



Mark Scheme (Results)

October 2020

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In History (9HI0/2D)
Advanced

Paper 2: Depth study

Option 2D.1: The unification of Italy, c1830-70

Option 2D.2: The unification of Germany, c1840-71

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Autumn 2020

Publications Code 9HI0_2D_2010_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

Generic Level Descriptors: Section A

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	8-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria but with limited justification.
4	13-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	17-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="379 203 1380 353">• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.<li data-bbox="379 365 1410 562">• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/ or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.<li data-bbox="379 573 1394 763">• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.

Section B

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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. • The overall judgement is missing or asserted. • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	4-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. • An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	8-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	13-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. • The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.
5	17-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		<p>of the relationships between key features of the period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="384 210 1390 322">• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.<li data-bbox="384 338 1374 450">• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.<li data-bbox="384 465 1337 530">• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

Section A: Indicative content

Option 2D.1: The unification of Italy, c1830-70

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the reasons for the failure of the First War of Italian Independence.</p> <p>Source 1</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a participant in the events of 1848-49, Pisacane was in a position to make informed judgements on the reasons for the failure of the War • Pisacane was looking back on recent events and was in a position to view the War in its wider context • Pisacane's republican views mean that he would have had a negative attitude towards the role of Charles Albert and Piedmont • The tone of the language suggests that Pisacane may be trying to blame Charles Albert for the failure; this could exemplify the mistrust of Piedmont that was itself a reason for the failure of the War. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the failure of the First War of Italian Independence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It implies that Charles Albert was more interested in his own self-interest than that of Italian independence ('his real aim was...consolidate his hold over Lombardy', 'rushed to occupy Milan') • It states that something happened to change the course of events in the war ('The outlook then changed.'), of which the Austrians took advantage ('Radetzky emerged') • It suggests that despite the Austrian attack Charles Albert was only half-hearted in his prosecution of the war in 1848 ('thin line that opposed', 'attacked with part of his army', 'insignificant fighting') • It claims that Charles Albert's forces in 1849 were militarily weak and disorganised ('entered into battle without any plan...without even a base'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p>

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revolutionaries in Milan and Venice were initially wary of Charles Albert's intentions; he mobilised his forces early in March but did not declare war on Austria until late March • Charles Albert's 'Italian' forces were initially successful and, by April 1848, his troops had advanced into the Quadrilateral and were threatening to invade Venetia • Marshal Radetzky was determined to restore order and commanded a well-trained and organised Austrian force; reinforcements arrived in May 1848 in the wake of counter-revolution in the Austrian Empire • The 'Italian' forces were made up of troops from different states led by their own commanders, and the Piedmont army lacked training and organisation. <p>Source 2</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a formal declaration by the Pope, with regard to his reaction to the War, both as the religious head of the Catholic Church and the temporal head of the Papal States • The timing of the Allocution (April 1848) coincided with a period of relative success for Italian forces, including those from the Papal States, in the war against Austria • The purpose of the Allocution was to distance the Papacy from, and so undermine the legitimacy of, the War. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the failure of the First War of Italian Independence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It asserts that the Papacy is unwilling to support those who support the war against Austria ('engage in war against the Austrians...against our wishes') • It provides evidence that the Pope is unwilling to accept nationalist ideas that he should lead a united Italy in the future (repudiating 'those who would have the Pope to be the head...some sort of new republic') • It suggests that those who support nationalist causes are going against the teaching of the Catholic Church ('treacherous advice') • It implies that the Pope is encouraging the Italian rulers and conservative elements in Italy to take back control of events ('remain loyal...whose good will they have already had experience'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some strands of Italian nationalism advocated the Papacy as a foundation for an Italian nation, particularly Gioberti • The rejection by Pius IX was of particular significance because his

Question	Indicative content
	<p>apparent reforming nature, on being appointed, had encouraged nationalists, e.g. Mazzini's 'open letter' to the Pope, 1847</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Until the Allocution, the actions of the Pope in the revolutionary period had suggested some support for the War, e.g. granting of a constitution in the Papal States, Papal Army participation in the early months of the War • The Allocution undermined the War, e.g. Charles Albert's confidence to prosecute the War was significantly affected, the King of Naples and other rulers, already reluctant, withdrew their forces from the War effort. <p>Sources 1 and 2</p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although Source 1 may exaggerate the failings of Charles Albert, both Sources show that there were a variety of different reasons for the failure of the War • Source 2 provides evidence for the change of outlook mentioned in Source 1 • Both Sources indicate the potential power of Austria; in Source 1 Austria's military strength and in Source 2 Austria's political power in 'restoration Italy'. • Both Sources indicate that, in 1848-49, Italy was not yet in a position to 'make herself'.

Option 2D.2: The unification of Germany, c1840-71

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the failure of German nationalists in the 1848-49 revolutions.</p> <p>Source 3</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engels is writing in hindsight and is likely to be commenting on events in light of his own political and personal perspective of what happened • The article was published outside Germany and so Engels is in a position to be frank about his views on the failures • As a socialist and radical political commentator he may lack objectivity in regard to the actions of the mainly liberal politicians of the Frankfurt Assembly; his tone is derisory. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the failure of German nationalists in the 1848-49 revolutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It claims that the Frankfurt Assembly failed to take advantage of the favourable position created in 1848-49 ('never possessed the will or the force to make its claims recognised') • It claims that the Frankfurt Assembly alienated the German people by their behaviour and actions ('childish conduct...disenchanted') • It suggests that German nationalists were the architects of their own failure ('disgraceful proceedings prompted by events in Schleswig-Holstein') • It provides evidence of popular support for the restoration of the German rulers ('German people...former solid foundations'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long debates over the nature of a future united Germany (<i>Grossdeutschland</i> v <i>Kleindeutschland</i>) meant the Frankfurt Assembly gained a reputation as a talking-shop • The Frankfurt Assembly claimed executive power over Germany but this was undermined when the 'crown' of Germany was offered to an Austrian Habsburg (1848) and to Prussia (1849) and was rejected by both

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In August 1848, the Assembly accepted a disadvantageous armistice with Denmark that had been agreed by Prussia; the Assembly was reliant on Prussia to provide an armed force during the Schleswig-Holstein action. <p>Source 4</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The speech provides an explanation for why Frederick William felt unable to further the cause of German liberal nationalism and, in particular, accept a <i>Kleindeutschland</i> solution to German unity • The purpose of the speech is to justify Frederick William's actions to the Prussian people and to Austria; as a result, the speech may exaggerate the nature of the radical threat and highlight the illegitimacy of the offer • The speech was made in May 1849, as the revolutionary period was coming to an end, so providing a context for the failure of the Frankfurt Assembly. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the failure of German nationalists in the 1848-49 revolutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It suggests that the nationalists in the German Assembly did not have legitimacy in the eyes of the Prussian king ('it does not have the right') • It claims that the German nationalists were undermined by the growing radicalisation of the revolutionaries ('such crimes have put an end to the hope that...can bring about German unity') • It implies that the failure of German nationalists in 1848-49 was due to the withdrawal of the goodwill of the German princes ('Prussian deputies...to be recalled...other governments will do the same'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a final attempt by German nationalists to create a united Germany by offering the crown to Frederick William IV in April 1849 • The complete resurgence of the Austrian Empire by the spring of 1849 made any attempt to create a united Germany unlikely • Increasing working-class and radical attacks in 1849, including against the Frankfurt Assembly, undermined the liberal nationalist gains of 1849 • After May 1849, Prussian troops brought the revolutions to an end across Germany and the Assembly physically dispersed in June 1849. <p>Sources 3 and 4</p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source 1 emphasises the structural weakness of German liberal nationalism in 1848-49 whereas Source 2 emphasises the power of the

Question	Indicative content
	<p>forces of conservatism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="352 203 1385 315">• Both Sources blame, to some extent, the German nationalists for their own failure; Source 1 for lack of courage and Source 2 for becoming too radical<li data-bbox="352 327 1410 439">• Both Sources suggest that the nationalists in the Frankfurt National Assembly failed to live up to the early expectations of both the public and the German rulers<li data-bbox="352 450 1289 477">• Each Source is written from an ideologically opposed standpoint.

Section B: Indicative content

Option 2D.1: The unification of Italy, c1830-70

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that, in the years 1849-70, Victor Emmanuel II played a symbolic role, rather than a leading role, in the process of Italian Unification.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1849-70, Victor Emmanuel II played a symbolic role in the process of Italian Unification should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victor Emmanuel had little personal interest or sympathy with the Italian nationalists, who flocked to Piedmont after the suppression of the 1848-49 revolutions in order to take advantage of the <i>Statuto</i> • It was Cavour who took the initiative in the diplomacy of the Crimean War and the outbreak of the Second War of Independence; Cavour wrote Victor Emmanuel's '<i>grido di dolore</i>' speech of January 1859 • Garibaldi calculatingly used the symbolism of Victor Emmanuel's position to help him conquer the South and it was Garibaldi who chose to hand over his acquisitions at Teano for the sake of Italy • Rulers and politicians from other countries played a greater role than Victor Emmanuel, e.g. Napoleon III in 1859, Bismarck and Napoleon III in 1866 and 1870 • Victor Emmanuel's position as King of Italy was never recognised by the Papacy. <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1849-70, Victor Emmanuel II played a leading role, rather than a symbolic role, in the process of Italian Unification should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victor Emmanuel's choice to retain the <i>Statuto</i> after 1849, so making Piedmont a haven for Italian nationalists, and his appointment of Cavour, enabled Piedmont to be seen as a 'modern state' • It was Victor Emmanuel who recognised the possibilities for furthering the 'Italian question' through Piedmont's participation in the Crimean War • Victor Emmanuel played a leading role in the Second War of Independence, e.g. his response to Napoleon III after the Orsini affair, his rallying speech of January 1859 • Victor Emmanuel played a leading role in the creation of the Kingdom of Italy, e.g. contact with Garibaldi, leadership after Cavour's resignation, leadership of the army which forced Garibaldi to hand over his conquests • Victor Emmanuel played a leading role in instituting the alliances that led

	<p>to the acquisition of Venetia (1866) and led the invasion of Rome (1870).</p> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>
--	---

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that in the years 1862-70, the obstacles to Italian unity that remained after the creation of the Kingdom of Italy were mainly overcome.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1862-70, the obstacles to Italian unity that remained after the creation of the Kingdom of Italy were mainly overcome should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austrian rule and influence was finally overcome with the acquisition of Venetia (1866) • The French occupation of the city of Rome was finally overcome in 1870 • The temporal power of the Papacy over Rome was overcome in 1870, allowing Rome to become the capital city of the Kingdom of Italy • The southern regions of the Kingdom of Italy were pacified during the 'Brigand's War' and economic investment in the South initiated • The Kingdom of Italy established itself as a constitutional monarchy with a standardised economic and fiscal system, unified criminal and civil code, unified education system and a national army and navy. <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1862-70, the obstacles to Italian unity that remained after the creation of the Kingdom of Italy were not mainly overcome should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were still areas deemed to be part of the Italian peninsula (<i>irredenta</i>) which were not part of the Kingdom of Italy, e.g. Nice and Savoy, the Holy See • The Papacy challenged the Kingdom throughout, e.g. the <i>Syllabus of Errors</i>, the Doctrine of Papal Infallibility, and refused to recognise the state, even in 1870, declaring himself a 'prisoner' in the Vatican • The North-South divide remained resolute; economic and social divisions were exacerbated by political resentment and the legacy of state actions during the 'Brigand's War' • The constitution ensured that the Kingdom was ruled by the same small social elite that had been in power prior to unification, leading to inequalities throughout the Kingdom • The Kingdom of Italy was viewed by many as 'Piedmontisation' rather than Italian unification; Victor Emmanuel II kept his regnal number as King of Piedmont rather than Victor Emmanuel I. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

--	--

Option 2D.2: The unification of Germany, c1840-71

Question	Indicative content
5	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the statement that, in the 1850s, Prussia made significant progress in strengthening its position as a leading German state.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the 1850s, Prussia made significant progress in strengthening its position as a leading German state should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prussia maintained its dominance over the <i>Zollverein</i> and decisively overcame Austrian attempts to create a <i>Mitteleuropa</i> economic union (1853) • Prussia made advances in the extraction of resources (iron, coal) and industrial production (steel), which made it into an advanced industrial power • The expansion of, and state investment in, the railway network gave Prussia dominance in the communication infrastructure of Germany • Manteuffel's reforms strengthened Prussia's economic and social resilience, e.g. advances in technical education, tax reform • German nationalists began increasingly to identify Prussia as the potential leader for a unified Germany; though not officially supported, the creation of the <i>Nationalverein</i> (1859) was significant in advancing this view. <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the 1850s, Prussia did not make significant progress in strengthening its position as a leading German state should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austria remained the dominant political power within Germany and retained the influence regained at Olmütz over the German Confederation • Prussia was not in a position to influence European affairs, remaining neutral during the Crimean War, and unwilling and unable to challenge Austrian power in the Italian War of 1859 • The Prussian army was in need of reform, e.g. recruitment, officer training and equipment, as proven by the difficulties encountered in mobilisation in 1859 • Prussia's wider political influence within Germany became stagnant because of the uncertainty of the regency under Prince William from 1857 • By the end of the 1850s, Prussia was on the verge of a constitutional crisis, as a resurgence in liberalism and the need to finance military reform created political tensions and weakened its influence.

	Other relevant material must be credited.
--	---

Question	Indicative content
6	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the statement that it was the Prussian defeat of Austria in 1866 that was the decisive turning point in the process of German unification in the years 1862-71.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that it was the Prussian defeat of Austria in 1866 that was the decisive turning point in the process of German unification in the years 1862-71 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The defeat of Austria and the terms of the peace meant that German unification would probably take the form of a <i>Kleindeutschland</i> solution • The emphatic victory over Austria ensured that Prussia was now the dominant economic and political state in Germany • The defeat of Austria allowed Prussia to annex Austria's north German allies and to bring the remaining independent north German states into a North German Confederation • Austrian defeat forced the four independent southern German states to consider and enter into a defensive military agreement with Prussia • The Austrian defeat strengthened Bismarck's hand domestically with the National Liberals and diplomatically in his dealings with France. <p>Arguments and evidence that the Prussian defeat of Austria in 1866 that was not the decisive turning point in the process of German unification in the years 1862-71 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 1866, non-Austrian Germany was still divided into a patchwork of political states, with independent rulers, made up of Prussia and the North German Confederation states and four southern German states • The rulers of the southern German states were still resolutely determined to remain independent • In 1866, Prussia was not yet in a position to threaten war directly with France; this was the situation most likely to lead to a union of all the German states in defence of Germany • It was the appointment of Bismarck in 1862 which was the decisive turning point, e.g. Bismarck's involvement in the three 'wars of unification' • It was only the declaration of war against France and its defeat in 1870-71 that guaranteed the final steps in the process of German unification. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

