



Pearson  
Edexcel

## Mark Scheme (Results)

November 2021

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
In History (9HI0)

Paper 2: Depth study

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

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)

November 2021

Question Paper Log Number P66273

Publications Code 9HI0\_2D\_rms\_20211216

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2021

## General Marking Guidance

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

## Generic Level Descriptors: Section A

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li> <li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question.</li> <li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria but with limited justification.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>13–16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<b>17–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/ or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.</li> </ul>

## Section B

**Target:** AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</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>4–7</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 focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–12</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>13–16</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>
<b>5</b>	<b>17–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li> <li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
<b>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 sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the impact of the creation of the Kingdom of Italy (1861) on southern Italy.</p> <p><b>Source 1</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Count Maffei was writing about recent events that he would have had first-hand knowledge of and, having lived in Naples, may well have witnessed</li><li>• Count Maffei's access to official Italian government documents would have provided him with up-to-date information about government policy and decisions</li><li>• Count Maffei's strong support for the Kingdom of Italy and the language and tone of the writing indicate his intention may have been purposefully to highlight the positive achievements of the new Kingdom.</li></ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the impact of the creation of the Kingdom of Italy (1861) on southern Italy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It claims that the social and economic conditions in southern Italy have been greatly improved under the government ('the poor do not have to rely on charity', 'railways have completely transformed the conditions')</li><li>• It provides evidence that southern Italy has improved communications with both the rest of Italy and other countries ('regions...now connected by railway to Turin', 'Investment is flowing from abroad...')</li><li>• It hints that the impact has not been wholly positive ('Despite financial difficulties and political agitation...', 'make impossible the return of brigandage').</li></ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• After 1861, southern Italy was subject to a policy described by many as 'Piedmontisation', in which the political, social and economic values of Piedmont were introduced into the newly-unified region</li><li>• Large infrastructure and agricultural projects did bring some prosperity to the region but mainly to the upper and middle classes; the working classes and the peasantry remained poor and illiterate</li><li>• Improved communications provided the opportunity for many living in southern Italy to move away from the region, either to the north or to emigrate</li><li>• The new government of Italy was almost bankrupt, with little money to spend in the south, and many officials had a contemptuous attitude towards a region that they had not really wanted to be part of Italy.</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p><b>Source 2</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report is a first-hand account of an uprising in Sicily in September 1866 written from the perspective of the commander of the government forces</li> <li>• The report provides a detailed factual account of the events of the uprising, but also possibly a justification of his defence of Palermo, to his superiors in the government</li> <li>• It provides a snapshot of the situation in Sicily in 1866 from the point of view of the Italian authorities.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the impact of the creation of the Kingdom of Italy (1861) on southern Italy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It indicates that a significant number of people were dissatisfied with the Italian authorities and willing to take up arms ('large armed groups...take over the government')</li> <li>• It suggests that the Italian authorities did not accept the legitimacy of the participants in the uprising ('we could never negotiate with rebels')</li> <li>• It suggests that the Kingdom of Italy had not brought peace and stability to the south of Italy and was forced to use violence against its own people ('the anarchy was decisively crushed')</li> <li>• It indicates that there was ill-feeling between the Italian authorities and the Catholic Church ('...actions of monks and nuns much influenced the disorders.', 'support demands for the suppression...religious strongholds').</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discontent with 'Piedmontisation' and support for the pre-1861 Bourbon monarchy led to an increase in brigandage in southern Italy</li> <li>• The Italian authorities violently suppressed rebel groups, resulting in a <i>de facto</i> civil war known as the Brigand's War; an estimated 100,000+ people lost their lives</li> <li>• Discontented Sicilians took advantage of the events of the Third Italian War of Independence to attempt an uprising in 1866</li> <li>• The Kingdom attempted to introduce secularism into southern Italy, causing the peasantry discontent and the Catholic Church consternation; monastic houses were suppressed in June 1866.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources 1 and 2</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Sources together give an indication of both positive and negative impacts on southern Italy, e.g. Source 1 providing evidence of economic and social improvement and Source 2 evidence of discontent</li> <li>• Both sources provide evidence of a military presence in southern Italy, e.g. Source 1 refers to 'regiments of young soldiers', while Source 2 is directly focused on the military presence</li> <li>• Both Sources provide evidence of poor relations between the Kingdom and the Catholic Church, e.g. Source 1 refers to the secular use of religious buildings, while Source 2 blames the Church for inciting discontent.</li> </ul>

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

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate why Prussia was able to defeat Austria in the Seven Weeks' War.</p> <p><b>Source 3</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The memorandum was written in April 1866, just two months before the outbreak of war so giving an up-to-date indication of the military strength of Prussia in relation to Austria</li><li>• As Chief of the General Staff, von Moltke is in a particularly strong position to be able provide a reliable overview of Prussian military strength</li><li>• The purpose of the memorandum was to outline the logistical and strategic strength of the Prussian army at a time of heightened tension.</li></ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences why Prussia was able to defeat Austria in the Seven Weeks' War:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It claims that a major advantage for Prussia was the logistical strength of its railway network ('cannot be overstated...advance our army on five railway lines')</li><li>• It provides evidence that Prussia could mobilise its army more quickly than Austria ('our army assembled... within 25 days', 'Austria will require 45 days to assemble')</li><li>• It implies that Austria could not rely on Bavaria to provide strong support in the event of war ('Bavaria will wait for an outcome')</li><li>• It suggests that, at the outbreak of the Austro-Prussian War, the Prussian military was in a strong enough position to be able to defeat Austria ('to achieve this we have to mobilise and assemble all our forces').</li></ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• State investment in the Prussian railways and the extensiveness of the railway network enabled the Prussian military to mobilise its forces rapidly</li><li>• The rapid mobilisation of the Prussian military in June 1866 meant that the central northern armies of the Austrian Empire on the border with Prussia were unable to take advantage of their geographical position</li><li>• Despite overall having fewer troops in the central European arena of the war, Prussia was able to defeat the Austrian Empire and its allies decisively</li><li>• Bavaria supported Austria in the war with Prussia but made little impact on the war and suffered defeat in battle.</li></ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<p><b>Source 4</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As the wife of a diplomat of an Austrian ally based in Berlin, Baroness Spitzemberg had access to information from both the Austrians and the Prussians as to the reasons for the Prussian victory</li> <li>• The diary entry was written as the events of the war were unfolding, so giving a clear indication of what were perceived to be the reasons for the Prussian victory at the time</li> <li>• Although clearly having sympathy with Austria, the Baroness is willing to address the Austrian weaknesses as well as the Prussian strengths.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about why Prussia was able to defeat Austria in the Seven Weeks' War:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It indicates that the Prussians were able to win because of their superior forces ('Sadowa...eight Prussian army corps gained a victory over five Austrian army corps.', 'terrible effect of the needle-gun')</li> <li>• It indicates that the leadership of the Austrian army was weak ('retreat degenerated into such chaos', 'irresponsible mistakes in leadership')</li> <li>• It provides evidence that Austria's allies were neither capable of, nor willing to stand up to, the Prussians ('Bavarians...skirmishes...no progress has been made', 'Baden...wished to withdraw his troops')</li> <li>• It suggests that Austria was not as powerful as it once was ('defeated as never before', 'begged Napoleon III to negotiate', 'Oh shame and disgrace!').</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recent Prussian army reforms had transformed the military into a well-trained and professional organisation. The Austrian army maintained outdated approaches</li> <li>• The Prussian development of military technology, particularly the Dreyse needle-gun, was decisive in battle against the older, less-effective military technology of the Austrians</li> <li>• Austria was manoeuvred into a war on two fronts by the Prussians; Bismarck's military agreement with Italy in April 1866 resulted in Austria fighting a war against both Italy in Venetia and Prussia in central Europe</li> <li>• Although the Prussians had fewer troops overall, the Austrians were outnumbered at Sadowa because of the need for Austria to deploy troops in the south; Sadowa was the decisive battle of the war.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources 3 and 4</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sources together provide evidence of a wide range of different factors that enabled the Prussians to defeat Austria, e.g. logistical, strategic, technological</li> <li>• Both Sources provide evidence of Prussian strengths and Austrian weaknesses; Source 3 indicates the imbalance in access to railways and Source 4 shows the different military capabilities of the two sides</li> <li>• Both Sources indicate the weaknesses of Austria's allies; the potential weakness of Bavaria indicated in Source 3 is borne out by the reality in Source 4.</li> </ul>

## 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 the suggestion that the 1848-49 revolutions in Italy resulted in complete failure.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the 1848-49 revolutions in Italy resulted in complete failure should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• By the end of 1848, Austria was once again dominant militarily and politically in the Italian peninsula</li><li>• The rulers/ruling families that had been initially successfully overthrown in 1848 were returned to power</li><li>• Radical nationalist and liberal ideas failed to capture mass popular support and the revolutions in Rome, Tuscany and Venice collapsed in the face of military intervention</li><li>• The First War of Independence resulted in failure for Charles Albert, with Piedmont failing to gain sufficient support for 'Italy to make herself'</li><li>• Giobertian hopes for an Italian federation ruled by the Papacy were dashed by papal actions in Rome, the Allocution (April 1848) and the establishment of the French garrison in Rome.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the 1848-49 revolutions in Italy did not result in complete failure should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Initially the revolutions were incredibly successful (e.g. Rome, Venice, the Two Sicilies) and were proof of what could be achieved when the circumstances were favourable</li><li>• Austrian dominance had been severely challenged by the revolutions (e.g. the initial success of the revolution in Venice, the resignation of Metternich), giving hope for the future</li><li>• Some of the restored monarchies felt obliged to take more consideration of the hopes and aspirations of the liberal middle-classes</li><li>• Many nationalists accepted that popular uprisings, by themselves, were unlikely to achieve unification and began to look to Piedmont for leadership</li><li>• The emergence of Victor Emmanuel as ruler of Piedmont, and his retention of the <i>Statuto</i>, paved the way for Piedmont to become the leading state in the eventual unification of Italy.</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 about the suggestion that Cavour had only a limited influence over the process of Italian Unification in the years 1856-61.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Cavour had only a limited influence over the process of Italian Unification in the years 1858-61 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was Victor Emmanuel who persuaded Cavour to take advantage of the Congress of Paris (April 1856) to discuss the 'Italian Question' and to meet with Napoleon III at Plombières (20 July 1858)</li> <li>• Napoleon III dominated events during the Second War of Italian Independence and made the unilateral decision to sue for peace at Villafranca (8 July 1859)</li> <li>• In the wake of Villafranca, Cavour resigned as Prime Minister; he did not take part in the Treaty of Zurich (November 1859) ending the war with Austria and remained out of public politics until January 1860</li> <li>• Cavour's relationship with Garibaldi was difficult and, in his take-over of the south, Garibaldi continually thwarted Cavour's attempts to intervene in events</li> <li>• Garibaldi's championing of Victor Emmanuel, as the natural ruler of a united Italy, forced Cavour's hand in accepting the unification of north and south despite his misgivings.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that Cavour had a significant influence over the process of Italian Unification in the years 1856-61 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cavour's diplomacy brought the 'Italian Question' to the attention of the major European powers at the Congress of Paris</li> <li>• Cavour developed a willingness to engage with the Italian nationalists of the National Society in the late 1850s and met with Manin and Garibaldi</li> <li>• Cavour met with Napoleon III at Plombières to negotiate the Pact that led to the Second War of Independence</li> <li>• Cavour was instrumental in negotiating the deal with Napoleon III that led to the annexation of the central Italian states and was heavily involved in ensuring a favourable outcome for Piedmont in the plebiscites</li> <li>• Cavour's decision to send the Piedmontese army to intervene in the Papal States, and to prevent Garibaldi from reaching Rome, ultimately led to the unification of the north and south of Italy.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

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

Question	Indicative content
<b>5</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 as to whether economic factors were more responsible than political factors for the outbreak of revolution in the German states in 1848.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that economic factors were more responsible than political factors for the outbreak of revolution in the German states in 1848 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• An acute agricultural crisis in the years 1845-1847 led to food shortages and a steep increase in food prices, causing discontent amongst both the peasantry and urban dwellers</li><li>• An industrial crisis, caused by both the introduction of mechanised production and over-production, led to widespread unemployment, which created hostility towards the elite classes, e.g. weavers riots</li><li>• Government attempts to feed the hungry through state-purchased imported food led to underinvestment in industry and business failures. As a result, middle-class businessmen began to question the political order</li><li>• The combination of agricultural and industrial problems over a sustained period from 1845-1847, created the perfect circumstances for the outbreak of violent working-class and peasant demonstrations.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that counter the statement that economic factors were more responsible than political factors for the outbreak of revolution in the German states in 1848 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The outbreak of revolutionary activity in the German states was triggered by the news of the political revolution in France in February</li><li>• Political developments in Baden in 1846-47 encouraged liberal and nationalist revolutionaries to take direct action in 1848</li><li>• Middle-class unrest was driven by demands for political rights and freedoms; it was the middle-classes who harnessed the economic distress of the workers and peasants to achieve political reform</li><li>• Nationalist sentiment was growing steadily in the 1840s, e.g. the Rhine crisis (1840), anti-Austrian rhetoric, Schleswig-Holstein crisis (1846), and was the driving force behind the establishment of the Frankfurt Assembly.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
6	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the statement that the defeat of France in the Franco-Prussian war (1870-71) transformed Germany into a strong, unified nation-state.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the defeat of France in the Franco-Prussian war (1870-71) transformed Germany into a strong, unified nation-state should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the aftermath of the military victory over Napoleon III, and with the siege of Paris about to end, the four remaining independent southern German states agreed to the creation of a <i>Kleindeutschland</i> federal state</li> <li>• The euphoria created by the defeat of France led to the North German Reichstag agreeing to the creation of a new German Empire and ardent support from most German liberals and nationalists</li> <li>• A new German Empire was declared with William of Prussia being crowned German Emperor on 18 January 1871</li> <li>• As part of the Imperial Constitution, the German Reichstag became responsible for most matters concerning trade, diplomacy, citizens' rights, communication, civil and criminal law and the press</li> <li>• The new German Empire was strong enough to be able to demand and enforce the humiliating Treaty of Frankfurt on the French, exacting war reparations and annexing the territory of Alsace-Lorraine.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the defeat of France in the Franco-Prussian war (1870-71) did not transform Germany into a strong, unified nation-state should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It took some persuasion from Bismarck to gain the support of the four remaining independent southern states for a united Germany; in particular, concessions were made to the King of Bavaria</li> <li>• The new German Empire was a confederation of states in which state rights and the power of individual rulers were quite considerable; William of Prussia became German Emperor and not Emperor of Germany</li> <li>• Not all liberals or nationalists were accepting of the Prussian-dominated <i>Kleindeutschland</i> that had emerged from the defeat of France and political divisions existed from the very beginning of its existence</li> <li>• Many considered the 'new Germany' to be nothing more than the aggrandisement of Prussia</li> <li>• The new German Empire did not have many of the symbolic features that often define a nation-state, e.g. it did not have a national flag, national anthem or national currency</li> <li>• An economic <i>Kleindeutschland</i> had already been in existence since at least 1867 with the creation of the <i>Zollparlament</i>.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>