



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2011**

**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 candidates' 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 candidates' 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 candidates' 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 © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

---

## Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

---

## CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

### AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

#### General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

---

##### Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

---

June 2011

**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 Cavour at the Paris Peace Conference. (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 candidates 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.**

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

- **Source A** portrays Cavour attending the conference as a politician who is 'not hopeful' and was at first not even inclined to attend; in **Source A**, Cavour 'arrives hoping to win territorial concessions'
- in **Source A**, Cavour 'knew there was no point' in demanding Lombardy; in **Source B**, Lombardy is 'perhaps' on the agenda along with the duchies

- 
- in **Source A** Cavour plays only a 'modest role'; in **Source B** he makes a 'considerable' achievement in getting the Italian Question out in the open. (**Source A** has the Austrians claiming there is no such thing as the Italian Question)
  - in **Source A**, British foreign secretary Clarendon appears very sympathetic to the Italian cause; in **Source B** the 'British and French are 'not prepared to fall out with the Austrians'.

Candidates will need to apply their own knowledge of context to explain these differences. They might, for example, comment on British ambivalence towards Piedmont, especially the fact that Clarendon seems to have gone beyond his diplomatic instructions and given Cavour false hopes as a result. Own knowledge could be used to develop the point that Cavour returned home from the conference with no territorial gains or military alliances. Candidates may also decide that one source is more convincing and 'correct' than the other in the debate over Piedmont's involvement in the Crimean War.

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

- both sources emphasise that the Great Powers were not interested in discussing Italy until negotiations with Russia were finished
- both sources show how eager Cavour was to raise the issue of Italy on the world stage.
- Cavour's 'hoping' in **Source B** is pretty low-key ('perhaps') and does not completely disagree with **Source A**
- although Cavour has one 'considerable' success in **Source B**, it is the only one. This could be seen as implicitly agreeing with **Source A** about his 'modest role'.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, candidates may show differentiation in explaining the extent the two sources differ or agree about Cavour's work and expertise at the peace conference. It may be acknowledged that gains for Piedmont were always going to be unlikely due to its small contribution in the Crimea and that although Cavour attended the conference as a junior statesman his ambitions were more about international recognition than territorial or military advantage. Candidates may therefore identify a level of agreement in terms of Cavour's success in a difficult situation, gaining recognition for the Italian Question and the problem of Austria's presence by the European powers.

---

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

How important was the contribution of Piedmont to the cause of Italian unification in the years 1848 to 1859? (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 candidates 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.**

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

Candidates should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A** portrays Piedmont having only a modest participation in the peace conference after the Crimean War. On the other hand, he gets encouragement from the 'very sympathetic' British foreign secretary
- **Source B** similarly presents Piedmont's attendance at the conference. Although no tangible gains are forthcoming, Cavour has highlighted the Italian question in Europe with Piedmont at the head of a move for future change. **Source B** also has useful evidence about Daniel Manin and how Cavour saw Manin as potentially very useful for 'channelling Italian patriotism towards' Piedmont' after 1856
- **Source C** describes the wider context before and after 1856. It shows how the status of Piedmont was enhanced from 1848 by the preservation of its liberal constitution, when other states had lost theirs, providing a focus for Italian unity as thousands of exiles arrive there from other states and give it a vibrant cosmopolitan atmosphere. The evidence about the Italian National Society, dedicated to the cause of unification by stirring up revolts all over Italy, can be linked to the importance of Cavour's political manipulation in the later 1850s.

From candidates' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting that Piedmont was important might include:

- Piedmont was the only truly Italian state after the failure of the 1848 revolts
- it had preserved its liberal constitution when all other states had failed to do so
- it began to flourish economically and politically during the 1850s
- it maintained a military force able enough to fight in the Crimea and against Austria
- the achievements of Cavour in terms of political reforms and economic and foreign policies.

Factors suggesting Piedmont's contribution was only limited might include:

- the achievements of Cavour as distinct from Piedmont as a whole
- the work of groups such as the Italian National Society
- the role of Mazzini in continuing to promote the Italian republican cause after 1848
- the significance of Garibaldi's achievements in Naples and Sicily.

Good answers are may conclude that in the period after 1848 Piedmont was indeed regarded as the leading light in Italian unification, particularly after the Pope's change of political direction and the failure of the Mazzinian republicans. The monarchy was also seen to be refreshed after the accession of Victor Emmanuel which replaced Charles Albert's ill-fated rule. Its status

attracted thousands of Italian exiles and it became a focal point for Italian unification and liberalism after 1848. Candidates may also argue that Cavour promoted Piedmont's status by initiating a more efficient political and economic environment which prepared Piedmont for its future role in unification.

On the other hand, candidates may regard other factors as equally or more significant, such as the contributions of other individuals and organisations to eventual unification. Louis-Napoleon's military and political agreements with Piedmont in 1858–59 were important. In addition, it was the work of the Italian National Society, made up of influential exiles that prepared the groundwork for Piedmont's later annexation of the central states in 1860. Although weakened after 1848, Mazzini and his diminished support continued to promote the republican cause for unification. Garibaldi's contribution towards eventual unification was important. Candidates may suggest that although Piedmont was indeed the base and focal point for unification, it was the work of key individuals and groups, as well as aid from foreign powers that kept the unification process on track and led to a successful outcome by 1859. It may well be argued also that nobody got very far towards Italian unification before 1860–61 and that it took another ten years before total unification was achieved; therefore Piedmont's contribution up to 1849 was only laying the foundations, not actually bringing huge achievement.

**Question 2**

- 03** Explain why Pope Pius IX was regarded as a possible leader of the 1848 revolutions in Italy. (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 candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.**

This question is firmly about attitudes and expectations at the beginning of the revolutions in 1848. There is no scope here for the later actions of Pius IX in turning against the revolutions, which will be highly relevant to answering Question 2, 04. Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the Italian States were extremely disparate in 1848 and the revolutions broke out in different places for different reasons. The Papacy was almost the only institution that could link most or all Italians together in a single cause
- the power base of the Papacy was Rome and there was a strong revolutionary movement in Rome for which Pius IX could have provided a focal point
- when he became pope in 1846, Pius IX seemed to be in sympathy with liberal ideals. He introduced some modest liberal reforms in the Papal States; and even Mazzini hoped to collaborate with him. Nobody knew in 1848 what a reactionary Pius IX would later become

- the Austrians blocked Pius IX's reforms and this led to the Papacy being seen as anti-Austrian. Many nationalists (including Garibaldi) gave their backing to Pius IX.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might comment on the links between nationalism and fervent Catholicism; or show awareness of the differences between over-optimistic illusions in 1848, compared with the more complicated and less romantic realities.

**Question 2**

- 04** 'The revolutions in Italy in 1848–49 failed because of poor leadership.'  
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 candidates 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.**

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not.

Evidence supporting the idea of poor leadership might include:

- Charles Albert was indecisive and hesitated over taking Piedmont into the revolts

- after appearing to be in favour of constitutional reform, Pius IX failed completely to provide the unifying leadership the revolutionaries had hoped for. It was his Papal allocution which condemned the revolts against Austrian rule to disunity and defeat
- Charles Albert abdicated after the defeat of his army at Novara
- Mazzini and Garibaldi failed to maintain the Roman republic against French forces
- Daniel Manin surrendered Venice after a year long siege against Austria
- there was a lack of co-ordination among the leaders of the individual states revolts.

Evidence against the key quotation might include:

- there were initial leadership successes in Palermo, Rome, Milan and Venice
- once Charles Albert had declared war on Austria, troops from across Italy converged on Lombardy to join with him to cleanse Italy of Austrian control.

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

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

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that to an extent the shortage of good leadership did contribute to the failure of the 1848–9 revolts, particularly in relation to Pope Pius IX and Charles Albert. There were however some examples of good leadership to be found such as Rosalino Pilo in Sicily at the outset of the revolt. Mazzini and Garibaldi also achieved some success with the establishment and defence of the Roman republic before its eventual destruction at the hands of overwhelming French forces. Daniel Manin led the Venetian republican movement and went on to organise the defence of Venice which lasted for a year before Austria finally broke the siege of the city.

Candidates may conclude that some good leadership was evident but it was limited; and that there were several other significant factors which also led to the eventual failure of the 1848–49 revolts. The Austrians were never fully expelled from Italy but consolidated their positions within the safety of the Quadrilateral forts. The Austrians defeated Charles Albert's forces at Custoza and Novara. They also put down revolts in the Central states. Ferdinand of Naples was able to crush Sicily's new constitution. The fact that the revolts operated in isolation meant that they could eventually be dealt with one at a time. The geography of the country along with poor communications added to this problem. The rebels consisted of Italians with no foreign military alliances to assist them whereas the conservative states rulers were able to call upon Austria and France for support.

