

A-level
HISTORY
7042/2L

Component 2L Italy and Fascism, c1900-1945

Mark scheme

June 2020

Version: 1.0 Final



Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer 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 associates 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 associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate 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, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead 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 from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

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

Copyright © 2020 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the rise of Fascism in Italy in the years 1920 to 1922.

[30 marks]

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

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 must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the author is British and is based in Italy so we can assume some knowledge of Italian politics. It gives an outsiders' viewpoint of the political situation in 1921, to a British audience, so is independent of Italian politics. This adds value to the source
- the date is significant because it was in the 1921 election that the Fascists achieved 35 seats, and they had been invited to form part of the government block
- the purpose of the article is to give a balanced assessment, for example, it recognises the existence of 'Fascist Terror' as well as 'Red Terror'. This adds value to the source
- the tone is one of concern at the violence of Fascism, 'it is a pity', whilst showing relief that the Socialist threat had been met, for example 'strike mania was general', and 'Italy lived in a revolutionary state'. Fascism was 'wonderful' at first and still has 'responsible leaders'.

Content and argument

- the source argues that the Liberal government was weak, which could be supported by the context of the Liberal government response to the rise of Socialism and the weaknesses of Italian democracy
- the source argues that Socialism was at its strongest in 1920, which could be supported by the context of the occupation of the factories and the 'two red years', and that this is when the Fascists began to fight back
- the source illustrates that the Fascist movement was welcomed in resisting Socialism
- the source is valuable in showing the perception of Mussolini as a 'responsible' leader in 1921. This could be related to the context of Giolitti admitting the Fascists into the government block and Mussolini's 'dual policy'.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the author is a Fascist squad leader who led the squads in violence against the Socialists. It is a first-hand account of the Fascist takeover of northern/central Italy in 1922, which is valuable
- the date is significant as the summer of 1922 was the culmination of Fascist violence against Socialism and the takeover of local governments
- as a diary, it is a contemporary account and so is of value. Balbo reports his success and is proud of his actions and this suggests bias. However, the events described can be corroborated by other evidence of the actions of the squads

- it was published in 1932. This might reduce the value of the source as the Fascist state was established securely by then and the source emphasises the strength of the Fascists
- the tone is triumphant and dramatic. It emphasises the need to destroy the Socialist threat, ‘we had to strike terror’, and the Fascists were carrying out ‘reprisals’ in order to ‘break for ever the Red Terror’. This is valuable in showing the viewpoint of a leading Fascist.

Content and argument

- the source shows that Fascism was anti-Socialist. This is in the context of the ‘two red years’, for example, the occupation of the factories
- the source illustrates how the Fascist squads operated, moving from town to town to attack socialist buildings, such as newspaper and union headquarters
- the source content suggests that the Fascist squads had support from the local police, or at least were not challenged by the authorities. This could be seen in the context of the greater fear of Socialism and the actions of the government, for example, admitting Fascists to the government block in 1921
- the source shows that Fascism spread in the rural areas. Large landowners (agrari) supported Fascism because it broke the power of the agricultural unions.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the speech is given by Mussolini, the leader of the Fascist Party. He wants a Fascist regime to be seen as moderate, able to work with the monarchy. This is valuable in showing Mussolini’s tactics as Fascism came to power
- the date is significant because the Fascist movement is on the verge of taking power, having taken over local government in many parts of northern and central Italy
- Mussolini’s speech is to a mass rally and was widely reported. His audience is the Fascist movement, which he seeks to moderate, and then the Italian people. His purpose is to build support for a Fascist government
- the tone is conciliatory towards the monarchists, ‘can be reformed without interfering with the monarchy’, yet maintains that the Fascist regime will be revolutionary and will require ‘courage’. The tone is also dismissive of Liberalism, which is mocked for being unable to resist Socialism, ‘unable to install a temporary printing press’. This is valuable in showing Mussolini’s ‘dual policy’.

Content and argument

- the source shows that Mussolini had abandoned his republicanism and was prepared to work with the monarchy. This could be seen in the context of Mussolini’s presentation of Fascism as a moderate political movement
- the source shows that Mussolini recognised that Fascist extremism would alienate many Italians, ‘suspicious of a change in regime which went so far’. The context is of the ‘dual policy’ adopted by Mussolini in which he benefited from Fascist violence (Source B) whilst appearing to be a moderate
- the source shows that Socialism was seen as the main danger to Italy. The context is of the ‘red years’ and the general strike of 1922
- the source shows Fascist contempt for the Liberal government. The Liberal government responses to the socialists could be contrasted with the Fascist approach.

Section B

- 0 2** To what extent did the rise of socialism cause political instability in Italy in the years 1911 to 1914?

[25 marks]*Target: AO1*

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

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.

Arguments supporting the view that the rise of socialism caused political instability in Italy in the years 1911 to 1914 might include:

- the Socialist Party (PSI) increased its representation in the Chamber between 1900 and 1913 reflecting increasing industrialisation and urbanisation. The Socialists did not enter the government coalition
- Trade Union membership increased and Giolitti responded to strike action with a policy of non-intervention, which angered the right wing. Strike action culminated in the 'Red Week' of 1914
- the Socialist movement included Maximalists who sought a revolution. The Maximalists gained control of the party in 1912. They were influenced by Marxist ideas
- the Socialist movement, as an atheistic ideology, was the enemy of Catholicism. To meet this threat, Catholics were allowed to vote in 1904 and put up candidates in 1909, which increased the instability in politics.

Arguments challenging the view that the rise of socialism caused political instability in Italy in the years 1911 to 1914 might include:

- the Socialist Party was never a real threat as it was divided between moderates and extremists. Through social reform, Giolitti appealed to moderates such as Turati. The voting system limited the actual number of socialist deputies elected
- through economic development and social reform Italy had become a strong and prosperous democracy by 1914. The conquest of Libya in 1911 gave Italy the status of a Mediterranean power.
- there were other causes of instability which brought Giolitti's fall in 1914. Giolitti's tactic of *trasformismo* was a cause of instability because he tried to play off one party against another, for example the Gentolini Pact (1913) and the Libyan War (1911). The extension of the franchise in 1912 made it more difficult to manage the assembly
- Catholicism was a cause of instability as the Pope allowed Catholics to vote in order to counter Socialism. After the 1913 election, Giolitti's agreement with the Catholics divided the Liberals and led to his resignation
- the Nationalists were a cause of instability. They put the Liberal government under pressure which led to the Libyan War in 1911.

Answers will show an understanding of Italian democracy before the war. It could be argued that the rise of Socialism was seen as a threat to the established order. Giolitti sought to compromise, for example, through social reform and the policy of non-intervention in strikes, but the threat remained, for example, 'Red Week' in 1914. On the other hand, it could be argued that Italy had developed into a mature democracy by 1914 and that the Socialist threat has been exaggerated. Another legitimate view would be that the causes of political instability lay elsewhere. Giolitti sought to stabilise the political system through '*trasformismo*' tactics, but his appeasing of the Socialists led to discontent from the Catholics and Nationalists. Whichever view is taken, the answer should be assessed on the quality of the evidence and argument offered.

0 3 'The strength of the Fascist regime in the 1930s depended on the police state.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

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.

Arguments supporting the view that the strength of the Fascist regime in the 1930s depended on the police state might include:

- the regime operated with a secret police, the OVRA, under Arturo Bocchini, a ‘Special Tribunal for the Defence of the State’ to try political crimes
- punishments ranged from beatings to confino and even executions. Confino was a brutal punishment
- the secret police were efficient and were supported by informers from the public. The press was censored, telephone calls and the post were monitored
- opposition was forced underground, for example, the Communists and Justice and Liberty. Opponents fled abroad where the state still pursued its enemies, for example, the murder of the Rosselli brothers.

Arguments challenging the view that the strength of the Fascist regime in the 1930s depended on the police state might include:

- the use of severe punishments was rare, only nine executions in peace time were ordered by the tribunal. This suggests a high degree of compliance with the regime
- Mussolini established a broad acceptance or compliance, through propaganda and the promotion of leisure and social activities
- it could be argued that the agreement with the Church and the promotion of the Corporate State and economic battles made the regime genuinely popular
- Italians supported the regime because of its policies. The reaction against the radicalisation of the regime in the later 1930s, for example, the race laws and the reform of manners, shows that the public were not intimidated by the police state. This argument could support the ‘consensus not coercion’ view of the 1930s.

Answers will show an understanding of the factors sustaining dictatorship in the context of Mussolini’s regime in the 1930s. It could be concluded that the Fascist regime was a dictatorship with violence and intimidation at its heart. Violence was central to fascist ideology and intimidation effectively suppressed anti-fascist activity. An alternative view could argue that the regime was genuinely popular for most of the 1930s for a variety of reasons, and the role of the secret police was minimal. The increasing unpopularity of the regime at the end of the 1930s, in response to the radicalisation policies, might suggest that the regime was supported by compliance rather than coercion.

0 4 'In the years 1936 to 1939, the close relationship with Germany was of no benefit to Italy.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

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.

Arguments supporting the view that in the years 1936 to 1939, the close relationship with Germany was of no benefit to Italy might include:

- the alliances with Germany (Rome-Berlin Axis 1936, Anti-Comintern Pact 1937, Pact of Steel 1939) reduced Mussolini's flexibility in foreign policy. In 1939, he made commitments that Italy was unprepared for. Mussolini had the humiliation of becoming a 'non-belligerent' power
- Germany was the dominant partner. Mussolini was unable to prevent the Anschluss in 1938. Hitler showed his contempt for Italy when he invaded Czechoslovakia without telling Mussolini in advance. Italy was economically dependent on Germany
- Italy joined Germany in the Spanish Civil War, a war which 'bled Italy white'. Italy suffered a humiliating defeat at the battle of Guadalajara
- Mussolini became less popular at home with his pro-German policies, such as the introduction of the race laws.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1936 to 1939, the close relationship with Germany was of no benefit to Italy might include:

- Mussolini enjoyed considerable international prestige, especially to 1938, for example, he played the role of 'honest broker' at Munich and was seen as a peacemaker. Mussolini seemed to have influence with both sides
- the Axis was formed during the Spanish Civil War, which the Fascists ultimately won. Mussolini's influence in the Western Mediterranean increased
- Mussolini enjoyed the propaganda value of the alliances, relishing the militaristic nature of the 'Pact of Steel' which reflected Fascist ideology
- Hitler gave support to Mussolini's imperial ambitions in the Mediterranean and North Africa in the secret agreements of the Rome Berlin Axis.

It could be argued that Mussolini made a fateful error in aligning with Germany, which lost him the support of the Italian people and ultimately destroyed the regime. On the other hand, Mussolini could be seen to be exploiting his influence with both sides in order to further Italy's imperial ambitions. Italy was able to avoid war in 1939 and was still in a position to choose its destiny. It would be equally valid to address this question with reference to foreign policy only, or to address issues of both foreign and domestic policy.