



**General Certificate of Education  
January 2012**

**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](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2012 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

---

January 2012

**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 Pope Pius IX. (12 marks)

*Target: AO2(a)*

**Levels Mark Scheme**

- |   |              |
|---|--------------|
| Nothing written worthy of credit.   | <b>0</b>     |
| <b>L1:</b> Answers will <b>either</b> briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources <b>or</b> identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak.   | <b>1-2</b>   |
| <b>L2:</b> 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.   | <b>3-6</b>   |
| <b>L3:</b> Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences <b>and</b> similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed.                                       | <b>7-9</b>   |
| <b>L4:</b> 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. | <b>10-12</b> |

**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 and explain differences between the views of the two sources. For example:

- Source B is the Pope fiercely denouncing the kind of nationalists who issued the proclamation in Source A
- the Pope's supporters link him to a hostile attitude to Austria in Source A – 'savage occupying army' and 'enemies of God'; as opposed to 'embrace all peoples and nations with equal fatherly love' in Source B

- Source A claims ‘the Holy Father has blessed your swords’ but Source B flatly denies this
- in Source B the Pope warns against being ‘carried away’ whereas Source A has emotive language designed to have exactly that effect and assumes this is in the name of the Pope.

Students will need to apply their own knowledge of context to explain these differences. They might, for example, note that Source B is in many ways a direct response to Source A, with Pius IX rejecting claims made in his name by the leaders of the army of the Papal States. Students may use their own knowledge of the sharp change in attitude by Pius IX when he swerved away from his possible role as leader of the revolution and issued his Allocution; and may explain also his reaction against the idea of a republic. In this sense, the sources are different in time, Source A belonging to the earlier phase and, by its extreme tone actually helping to cause the Pope’s switch away from revolution and towards reaction.

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

- both sources agree on the central authority and importance of the Papacy
- both agree that Rome is influenced by events elsewhere in Italy, such as the actions of Charles Albert
- both claim to be speaking in the name of God.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may conclude that there are significant differences in tone and emphasis as well as specific differences of view – and that Source B is setting straight mistaken assumptions like those expressed in Source A.

---

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

How far was the failure of the 1848–49 revolutions in Italy due to internal divisions?

*(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.

The key issue of internal divisions must be addressed, and *could* provide the basis for most of the answer, though it is possible that many students will focus their arguments on other factors deemed to be more important. These factors include the mistakes and failings of key individuals – especially Pius IX but also Charles Albert; the residual strength of the Austrian military forces; the lack of sufficient popular support; lack of recognition from foreign powers; the unrealistic expectations of nationalist idealists.

Students should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A** – is an attempt to whip up patriotic and religious enthusiasm among the soldiers. Its tone implies that there is massive popular support for their cause both as a national struggle and as a ‘Christian war of civilisation’. No internal divisions on show here!
- **Source B** – shows clear divisions in that the Pope rejects extreme actions and regards popular support for the mood in Source A as regrettable and dangerous (‘some at present desire’; ‘carried away’ and the need for an ‘urgent warning’ not to break away from obedience to existing rulers).
- **Source C** – is full of evidence on the importance of Pius IX and his ‘thunderbolt’ as a turning point, with Pius IX ‘largely responsible’ for starting the nationalist movement and also for halting it. By implication, it also rejects the idea of widespread popular support and focuses on revolution from the top down. Here, there is plentiful evidence of ‘internal divisions’ – ‘confusion’ and the role of the King of Naples; the key failure of Piedmont, whose King was ‘more concerned with dominance over Lombardy and Venetia than with freeing the Italian people’; the ‘hesitation’; and the implicit reference to the Austrian strength.

From students’ own knowledge:

Factors suggesting internal divisions were important might include:

- the undemocratic nature of ruling regimes, apart from Piedmont
- the fact that those who showed enthusiasm for (and articulated the ideals of) national independence tended to be from the educated classes and had little contact with or knowledge of the masses
- the fact that revolution was actually unwelcome and frightening to many people – as is shown by the Pope’s reaction to republicanism in Source B and the ‘counter-revolution’ led by the King of Naples (Source C).

Factors suggesting other factors were more significant might include:

- weak leadership by Charles Albert and others
- the central importance of the Pope and his influence over huge numbers of Catholics
- local and class differences and the whole question of lack of coordination between uprisings in different places, at different times and with different aims
- personality clashes among the revolutionaries
- the impossibility of achieving lasting military success against Austrian armies without foreign support
- the damaging effects of unrealistic expectations and impractical ideals, e.g. Mazzini.



Good answers may show skill in assessing the relative importance of a wide range of factors; or good understanding of links between different factors. It might even be argued that lack of popular support was more a symptom of failure than its cause.

---

**Question 2**

- 03** Explain why Cavour made an agreement with Napoleon III at Plombières in 1858. (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 include a range of Cavour's motives for the meeting at Plombières and why he was able to reach an agreement satisfactory to himself and to Napoleon III.

(Note that the focus of the question is on *why* the deal was made, not *what* was agreed).

Students might include some of the following contextual factors:

- the cause of Italian unification was on the agenda in the late 1850s (as with the formation of the National Society in 1857) but there was no prospect of it succeeding without foreign assistance
- the chance event of the Orsini assassination attempt in 1858 triggered a response from Napoleon III and got him more closely involved in Italian affairs. He wanted to acquire Savoy and Nice as the price of his support to Cavour; and he had always wanted to 'do something for Italy' since his experiences with Young Italy in the 1830s.

Students may refer to some of the following factors influencing Cavour:

- Cavour was already eagerly seeking foreign help – in 1856 he attended the Paris peace conference in the hope of gaining backing from Britain and/or France
- Cavour wanted to keep complete control over the negotiations – he seems to have been aiming for Piedmont to dominate northern Italy, not trying to unify Italy
- the opportunity to make a largely secret deal with Napoleon III behind closed doors suited his political style – especially since he was so keen on getting Napoleon III on board that he was willing to give away Nice and Savoy
- Cavour knew Napoleon III was worried that a united Italy might be a threat to France but Cavour was happy to reassure him that Piedmont was not working for total unification.

To reach the higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might analyse Cavour's motives, while explaining that these did not reflect the views of other key players such as Mazzini or Garibaldi (or even his own King).

NB Some answers will relate extensive evidence concerning Napoleon III and his motives. This can only be implicitly relevant to the question. Answers cannot rise above Level 2 unless specifically focused on Cavour.

---

**Question 2**

- 04** 'Garibaldi was the main reason for the success of Italian unification in the years 1859 to 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.**

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence that supports the view given against that which does not. Many answers will put forward arguments that Garibaldi's contribution was not the main factor at all: for example that Cavour's contribution was much more important; or that *the* decisive factor was support from foreign powers; or that deeper

forces of history were pushing Italy (as also Germany) forward to some kind of unification in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, regardless of key individuals.

Evidence which supports the view that Garibaldi was the main factor might include:

- the powerful appeal of nationalism and of Garibaldi's charismatic popular appeal
- the fact that it was his intervention in Sicily which forced Cavour into acting more radically than he wished to. (Cavour tried hard to prevent or at least to slow down Garibaldi's momentum but was unable to do so – he ended up being carried along on Garibaldi's tide)
- it was Garibaldi's meeting with the King at Teano that decided the outcome of the unification process, with the South included
- it was Garibaldi's willingness to stand back in 1861 that allowed the political process to be carried through without internal divisions boiling over.

Evidence to support the view that other factors were more important might include:

- unification could only take place if Austria was militarily defeated. This was done by the French Army and would have been completely impossible for Italian forces
- British assistance (and diplomatic acceptance) was also vital
- only Cavour had the political skill to attract this foreign support and keep it 'onside'
- only the modernisation and political strength of Piedmont could provide the basis for unification
- only Cavour's political realism could save Italy from the chaos that would have been caused if unification was led by impractical idealists such as Garibaldi or Mazzini.

Good answers are likely to explain how various factors were inter-related, perhaps concluding for example that although Cavour was the key figure his actions were different than they would have been without the 'trigger' of Garibaldi's invasion of Sicily; or (as argued above) that Italian unification in some form or other was going to take place anyway because of wider historical and economic developments but that Garibaldi had a uniquely important role in accelerating the process and making it more nationalist.

---

**Question 3**

**05** Explain why French troops remained in Rome until 1870. (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 include a range of reasons as to why French troops remained in Rome. Some students may use their knowledge of why French forces were finally withdrawn in 1870 – this could be relevant and effective but only if directly applied to the question.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- the revolutionary situation in Rome in 1849 led to the arrival of a French army which restored Pope Pius IX – a French garrison remained afterwards to protect the Pope
- Napoleon III was pressured by French Catholics to continue his protection after the revolutions were over
- Napoleon III was ambivalent about the pace and extent of Italian unification. Although he promised in 1864 to assist Italy to make Rome its capital, he did not really want this
- Garibaldi made attempts to seize Rome in 1862 and again in 1867 – French forces were seen as essential to block this (as they did by defeating Garibaldi at Mentana in 1867)
- Napoleon III was never willing to pull his garrison out of Rome voluntarily – he only did so in 1870 because France was fighting a losing war against Prussia.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might differentiate between (or make connections between long-term and short-term factors; or show depth of understanding in separating the public stance taken by Napoleon III from his *real* motives.

**Question 3**

- 06** 'In the years 1862 to 1871, Italy achieved national unity.'  
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 points which agree with the view that national unity was achieved. Many, perhaps most, students may challenge this view, emphasising the gulf between hopes and realities and the deep disillusionment felt by idealists like Mazzini; but there is indeed a balance of evidence on either side. The key dates are important: 1862 marks the period after the first phase of unification in 1859–61 and after Cavour was dead. There is scope for a valid assessment of the extent of unity achieved by 1861, and of



the context in which the process of unification moved forwards from 1862, but descriptive detail on Cavour and the events up to 1861 would have very limited relevance.

Evidence to support the view unity was truly achieved might include:

- the Society for the Emancipation of Italy was set up by Garibaldi in 1862; this was part of the enhanced feeling of national expectancy in the 1860s
- an alliance between Italy and Prussia in April 1866 paved the way for the acquisition of Venetia after Prussia's victory over Austria at Sadowa. The massive yes vote in the plebiscite held in Venice to approve annexation showed intense enthusiasm for unity
- the 'liberation' of the Papal States in 1870 virtually completed territorial unification
- the establishment of Rome as the historic national capital was a key symbol of national unity, replacing regional capitals such as Turin and Florence
- the extension of the Italian monarchy under the new liberal constitution gave Italy the political basis of a modern nation-state.

Evidence suggesting that true unity was *not* achieved might include:

- the monarchy was widely seen as Piedmontese, not genuinely Italian; and this reaction against 'Piedmontisation' extended to the way the new state was run, including the legal system and the economy
- democrats and national idealists disliked the political domination of a narrow northern elite and were disillusioned about the lack of democracy
- there was a massive cultural and economic divide between North and South
- the bitter disputes between the new Liberal Italy and the Papacy (symbolised by the Syllabus of Errors in 1864 and the Doctrine of Papal Infallibility in 1870) left the Papacy a bitter enemy of the new state for the next 60 years – in a nation that was overwhelmingly Catholic this was a huge obstacle to unity and deprived the new state of legitimacy.

Good answers may show skill and balance in differentiating between territorial unification and the more complicated 'national mood'; or they may show depth of understanding of the reasons why Italy's history and geography made it incredibly difficult to weld together the various regions and city-states of Italy into one coherent whole. Some answers may conclude that there was never any realistic possibility of forming a state that would satisfy the hopes of men like Mazzini and Garibaldi.

### **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](http://www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion)