



Pearson  
Edexcel

## Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel GCE History (8HI0/2D)  
Advanced Subsidiary

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](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 2019

Publications Code 8HI0\_2D\_1906\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## 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 1a/2a

**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.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–2</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 if any substantiation. Concepts of utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>3–5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis 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 or confirm matters of detail.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>6–8</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>• Knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>

## Section A: Questions 1b/2b

**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.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–2</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. Concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>3–5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, 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. Concept of reliability is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>6–9</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 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.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>10–12</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.</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 not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</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.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<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>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–10</b>	<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 question.</li><li>• 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.</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>
<b>3</b>	<b>11–16</b>	<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>
<b>4</b>	<b>17–20</b>	<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>

## Section A: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
<b>1a</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 the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the reasons why Mazzini founded the Young Italy movement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>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"><li>• It conveys a sense of frustration with previous attempts to force change in Italy ('lack of success previously...misguided efforts')</li><li>• It provides evidence of Mazzini's belief that Italian unity could only be achieved by an organisation dedicated to the cause of revolutionary republicanism ('join this association... with the firm intention')</li><li>• It suggests that Mazzini felt that there was a need to provide more support for radical politics within Italy ('reach its aim is by education').</li></ul></li><li>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"><li>• It was written by Mazzini himself</li><li>• It was written to promote Mazzini's aims and give guidance to the Young Italy movement and so can provide insight into his motivations</li><li>• It was written in 1831; this was the year that Mazzini founded Young Italy.</li></ul></li><li>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"><li>• Mazzini's decision to found Young Italy was in response to his frustration at the failures of the attempted revolutions in Italy in 1830</li><li>• The 1830 revolutions had been characterised particularly by a lack of co-operation between the revolutionaries and a sense of localism</li><li>• The idea of a <i>Risorgimento</i> – the 'rebirth' of Italy based on the ideals of Italian national unity and liberal freedoms – influenced the political views of many Italians at this time.</li></ul></li></ol>

Question	Indicative content
<b>1b</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 reliability of the results of the plebiscites held in southern Italy in 1860.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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"> <li>• It is an eyewitness description of voting actually taking place on 22 October</li> <li>• The author is Swiss and so it is probably written from a neutral perspective</li> <li>• Although the author only witnessed events in one specific location, as the most public place in Naples, it is probable that the events in St Francis' Square were typical and even more intimidatory where less public.</li> </ul> </li> <li>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"> <li>• It provides evidence that outwardly the plebiscite appeared to be peaceful and well-organised ('perfect order') with those eligible being able to cast a vote ('the vote would be free from interference was honoured')</li> <li>• It claims that the method of voting left voters open to intimidation ('punished with a stiletto blow')</li> <li>• It could be inferred that the results of the election did not necessarily reflect the true opinion of the people of Naples ('A negative vote was difficult ... to give').</li> </ul> </li> <li>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"> <li>• The 1860 plebiscites held in southern Italy were in response to Garibaldi's decision to 'hand over' his conquests in the south to Victor Emmanuel II; their purpose was to agree to the creation of a Kingdom of Italy</li> <li>• Those in authority in Piedmont felt that plebiscites were a means of legitimising decisions made by political leaders; a speedy endorsement of the new kingdom suited Cavour's altered agenda, in particular</li> <li>• The majority of people were probably in favour of unity but the political authorities had a vested interest in ensuring that the results reflected very strong support.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>



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

Question	Indicative content
<b>2a</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 the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the significance of Prussia's victory over Austria in Seven Weeks' War.</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It provides evidence to suggest that Prussia was now the dominant political force in Germany ('closer Union of the states located north...established by the King of Prussia', 'rights over the Duchies')</li><li>• It indicates through the language used the scale of the victory over Austria ('consents', 'promises to recognise', 'transfers', 'undertakes')</li><li>• It indicates that any future unification would reflect a <i>Kleindeutschland</i> solution ('without the Austrian Empire').</li></ul> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It is an official document agreed between Austria and Prussia</li><li>• The terms of the Preliminary Treaty were unlikely to change significantly in the final version of the Treaty</li><li>• The purpose of the Treaty was to bring an end to hostilities and so reflects the position of the two sides on 26 July 1866.</li></ul> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The scale of the Prussian victory at the Battle of Sadowa, 3 July 1866, so soon after the outbreak of the Austro-Prussian war, forced the Austrians to agree to peace negotiations</li><li>• Following Austria's defeat, a North German Confederation under Prussia was organised, a military agreement with the southern states was established and Prussia annexed some German states</li><li>• Bismarck hoped that leaving the majority of the Austrian Empire intact would prevent the need for Austria to gain revenge in the future and allow Prussia to pursue a <i>Kleindeutschland</i> solution to German unification.</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
<b>2b</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 significance of the Hohenzollern candidature for Prussia's relations with France.</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bismarck was the Foreign Minister of Prussia and so was in a position to reflect with some authority on the impact of the candidature on relations with France</li> <li>• The letter was intended to put on record a conversation held earlier with King William I and appears candidly to reflect his opinion of the candidature</li> <li>• The tone of the letter suggests that Bismarck may have been exaggerating the impact of the acceptance of the candidature in order to persuade the king to agree.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides evidence that the acceptance of the Hohenzollern candidature would have a direct impact on relations with France ('it is desirable to have, located on the other side of France,')</li> <li>• It claims that the acceptance of the Hohenzollern candidature would strengthen Prussia's position in relation to France ('position of strength...political interests that the Prince should accept')</li> <li>• It suggests that Bismarck may have hoped to use the Hohenzollern candidature to manipulate future relations with France ('serve...interests', 'conflicting interests...neighbours').</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 the content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The geographical position of Spain meant the acceptance of the Hohenzollern candidature would place Prussian interests on two borders with France, so potentially changing the dynamics of their relations</li> <li>• Having initially declined the throne, a move welcomed by King William I, Prince Leopold was then encouraged to change his position by Bismarck who hoped to use the situation to, at least, unsettle the French</li> <li>• Bismarck used the acceptance of the Spanish throne to manipulate the events leading to the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, in particular, the situation regarding the Ems Telegram.</li> </ul>

## Section B: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
<b>3</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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that the main reason for the failure of the 1848–49 revolutions in Italy was a lack of revolutionary unity.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the main reason for the failure of the 1848–49 revolutions in Italy was a lack of revolutionary unity should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The revolutions were not a national uprising but a series of separate revolts all with different causes, championing different objectives and with different leaders; this made it relatively easy for Austria to reassert power</li><li>• Charles Albert, who was a prime candidate for national leadership, found it difficult to recruit troops in the First War of Independence by appearing to be simply advancing the cause of the house of Savoy/Piedmont over Italy</li><li>• The radical republican strongholds in Milan, Venice and Rome did not co-operate or co-ordinate sufficiently to resist Austrian counter-revolution</li><li>• Middle-class nationalists failed to unite with the peasantry; some of this hostility undermined the revolutions, e.g. the return of the Pope was cheered by many peasants in the Papal States.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the main reason for the failure of the 1848–49 revolutions in Italy was not a lack of revolutionary unity and/or that there were other reasons should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There were examples of revolutionary co-operation, e.g. Venetia and Piedmont and declaration of national unity, e.g. Charles Albert (<i>'Italia fara da se'</i>) and Mazzini ('the war of the people begins')</li><li>• The success of the counter-revolution in Austria and the determination of Marshal Radetsky to regain control</li><li>• The actions of Pope Pius IX (refutation of the constitution, the Papal Allocution) and the intervention on his behalf by France</li><li>• The failure of the revolutionaries to gain support from a major European power.</li></ul> <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 whether economic development was the key factor in the rise of Piedmont in the years 1849–56.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that economic development was the key factor in the rise of Piedmont in the years 1849–56 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Free-trade treaties with France, Britain and Belgium created links with major European industrial powers</li> <li>• Government investment in infrastructure and industrial projects helped to boost the prestige of Piedmont</li> <li>• The development of a railway system and railway engineering encouraged Britain to view Piedmont increasingly as a 'modern state' worth supporting</li> <li>• The growing economy financed internal loans to pay for military expenditure and contributed to paying off the war indemnity owed to Austria after 1848–49, so re-establishing Piedmont's sovereignty.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that economic development was not the key factor in the rise of Piedmont in the years 1849–56 and/or there were other factors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic development was still on a small scale and Piedmont was burdened by an ever-increasing public debt</li> <li>• Political developments brought stability and promoted Piedmont as a 'liberal' state, e.g. the <i>Statuto</i>, parliamentary rule, providing refuge to exiled nationalists from other states, secularisation</li> <li>• Diplomacy boosted Piedmont's international prestige and enabled Piedmont to bring the 'Italian Question' to the attention of the major European powers, e.g. participation in the Crimean War and the Paris Peace Congress</li> <li>• The appointment of Cavour as Prime Minister in 1852 was the catalyst; Cavour was directly involved in economic, political and diplomatic developments.</li> </ul> <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 accuracy of the statement that the most significant obstacle to Italian unity, in the years 1861–70, was the north-south divide.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the most significant obstacle to Italian unity, in the years 1861–70, was the north-south divide should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The prejudice and ignorance demonstrated by each geographical area about the other created an atmosphere of distrust and hostility</li> <li>• Many southerners viewed the new king as a 'foreign' ruler and this was exacerbated by the 'Piedmontisation' of the political system of the new Kingdom of Italy, e.g. the constitution, the currency</li> <li>• The economic development of the industrial north outstripped that of the agricultural south, leading to inequalities which were resented by those in the south</li> <li>• Political, economic and social inequalities resulted in physical opposition in the south amounting to civil war; in the Brigands' War the kingdom deployed 90,000 Italian troops and there were over 100,000 deaths.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the most significant obstacle to Italian unity, in the years 1861–70, was not the north-south divide and/or that there were other more significant obstacles should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued foreign control and influence over <i>irredenta</i> lands, particularly Austrian control of Venetia and the French occupation of Rome</li> <li>• The psychological impact of the failure to establish Rome as the capital city, due to the stubborn refusal of the Papacy to accept the Kingdom of Italy</li> <li>• The influence of the Catholic Church in the lives of the majority of Italians undermined political and social cohesion, e.g. discouragement of political participation, influence on education and schooling</li> <li>• Bitter local rivalries existed elsewhere in the new Italian kingdom, not just in relation to 'north-south' differences, e.g. Florence and Siena.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

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

Question	Indicative content
<b>6</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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that the main reason for popular unrest in Germany, in the years 1846–48, was the growth of nationalism.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that that the main reason for the growth of popular unrest in Germany, in the years 1846–48, was the growth of nationalism should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Many people felt that the problems faced by the states of the German Confederation in the 1840s could be solved by establishing greater political and economic union; the <i>Zollverein</i> became a symbol of such potential</li><li>• There was resentment of Austrian domination and, particularly, the repressive methods used by Metternich against political opposition</li><li>• The Schleswig-Holstein situation of 1846 created a popular outcry based on nationalist ideas of a Danish threat to the German Fatherland.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the main reason for the growth of popular unrest in Germany, in the years 1846–48, was not the growth of nationalism and/or that other reasons were more important should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Support for nationalism was relatively small and often centred on cultural rather than political identity</li><li>• The influence of liberalism, in particular, the desire of the middle-classes for constitutional government and parliamentary representation</li><li>• Agricultural crisis: economic and social grievances emerged in reaction to harvest failures, e.g. potato blight in Prussia (1847), bread shortages and increases in the price of food</li><li>• The impact of industrialisation and urbanisation: economic and social grievances caused by overproduction, unemployment, overcrowding</li><li>• The impact of specific events, e.g. the constitutional crisis in Baden, the February Revolution in France (1848).</li></ul> <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 as to whether the political situation in Germany in 1851 was no different from the political situation before the 1848–49 revolutions.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the political situation in Germany in 1851 was no different than it had been before the 1848–49 revolutions should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dominance of Austria within Germany continued; the balance of power with Prussia had been restored with the capitulation of Olmütz (1850)</li> <li>• The German Confederation was reconstituted and restored in 1851</li> <li>• The traditional rulers of the individual German states had been restored</li> <li>• Support for liberalism and German nationalism was generally limited and political opposition under control.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the political situation in Germany in 1851 was different than it had been before the 1848–49 revolutions should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Austrian power had been undermined by the successes of the 1848–49 revolutions and it had taken until 1851 to renegotiate its dominant position</li> <li>• The potential political power of Prussia had been highlighted during the events of 1848–49, e.g. the offer of leadership of a <i>Kleindeutschland</i> to Frederick William IV by the Frankfurt Assembly, the Erfurt Union</li> <li>• The Frankfurt Assembly had left a political legacy, e.g. constitutionalism, a <i>Grossdeutschland v Kleindeutschland</i> debate</li> <li>• Moderate national-liberalism may have suffered a setback but many conservatives had been awakened to the potential power of National Liberalism.</li> </ul> <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 the extent to which Prussia strengthened its position in Germany in the years 1852–62.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Prussia did strengthen its position in Germany in the years 1852–62 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prussia became the dominant economic power in Germany through its development and expansion of the <i>Zollverein</i></li> <li>• Prussia represented the <i>Zollverein</i> states internationally; acting as the chief negotiator in trade treaties with Piedmont, Holland, Belgium and France</li> <li>• The development of an arms industry, e.g. Krupps and a state-controlled railway system enhanced Prussian military capabilities. This was further enhanced by the army reforms overseen by von Roon and von Moltke</li> <li>• Prussia was able to take advantage of the political and economic weaknesses emerging in Austria, e.g. Austrian rejection from the <i>Zollverein</i>.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that Prussia did not strengthen its position/its position was limited in Germany in the years 1852–62 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As leader of the German Confederation, Austria continued to hold political and moral authority over Germany</li> <li>• Prussia was not politically stable enough to challenge for political power, e.g. regency of William I and the constitutional crisis</li> <li>• It was not until Bismarck's appointment in 1862 that Prussia would really be able to start to strengthen its political position in Germany, e.g. solving the constitutional crisis and facilitating army reforms.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>