

Examiners' Report
June 2018

GCE History 9HI0 2D

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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.

June 2018

Publications Code 9HI0_2D_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range with A Level paper 2D which deals with the Unification of Italy, c1830-70: (2D.1) and the Unification of Germany, c1840-71: (2D.2).

The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two linked sources. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. Examiners continue to note this year that a number of scripts posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers were able to develop reasoned and supported inferences based on the sources and to evaluate the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the enquiry on the basis of both the contextual knowledge displayed and an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It is important, as was stated last summer, that candidates should be clear that weight is not likely to be established by a discussion of what is missing from a source. If the author of the source has omitted something intentionally in order to modify meaning or distort the message of the source, then it will be relevant to discuss that omission in reaching a conclusion regarding the use that a historian might make of the sources. However, comments on all the things that the sources might have contained, but failed to do so is unlikely to contribute to establishing weight. This approach was still evident this summer, although less so than last summer. The question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and it was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates continue to be aware of this requirement. It can be achieved using a variety of different approaches.

In section B it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question, although weaker candidates continued this summer to often engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Last summer candidates were advised to ensure that there was both an argument and a counter argument in their responses; it is pleasing to note that there was less evidence this summer of a lack of counter arguments. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology, not merely using the start and end dates as bookends with little consideration of the events between. Not all candidates have a secure understanding of what is meant by 'criteria' in terms of bullet point 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates explicitly state in the introduction to the essay that they are naming the criteria that they plan to use, when in actual fact they are referring to the issues or the factors that will be discussed in the response. 'Criteria' in bullet point 3 of the mark scheme refers to the basis on which candidates reach their judgement, not the issues that are discussed in the process of reaching that judgement.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1

Section A

It was very encouraging to see that many candidates were well prepared to demonstrate the AO2 skills requirements and to consider both sources together. The question instruction is to use both sources together and as long as this is apparent within the structure of the answer it is possible for candidates to use a variety of approaches in coming to their overall judgement. Many candidates integrated both sources into their discussion of 'how far... make use' while others looked at each separately and then brought the sources together; there were also variants on these approaches. High level responses were seen using all valid approaches. Those candidates who addressed the strengths of the source material for the investigation in relation to its limitations were often able to come to a clear judgement as to the weight of the evidence.

Question 1

For question 1 stronger responses showed a clear understanding of both sources, used them together and were able to draw out inferences from them which related to investigating the causes of the 1848 revolutions in Italy. Both sources were full of possibilities to draw inferences and to link these to the utility of the sources to the historian in the context of the investigation (e.g. Source 1 suggests that poor leadership was a cause; Source 2 suggests that events in Piedmont are encouraging nationalism elsewhere in Italy). Moreover the best answers produced thoughtful observations concerning the provenance of the sources and linking it to the content to help judge how far the historian could make use of them to consider the enquiry. Good contextual knowledge was deployed to discuss the strengths of the evidence and some consideration was given to interpreting the material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it was derived (e.g. Source 1 Pope Pius IX had introduced reforms into the Papal States which encouraged liberals and nationalists who followed the ideas of Gioberti; Source 2 The Metternich system of police brutality, censorship and spy networks was used against Italian nationalists in areas under Austrian control). The very best interrogated the evidence and made clear supported judgements which weighed up the strengths or otherwise of the material in relation to the investigation under consideration. The latter point is important as the focus of responses needs to be directly on the area of investigation asked in the question.

Weaker responses appeared in a number of different forms. There were those where paraphrasing of the sources dominated and very few, if any, inferences relevant to the stated issue were made. In these types of responses contextual knowledge was often limited and, if evident, used to simply expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail in the sources. Moreover many responses focused too much attention on what the sources left out and used this as the basis for their evaluation. Unless candidates can show that omissions are deliberate, this line of argument carries little value. Source material cannot be expected to include everything, so observing that the source doesn't mention a specific point, unless being used for an example of deliberate omission is unlikely to be a valid criteria for judgement. Candidates are asked to evaluate what is there rather than what is not.

However, in some responses there was considerable knowledge displayed and focused on the specified investigation but with almost no or exceptionally limited references to the sources. As this question is targeting AO2 (analysis and evaluation of source material) these kinds of responses cannot score highly. Moreover in a number of cases knowledge displayed didn't relate to the sources but explored events beyond the dates the sources were written and sometimes even considered reasons for the failure of the revolutions. In other instances, where utility was addressed through the provenance it was often based on either stereotypical judgements or questionable assumptions. This often took the form of comments such as the memoir is by a political writer and he knew what he was talking about (Source 1) or Torelli was a moderate so we

can trust what he says (Source 2).

This is a level 4 response.

Whilst the ultimately failed to achieve their goals, the revolutions that swept across the Italian Peninsula signalled a growing shift in the attitudes of ordinary Italians to the prospect of an Italian nation. However, there was still a variety of reasons for these revolts, similar to those of the early 1830s, despite this slow shift in their objective. These different motivations are highlighted in the differences in sources 1 and 2, although their usefulness is limited somewhat by their narrow focus on specific areas.

Source one's primary focus is on the events occurring in Naples in 1847, and helps us to find the people living there's main reason for revolt. This is given on the 4th line where protesters are described as shouting "long live Pius IX" by Settembrini. From this we can infer that one of the reasons for revolutions in 1848, at least in Naples, was support for Pius IX, and the desire to see his recent liberal reforms replicated by the king of Naples. In the years following his ascension to power, up until being forced to flee Rome in 1848, Pius IX had been far more liberal than Pope's before him, releasing political prisoners from prison and introducing a limited constitution to the Papal States.

whilst he would go on to appoint the reactionary and absolutist Cardinal Antonelli following his return to Rome in 1853, and dismiss the nationalist cause with the 1848 papal allocution, his liberal reforms ~~near~~ prior to 1847 had put Pius at the forefront of the nationalist movement, and many saw him as the prime candidate for Italy to unify under. Source 1 also states that the king "frequently cursed Pius; whose reforms had disturbed the hornets nest" further strengthening this inference that revolution in Naples was due to the desire for a similar constitution to those provided by Pius, or Charles Albert with his statute.

In contrast, source 2 focusses on Lombardy in the North. ^{This} ~~talks extensively about~~ ~~read~~ makes the sources useful when used together since it allows comparison of the reasons for revolution in both the North and South of Italy, ~~very different~~ which had very different cultures, and as a result ~~different~~ reasons for revolt.

Source 2 provides a strong case as to why the revolt in Lombardy took place. Like source 1 it is ^{from} ~~the~~ shortly before the revolution beginning, and is written by a nationalist, so we can assume that both sources provide accurate reasons for the revolutions in their respective areas, since those writing them were part of the unification movement. Source 2 talks extensively about the repressiveness of the Austrian rule over Lombardy, and how as a result resentment of Austria was growing at the time. For instance, Torelli states that "people live in continuous fear of arrest" and that

"Events in Milan are being hastened by the brutality of the police² and repressive actions of the Austrians." From this we can infer that the main reason for uprisings in Lombardy and by extension Austrian-controlled Venetia was the harsh rule of the Austrians, and the growing resentment towards them from the Italian people. This is shown by the goal of the Milanese tobacco boycott, and later on the five days of Milan, both of which aimed to reduce Austrian influence in the areas, as tobacco was one of the most profitable industries for the Austrians in Lombardy. The fact that the two sources have such different reasons ~~shows that~~ means that when used together they provide a greater range of reasons than just one or the other, and help show how different cultures wanted different outcomes to the rebellious revolutions.

However, the usefulness of these sources is limited entirely to only 3 locations, Sicily, Naples and Milan. Whilst the revolts taking place in these areas were significant, many other revolutions occurred in 1848 and 49 with very different reasons, for instance the Venetian revolution which aimed to create a constitutional republic, the Roman republic which had a similar goal, or the revolutions in the south which were motivated far more by the distribution of land.

similarly, the writers of both sources are considered moderate nationalists, and as a result it can be argued that they only highlighted reasons for these revolts relating to Italian nationalism. For example, source 1 does not mention the reason for the sicilian revolution, which would lead the reader to assume it was due to the same reasons as in Naples. However, it can be argued that many "revolutions" in the south, including sicily, were more due to the peasants' dissatisfaction with how land was divided and owned by the wealthy. ~~The~~ In Even by 1858, the second revolution in Sicily still did not aim for unification, instead desiring independence and as a result the ability to distribute land ownership as the islanders saw fit, rather than ~~to~~ how the king of Naples wished.

overall, whilst the two sources are from shortly before the revolutions, and are written by nationalists giving an insiders perspective, the fact that they only focus on a handful of areas, and do not discuss other reasons for rebellion such as disputes over land means these sources are of limited usefulness when not comparing the difference reasons in reasoning between nationalists in the north and south, which is far too specific to answer the overall question of why revolutions occurred in 1848/49.



It considers the content of the source material and uses this to come to a judgement with regard to using the sources together. There is also some use of the historical context to illuminate what can be gained from the source content. However, there is more limited use of the information given about the sources to establish how secure the source material is in providing evidence.



Try to integrate historical knowledge and the information given about the source material when considering the suitability of the source material. Consider the strengths and limitations of the source material as evidence for the investigation.

Question 2

For question 2 stronger responses showed a clear understanding of both sources, used them together and were able to draw out inferences from them which related to investigating relations between Austria and Prussia in the early 1850s. Both sources were full of possibilities to draw inferences and to link these to the utility of the sources to the historian in the context of the investigation (e.g. Source 3 It implies that Austria still feels superior to Prussia within Germany; Source 4 It suggests that Prussia gave up very little power in 1850 with the reassertion of the German Confederation under Austria). Moreover the best answers produced thoughtful observations concerning the provenance of the sources to help judge how far the historian could make use of them to consider the investigation. Good contextual knowledge was deployed to discuss the strengths of the evidence and some consideration was given to interpreting the material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it was derived (e.g. Source 3 After Olmütz the Austrians were determined to consolidate their political power, and re-establish their commercial power, over Germany at the expense of Prussia; Source 4 Prussia had been forced to give up its attempt to increase its political power within Germany with the failure of the Erfurt Union). The very best interrogated the evidence and made clear supported judgements which weighed up the strengths or otherwise of the material in relation to the investigation under consideration. The latter point is important as the focus of responses needs to be directly on the area of investigation asked in the question.

Weaker responses appeared in a number of different forms. There were those where paraphrasing of the sources dominated and very few, if any, inferences relevant to the stated issue were made. In these types of responses contextual knowledge was often limited and, if evident, used to simply expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail in the sources. Moreover many responses focused too much attention on what the sources left out and used this as the basis for their evaluation. Unless candidates can show that omissions are deliberate, this line of argument carries little value. Source material cannot be expected to include everything, so observing that the source doesn't mention a specific point, unless being used for an example of deliberate omission is unlikely to be a valid criteria for judgement. Candidates are asked to evaluate what is there rather than what is not.

In some weaker responses there was considerable knowledge displayed and focused on the specified investigation but with almost no or exceptionally limited references to the sources. As this question is targeting AO2 (analysis and evaluation of source material) these kinds of responses cannot score highly. Moreover in a number of cases knowledge displayed didn't relate to the sources but explored issues relating to the later 1850s or even Bismarck and unification in the 1860s. In other instances, where utility was addressed through the provenance it was often based on either stereotypical judgements or questionable assumptions. This often took the form of comments such as Bruck was Austrian and biased (Source 3) or as it is from a newspaper we can trust what it says (Source 4).

This is a Level 2 response.

Following the German Revolutions of 1848-49, the rivalry between Prussia and the Austrian Empire over who will lead Germany into the future. The forms this rivalry took were varied, many sources give different reasons for ~~the~~ ^{this} rivalry. I will be debating how useful these sources are, when used ~~together~~, to investigate the relations between these two states. This ^{can} be measured by examining the sources' ^{and} content, ^{and} ^{and date of creation} origin, ^{and} intended audience.

The ~~source~~ content of each source seems to give a good level of detail. Both sources discuss the ^{causes, and to a} ~~economic~~ lesser extent, reaction to Austrian economic advances. Following the revolutions, Austria tried to secure ^{total} ~~the~~ economic influence ~~of~~ over the lesser & German states. The aim of this was to eventually directly control these states. Prussia, wanting independence ^{ance} ~~ese~~ from Austria, countered this via the establishment of a Prussia lead & Customs Union known as the Zollverein. Both sources reference these rival Customs Unions, source ^{three} ~~one~~ mentions the ^{negotiation} hope to bringing Prussia into the 'Austro-German Customs Union'. Source four also mentions how Prussia must 'make it her purpose in commercial policy to maintain the Zollverein's power'. However, these sources only mention the economic rivalry between

these two states. While, from my own knowledge, the economic rivalry was vital, it was not the only factor. The growing political rivalry over control of the federal diet, for example is never referenced. Overall, the content of these sources is detailed and accurate. But only in regards to economic factors.

The sources' ^{authors} origins also brings in questions about their usefulness. Source ^{one} ~~one~~ is a report to the Austrian Minister-President by the Minister for trade. Source ^{two} ~~two~~ is an article from a Prussian newspaper. Source ^{three's} ~~three's~~ origin means that it must be truthful. This is because, as ^{it is a} ~~is a~~ report to a high ranking government official, the author would not be allowed to lie. If it was found they did so, they could be ~~fired~~ demoted or fired. Source ^{four's} ~~four's~~ however, is less reliable useful. The newspaper the source comes from is bias ~~against~~ in favour of 'National Liberals' (liberal elements of the German nationalist movement). Meaning that they would print information that would favour their cause rather than the truth. Meaning these sources cannot as easily be used together.

*

In conclusion, the information in these sources, though detailed, provides only limited insight into the Austro-Prussian rivalry. Furthermore, source four shows a clear bias, meaning that these sources are only somewhat useful.

*=The time ^{whole} The sources were made does ^{somewhat} make up for this however. Both sources were written at the time of this rivalry. Meaning that the information they give is ~~exactly~~ likely what people thought at the time. From my own knowledge, I know that the information in these sources is accurate to what people thought at the time. However, they are still limited by the lack of hindsight. The people who were living at the time were ^{and} unable to fully understand the entire situation. Meaning ^{normally} the information they give tends to be very restrained. However, In spite of this, the information does ~~we go~~ capture the attitudes held by these governments at the time.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Level 2 response. There is some understanding of the source material but largely through summarising. What inferences there are are unsupported. Knowledge is evident but not always linked to how it can be used to further the investigation. Evaluation is limited and often based on questionable assumptions.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Try to develop and support inferences through selection from the source material and supporting own knowledge.

Question 3

Section B

As suggested in the introduction, both centres and candidates are often more confident with the AO1 skills essay structure. Candidates are aware of the need to produce a response which uses historical knowledge to support an analysis of the key issues relevant to the question asked. Examiners noted that there were many excellent responses which explored the issues raised in the question with discrimination and detailed knowledge which were a pleasure to read. There does, however, still appear to be a tendency for some candidates just to rewrite practice questions on a similar theme or topic and even, in some cases, evidence of candidates apparently having a prepared answer that generally engages with a theme or topic. It is very important to note that the mark schemes, particularly in relation to Level 4 and 5, clearly indicate that candidates should engage with the specific question being asked – in terms of the second-order concept(s) being addressed, the specific wording, and, where indicated, the time period. Historical knowledge was generally secure and it is important to note though that major inaccuracies may undermine the ability of the candidates to reach an overall supported judgement and affect the logic and coherence of an argument.

Question 3.

This was the least popular of the two Italy questions. The question considered the extent to which the Roman Republic was so short-lived because of lack of strong leadership. Stronger responses clearly addressed the reasons for failure and weighed up the relative importance of a lack of strong leadership as one of them. Other factors would also be discussed to develop a counter case. Key areas such as the work of the triumvirate and inadequate military preparation were explored and discussed using valid criteria to judge. Counterarguments relating to the importance of the attitudes of Pius IX or the military action of France were often discussed well. The very best were wide-ranging in the evidence they assembled and sustained in their argument, as well as being organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended towards either narrative or generalisation. If analysis was present, the support offered tended to be limited in both range and depth. Weaker responses also found it harder to clearly outline the events in Rome in 1849 and so struggled to make supported judgements relevant to the question. Occasional responses only engaged with the stated factor given in the question and so limited severely their ability to score highly.

This a Level 5 response.

The Roman Republic was one of the most prominent of all the 1848-49 revolutions, however it too was short-lived.

One reason for the short existence of the Roman Republic was a lack of strong leadership, with the likes of Mazzini and the rest of the Triumvirate failing to find a common direction. However, there were other factors at play including intervention by the French and General Duvivier and a lack of popular support from the people of Rome for a Republic. Lastly a lack of ~~popular support~~ support from other Italian states due to the influence of the Pope led to the short existence of the Roman Republic. Overall, the military action by the French was the most critical to the short-livedness of the Roman Republic.

Firstly, a lack of leadership hindered the progress made by the Roman Republic during its existence. The Constituent ~~held elections~~ decided to govern Rome by a Triumvirate one of which was Mazzini. Mazzini had been living in exile following the failure of his Young Italy uprisings in Piedmont (1833) and Genoa (1834). Mazzini was evidently not a strong leader, due to the fact

that he was out of touch with the state of Italian politics and society. This meant he failed to compromise any of his ideals for the Republic, which drew him into direct conflict with the other leaders of the Republic. This conflict, prevented the effective governance of the Republic and eventually led to a failure to attract support from other areas, as Mazzini had a reputation for being a radical, revolutionary. In addition to this Mazzini and Garibaldi (who led the defence of the Republic) were known to dislike each other. This ~~the~~ lack of cooperation between the two, led to a lack of an agreement on how to ~~govern~~ ^{defend} Rome under French siege and therefore shortened the life of the Republic. Therefore, I do to a reasonable extent agree that the Roman Republic was shortlived due to a lack of strong leadership.

Secondly, a lack of popular support for the Republic among the Italian peasantry led to its short existence. There was to a degree a lack of support for the Roman Republic amongst the citizens of Rome itself. Although the Triumvirate ordered public works to be carried out and the clearing up of the Roman slums, most Romans remained in abject poverty, meaning. Therefore, ~~as a~~ a failure to improve living conditions substantially and the ~~biggest~~ ^{biggest} horror of disease brought about by the French

siege of Rome reduced popular support for the Republic, when it needed it most. In addition to this, there was a lack of popular support across the Peninsula on the basis that this was another Mazzinian uprising. Mazzini's ideology and plan for a unified Italy made no effort to consider ways of improving the lives of the poor, meaning they never supported him. This contributed to the ~~lack~~ ^{timespan} short ~~nature~~ of the Roman Republic as it meant there was no large-scale revolution which could have supported the Republic by challenging the French. However, it could be argued that had the Republic had better leadership, there would have been more support for the Roman Republic.

Thirdly, the influence of the Pope over the other leaders of the Italian States, ~~reduced~~ contributed to it being short-lived. The Roman Republic was doomed when the Pope fled to Gaeta in response to the murdering of his PM Rossi on the 11th September 1848. Therefore the Pope was utterly against the Republic, as he'd been ousted from his spiritual home of the Vatican. The pope ~~was also~~ ~~also~~ had also issued the Papal Allocution ~~in 1848~~ on the 29th of April 1848, condemning the revolution. This paralysed General Durango (Papal States) and General Pepe (Neapolitan) ~~that~~ who weren't prepared to go against the Pope's wishes and disobey him. Therefore Papal objection to the Republic, meant that no leader of Italy such as Charles

Albert, was prepared to alienate the majority of their population by going against the Pope's wishes. This therefore meant the Roman Republic was short-lived as it didn't receive any military support from fellow Italians, which could have helped it extend its existence by bolstering its forces against the French. However, it could be argued that if Mazzini wasn't leading the Republic other leaders such as Charles Albert would've been more prepared to assist it.

Lastly, French intervention contributed to the short-life of the Roman Republic. In the face of Catholic uproar at home and a vote by the French Parliament, Louis Napoleon was forced to send General Oudinot and French troops to liberate Rome. This was significant as it was the only threat of military action against Rome. After a 2 month siege the French troops retook Rome for the Pope on the 11th July 1849, ending the Roman Republic. In the end Garibaldi's army had simply been outnumbered and overpowered by the French, who had managed to amass a force of 20,000 at the gates of Rome. French intervention was the most crucial to the short lifespan of the Roman Republic as it was the only conceivable threat to the Republic in the short-term. It's likely that without French intervention, the Roman Republic may have fallen, but it wouldn't have fallen remotely as quickly.

Overall, I don't ~~to~~ agree with the statement to a reasonable extent, because the military intervention by France was more influential in the fall of ^{the Roman Republic} Rome than the lack of strong leadership. This is due to the fact that many Italian states such as Naples, survived with weak leadership for far longer than the Roman Republic. However, it could also be argued that the influence of the Pope led to the short-lived nature of the Roman Republic, as it was the cause of French intervention.



This is a L5 response which has a sustained argument, is well supported with key discussions about leadership, the influence and role of the Papacy as well as foreign involvement.



Questions on the Roman Republic often show limited understanding of what it did, how long it lasted and who was in charge. These might be areas to give more consideration to.

Question 4

This was the more popular of the two Italy questions. The question considered the extent to which the candidate agreed that the process of Italian Unification, in the years 1859-70, resulted in the creation of an enlarged Piedmont rather than a unified Italy. Stronger responses clearly addressed the two issues and weighed up the extent of Piedmontisation within the new Italian kingdom. Key areas such as Victor Emmanuel II of Piedmont becoming Italian King or the imposition of the Piedmontese constitution on Italy were explored and discussed using valid criteria to judge extent. Counterarguments relating to Rome becoming the capital or the formation of a national army were often discussed well. The very best were wide-ranging in the evidence they assembled and sustained in their argument, as well as being organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended towards either narrative or generalisation. If analysis was present, the support offered tended to be limited in both range and depth. Weaker responses also found it harder to clearly outline examples of Piedmontese influence in the new kingdom of Italy and so struggled to make supported judgements relevant to the question. Occasional responses only engaged with one of the two issues given in the question and so limited severely their ability to score highly.

This is a Level 5 response.

Upon the creation of a united Italy, a period of Piedmontisation occurred where Piedmont's systems and laws were imposed upon all Italian states. It could be suggested this created a united Italy as it involved the nationalisation of the military and education systems and civil laws and currency were identical across the peninsula. On the other hand, this period of Piedmontisation perpetuated the idea that one state was conquering the rest and it can be argued this was the case - the south was drastically different to the north and it can't be argued there was much social unity. It can be argued that the unification process resulted in an enlarged Piedmont as opposed to a united Italy.

Some would argue that come 1870, the process of unification had resulted in a united Italy as opposed to an enlarged Piedmont. The military was nationalized and became ~~one of~~ a symbol of pride for many Italians. The army was developed with Russian guidance ~~on~~ and included 2 million ~~to~~ in reserve; the security of the peninsula as a whole was greatly improved by the unification process.

Similarly, the Italian navy was developed under the guidance of ~~British~~ the British. Lira became the national Italian currency and weights and measures were nationalised across the peninsula. The education system was also nationalised through bringing all Italian universities under state control. The 1859 Casati Laws also sought to impose a compulsory, free primary education across the peninsula. Another symbol of pride for the new Italian state was the monarchy - Victor Emmanuel II became the king of Italy and pride was taken in the revolutionary wars, especially the Capture of Rome from French and Papal opposition. These ~~elements~~ ^{changes} all seem to signal that the unification process had resulted in a united Italy as opposed to an enlarged Piedmont.

However, there were issues with these developments. Victor Emmanuel II remained the second, despite being the first monarch of the newly created Italian kingdom. This, symbolically, reveals that Victor Emmanuel II remained loyal to Piedmont as a state as opposed to a united Italy. The nationalisation of the education system didn't occur across the peninsula - the 1859 Casati Laws were only successful in northern Italy and Piedmont due to the high levels of literacy in southern Italy. Even though outwardly developments pointed to a united Italy, the reality was that the nationalisation that occurred was either unsuccessful in the south or hinted at loyalty to

the state of Piedmont rather than Italy as a whole. ~~The~~

The difference between southern Italy and Piedmont highlights the idea Italy wasn't unified but essentially an extension of Piedmont. Piedmontisation ensured that ^{there was one} legal system in the peninsula - that of Piedmont's. This didn't create the sense of unity desired - for example, the legal system in Naples was changed by 53 decrees in 2 days. This reflects the idea that Italy was essentially an enlarged Piedmont rather than unified. Lombards were resented the fact that Piedmontisation ensured they didn't receive the ^{Lombard} constitution they had been promised. Instead a new Italian constitution, based upon Piedmont's 'Statute' of 1848, was introduced.

This gave the sense that one state was conquering the others rather than the idea of a united Italy. In reality, the plebiscites that had occurred in the south were ~~not~~ voted as a vote against the repressive ~~and~~ Bourbon rule and not a vote for annexation to Piedmont.

The existence of a dual economy also reinforces the idea that the unification process was essentially the expansion of Piedmont. ~~to~~ The economy suffered because of the south - southerners had a distrust of paper money and regarded borrowing as immoral so the Piedmontese systems imposed upon them were unsuccessful. The 1861-65

Brigandage war underlines resentment of the new Kingdom of Italy from southerners as many Sicilians and Neapolitans

took to the hills in order to avoid conscription. Victor Emmanuel II wasn't popular in the south.

The political system imposed on Italy also further the idea that the unification of Italy was essentially the enlargement of Piedmont. Piedmont's political system remained - parliament was made up of Piedmontese upper and middle class men who were ignorant of events in other states. For example, Cavour never travelled further south than Tuscany. The electorate was just 2% of the new Italian population and no change was made - ~~only~~ 60% of the electorate didn't participate on principle (either being republicans or Catholics as the Pope didn't accept the new kingdom of Italy until 1929). Imposing Piedmont's political system upon the rest of Italy, with the Piedmontese monarch and constitution underlines the fact the new kingdom was ultimately an enlargement of Piedmont rather than a united Italy.

Additionally, socially Italy was centred on Piedmont. Piedmont had 819km of railway, which accounted for 1/3 of the railway of the peninsula. Although it could be argued that the development of railways aided unity by creating links across borders of states, ~~the~~ the reality was that the railways remained centred in Piedmont and in developing links with France. By 1870, Sicily and Sardinia still had no railways which signals that Piedmont's enlargement

hadn't fully occurred in these areas ^{and} that unity wasn't present across the peninsula.

In conclusion, it can be argued that the unification process resulted in the creation of a kingdom that was ultimately an enlargement of Piedmont. The Piedmontisation that occurred felt like one state was conquering the others as opposed to the sense of national unity it was intended to create. Piedmontese systems struggled to be successful in the south and the north-south divide underlines the fact that ~~unity or unity~~ Italy ~~didn't~~ ^{geographical} the ~~unification~~ ^{of} Italy was limited in success in politics and in the socio-economic condition of the peninsula.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response considers the arguments for and against the statement in the question across the whole time period using sufficient knowledge to meet the demands of the question fully.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Always make sure that the answer covers the whole time period of the question when this has been specifically stated.

Question 5

This was the least popular of the two Germany questions. The question considered whether it was the weaknesses of the revolutionaries rather than the revival of the forces of conservatism that caused the failure of the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany. Stronger responses clearly addressed the reasons for failure and weighed up the relative importance of the weaknesses of the revolutionaries and the revival of the forces of conservatism. Key areas such as the divisions within the Frankfurt Parliament, differences of nationalist opinion over a Grossdeutsch or Kleindeutsch unification and King Frederick William IV regaining control of Berlin were explored and discussed using valid criteria to judge. The very best were wide-ranging in the evidence they assembled and sustained in their argument, as well as being organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended towards either narrative or generalisation. If analysis was present, the support offered tended to be limited in both range and depth. Weaker responses also found it harder to clearly outline the events in Germany in 1848-49 and so struggled to make supported judgements relevant to the question. Occasional responses only engaged with one factor given in the question and so limited severely their ability to score highly.

This is a Level 4 response.

⑤ The revolutions that affected Germany in 1848 and 1849 had indeed come to an end by March 1849. This was due to a number of factors that diluted and undermined the revolutionaries. Certainly, there were fundamental weaknesses of the revolutionaries such as organisation and support, including the failure of the Frankfurt parliament, that proved damaging to the outcome of the revolutions. However, the powerful conservative forces contributed to the failure of revolution through the counterrevolution, questioning the extent that revolutionary forces alone caused failure. A greater understanding is therefore needed of the outcome of revolutions, and ~~center for them~~ both long term and short term.

Without any doubt, the revolutionary forces held considerable weaknesses that decreased their effectiveness and organisation. There was no united body of revolutionaries due to different aims and levels of prosperity that diluted the demands and damaged the leadership. In 1848, a successful harvest increased prosperity in the rural sector of Germany. Many peasants lost interest in further revolution as feudalism had by the

point been abolished. The revolution was also limited with relatively little violence, aside from the shooting on the 18th March of 230 people, many violent-ferozest died down. This decreased ^{the} influence of the revolutionaries on the junkers and parliament. The creation of the liberal-minded Frankfurt parliament in ~~the~~ March 1848 had the potential to cause the revolutions to be successful. ^{It} Arranged at impressively short notice, ~~the~~ the parliament focused liberal aims with basic rights of the German people being put forward in 50 articles in December. However the parliament proved to be a failure, the leadership of von Gagern ~~was~~ lacked character and the divisions within the party led to discussions becoming a 'talking shop' of ideology from left and right wing liberals and radicals from a mixed population in Germany of Czechs, Croats, Italians, Prussians and Danes. ~~to~~ Ultimately the parliament was indecisive and eventually undermined by the return of conservative power. ~~Therefore~~ Therefore, the revolutionaries of 1848 and 1849 suffered damaging weaknesses of organisation, leadership and collective strength. They lacked an effective and clear aim and suffered from the declining political and social atmosphere. It is clear that, to a large extent, the weakness of the revolutionaries played a large role in causing the failure of the 1848/9 revolutions.

One could certainly argue that the revival of the forces of conservatism, in many ways, took advantage of the revolutionary weaknesses. This allowed them to regain control of power using resources that the revolutionaries lacked. Both in and outside Germany, conservatism proved the victor of revolutions. After granting liberal reforms, Frederick William IV of Prussia regained his troops and conservative support at Potsdam, speaking of humiliation and ~~an~~ an aim of establishing conservative power once more. Crucially, he rejected the leadership of the Frankfurt parliament, which proved an important reason for its downfall by October 1849. In Austria, Metternich had returned to re-establish martial law as the parliamentary forces began a counter-revolution after 2000 were killed in Vienna. Democracy was once again suppressed, in Prussia, the three tier voting system ensured power remained with aristocratic Junkers and the upper class. Around Europe, other revolutions in France and Italy had failed due to the power of the reactionary forces. The forces of conservatism, in many German states, used their power over the army to regain control after the revolutionaries had, for a short time, been successful in granting reforms. Therefore, it is clear that the conservative forces fought an effective counter-revolution that ~~did~~ suppressed revolutionary actions. This demonstrates how the conservative forces utilised the revolutionary weaknesses, working with this factor to ensure the shortlived of revolution. The revival of the forces of conservatism

is therefore equally as important as the weakness of the revolutionaries in causing the failure of revolution.

Certainly, both of these factors led to the failure of revolution, however one, ~~and~~ despite this, it is questionable whether the revolutions were a complete failure. The monarchy in Germany was modernised with an increased awareness of the working classes. There was an end to feudalism and the fight for a united Germany had effectively begun to reach a political agenda. This therefore questions the overall failure of the revolutions. ~~and~~

Overall, it is seen that, rather than being more of a factor than the revival of the forces of conservatism, the weakness of the revolutionaries was crucial to the failure of revolutions in partnership to conservative strength. It allowed conservatives to take advantage of ~~the~~ weakness to regain control. It is incomplete to suggest the revolutions were a complete long term failure, however, in the short term, both the strength of the revival of conservatism and the weakness of the revolutionaries are equally responsible for the causes of the failure of revolution.



This L4 response explores some of the key features of the failure of the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany but does become generalised and lacking in support in places. Criteria for making judgements could be more clearly established.



To move to the highest level there would need to be a more sustained quality to the analysis as well as clearer criteria to establish judgement.

Question 6

This was the more popular of the two Germany questions. The question considered the extent to which the candidate agreed that the process of German Unification, in the years 1862-71, resulted in the creation of an enlarged Prussia rather than a unified Germany. Stronger responses clearly addressed the two issues and weighed up the extent of Prussian influence within the new German Empire. Key areas such as William I of Prussia becoming German Emperor or the imposition of a Prussian dominated constitution were explored and discussed using valid criteria to judge extent. Counterarguments relating to the rights of other German states which were granted under the constitution or the formation of national political institutions were often discussed well. The very best were wide-ranging in the evidence they assembled and sustained in their argument, as well as being organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended towards either narrative or generalisation. If analysis was present, the support offered tended to be limited in both range and depth. Weaker responses also found it harder to clearly outline examples of Prussian influence in the new German Empire and so struggled to make supported judgements relevant to the question. Some candidates presented lengthy narratives of the wars of German Unification which could not be expected to score highly. Occasional responses only engaged with one of the two issues given in the question and so limited severely their ability to score highly.

This is a Level 3 response.

The process of unification between the years 1862 - 1871 was the result of three wars: Danish-Prussian, Austro-Prussian and Franco-Prussian. These wars resulted in three different treaties all giving Prussia territory gains. This essay will discuss these factors and make a judgement as to whether the process of unification led to an enlarged Prussia or unified Germany.

Firstly, many argue that the process of German unification resulted in a unified Germany due to the treaty of Frankfurt in 1871. This treaty (due to the Prussian victory in the Franco-Prussian war) had three different stipulations: reparations of 5 billion francs, territories of Alsace and Lorraine and that France recognises a new unified Germany (under the leadership of Emperor William). The fact that the unification of Germany was written into law, consequently means that the process of unification directly led to the creation of a unified Germany.

On the other hand, some argue that the process of unification led to an enlarged Prussia - due to the treaty of Prague in 1866. One of the agreements of this treaty was that a North German Confederation be set up. However, ~~however~~ this treaty excluded the Southern states. But, Bismarck being tactical negotiated secretly an alliance with ~~the~~ 14 Southern states - that in the event of war they would fight alongside Prussia and their armies be under Prussia's control. Therefore, it can be argued that the process of unification led to a North German Confederation (Prussia the controller) with the annexation of a few ~~the~~ Southern states rather than a unified Germany.

Furthermore, it could be argued that the process of unification led to ~~the~~ a unified Germany. This is because, ~~the~~ of the international situation. Many other nations accepted that Germany had been fully unified. Countries such as Britain, Russia and Italy later acknowledged publically that ~~the~~ they now recognised Germany to be unified (as a result of the unification process).

It can be argued that the unification process led to ~~an enlarged prussia~~ an enlarged prussia - due to the fact that the new 'nation' was under prussian ~~the~~ leadership.

Although it was accepted that ~~the~~ the new unified 'Germany' was an independent and self governing nation with autonomy - it was placed under prussian control (Friedrich William). The ~~Frankfurt~~ Frankfurt Treaty of 1871 stipulated this. Therefore, the fact that Prussia was effectively in control of the other member states meant that the process of unification led to an enlarged prussia and not a unified Germany.

To conclude, to some extent the unification process led to ~~the~~^{an} ~~enlarged prussia~~ an enlarged prussia and not a unified Germany. This is because, the Treaty of Frankfurt stipulated the recognition of a unified Germany. However, this was placed under prussian control therefore meaning that effectively the unification process simply led to an enlarged prussia.



This response considers some of the relevant key features with regard to the question but these are explained rather than explored. Some descriptive passages are evident and overall supporting evidence limited in places.



Higher Level responses explore the key issues by creating a discussion of the question asked rather than just considering key aspects.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A

- Candidates should go beyond paraphrasing the content of the sources to draw out reasoned and developed inferences
- Candidates should move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature/purpose and authorship of the source by, e.g. looking at and explaining the specific stance and/or purpose of the writer
- Contextual knowledge should not be used to list all the information that is missing from the sources, unless omission was the aim of the author
- Contextual knowledge should be linked to the material provided in the source
- Candidates should make use of the sources together at some point in the answer.

Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure the second order concept is correctly identified; candidates need to be aware that not all questions demand a factor/other factors approach
- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues rather than merely present a list of factors.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

