



## Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
In History (9HI0/02)

Paper 2: Depth study

Option 2D.1: The unification of Italy, 1830-70  
Option 2D.2: The unification of Germany, 1840-71

## **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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2022

Question Paper Log Number P69335A

Publications Code 9HI0\_2D\_2206\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

## 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
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1-3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4-7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question.</li> <li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8-12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>13-16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	17-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="384 147 1404 304">• 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><li data-bbox="384 315 1404 517">• 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><li data-bbox="384 528 1404 707">• 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.</li></ul>

## 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"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
2	4-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
3	8-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
4	13-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

5	17-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and</li> </ul>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
		<p>substantiating the overall judgement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

### Option 2D.1: The unification of Italy, 1830-70

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 why there was little progress in challenging the restored order in Italy in the years 1830-47.</p> <p><b>Source 1</b></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"> <li>• Metternich, as the most powerful politician in the Italian peninsula in his role as Austrian Chancellor, is in a privileged position to comment as both insider and outsider</li> <li>• The private nature of the letters means that Metternich can be as candid as he wishes in expressing his opinion of matters of Italian politics</li> <li>• Metternich is writing at the beginning of the 1830s, at a time of particular upheaval in Italian politics, and so is commenting on events unfolding at the time.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons why there was little progress in challenging the restored order in Italy in the years 1830-47:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It implies that most Italians were either uninterested or too self-interested to challenge the existing order ('go quietly about their lives', 'do not have...the necessary seriousness', 'unity...created by strangers')</li> <li>• It claims that Metternich himself was responsible for the lack of progress ('representative system...So, I have not given them such a system.')</li> <li>• It implies that Italians were too divided to instigate change ('hate each other...only real patriotism...town where they were born.')</li> <li>• It implies that Italians who did want change were not energetic enough or capable enough to make a successful challenge ('layabouts who waste their days talking politics', 'promises of the political societies are false.').</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• Metternich controlled the Austrian Empire and influenced the whole of the</li> </ul>



	<p>Italian peninsula through the 'Metternich System' of repression, censorship and military deployment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Localism was a significant feature of life in the Italian peninsula, e.g. the failure of revolutionary leaders in Modena and Parma to join together in the 1830 revolutions</li><li>• Italian society was generally very conservative; the majority of the population were peasants, and the Catholic Church – the Pope being a restored ruler himself<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– had a significant influence</li></ul></li></ul>
Question	Indicative content

- Italian revolutionaries were often based outside of Italy, e.g. Mazzini, which hampered both their understanding of grassroots politics and their ability to organise insurrection.

### Source 2

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:

- In 1846, Cavour was a member of the Italian political élite, but not yet in public office, and so is writing from his own specific point of view rather than with an overtly political agenda
- Written in May 1846, Cavour is in a position to give an overview of political progress in Italy throughout the period from 1830 onwards
- The article was published in France allowing Cavour to write more candidly on political progress and the Italian rulers; censorship of published material by restored rulers was universal across the Italian peninsula.

2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons why there was little progress in challenging the restored order in Italy in the years 1830-47

- It claims that the main reason for a lack of progress was Italian divisiveness ('rivalries for each other', 'mistrust divides our rulers from those they rule.')
- It claims that political movements in Italy are incapable of attracting mass support ('relying solely on republican ideas and rabble-rousing passions', 'no great support', 'gaining little influence')
- It claims that Italians are unwilling to countenance change ('common people...deeply attached to the old institutions', 'Political activity...middle class...upper class...only wish to defend their own interests.')
- It suggests that there is little chance of revolution breaking out in Italy at any time soon ('stormy passions...now calmed down...traces are almost destroyed...returned to their natural course.').

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:

- The majority of the restoration states in Italy were either directly ruled, or substantially influenced, by the Austrian Empire; for either liberalism or nationalism to progress, Austria would need to be

challenged effectively

- In 1830-31, revolutions in Modena, Parma and the Papal States, influenced by the July Revolution in France, broke out and were relatively quickly put down by Austrian troops at the request of the restored rulers
- Young Italy was founded by Mazzini, in the wake of the 1830-31 revolutions, but Mazzini had little interest in encouraging popular support and actively discouraged his followers from engaging the peasantry
- In 1846, economic and social discontent was brewing in Italy, leading to signs of discontent and the potential for revolutionary activity to re-emerge; harvest failures in 1847 exacerbated the situation.

Question	Indicative content
	<p data-bbox="296 159 507 192"><b>Sources 1 and 2</b></p> <p data-bbox="296 199 1214 232">The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul data-bbox="347 286 1394 680" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="347 286 1394 398">• Both sources are written by members of the political élite connected to Italy but Source 1 is written by a representative of a foreign power 'with influence' in Italy and Source 2 is written by an Italian</li><li data-bbox="347 405 1394 479">• The sources together give an overview of the period; Source 1 being written in the early 1830s and Source 2 in 1846</li><li data-bbox="347 486 1394 598">• Both sources agree that a lack of progress is due to the weaknesses of the Italians themselves, e.g. internal divisions, lack of interest, self-interest, fear of change</li><li data-bbox="347 604 1394 680">• Source 1 indicates, and Source 2 suggests, the strength of the restored order in Italy.</li></ul>

**Option 2D.2: The unification of Germany, 1840-71**

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 response of Frederick William IV of Prussia to the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany.</p> <p><b>Source 3</b></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"> <li>• The speeches reflect the public response of Frederick William IV to the ongoing situation in Berlin in March 1848</li> <li>• Frederick William IV is speaking on 21 March at the height of the March Days of revolutionary activity in Berlin and this reflects his immediate response to events</li> <li>• The tone and language suggest that the purpose of the speeches is to reassure the public in regard to his support for the revolutionary events taking place in Prussia and Germany as a whole.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the response of Frederick William IV of Prussia to the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It indicates that Frederick William IV has accepted the events of the revolution ('proudly...my capital city...powerful opinion has expressed itself.') and is aware of its significance ('A decisive day.')</li> <li>• It suggests that Frederick William IV is uncertain of the reaction to the procession ('colours I wear do not belong to me.', 'I do not want...another crown or another territory.')</li> <li>• It indicates that he is willing to work in future with supporters of the revolutions ('Students...In you...beginning of a great future.', 'seized the banner', 'Citizens...I desire nothing but good for you and Germany.')</li> <li>• It suggests that Frederick William may not be as supportive as he appears. He may be trying to prevent events escalating ('I want good order.') and biding his time ('my army is certainly strong and brave').</li> </ul> <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>

- 18-21 March 1848 was the high point of the Revolution in Prussia; on 19 March, violence broke out after Prussian troops fired on a crowd at the Castle and Frederick William was forced to view the bodies of those killed
- Frederick William IV refused the wishes of his generals to withdraw from Berlin to Potsdam and, on 21 March, agreed to a public procession in solidarity with the revolutionaries in a bid to save the monarchy
- Frederick William IV agreed to a meeting of the Prussian United Diet on 2 April 1848, which resulted in the creation of an elected Prussian National Assembly  
designated with establishing a Prussian constitution

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University student associations were at the forefront of the demonstrations of 1848 across all of the German states and were influential in the initial events on the ground.</li> </ul> <p><b>Source 4</b></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"> <li>• Frederick William IV is writing a private letter to someone he clearly trusts and so would not expect the letter to become public</li> <li>• In December 1848, Frederick William IV was in a position to be candid about his feelings as he had recently retaken control of the situation in Prussia at the expense of the Prussian National Assembly</li> <li>• The King may have hoped that Bunsen would use the information to signal to the new Emperor of Austria that he had no interest in accepting the leadership of a <i>Kleindeutschland</i> from the Frankfurt Assembly.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the response of Frederick William IV of Prussia to the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It claims that Frederick William IV has no intention of working with the revolutionary Frankfurt Assembly to accept leadership of Germany ('I want neither the consent...nor the crown itself.')</li> <li>• It claims that the Frankfurt Assembly is not legitimate ('crown...is not one offered...created by revolution.', 'a right that is not their right to give!')</li> <li>• It indicates that Frederick William IV views the 1848-49 revolutions with utter contempt ('stinking as it does', 'silliest, most stupid and wickedest Revolution of the century.')</li> <li>• Frederick Williams's concern over the legitimacy of his actions ('crown that is fit for a Hohenzollern to wear', 'presented by the Emperor... by myself, and by our equals.') suggests that he wants to underline his conservatism.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• Frederick William IV agreed that Prussian representatives could be sent to the Frankfurt Assembly; many of these representatives were conservatives and supportive of a united Germany under the Prussian king</li> <li>• In November 1848, the Prussian military regained control of Berlin and on 5 December 1848, from his military stronghold at Potsdam, Frederick William IV unilaterally declared a new conservative constitution</li> </ul>

- The abdication of the Austrian Emperor in favour of his nephew, Franz Joseph, on 2 December 1848, provided a foundation stone from which the Austrian authorities were able to re-establish their authority
- Frederick William IV had a genuine desire to take a leadership role in a united Germany but, as a believer in 'divine right', was never comfortable with challenging Habsburg power.

**Sources 3 and 4**



Question	Indicative content
	<p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="347 241 1310 315">• The speeches in Source 3 reflect Frederick William IV's public response, whereas Source 4 probably more clearly reflects his private feelings</li><li data-bbox="347 327 1238 434">• The speeches in Source 3 were made at the very beginning of the revolutionary period, whereas Source 4 was written later in the revolutionary period</li><li data-bbox="347 445 1321 519">• Both Sources reflect views about Frederick William IV's attitude towards his potential leadership of Germany</li><li data-bbox="347 530 1299 672">• Source 3 is supportive of the revolutionaries but at a time of great pressure, whereas Source 4 is dismissive of the revolutions at a point when Frederick William IV was more confident of his position.</li></ul>

## Section B: indicative content

### Option 2D.1: The unification of Italy, 1830-70

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 about the statement that Piedmont was in a better position to lead Italy towards unification in 1858 than it had been in 1848.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Piedmont was in a better position to lead Italy towards unification in 1858 than it had been in 1848 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the rule of Victor Emmanuel, Piedmont had developed into the most stable Italian state; moderate liberal nationalists had more confidence in Victor Emmanuel than in his less predictable predecessor, Charles Albert</li> <li>• By 1858, many of the Mazzinian nationalists, who had rejected the leadership of Piedmont in 1848, had been won over by Cavour and had become instrumental in developing the Piedmont-based National Society</li> <li>• In 1858, Piedmont had a more developed modern economic and industrial infrastructure than in 1848 and one which was increasingly capable of supporting further expansion</li> <li>• In 1858, as a result of Cavour's diplomacy, Piedmont was increasingly being seen in Europe as a driving force behind support for Italian nationalism, whereas in 1848 there was little support for Charles Albert</li> <li>• In 1858, Cavour was sufficiently confident to be able to broker an agreement with France (the Pact of Plombières) to form an alliance in a future war to liberate northern Italy from Austrian rule.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that Piedmont was not in a better position to lead Italy towards unification in 1858 than it had been in 1848 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As in 1848, many nationalist supporters, particularly radical Mazzinian nationalists, still did not trust the intentions of the Piedmontese élite, seeing them as expansionists rather than supporters of Italian unity</li> <li>• As in 1848, the Papacy was resistant to the cause of Italian independence. In 1858, the Papacy was particularly hostile to Piedmont's potential leadership of Italy, with Piedmont's anticlerical laws</li> <li>• In 1858, the ambitions of Victor Emmanuel and Cavour were to force Austria out of the peninsula and create a kingdom of the North; the Piedmontese economy was not developed enough to unite with the South</li> <li>• As in 1848, Piedmont was not strong enough to pursue Austria alone; the Plombières negotiations indicated that Napoleon III was the dominant</li> </ul>

partner and Piedmont was dependent on France

- In 1858, as in 1848, the British were willing to give vocal support to Italian independence and unity but were not willing to provide physical support.

Other relevant material must be credited.

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 statement that that it was mainly the actions of Italians themselves that shaped Italian unification in the years 1858-70.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that it was mainly the actions of Italians themselves that shaped Italian unification in the years 1858-70 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was Victor Emmanuel and Cavour who were the driving force behind the Second War of Italian independence 1858-59 against Austria.</li> <li>• Cavour was responsible for manipulating and organising the plebiscites that led to the annexation of the central Italian states in the years 1859-60</li> <li>• Garibaldi's invasion of Sicily and southern Italy created the circumstances that led to his meeting with Victor Emmanuel at Teano in 1860 and the declaration of the Kingdom of Italy in 1861</li> <li>• Victor Emmanuel and Cavour took the decision to send military troops south to counter Garibaldi's attempt to take Rome in 1860</li> <li>• In 1866 and 1870, Italian military action contributed to bringing <i>irredenta</i> territory, Venetia and Rome, into the Kingdom of Italy</li> <li>• The actions of Pope Pius IX, as both ruler of Rome and the Catholic Church, prevented Rome from becoming the capital of the Kingdom of Italy until 1870.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that it was the actions of others that shaped Italian unification in the years 1858-70 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Napoleon III was the dominant partner in the Franco-Piedmont alliance against France in 1858-59; Napoleon brokered the Pact of Plombières with Cavour and agreed the armistice at Villafranca without informing Cavour</li> <li>• It was French troops that did most of the decisive fighting in 1858-59 and the failure of the Italian navy at Lissa in 1866 almost led to Italy failing to regain Venetia in 1866</li> <li>• It was the belief that British naval ships were protecting Garibaldi that allowed Garibaldi to invade the Neapolitan mainland in 1860</li> <li>• The French occupation of Rome influenced the actions of Piedmont in only partially invading the Papal States in 1860 and the reaction of Victor Emmanuel to Garibaldi's attempts to take Rome in 1862 and 1866-67</li> <li>• It was Prussian diplomacy that saw Napoleon III cede Venetia to Italy as part of a Franco-Prussian agreement on the Prussian defeat of Austria in 1866</li> <li>• Victor Emmanuel's entry into Rome in 1870 was as a result of the withdrawal of the French garrison due to the need for French reinforcements in the Franco- Prussian War.</li> </ul>

Other relevant material must be credited.

### Option 2E.2: The German Democratic Republic, 1949–90

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 suggestion that the development of the <i>Zollverein</i> was the most significant factor in the rise of Prussia in the years 1852-67.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the development of the <i>Zollverein</i> was the most significant factor in the rise of Prussia in the years 1852-67 should be analysed and evaluated.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prussian domination of the organisation of the <i>Zollverein</i> was a clear indication that Prussia was potentially capable of leading a future <i>Kleindeutschland</i> political entity</li> <li>• Prussia's success in renewing the <i>Zollverein</i> in 1852, at the expense of the Austrian plan for a <i>Mitteleuropa</i> Customs Union, highlighted Prussia's continued economic dominance in Germany despite Olmütz</li> <li>• Prussia negotiated international trade deals on behalf of the <i>Zollverein</i>, including with Austria, Belgium and particularly France, so raising its diplomatic presence and status amongst other European powers</li> <li>• Free trade and common regulations enabled economic development, as well as the internal strengthening, of the Prussian state by creating more secure and effective links between its eastern and western regions</li> <li>• Prussia used the <i>Zollverein</i> as a means to exclude Austria from 'German' economic interests; the commercial treaty of 1865 with Austria was a final indication that 'German' economic unity would not include Austria</li> <li>• The creation of the <i>Zollparlament</i> in 1867 created a formal economic tie between the new North German Confederation and the remaining independent southern states, reinforcing Prussia's economic dominance.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that other factors were more significant in the rise of Prussia in the years 1852-67 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <i>Zollverein</i> did not enable Prussia to increase its political influence within Germany; most German states still looked to Austria for political leadership, e.g. Confederation reform 1865, Austro-Prussian War 1866</li> <li>• Prussian political developments, e.g. the handling of the constitutional crisis from 1862 by the newly appointed Minister-President Bismarck enabled Prussia to challenge Austrian political power in Germany</li> <li>• The development of the Prussian economy as a whole, particularly state support for railway building, established Prussia as the major mainland European economic power</li> </ul>

- The reform and development of the Prussian military: Prussia was able to defeat Austria in war in just seven weeks in 1866
- The growing belief amongst German liberal-nationalists, particularly in the late 1850s, that Prussian leadership was the solution to creating a unified Germany
- Austrian weaknesses.

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 France was more responsible than Prussia for the breakdown in relations between Prussia and France in the years 1866-70.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that France was more responsible than Prussia for the breakdown in relations between Prussia and France in the years 1866-70 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The French popular reaction to Prussian gains, in the aftermath of the Austro- Prussian War, soured relations between the two nations, causing Napoleon III to look to reassert French prestige</li> <li>• Napoleon III's attempt to purchase the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg from the Kingdom of Holland created hostility with Prussia</li> <li>• Empress Eugénie and French government ministers were responsible for engineering the controversy surrounding the Hohenzollern candidature</li> <li>• Napoleon III's appointment of the fiercely anti-Prussian politician, Gramont, as Foreign Secretary in May 1870 increased tensions; Gramont gave Benedetti the instruction to approach William I at Ems in July 1870</li> <li>• It was the decision of Napoleon III to declare war on Prussia on 19 July 1870.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that Prussia was more responsible than France for the breakdown in relations between Prussia and France in the years 1866-70 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From 1866, Bismarck purposefully allowed the more positive relationship between Prussia and France, that had been negotiated in 1865 to ensure French neutrality in the Austro-Prussian War, to lapse</li> <li>• Bismarck looked to provoke France into a war that would lead to German unification; the need to defend Germany from France would see the Northern Confederation unite with the southern German states</li> <li>• It was the Prussian army generals' and Bismarck's manipulation of the press that provoked the Luxemburg Crisis</li> <li>• German nationalists created an atmosphere of hostility, particularly in the Rhineland border regions, which led to sustained antagonism with France</li> <li>• Bismarck deliberately amended the Ems Despatch to create the impression that the Kaiser had snubbed the French over the resolution of the Hohenzollern Candidature, and so triggered war in July 1870.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>