**Question 3**

**05** Explain why Venetia became a part of the united Italy in 1866. (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 candidates 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.**

Candidates might explain the diplomatic complications of 1866, including some of the following factors:

- Bismarck, aided by Louis-Napoleon, set up an alliance with Italy. The alliance required Italy to support Prussia in war if hostilities broke out within 3 months. Italy was to receive Venetia for supporting Prussia
- Louis-Napoleon promised Prussia its neutrality in the event of war but also made a secret pact with Austria whereby France would be given Venetia in return for its neutrality if a war broke out
- at the outset of the 1866 Austro-Prussian war, Italy declared war on Austria in accordance with its pact with Prussia. The Italians were defeated by the Austrians at Custoza and Lissa but Austria lost its bigger war against Prussia and handed Venetia over to France. Louis-Napoleon then handed it to Italy in compliance with the earlier agreement.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might differentiate between long-term factors such as:

- Louis-Napoleon's ambition to establish a strong pro-French state in Northern Italy
- Bismarck's plan to gain allies against Austria in the event of war
- Venetia, along with Rome, was regarded by Italian nationalists as unfinished business after 1861.

and short-term or immediate factors such as:

- the decision by nationalist politicians to take Piedmont into an alliance with Prussia despite a lack of military preparation
- the military outcome of the Battle of Sadowa, which mattered more than anything that happened in Italy.

Although the Italians kept to their side of the bargain and declared war on Austria when the time came, they were not as well trained and equipped for war as the Prussians and Austrians. Although they obtained annexation of Venetia at the end of the war, they had been embarrassed militarily at Custozza and Lissa. Despite this humiliation, when a plebiscite was held in Venetia to approve the annexation, an overwhelming majority voted in favour.

**Question 3**

- 06** 'Garibaldi's invasion of Sicily and Naples in 1860 ended in a political compromise that satisfied nobody.'  
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 candidates 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.**

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing a range of arguments for and against the view that the political outcome of Garibaldi's campaigns represented a 'compromise that satisfied nobody'.

There are at least three other possible interpretations:

- a) that Garibaldi and his supporters actually achieved a great success and his actions paved the way for unification by forcing Cavour to support including the South in a united Italy;
- b) that Garibaldi was completely defeated by the political cunning of Cavour and all his democratic ideals ended in failure and disillusionment;
- c) that the final 'compromise' was the best settlement that could have been hoped for in the circumstances of the time.

Possible evidence in agreement with the key quotation might include:

- Garibaldi was not satisfied because he went into semi-retirement and many of his democratic and republican supporters were bitter about the outcome of events in 1860–61. Garibaldi's invasion had produced a complete military success. The governing of Naples was taken over by pro-Garibaldi democrats even before Naples was taken. With the final defeat of Ferdinand's forces at Volturno, Garibaldi had conquered the Two Sicilies but he was pressured into handing over his conquests to the king at Teano. Despite their triumphal entry into Naples, the King and Garibaldi parted on bad terms
- Mazzini and his followers were dissatisfied because they distrusted Cavour and felt Piedmont had hi-jacked unification and they saw the 1861 unification as very incomplete
- Cavour was dissatisfied because he would have preferred the unification of northern Italy without the South
- the situation of the Papacy and the Papal States was left unresolved
- Austria had to accept the loss of her Italian territories.

Evidence which could be used to disagree might include:

- Cavour ensured that Italy became a constitutional monarchy dominated by Piedmont, with Victor Emmanuel as King – that was exactly what he wanted
- many in Britain were pleased at the emergence of Italy as a liberal, 'progressive' state
- many, including the Pope, were happy to see republicanism stopped in its tracks
- Napoleon III was satisfied to see the advance of unification and the increase in international prestige for France (not to mention Nice and Savoy).

Good answers may conclude that Garibaldi was a brilliant military leader who lacked realism and political skill (in contrast to Cavour). Thus it may be argued that Garibaldi and Mazzini were the losers and Cavour and Piedmont were the winning side because Garibaldi was outflanked by Cavour, who had sent a force down from Piedmont to block any attempt by Garibaldi to seize Rome (in order to prevent him from provoking French military intervention. Garibaldi was later pressured by Piedmont to hand over his conquests to Victor Emmanuel.

Equally, however, good answers may argue that unification was not a zero-sum game and that all sides had reason to claim success in 1860–61. Such answers may skilfully differentiate between degrees of success and failure, both in 1860–61 and later, when unification was finally completed in 1870. It could be argued, for example, that it was always Garibaldi's intention to hand his conquests over to the King, regardless of Cavour's actions. Whatever view is put forward, the key requirement is for a balanced argument backed by precisely selected evidence.

### **Converting marks into UMS marks**

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

**UMS conversion calculator:** [www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion](http://www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion)