaganda and antagonised members of the Fascist Grand Council by dismissing key ministers in the Spring of 1943 who disagreed with his military decisions
- Italian Fascism and Mussolini's position of power as prime minister were dependent upon the support of the king and the Italian establishment. Allied victories and Mussolini's weaknesses as a war time leader left the king with little choice but to remove Mussolini from power in July 1943
- from July 1943 Mussolini was 'a walking corpse', a shadow of his former self. He was unable to exert influence over the Salò Republic. Mussolini was focused on getting revenge, rather than unity, e.g. he ordered the death of Ciano and other Fascists who betrayed him in July 1943, this weakened his authority within the Salò Republic, making his removal from power in April 1945 more likely
- the Salò Republic was completely reliant on Germany. All decisions had to go through German Ambassador Rahn or SS General Wolff. As the Germans were forced to retreat all physical protection for the Salò Republic and Mussolini was removed
- the British Hewitt Report after the war concluded that "without these partisan victories there would have been no Allied victory in Italy so swift, so overwhelming, or so inexpensive." Therefore the role of the anti-Fascist partisans must be considered in the period between July 1943 and April 1945.

Mussolini was removed from power twice and therefore reasons for his downfall vary between 1940 and April 1945. The War was a fundamental reason why Mussolini was dismissed in July 1943 and why he was forced to retreat in April 1945. However it can legitimately be argued that Mussolini's ill-informed decisions and the failures of his version of totalitarianism were also to blame for his fall from power.

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