



Mark Scheme (Results)

October 2020

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In History (8HI0/2D)
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 8HI0_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: Questions 1(a)/2(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 | 1-2 | <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, if any, substantiation. Concepts of utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements. |
| 2 | 3-5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis 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 or confirm matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of utility is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and may be based on questionable assumptions. |
| 3 | 6-8 | <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. • Knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria although justification is not fully substantiated. Explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. |

Section A: Questions 1(b)/2(b)

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 | 1-2 | <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. Concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements. |
| 2 | 3-5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, 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. Concept of reliability is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions. |
| 3 | 6-9 | <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 weight 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, with some justification. |
| 4 | 10-12 | <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. • 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 not be fully |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement. |
|--|--|--|

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 | 1-4 | <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 | 5-10 | <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 question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it 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 | 11-16 | <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 | 17-20 | <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. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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. |
|--|--|---|

Section A: Indicative content

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

| Question | Indicative content |
|--------------------|--|
| <p>1(a)</p> | <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 the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the social and economic conditions in Italy in the 1840s.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It claims that there is a moral and material difference between conditions for peasants in Tuscany compared to that of the Papal States and Naples ('Tuscan peasant...honest pride...decent clothes...not a trace...southward') • It implies a wide north-south divide in Italy ('journey from Rome to Naples...there is not a single trace of happy, prosperous...') • It suggests that observers might conclude that, in the south, the poor suffered from poverty and illiteracy ('Rags, filth, ignorance') and, possibly, were adversely influenced by the Catholic Church ('superstition'). 2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an eyewitness account describing the conditions of the peasantry in different parts of Italy in 1841 • The author is writing to inform the British public of the situation in Italy; here the intent is to specifically compare the situation in Tuscany with that in the Papal States and southern Italy • As a foreign observer the author is probably able to write in a more detached manner than an Italian author would. 3. Knowledge of the historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was an acknowledged growing north-south divide in Italy in the 1830s and 40s in response to economic and social developments sweeping through Europe at the time • The restored rulers of the northern and central states, such as Tuscany, often promoted modern developments in agriculture and industry as a means of discouraging economic and social discontent • Rulers of the southern states were unsupportive of modern economic developments; underdevelopment and illiteracy were key characteristics of the Papal States particularly before 1846. |

| Question | Indicative content |
|-------------|--|
| 1(b) | <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 source in relation to an enquiry into the relationship between Garibaldi and Victor Emmanuel in 1860.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The author was an eyewitness who, as a member of Garibaldi's entourage, was close enough to the activities to overhear the conversation between the King and Garibaldi • As a supporter of Garibaldi, the author is likely to portray the relationship in a favourable light • The memoir was published very soon after the events; the book title and tone of the language suggests that it was produced in order to publicise the achievements of Garibaldi and his 'redshirts'. 2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides evidence of a respectful relationship between the two ('My dear Garibaldi', 'The King and the Dictator chatted'.) • It provides evidence that Garibaldi was deferential to the King ('Hail to the King', 'keeping his horse a few paces behind', 'Garibaldi lift his hat') • It implies that the two had little in common ('talked of fine weather and bad roads', 'returned to his own men -...modest redshirts...splendid uniforms') • There is the suggestion that it was Garibaldi who had the real power in the relationship; the use of 'Dictator' implies equality, Garibaldi is presenting the King to the crowd and persuading the peasants of the King's authority. 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 the content. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victor Emmanuel, in a wish to assert his nationalist credentials, had been in communication with Garibaldi over a long period of time • From the beginning, Garibaldi had publicly proclaimed his conquests in the South in the name of Victor Emmanuel • The handing over of the South at Teano was viewed by contemporaries in different ways, e.g. the capitulation of Garibaldi in the face of battle, as a heroic gesture of self-sacrifice on the part of Garibaldi • Victor Emmanuel was known to resent Garibaldi's obvious popularity in the South. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

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

| Question | Indicative content |
|--------------------|---|
| <p>2(a)</p> | <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 the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the significance of the <i>Zollverein</i> in the process of German unification.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It indicates that the <i>Zollverein</i> brought economic unity to its members ('get rid of barriers to intercommunication...separate economic legislation') • It claims that the <i>Zollverein</i> is an effective vehicle for the advancement of national unity ('It has done wonders in breaking down petty and local prejudices.') • It identifies the <i>Zollverein</i> as the potential basis for a future nation-state ('one great alliance'). 2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The author was a respected expert who had witnessed the impact of the <i>Zollverein</i> for himself • The Report was written in 1840 so suggesting that the <i>Zollverein</i> was a significant influence on events in Germany from an early stage in the unification process • The interest of the British government suggests that the <i>Zollverein</i> was a significant development. 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Zollverein</i> flourished under the leadership of Prussia during the 1840s, having been founded in 1834 • Metternich believed that the <i>Zollverein</i> had the potential to challenge Austrian dominance of the German states • German nationalism was flourishing in the 1840s and the <i>Zollverein</i> was seen by many nationalists as a blueprint for bringing the German people together. |

| Question | Indicative content |
|-------------|--|
| 2(b) | <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 source in relation to an enquiry into the strength of the Prussian state in 1860.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The article provides an outsider's view of Prussia at the time and so may be reflecting a more honest opinion of the situation than might be found in Prussia itself • The tone of the article is particularly critical and belittling suggesting that the writer was being extremely partial, particularly as <i>The Times</i> was known to promote British interests • The strength of the criticism in the article reflects the particularly poor light in which Prussia was held internationally in 1860. 2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It suggests that Prussia acts and looks like a powerful state but has no right to claim great power status ('large army', 'plentiful diplomatic circulars and notes', 'no one dreads her as an enemy', 'nobody can tell') • It claims that Prussia is diplomatically weak and isolated ('never willing to help herself', 'No one counts her as a friend') • It indicates that the government is ineffective and indecisive ('seeking assistance from other nations', 'never sides for or against') • It claims that the Prussian army is incapable of defending Prussia ('in no fit condition for fighting', 'without allies...would not be able to defend its borders'). 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 the content. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 1859, Prussia failed to take advantage of war between France and Austria either by supporting Austria as a German state or by standing up to French expansionism • Prussia had gained the support of the German Confederation for non-intervention in the Crimean War (1854) and maintained a strong leadership of the <i>Zollverein</i> • The army was in desperate need of reform; recruitment was outdated, nepotism was rife and in 1859 an attempt to mobilise had been disastrous |

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In 1860, Prussia was in a period of political uncertainty; King William IV's brother, William, was acting as regent due the King's mental incapacity after a stroke. |
|--|--|

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 about whether the political situation in Italy in 1850 was similar to the political situation in Italy before the 1848-49 revolutions.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the political situation in Italy in 1850 was similar to the political situation in Italy before the 1848-49 revolutions should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austria remained the dominant political force in Italy • Most of the original rulers and all of the ruling families were restored to power; Charles Albert was replaced by his son, Victor Emmanuel • There appeared to be little popular support for radical nationalist and liberal ideas • The power of the Papacy to influence politics remained very strong. <p>Arguments and evidence that the political situation in Italy in 1850 was different to the political situation in Italy before the 1848-49 revolutions should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The events of 1848-49 had proven that Austrian power in Italy was vulnerable • Piedmont had developed into a constitutional monarchy with pretensions to 'lead' Italy in the future • The role of Piedmont in the First Italian War of Independence had convinced many nationalists that Piedmontese leadership could provide a basis for future unity; many nationalists moved to Piedmont to carry on the cause • The maintenance of Papal government in Rome required the protection of a French garrison. <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 on how significant the role of Napoleon III was in the events leading to the outbreak of the Second Italian War of Independence.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the role of Napoleon III in the events leading to the outbreak of the Second Italian War of Independence was significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Napoleon III had a belief that he wanted to 'do something for Italy' and used the Orsini Affair as a pretext for intervening in Italian affairs • Napoleon III was responsible for arranging the secret meeting at Plombières to discuss potential support for Piedmont in a war against Austria • Without Napoleon III's agreement in the Pact of Plombières to provide two-thirds of the military might, a 'war of independence' would not have been possible. <p>Arguments and evidence that the role of Napoleon III in the events leading to the outbreak of the Second Italian War of Independence was limited/other factors were more significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was Victor Emmanuel who persuaded Napoleon III that, despite Orsini's attempted assassination, the Italian cause against Austria was worthwhile • It was Cavour that engineered the relationship with Napoleon III that led to the meeting at Plombières and the agreement to fight Austria, e.g. Cavour had gained French favour by committing Piedmont to the Crimean War • Napoleon III could find no clear reason to go to war with Austria; Cavour provoked the Austrian reaction by mobilising the Piedmontese army • The Austrian decision to declare war on Piedmont (29 April 1859) forced Napoleon III into implementing the Pact of Plombières; at the time Napoleon was beginning to favour a congress to solve the 'Italian question'. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |

| 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 on the statement that, in the years 1861-70, it was a lack of commitment from the Kingdom of Italy that explains why it took so long to achieve unity with Venetia and Rome.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1861-70, it was a lack of commitment from the Kingdom of Italy that explains why it took so long to achieve unity with Venetia and Rome should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Kingdom of Italy actively obstructed attempts by Garibaldi and his supporters to take control of Venetia and Rome in the years 1862-64 • The 'Convention of September' (1864), which brought about a short-lived withdrawal of the French garrison from Rome, included an agreement that Italy would protect Papal territory from attack • It was only in 1866 that the Kingdom of Italy began to make diplomatic/military moves to take control of Venetia and even then with some reluctance • In 1870 the Italian government waited until hearing of the formal defeat of France in the Franco-Prussian War before occupying Rome. <p>Arguments and evidence that counter the statement that, in the years 1861-70, it was a lack of commitment on behalf of the Kingdom of Italy that explains why it took so long to achieve unity with Venetia and Rome should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the early years particularly, the new Kingdom of Italy was not strong enough to challenge the Austrians in Venetia and the French in Rome, e.g. during the Brigands' War • Victor Emmanuel made clear his commitment to taking control of Venetia and Rome and the Third War of Italian Independence against Austria (1866) resulted in Venetia being ceded to the Kingdom of Italy • There was little popular support for unity with the Kingdom of Italy in either Venetia or Rome • The Papacy remained a determined obstacle to Rome becoming the capital of the Kingdom of Italy throughout the period. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |

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

| 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 on the statement that the main reason for the initial success of the revolutions in the German states in 1848 was the situation in the Austrian Empire.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the main reason for the initial success of the revolutions in the German states in 1848 was the situation in the Austrian Empire should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The success of the revolution in Austria and the fall of Metternich (13 March 1848) were both a symbolic and physical encouragement to revolutionaries across Germany • The rulers of other German states lost their confidence as a result of the news of revolution in the leading German state, e.g. Frederick William IV in Prussia • Austrian counter-revolutionaries prioritised putting down nationalist revolutions in the eastern Empire during the later months of 1848, so allowing the revolutions in the German states to thrive. <p>Arguments and evidence that another factor was the main reason for the initial success of the revolutions in the German states in 1848 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scale and intensity of revolutionary activity caused by a specific combination of political, social and economic crises in early 1848 • The swift capitulation of the German rulers to the demands of the revolutionaries, particularly in Prussia • The popular and wide-ranging support for the revolutions, including influential middle-class liberals and some Prussian Junkers • The organisational ability of nationalist and liberal political networks; the <i>Vorparlament</i> met in March 1848 and the Frankfurt Assembly was in session by May 1848. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |

| Question | Indicative content |
|----------|--|
| 7 | <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 the main reason Prussia was able to defeat Austria in the Seven Weeks' War (1866) was Prussian military strength.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the main reason Prussia was able to defeat Austria in the Seven Weeks' War (1866) was Prussian military strength should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The staff and organisational reforms of von Moltke and von Roon had created a more effective, modernised and mobile army than that of Austria • The Prussian army used the Prussian railway network to mobilise troops and deploy troops effectively • The Prussians were equipped with modern breech-loading Dreyse needle guns • The Prussian general staff devised and implemented an effective strategy against the Austrians. <p>Arguments and evidence that Prussia was able to defeat Austria in the Seven Weeks' War (1866) due to other factors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austrian military deficiencies; Austria and its allies outnumbered Prussia and its allies but lost five times as many men • Bismarck's diplomatic preparations for war; France was neutralised by the Biarritz agreement (1865) and Italian support gained by a military alliance (1866) • The favourable broader international situation; Britain was unable and unwilling to intervene in a land war in Europe and Russia no longer viewed Austria as its natural ally • Prussian economic strength; it was the economic development of Prussia in the 1850s that provided the Prussian military with the means to carry out the victory. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |

| Question | Indicative content |
|----------|--|
| 8 | <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 how significant the role of Napoleon III was in the breakdown of relations between Prussia and France in the years 1866-70.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the role of Napoleon III was significant in the breakdown of 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"> • Relations were soured by Napoleon III's resentment of Prussian gains in the aftermath of the Austro-Prussian war and the loss of French prestige • Napoleon III's attempt to purchase the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg from the King of Holland created hostility with Prussia and a German nationalist outcry • Napoleon III appointed a fiercely anti-Prussian politician, Gramont, as Foreign Minister in May 1870 • It was Napoleon III's decision to declare war on Prussia on 19 July 1870. <p>Arguments and evidence that the role of Napoleon III in the breakdown of relations between Prussia and France in the years 1866-70 was limited/other factors were more significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was the Prussian army generals who provoked the Luxembourg Crisis • It was the Empress Eugenie and French government ministers rather than Napoleon III, who was unwell at the time, who engineered the controversy surrounding the Hohenzollern Candidature • It was Bismarck who manipulated the relationship with France in the years 1866-70 in order to provoke a conflict, which would lead to German unity; Bismarck purposefully amended the Ems Despatch • Popular feeling in both Prussia and France influenced the breakdown in relations; German nationalists condemned French expansionism and the French government reacted to populist negativity towards Prussia. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |

