



Pearson

Examiners' Report
June 2017

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 2017

Publications Code 9HI0_2D_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range with the new A-Level paper 2D; with the choice of option – The Unification of Italy, c1830-70 (2D.1) or 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; questions can also combine second order concepts. Candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. However, examiners did note that more scripts than has been usual posed problems with the legibility of hand writing; it is important to be aware that examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers demonstrated an ability to draw out reasoned inferences developed from the sources and to evaluate the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the question on the basis of both contextual knowledge and the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It is important that candidates appreciate that weight is not necessarily 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. The question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and it was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates were aware of this instruction and achieved it using a variety of different approaches.

Candidates are more familiar with the essay section of Paper 2 and in section B, most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question, although weaker candidates often wanted to engage in a main factor/ other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counterargument established within their answer; many candidates lacked any counterargument at all. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period covered by the question.

Candidate performance on individual questions for Paper 2D is considered in the next section.

Please note that it is recommended that centres look at a selection of Principal Examiner Reports from across the different routes of the paper to get an overall sense of examiner feedback, centre approaches and candidate achievement.

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.

The question instructions clearly indicate that candidates should use the sources (source content), the information given about them and their own knowledge of the historical context. The higher Level responses bring these three elements together to determine the extent to which the source material is useful. It was good to see that most candidates are clearly aware that they should be looking to interrogate the content of source material being presented inside the source box. Most are aware that they need to make reasoned inferences from the content in order to access the higher levels but fewer were confident in attempting to distinguish between what can be determined as information and what may be claim or opinion. Candidates who took the source material at face value and/ or focused on 'missing' material (see below) often failed to make inference or at best made unsupported generalised inferences (L1/L2). Several examiners commented that they had the impression that many candidates did not read or consider all of the source material leading to a failure to be able to make some of the more obvious inferences that might be made.

Candidates were also generally confident in using their knowledge of the historical context to both illuminate the strengths and discuss the limitations of what could be gained from the source material. However, the question is focused on how far the source material can be used and historical knowledge was often used to claim that the source material was virtually useless because the sources did not include everything about the enquiry being investigated; some responses claimed that sources were not useful because they 'did not mention' or 'failed to mention' events which occurred after the source was written. Source material cannot be expected to include everything, so 'fail to mention', unless being used for a specific example of deliberate omission (see Introduction above), is unlikely to be a valid criteria for judgment. However, responses which used the source content and the historical context along with the information given about the date of the source to establish (not just state) that it was only representative of part of the time period of the enquiry were more valid. Also, please note that stand alone historical knowledge presented at the start of the response can only meet the requirements for Level 1 unless clearly linked to the source material in some way. Although most candidates go on to integrate their knowledge at a more rewardable level later in the response the time spent on introductory contextual knowledge might be spent more profitably analysing the source material. These responses often lose focus and end up answering the investigation rather than deploying AO2 skills in relation to the enquiry.

The use of the information given about the sources (the provenance of the sources) was perhaps the most disappointing aspect of candidate responses. A small but significant number of responses merely copied out the information given, often without even asserting

that this made the source useful or unreliable. A significant number also just asserted that the source material was unreliable because it was biased or that any statement by an individual was biased, without reasoning or justification. The majority did consider the provenance in some way but in focusing on what was 'missing' from the sources often missed the opportunity to use the provenance in conjunction with contextual knowledge to establish reliability or accuracy. Many candidates also judge the utility/ reliability of the provenance (assuming that this is the 'source') rather than using the provenance to aid the interrogation of the usefulness of the source content.

Please also refer to pp. 31-37 of the Getting Started document and pp. 7-8 of the Applying Criteria document that are to be found on the Edexcel Pearson History subject website.

Question 1

Examiners commented that candidates answering the Italy questions were generally well prepared. Most candidates had good contextual knowledge of the role of the Papacy in Italian unification and were able to place the two sources within the chronological development of the Italian state. These candidates were usually able to comment on how the sources were able to reflect the position of the Papacy at the beginning and end of the period and so provide evidence of change and/ or continuity. Some candidates, however, used their knowledge to answer the investigation rather than to consider how far the sources could be used to further an investigation; these responses also often referred to the revolutions of 1848. A significant number of responses asserted that the Papal protest (Source 1) 'failed to include' events which occurred after 1861 or that other obstacles were not mentioned believing that the investigation concerned the most important obstacle to unification. Some weaker responses stated that both Source 1 and Source 2 were of little use at all because as the represented Catholic and Protestant views they were 'biased'. A disappointing number of responses used the information given about the sources to consider the weight that could be given to each source. Some higher level responses did consider the nuances of the provenance of Source 2 weighing up the strengths of the eye-witness account of a historian against the Protestant hostility the author was known to have shown. Those responses that focused on how far the sources could help the investigation, weighing up the strengths in relation to the limitations, rather than focusing limitations tended to be able to meet the higher level descriptors more fully. Some of these focused on the indignation voiced in the Papal protest and they used contextual knowledge to highlight the events in 1861 that Antonelli was alluding to. Others used the sources together either to show that the Papacy remained steadfastly opposed to the Italian state from the declaration of the Italian kingdom to the take-over of Rome ('announced himself a prisoner' – Source 2) or that, despite the issuing of protests (Source 1 and Source 2), Source 2 provided evidence (confirmed by contextual knowledge) that the Pope was really dependent on the presence of the French garrison across the whole period.

This is a Level 4 response.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

Whilst the influence of the Pope had receded since the middle ages, his geopolitical clout was still considerable throughout the 17th century. Both sources correctly allude to his influence; however the sources place their emphasis in different places, making them unequal in usefulness. While source 1 is useful in that it draws attention to the pope's individual role in obstruction and also purports the supremacy of the Church's rights and religious law, it fails to mention the dependency of the Church's power on foreign Catholic states. Source 2 is more useful for showing that the Catholic state church was very much dependent on France and that the church sought to sway people with its divine mandate and majesty. Further both sources are limited in their usefulness by their provenance. Each writes ~~voicing opinions whilst invested in criticism~~ Therefore, together the sources are very useful in an investigation as to the role of the Papacy as an obstacle to unity, due to their compensating for each other's omissions.

Firstly, source 1 is useful because it shows that the Papacy aimed to portray the 'Catholic king'

Victor Emmanuel as a pretender king and so act as an obstacle to unity. Cardinal Antonelli writes that Victor Emmanuel had forgotten all "religious principles" and was "contemptuous of all rights and trampling on all laws". By this, Antonelli can only be pointing to the anti-Jewish laws that the Piedmontese government had enacted into legislation and now sought to impose on the rest of Italy. It is clear that the Papacy was still trying to wield power across the peninsula by being self-appointed arbiters of moral and civil law. Indeed it is the legitimacy of Victor Emmanuel that the Papacy seeks to undermine, revealed by Antonelli when he wrote that Victor Emmanuel had 'assumed the title of King of Italy', as opposed to rightfully gaining it. Certainly, the suspicious way in which the North of Italy was united, by plebiscite, would have harmed the legitimacy of Victor Emmanuel and the Papacy was duly advantaged of this. Further, the source is useful because it shows that the Papacy sought to obstruct by way of the Pope individually making his protests clear. Antonelli remarks that the Pope "solemnly protested solemnly against every new enterprise which has offended his rule". He goes on to say that the Holy Father can never "recognise the title of the King of Italy". So from this it can be

concluded that the Papacy sought to not only have the legitimacy of the new Italian king but to put their most valuable asset, the Pope himself, at the forefront of such as a standstill. However, the Cardinal does not mention the various concordats and legal treaties the Papacy negotiated to gain the support of foreign powers. The fact that the Papacy depended very much on the support of foreign Catholic states and in particular the French contingent protected protestants, Rome, is omitted. Indeed, the provision shows why the source is of limited usefulness on its own. Cardinal Antonelli was a renowned reactionary and for him, writing in 1861, after the fall of Piedmont was asserting its power, his account would only ever highlight the more damning aspects of the Pope's protest. For example, Antonelli never goes into sufficient detail as to what forms these protests took. As such, the source carries, on its own, limited weight.

Source 2, however, addresses some of the points missed in Source 1. It is useful because it shows that the Papacy sought to obstruct by exerting its divine mandate and putting on show its majesty. This compounds the point made in Source 1 that the Pope had an important say in any political or religious matter. This

can be seen by Gregorovius saying the Pope believes himself to be "God's instrument; voicing God's opinions". This divine knowledge is supported by the proclamation of Papal Infallibility in 1870. As an obstacle to Italian unity, obscurantism was a particular instrument of the Papacy, hinted at in Source 2. The Syllabus of Errors, in 1864, epitomises this obscurantism, with the declaration of papal supremacy over all matters cultural, political and scientific. Also, Source 2 raises the point of the Papal reliance on foreign support to address obstructive units. The quote "The French are leaving and Rome will soon fall" demonstrates the extent of this support, to the point of mere survival. The Catholic states of Austria and France were seen by the Papacy as the ~~opponents~~ protectors of the Papacy. Indeed this tradition had been most effective since the Abolition in which the Pope first showed his allegiance. The decline of the neo-Guelph movement is also evidence that the Pope had allied itself with foreign powers above those of Italy and above the Italian nation. Whilst the provocation is weak due to the writer being protestant and known for his "hostility" towards the Pope; & in the case of the two sources being used together, the hostility is a good counterbalance to the zeal of the Cardinal. Therefore, due to the attention given to omitted parts in source 1, source 2 is very useful and carries

strong weight is on investigating its papal power in the late 19th century, but particularly to its role as an obstacle to unity.

To conclude, both sources are weakened by their provenance, but together, they act as useful counterbalancing to each other. On the one hand, Source 1 gives account to the attempt by the Pope to delegitimise the new king and to assert the Pope's individual legitimacy, but it fails fully to mention the reliance by the Pope on foreign powers to obstruct unity. Source 2 is more useful in this regard, not only supporting and expanding the point made on the Pope's individual role, adding to it the particular dynamic of a divine mandate, but it alludes to the international relations of the papacy. Therefore only together are these sources useful in an investigation as to the role that the Pope played in acting as an obstacle to unity.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

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 limited use of the information given about the sources to establish how secure the source material is in providing evidence.

This is a low Level 5 response.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: **Question 1** **Question 2**

Source 1 can be used to investigate the reasons for the Papacy as an obstacle 1861-1870, and source 2 can be used to investigate the events of 1870 and the Papacy's ~~the~~ weakening power as a reason for objecting to unification, so together the sources provide reasoning for the objection of unification in 1861 and 1870. Source 1 provenance strengthens its weight as it was written and published after the main events of 1860-1861 and gives clear reasoning as an official Catholic objection, but the nature of the source means it may be exaggerated and less objective. Source 2 provenance ^{weakening the weight} strengthens its weight as it is a recording of the events in 1870 as they happened, however its provenance is weakened by the anticlerical author meaning it is less objective, and as it was published it may have been edited or exaggerated.

Source 1 can be used to ~~investigate~~ show the reasons for the Catholic church's objection, and becoming an obstacle, to the unification of North and South Italy in 1861. This is shown by ~~the~~ "the Holy Father can never forgetful of all religious principles, ~~each~~ contemptuous

of all rights and trampling on all laws" as it clearly shows that the papacy ~~do~~ became an obstacle as they saw unification as ~~an~~ infringing on their rights, laws and way of life. This view would be expanded, and publicised ^{further} with the proclamation of papal infallibility which gave the church control over spiritual and moral matters. ~~So~~ The source is also useful to show the view of the papacy when it came to unification of Italy, that the Church could "never recognise the title of king of Italy" that Victor Emmanuel ~~was~~ was proclaimed as when the source was written in March 1861, and uses this as a basis for its objection - unification "harms" the Church. This view on unification began in 1848 with the Papal Allocution, when the Pope openly denounced the idea of a united Italy, and so this source builds on, and worsens the obstacle to unification that was the Papacy, as it not only weakened them, but also damaged their power and international position. The provenance of the source adds weight to it as it is an 'official papal protest' against unity, and so represents the Church's stance, as well as being written in March, when the kingdom of Italy was proclaimed, but ~~not~~ made public in April, meaning the Church had had time to not only start becoming an obstacle, but official become one, as March-April was when the

plebiscites began. However, the weight is weakened as being a public announcement means it omits ~~so~~ much of the detailed reasoning for objecting as well as perhaps exaggerating any grievances in order to gain support. The author also weakens the weight as being part of the Papacy adds legitimacy to the source but means it may not offer a completely unobjective reason for the Church becoming an obstacle. Overall, source 1 ~~is~~ useful for showing the Church's view on unity and reasoning for objection.

Source 2 is useful as it can be used to show ~~the~~ ^{one} of the reasons for the Church being an obstacle to unification was its strength from international support and a reaction to losing power from unification. This is shown by "the French are leaving" meaning the Church became unsupported, further weakening the "frail" Pope and lessening the "shadow" of the Church on events, as the Papacy was no longer in a position to object to unification, and so became less of an obstacle due to the weakening of the Church. This began in 1867 when Church land was sold off after unification in 1861, meaning over $\frac{2}{3}$ of land was lost, weakening the social + economic influence of the Church, and so weakening it as an obstacle.* The source also shows that it was the Papacy as being an obstacle to unification, not the people and so

not necessarily all Catholics. The "great excitement" the taking of Rome would have caused without the shadow of the "Franco-Prussian war" ~~meant that~~ ^{shows that} unification was not seen negatively by all, only those in the Church and their supporters; ~~and~~ ~~so~~ this shows how views ~~to~~ had shifted since the Pope had been welcomed back after the fall of the Roman Republic, and so even if the people's view changed, the Church's had not, meaning the Church had been the obstacle to taking Rome. This reinforces the ~~view of~~ ~~source 1~~ ^{reason the view of} unity the Church had in source 1, that it was the Church's belief the Pope had a "right to govern Rome" that prolonged unification, not the people. The provenance of ~~the source~~ ^{strengthens} the weight as it was written during the events of the taking of Rome in 1870, and so offers a clear view on unification from a ~~citizen~~ ^{member} of the public in Rome, as well as a view on the reason for the Papacy objecting and becoming an obstacle to unification - the Church was losing power. However, the weight is weakened as it focuses only on the events of 1870, and none before, and is less objective due to the author's anti-clerical 'hostility to the Papacy', nature and the nature of the source - being published may mean it was edited or exaggerated. Overall source 2 offers a clear view as to why the Church continued to be an obstacle, and the

extent of the church as an obstacle.

Together both sources can be used to investigate the reasons and strength of the papacy as an obstacle to unification 1860-1870, with source 1 + 2 providing detail for 2 of the main unification events in the time period, although they are less useful as they omit the events in the middle. Source 2 is more valuable as it has more detail, and presents a clear view on the Church's effect on being an obstacle, and so has stronger weight than source 1 that suffers from less detail as it is a reaction, not an account. Overall, the sources are useful together for showing the role & reasons of the papacy in being an obstacle 1861-1870 in unity.

This ~~re~~ expands on the reasons for objecting to unity source 1 presents, as it offers a reason behind the, and expands on the impact, of the "harm" unity causes the papacy.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response interrogates the content of the source while considering the usefulness as evidence for the investigation by deploying both knowledge of the historical context and the information given about the sources. It uses context and provenance to gauge the security of the content as evidence and attempts to weigh up the extent to which the source material is useful in the conclusion.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Always try to come to an overall judgement in a conclusion which considers the weight of the evidence presented in the source material, and if appropriate, the degree of certainty with which the evidence can be used.

Question 2

Fewer candidates are entered for the Germany option compared to the Italy option. Most candidates were well prepared to cover the requirements of the specification but a significant number of candidates seemed confused with regard to the chronology of events in some of the questions.

Many candidates were able to discuss the use of the sources together by pointing out that the sources were useful because Source 3 reflected aspects of the negotiations taking place in 1871 to create the new German Empire while Source 4 reflected the outcome of these negotiations.

Some candidates argued that the sources together were of limited value because they did not mention events which took place in the process of unification without clearly considering the timing or the nature of the sources; for example, suggesting that Source 4 'missed out' information about the Franco-Prussian War which clearly it could not have been expected to. However, there was scope within these sources to select some key points and make some reasoned inferences about the importance of Prussia in the Kleindeutschland solution. For example, some responses stated that the viewpoints of other states were missing from the source material but Source 3 provided both information about the Bavarian stance and ample opportunity to make reasoned inferences about the actual power of Prussia in relation to other states. The language of the constitution in Source 4 was used by many to show evidence of the subtleties of the negotiations and to infer that the emotional concerns voiced in Source 3 were apparently not completely founded. It was pleasing to see that many candidates did use the provenance to consider reliability with some discernment. Few candidates asserted that the Crown Prince (Source 3) would automatically be biased but considered the private nature of the diary and linked this to the candid portrait being painted of King William. Also few candidates asserted that the constitution was 'not complete' and so limited, so clearly were aware that they were evaluating the source content presented not the parts of it which were not included. There were relatively few Level 5 responses but these were able to deploy awareness of the provenance and contextual knowledge to interrogate the content of the sources in relation to the investigation.

Both of the responses below are Level 4.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

The unification of Germany in 1871 under a Kleindeutsch solution was no unexpected or ~~surprise~~ event with only short-term causes; it was the result of a long campaign for the unification of the states within the German Confederation that had begun with nationalist and liberal sentiments before the 1848 revolution. Skillfully manipulated by Prussian First Minister Bismarck, events such as the 1866 Seven Weeks War with Austria and the 1871 Franco-Prussian War, led to unification - thus in this sense of Bismarck's diplomacy, Prussia was instrumental in the attainment of unification by 1871. Thus the issue the question is concerned with - the importance of Prussia in the Kleindeutsch solution - may be interpreted in two ways. Firstly, this could refer to the ~~the~~ pretext to which Prussia may be attributed with triggering ^{unification;} ~~legislation~~ ~~and~~ ~~seceding~~ ^{alternatively} it could be an allusion to the place held by this state after 1871. In this essay I will look at the ways in which the two sources ~~be~~ could aid the historian in this enquiry, and ~~that~~ I will thus come to a judgement on their usefulness.

Source 3 presents Bismarck as playing a pivotal role in the unification process; his power over even the Prussian King and now German Emperor is shown in the quotes 'Bismarck, without asking His Majesty, ... agreed'; 'displeased the King, Count Bismarck remained firm' - ~~despite~~ ^{despite} when King William I's preference for the title 'Emperor of Germany', Bismarck, the ever diplomatic politician, insisted on a title that would appear more conciliatory to the other states. From my own knowledge, Bismarck was careful not to offend any of the southern states who had been rather more

thereby seem to attribute King William with much power, ~~and~~ in one sense this is not surprising. As leader of the largest state of ~~the~~ in Germany, and additionally the German Emperor, it is perhaps natural that this place should be given to the Prussian King.

The fact Prussia had '17 votes' of a total of 58 also shows the important place that Prussia retained after 1871 - yet the votes would likely have been calculated on a proportional basis, and thus Prussia was likely to have the biggest vote share. Nevertheless, Bavaria was the next biggest state in the Confederation and was only given 6 votes; thus the distribution may in some way have been preferential towards Prussia.

Thus the two sources are useful in conjunction with one another; the fact source 4 is an extract from the Constitution of the German Empire means the historian can rely on the text being an unbiased statement of fact. As a result, source 4 is useful in conjunction with source 3 as statements of opinion made in source 3 can, ~~in~~ in certain ways, be verified by the inferences of the Constitution. For example, as already mentioned, the clear statement in source 4 that places the ~~the~~ German Emperor as an Emperor for all explains Bismarck's actions as described in source 3.

^{Thus} ~~Nevertheless~~, while source 3 is a statement of opinion, as written by the Crown Prince of Prussia this opinion is useful to the historian: the views of the monarch of the time can be gleaned. Due also to the ~~rather~~ nature of the source, this opinion can be relied upon as true of the time; the Crown Prince would not have expected his diary entry to be read and thus would have been candid in expressing his thoughts.

However, the historian should be aware of the way source 3 is based on opinion so as to recognize the bias with which information is recorded in

conclusion, sources 3 and 4 could be used together to give the historian a significant insight into the importance of Prussia in the Kleindeutsche Lösung - however they should be cognizant of one key limitation: neither source covers the viewpoints of other states within the German Empire, nor is information given as to their part in state formation.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Both of these responses attempt to interrogate the source material in relation to the investigation. However, they are both limited to some extent in the ways suggested in the commentary above. The first response has an introduction that is focused on stand alone AO1 knowledge rather than AO2 skills and neither really address the source material by deploying knowledge of the historical context or the provenance with confidence. The second response - which is the weaker of the two - concludes by addressing the investigation rather than considering 'how far' the source material could be used to further the investigation.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

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.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: **Question 1** **Question 2**

In the years building up to German Unification there was considerable debate surrounding the nature of a unified Germany. The choice was between a Kleindeutschland solution with Prussia as its head and the exclusion of any ~~non~~ non-German speaking states along with Austria or the Grossdeutschland solution that ~~would~~ would incorporate Austria and Prussia together. This debate stemmed in many ways from the feud between Austria and Prussia and Prussia's growing dominance. Source 3 talks more about the symbolism of Prussia leading the Kleindeutschland while source 4 highlights the more practical side to Prussia leading a Kleindeutschland solution. Therefore, a historian could make use of both sources in investigating the importance of Prussia in the Kleindeutschland solution to German unification. However, both sources do little to talk about what ~~Prussia's~~ Prussia's politics would mean for a Germany under Prussia.

A historian could make good use of source 3 to investigate the importance of Prussia in the Kleindeutschland solution to German unification. This is because the Crown Prince of Prussia talks of the ~~big~~ debates surrounding the nature of the new role and makes no suggestion that its leader could ^{not} be anyone but King William I. This is shown in source 3 with the fact that even although the King was displeased with his title 'German

Emperor' they simply had to 'submit'. This suggests that the only viable leader of a Kleindeutschland solution would be Prussia and highlights the importance of Prussia to a historian. Furthermore, the fact that from the beginning of discussions of a unified Germany in the Frankfurt Parliament, the leader was favoured to ~~would~~ be Prussian ~~so~~ adds weight to source 3 in ~~the~~ showing how ~~the~~ Prussia seemed the only option to many to lead and therefore its co-ordination played a huge role in the success of a Kleindeutschland solution. Arguably however, source 3 highlights how Prussia's role was somewhat based around the symbolism of it leading and not its practical duties. This is shown ^{in the source} by the fact that Prussia had no choice ~~to~~ but to listen and 'acknowledge that... the Bavarian representatives had not wished to permit the title 'emperor of Germany' and therefore ~~so~~ had to 'submit'. ~~The fact that~~ Source 4 does however talk about Prussia's practical role within the Kleindeutschland solution and therefore, source 3 coupled with source 4 highlights the importance of Prussia both symbolically and practically (in the Bundestrat). Source 3 also talks about Bismarck's role in the discussions around the Kleindeutschland solution and this, coupled with the fact that Bismarck's political skill and opportunistic nature played ~~to~~ a very large role building up to a Kleindeutschland solution ~~to~~ such as the Ems telegram and the Luxembourg crisis, ~~adds to~~ ~~the~~ makes the source very useful. This is because it shows that perhaps Bismarck ^{himself} had greater importance than Prussia in ~~going to~~

gaining the Kleindeutschland solution. ~~However~~ § The prince is also a reliable source because there was no reason to hide the truth behind the discussions as ~~the Prussia~~ it was a diary and so it is unlikely he would lie. This therefore adds weight.

~~Source~~ § Source 4 is also very useful to a historian in investigating the importance of Prussia in the Kleindeutschland solution. This is because ~~the~~ the Constitution clearly points out Prussia's clear dominance and importance in the new Kleindeutschland - for instance the fact that Prussia itself had '17 votes' which we can see is more than double the nearest state. These 17 votes essentially allowed Prussia to have dominant control in the new unified Germany as it could veto things brought up in the Bundestrat. This therefore highlights how important Prussia ~~was~~ was to a historian. Article 11 simply states that 'the head of the federation shall be the King of Prussia' which again shows the practical strength of Prussia. The fact that 'imperial laws takes precedence over state laws' is useful to the historian investigating because it shows how Prussia therefore even had ~~more~~ control before the individual states issues and representatives. However, source 4 does not give us very much ~~useful~~ information about Prussia's political leaning which would be useful to a historian studying their importance to the Kleindeutschland solution. Although we do know that ~~the~~ the Prussian king was very conservative while Bismark had 'realpolitik' objectives.

the source gives us little information into the impact and importance these politics would have on the Kleindeutschland solution. However, source 3 does touch on the King's attachment to 'old Prussia' which was extremely conservative and suggests he may bring these conservative ideologies to the new Kleindeutschland; they both do little to show Prussia's political importance to a historian. The fact source 4 is not opinion but a statement of constitution adds weight to the source because it ~~is~~ gives the true facts behind Prussia's dominance. Although, it does lack in reasoning behind their importance which perhaps is made up for in source 3.

In conclusion, source 3 and 4 are very useful to a historian investigating the importance of Prussia in the Kleindeutschland because ~~as~~ together they give both its ~~is~~ symbolic and practical importance. However, a historian should be wary as both sources do little to tackle ~~the~~ Prussia's political importance.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Please see the commentary above.

Question 3

Section B

As suggested in the introduction (please see above), 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, 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. Responses do not always require a multi-factor approach but a small number of candidates do try to shoe-horn all answers into this approach. Historical knowledge was generally very good, particularly in the context of the qualification being linear. It is important to note though that major inaccuracies may undermine the ability of the candidates to reach an overall supported judgement and/ or affect the logic and coherence of an argument. Finally, some candidates assume that the key issues/ factors discussed are also the ‘valid criteria’ applied when coming to a judgment, ‘valid criteria’ are the indicators/ measurements used to determine whether change has taken place, a ‘given factor’ is the main reason, significance (impact/ difference made) etc.

Please also refer to pp. 23-7 & 37-38 of the Getting Started document and pp. 2-6 & 9-10 of the Applying Criteria document that are to be found on the Edexcel Pearson History subject website.

Question 3

Candidates were clearly well prepared for a question focused on nationalism and so were able to discuss the role of Mazzini and his supporters with some confidence. Most were able to chart the general course of nationalist success but many responses failed to read the question carefully and did not discuss the role of Mazzinian nationalism after the 1848 revolutions. A small but significant number of responses omitted any mention of Mazzini’s role in the Roman Republic. Also, some responses made the valid point that figures inspired by Mazzini would have a role post-1856 but then went on to describe or explain these in detail so limiting the time available for discussion of the time period in the question. There were, however, many good responses and these were able to weigh up the success and failures in order to come to a judgement with regard to overall achievement across the time span. Some agreeing with the statement judged that, despite some small successes, Mazzini achieved very little at all while others suggested that Mazzini himself may have had little success but that his ideals and inspiration of others meant that overall a lot was achieved.

This is a Level 5 response.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4

Question 5 Question 6

~~For a large extent it is true~~ During the years 1830 to 1856 it is ~~correct~~ true to a large degree that Mazzini and his Nationalist Supporters achieved very little, as a large majority of Mazzinian inspired revolutions failed to gain popular support and his ideas tended only to be popular with small numbers of the middle class rather than those with a true ability to effect change such as the working class or ruling elites. ~~However~~ ~~&~~ However it would be wrong to suggest that Mazzini and his supporters enjoyed no success, however, generally examples of Mazzinian achievements were very short-lived such as the Roman Republic and ultimately Italy united under a constitutional monarchy by a 'top down' revolution rather than by a mass nationalist ~~movement~~ peasant-based movement.

Initially Mazzini and his supporters enjoyed very little success in their attempts at provoking mass uprisings to unify Italy as a Republic. The attempts during the 1830s failed to garner any popular support and were often opposed by peasants who believed that their conditions would worsen as a result of Mazzinian inspired revolutions and they were far more concerned with land ownership than the political geography of Italy. ~~Indeed~~ Indeed this is shown by Garibaldi's failed attempt to start an uprising in Genoa in 1833 ~~&~~ 1834 which failed to start as well as the

Bandiera's brother's Mazzini inspired invasion of Calabria which only managed to get 21 people to support it and ultimately failed. This shows how unsuccessful Mazzini and his supporters were amongst the working class, and Mazzini's political party, Young Italy, founded in 1831 was mostly supported by the middle-class, rather than the peasants. Mazzini hoped to inspire to revolt in the name of creating a unified Italian Republic. ~~However~~ Indeed the 1848-9 revolutions revealed the extent to which Mazzini's tactics were flawed as all of the successfully created Mazzinian inspired Republics collapsed under invasion from France in 1849 of the Roman Republic and Austria in the case of the Venetian Republic, demonstrating the difficulties in maintaining Mazzinian inspired Republics without support, ~~from~~ of foreign entities, thus rendering Mazzini's movement irrelevant. After 1849 further attempts at revolution by Mazzini were quelled such as the 1851-2 Sicily ~~uprising~~^{revolution} and the 1853 Milan uprising, both failing due to lack of support by the ~~working class~~ ~~peasants~~ peasants and in the case of Milan, because ~~could~~ ~~wanted~~ Austria in advance, further demonstrating the flawed nature of Mazzini's people led revolutionary ideas. Thus, in this way Mazzini and his supporters can be said to have enjoyed little success in the years 1830-56 because ultimately all of the Mazzinian inspired revolutions failed to garner popular support and so were ~~not~~ quelled ~~by~~ ~~early~~ by their opponents.

In addition to failing to create support amongst the parents of Italy, Mazzini and his nationalist supporters also failed to become a successful movement amongst the middle-class and rulers of Italy, ^{Piedmont} ~~Italy~~ whom were ultimately responsible for the Unification process. The failure of Young Italy ~~is~~ to demonstrate by Garibaldi's ~~gained~~ support amongst this section of society is demonstrated by the popularity of Cesare Balbo's 1844 'Hopes of Italy', which ~~se~~ argued for a Northern Federation of Italy rather than a centralised Mazzini Republic of the whole of Italy. The success of this book in Piedmont in many ways helped to inspire the nationalist movement, with Cavour and Charles Albert becoming supporters of these ideas, whilst Mazzini's 1831 letter to Charles Albert asking that he ~~become the leader~~ lead Italy to unification was ignored. This demonstrates the lack of popularity Mazzini had within Italy and goes some way to explaining why Mazzini and his nationalist supporters achieved very little 1830-57. Indeed, other writers such as Gioberti, who set out plans for a Papal led Italian Federation in ~~his~~ his 1843 'Book on the morale and civil primacy of Italians', condemned the ideas of Mazzini labelling them 'damaging'. The lack of ^{any} appetite for revolution as a means of achieving unity portrayed by both Balbo and Gioberti is exemplary of wider middle-class attitudes, many of whom feared the ideological and radical revolutionary ideas of Mazzini, instead preferring the more conservative and pragmatic approach later adopted by Cavour. The act of ~~distancing~~ Garibaldi distancing

himself ^{in 1854} further demonstrates the failure of Mazzini's, as does the acceptance of Piedmontese leadership by ~~Daniel~~ Mazzini's supporter Daniel Manin in 1855 as well as the absorption by the National Society following its foundation in 1857, encourages more peaceful action to achieve unification and the rallying of nationalists under Piedmontese monarchy, which further damaged Mazzini's and demonstrates how little his ideas had achieved 1830 to 1856. Indeed, historian ~~Robert~~ L. P. Ball said that it was the "National Society that was crucial in marking a common sense of Italian nationalism" rather than Mazzini's Young Italy. In this way, it can be said that Mazzini and his supporters achieved very little in the years 1830-56 and the abandonment of many of high-profile Mazzinians like Garibaldi and Daniel Manin as well as the Mazzinian absorption by the National Society in 1857 demonstrated both the end of any significant Mazzini one had and his failure to inspire any ~~middle class~~ support amongst the middle-class or ruling ~~members~~ of elites of Italy.

However, it is not ~~entirely~~ true that Mazzini and his nationalist followers achieved nothing in the years ~~1830~~ 1830 to 1856, as the 1848-9 Roman Republic and Venetian Republic were both governed on the principles of Mazzinism. Indeed Mazzini even became the leader of the Roman Republic in 1848 and managed to achieve many social and economic reforms such as removal of the death

penalty, introduction of elections, free speech and even a Constitution. The Roman Republic also began to attempt to clear many slums in the city of Rome, and the Mazzinian government of the 1848-9 Roman Republic was, on the whole, fairly popular. This ~~demonstrates~~ The Roman Republic was therefore, for all intensive purposes, a success, albeit short-lived. The nationalist Mazzini followers were even able to hold back the invading French army during ~~1848~~ 1849 under the leadership of Garibaldi; whilst the Venetian Republic led by Daniele Manin also managed to hold out a long time. Whilst the Roman Republic and the Venetian Republic were clear examples of Mazzinian achievements during the year 1830-56, these achievements were clearly very limited as the 1849 Roman and Venetian Republics ultimately collapsed. Furthermore, despite the seeming success and popularity of Mazzini's government in Italy, when the pope returned to Rome in April 1850 after having fled in 1848, he was met with large cheering crowds. This somewhat undermines the already limited achievements of Mazzini and his nationalist followers as it suggests that despite the implementation of Mazzini's ideas in Rome, the Roman people had little or strong desire for them. In this way, whilst Mazzini and his nationalist supporters can be said to have made some achievements in the period

1848-9 1830-36, ~~in~~ With the Roman and Venetian Republics, these achievements themselves were even quite limited.

However in some respects Mazzini and his supporters were achieving some of their ~~ide~~ aims, as Italy was beginning to unite ~~under~~ in a centralised way through the implementation of Piedmontisation after 1860, and although this was done under the banner of the Piedmontese monarchy, it ~~was~~ did mean that Austrian rule in the peninsula was being effectively challenged and Mazzini himself ~~supported~~ believed in supporting monarchs if they opposed Austrian rule and ~~the~~ believed constitutional monarchies, as Piedmont had become under the 1848 Statute were 'governments of transition' to an Italian United Republic. However, the mass representation in parliament and revolution from below desired by Mazzini had not been achieved, with unification led by Piedmontese politicians and the parliamentary electorate including only 2.2% of the population. In this way Mazzini had indirectly started to achieve some of his aims, but ultimately Mazzini and his nationalists ~~had~~ had little responsibility for this and whilst some elements of unification resembled Mazzini's ideals, it is more accurate that Italy united ~~under~~ by very different methods to those envisioned by Mazzini and his nationalists, therefore it can be said to a large degree that Mazzini and his supporters achieved very little 1830-36.

Achievements

Overall, whilst Mazzini enjoyed some success, though the Venetian and Roman Republics, ultimately the success achievements of Mazzini and his nationalists were very limited and his failures far outweighed any achievements that he did make. The failure of Young Italy to inspire either middle class support en masse or the support of peasants during Mazzinian inspired uprisings only adds to the idea that Mazzini and his nationalists achieved very little ~~in~~ 1830-56 and although some elements of Mazzinism were developing in Italy such as a constitutional monarchy as the transition phase between a Republic and later centralisation through Piedmontisation, ultimately very little of Mazzini's ideas had successfully been implemented, and as such it is true for the most part that Mazzini and his followers achieved very little in the years 1830-56.



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 4

This was the more popular of the two choices. In general, candidates had excellent knowledge of the role of Cavour in Italian unification but a significant number were not able to select with any clear discrimination supporting material specific to addressing the focus of the question. To reach high Level 4 and Level 5, it is important that candidates focus on the question asked. This was not a question on Cavour's general role in the 1850s but an extent to which Cavour was the 'driving force behind the events leading to the outbreak of the Second Italian War of Independence'. Many candidates wrote generalised accounts of Cavour's contribution in relation to other factors such as other individuals or the decline of Austrian influence over Italy with an emphasis on Cavour's contribution to the economic and political development of Piedmont. Much of this material was relevant but candidates did not link these explicitly enough to the events leading to the outbreak. Cavour's development of Piedmont is relevant but needed to be linked to Piedmont's confidence in challenging Austrian domination and willingness to go to war, for example. Some candidates also covered the events of 1860-61 which was not the focus, and so included large amounts of detail about Garibaldi's contribution which was irrelevant. It is important that candidates are aware that, at A-level in particular, questions will have specific wording that needs to be addressed. Having said this, there were many excellent higher level responses that focused on the events leading to the outbreak such as entry into the Crimean War, the Paris Peace Conference, Plombières, the Orsini affair and the declaration of War. Most of these addressed the concept of a 'driving force' by establishing the relative significance of Cavour, Victor Emmanuel and Napoleon III in pushing forward the events but there were also those that discussed the relative strength of Piedmont in relation to Austria in driving events forward.

This is a lower Level 5 response.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4

Question 5 Question 6

The events leading up to the outbreak of the 2nd Italian war of Independence in 1859 were to a large extent driven by the actions of Cavour in strengthening Piedmont and building international relations. However Cavour was not the sole factor, as the desire and actions of Napoleon as well as nationalist organisations and individuals also played an important part in the outbreak of war. In order to be the 'driving force' behind the war, the factor which had the most impact in the short term for causing war in 1859 and in the long term for creating the 2nd War of Independence, ~~but it must also be the factor that~~

Cavour played a very large and important role in the events that led to Piedmont declaring war in 1859. Cavour's actions began with the rise of Piedmont, creating a leader for unification and so creating the means for war to be declared under the banner of ~~unification~~ ^{independence} from foreign power. This was done by ~~the~~ investing in the industry and infrastructure of Piedmont - Piedmont had 40% of all railway in Italy, which would also allow for the transportation of soldiers & supplies in the war, meaning Cavour's long term actions were significant

in enabling a war that Piedmont could be prepared for. By building up international relations Cavour not only increased the influence of Piedmont but also gained the necessary allies for needed to go to war with Austria. In 1855 during the Crimean War, Piedmont sent needed troops to support Britain and France before Austria, successfully improving the international standing of Piedmont and gaining allies whilst damaging Austria's reputation. This development of international relations as a factor enabling the 2nd war of Independence to happen continued with the treaty of Plombieres, a treaty that meant France would aid Piedmont in a war to unite the north and expel Austria in exchanged for a political marriage between house Savoy and Napoleon as well as ensuring Piedmont would provoke the war soon. This caused the 2nd War of Independence as it meant not only did the war have to happen soon - it was a factor for war in 1859 - but also that it would happen - ~~they had~~ Cavour had gained Piedmont the necessary international aid. This means that Cavour was a significant driving force in the 2nd War of Independence starting, as overall Cavour successfully built up ~~long~~ international relations and ensured Piedmont would have the ability to fight across Italy, in the long and short term.

However, in contrast to the long and short term impact of Cavour in causing the outbreak of war in 1859, Napoleon was significant in the short term in outbreak, and so whilst ~~was~~ less significant overall he had a very significant short term impact. Napoleon is significant as he created the treaty of Plombières with Cavour, in which Napoleon would provide 200,000 troops to Piedmont, transported along the Turin-Genoa railway Cavour had developed. ~~Was~~ This enabled Cavour to have war declared, as without the aid of France the 2nd war of independence may not have happened in 1859 or at all. Napoleon was willing to aid Piedmont as he desired a war to prove himself to the people of France, as Napoleon I had done, as well as being inspired by the Orsini affair in 1858. Whilst ~~the~~ Orsini had attempted to assassinate Napoleon, his failure proved to Napoleon the passion of the Italian cause, encouraging him to aid Italy in gaining independence both to increase ~~the~~ France's international power as well as aiding a cause that was seen as just. This desire to ~~be~~ aid Italy in expelling Austria came from the failed attempt in the 1830s to start a pro-France revolution, as well as the Italian people's support of Napoleonic ideas such as the Napoleonic code of conduct. Overall,

Whilst Napoleon is a less significant factor than Cavour, and so is not the 'driving force', as his impact on the outbreak of the war is only short term, he did allow for the actual outbreak of war. Without the support of France ~~Napoleon~~ the 2nd war would not have happened, nor would it have had any successes, although arguably Napoleon's impact is reliant on Cavour being willing to create the treaty of Plombières. This means that overall Napoleon is a less significant factor in the outbreak of war than Cavour.

~~Enzo~~ Cavour and Napoleon led to the outbreak of war as they created the means for it to happen, but the desire and support came from the work of nationalists whom without the 1st war of Independence would not have been such widespread in Italy. ~~The~~ The ~~new~~ National Society created the support in Piedmont for expelling Austria by spreading their ideas of Italy uniting against a common enemy, and the society was the actual reason for the outbreak of the war Napoleon + Cavour planned for. The National Society amassed on the border between Austria and Piedmont, causing Austria to declare war like Napoleon agreed to in Plombières. This means the most significant short term reason

for the outbreak of war were the actions of the national society, not Cavour or Napoleon. The national society gained the necessary support and numbers through the work of nationalists such as Verdi and his chorus of Hebrew slaves, inspiring anti-Austria and pro-Italy sentiments as well as leading to the 'Viva Verdi' code in order to pass on messages that spread support. The support came from the 100,000 radicals that had fled to Piedmont after the 1848 revolutions failed. This shows that to an extent, a 2nd war was inevitable as not only were the radicals in 1 place and so better able to plan, but a 2nd war and 3rd attempt would show that the movement was still alive and making progress. Overall, the work of nationalists led to the contingent factor of the outbreak of war, and so in this way is more significant than Cavour or Napoleon in causing the war in 1859. However, it is less significant as without Cavour and Napoleon the actions of the national society and ideas of nationalists would not have been encouraged or allowed to develop into provoking a war. Overall, the ~~work~~ actions of nationalists is more significant in causing the war in the short term, but is less significant than Cavour or Napoleon as otherwise the nationalists would not have been allowed to provoke war, nor was

their long term work the reason for the 2nd war of Independence being led directly by Piedmont rather than the isolated attempts previously.

Overall, ~~error~~ I agree that Cavour was the driving factor in the outbreak of ~~the~~ the 2nd War of Independence overall. This is because Cavour created the means for Piedmont to have the ability to go to war, something nationalists and Napoleon did not. However, as the most significant factor in the short term it was the work of the National Society, although Cavour was more long term with a wider impact. This means Napoleon is less significant, as his significance comes from enabling Cavour to ~~drive the~~ allow factors to ~~also~~ drive the outbreak of war, ~~and~~ but without Napoleon Cavour could not have so confidently created the means or ability for war, meaning Napoleon is still significant. In conclusion, Cavour was the driving factor in the outbreak of war overall, but in the short term the work of nationalists had a larger ^{significance} impact, and Napoleon is significant in enabling Cavour.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response has focused clearly on the role of Cavour as a driving force (considering his significance in causing the outbreak of war) and considered Cavour's contribution in relation to that of the National Society and Napoleon III. Other higher level responses often considered the role of Victor Emmanuel in events.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Always consider the wording of the question carefully.

This is a Level 3 response.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4

Question 5 Question 6

I somewhat agree with the statement, that Cavour was the driving force behind the events leading to the outbreak of the Second Italian War of Independence, however there are many other factors to consider, such as the Orsini affair and the pact of Plombières.

Cavour was useful in two ways, which was the industrialisation of Italy and the Crimean War. Firstly he became prime minister of Piedmont in 1852 after creating the ~~was~~ ^{with} ~~was~~ Rattazzi, to reduce d'Azeglio's power. He then immediately started to industrialise, by building railways and canals as well as building Piedmont's first ~~steam~~ steamship in 1855 called "the Sicilia". A railway was made ~~from~~ from Milan to Turin to the French border, which influenced trade. Between 1847 and 1859 trade rose by 300% due to canals. However national debt rose from 1850 million lire to 725 million lire. The creation of these railways allowed ~~made~~ it easier ~~for~~ ^{for} French troops to

help with the second war of independence. The other way that he helped was through the Crimean War. This was Britain and France against Russia. The allies wanted help, however Austria had stayed neutral because they didn't want to upset either side. This led to Piedmont who gladly sent 18,000 troops to assist, however very few ever reached the front, only 30 Sardinian troops died from wounds whereas 2,000 died from malaria. In 1866 Russia sued for peace after Austria threatened to join the allies. This led to the Congress of Paris in which Cavour was invited but Austria wasn't. Although nothing happened towards the unification of Italy, France and Britain owed Piedmont.

Another key event was the Orsini affair. This was an attempt by 3 Mazzinian followers and an assassin, to assassinate Louis Napoleon III at the opera using 3 bombs. One of these people was Count Felice Orsini which is why it was called the Orsini affair. They failed to kill Napoleon, however they did kill 153 people. Their motive had been to kill

Napoleon and hope that the person who took over, would be more helpful in unifying Italy. The man court, was poisoned in prison, which has led to theories that Napoleon planned it himself as an excuse to get involved in Piedmont.

As a result of the Orsini affair, Cavour and Napoleon met and formed the pact of Plombières. This was an agreement that Piedmont would join Lombardy and ~~Apulia~~ Venetia to form the upper kingdom of Italy, Tuscany and the central duchies would form the middle kingdom, Sicily and Naples would see stay as it is as well as Rome. Also Austria must be seen as the aggressors, France would get Nice and Savoy as well as the deal would be sealed by marriage between Victor Emmanuel's daughter and Jerome Bonaparte. In return Piedmont would gain 20,000 French troops to attack Austria with.

~~To say that Cavour was~~

There were other smaller factors to also consider, such as Victor Emmanuel who allowed Cavour to do this as he could have dissolved the Statute if he wanted to.

Victor ~~emmanuel~~ emmanuel also loved war which is why he agreed to the pact of plombieres. Also the work of secret societies and the national society must not be understated. ~~People~~ ^{the} national society has a group of radicals who had fled to Piedmont after the 1848 revolutions, they numbered around 8000. However people like Daniel Manin who had originally believed in a republic, now believed that Piedmont was the key to unification. Without this support, events like the Orsini affair might not have happened.

To conclude, as you can see, Cavour played a key role in starting the second war of independence, by events like building railways so that troops could easily be transported, joining the Crimean war to gain foreign allies and finally through the pact of ^{French} plombieres in which Piedmont gained 20000 troops to start the second war of Italian unification against Austria with. However there are other ^{important} ~~important~~ events such as the Orsini affair, which without, the war may never have started as Napoleon wouldn't have wanted to help.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response considers various key features relevant to the question but does not always link them specifically to the events leading to the outbreak of the war. In particular, Cavour's role has elements of description and the supporting material is partial in developing Cavour's contribution.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Always clearly link the key features/ issues being developed to the focus of the question.

Question 5

Most candidates had a good knowledge of the general causes of revolution and so were able to discuss the underlying situation but many seemed to be devoid of an awareness of the actual outbreak of the revolutions themselves. This made it difficult for many candidates to then go on to argue that there were a variety of different underlying causes because they were unable to demonstrate this in relation to different states. Most responses agreed with the statement suggesting that there were a variety of different causes or inter-related causes rather than a single cause such as liberal-nationalism, nationalism, economic and social difficulties etc. Responses, therefore, needed to be able to demonstrate this to reach the higher Level. Many candidates struggled to show this clearly and many responses remained in Level 3 with more explanation of causes than exploration or merely listed a series of developed paragraphs about what could have been an underlying cause. However, there were some very good responses which were able to show the inter-relationship between causal factors and some that argued that, indeed, one cause – usually political or socio-economic – was more dominant. There was some excellent understanding of the political, social, economic and cultural climate in the German Confederation of the 1840s.

This is a Level 3 response.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: **Question 3** **Question 4**

Question 5 **Question 6**

In the 1840s, Germany was no single state and was split into 39 smaller states which were united under a loose confederation. The states were mostly monarchical and aristocratic, very few had parliaments. In this confederation Prussia and Austria were the largest and most dominant states with Austria being the traditional power. However with social change came the desire for political change and in the late 1840s Germany, like the rest of Europe, was hit by revolution. There were many factors for this although some historians argue that

one cause was the most important.

Middle class unrest was certainly a key cause of what would soon become a predominantly middle class revolution. Industrialisation and urbanisation was creating a larger, more educated middle class, which felt because of their wealth and status they should have political representation. There was also a large amount who thought that Germany should unite. These Nationalists, inspired by the French and American revolutions, desired a unified German state. The idea of nationalism superseded borders and worried all German states as it would potentially undermine their aristocracy. Artisans, the traditional middle class, also rose up. Artisans were particularly annoyed about industrial machines replacing their work and the economic crisis removing business. Middle class unrest was spread all around Germany and it was the middle class who were at the forefront of the revolt.

The economic crisis of 1846/7 was perhaps the most significant cause of the revolution. Two years of failed harvest left many farmers out of work, leaving landowners with less money, and therefore less money to spend on American products, this knock on effect created a huge economic crash in

Germany. The potato blight also destroyed most workers' seed access and with seed prices going up 120%, ~~seed~~ starvation was common. Less seed made factory workers' productivity decrease and with already less wages, profits dropped. Some argue this was the real reason for middle class unrest; less profits. Although in cities middle class unrest was bad, this wasn't really a problem for the ruling classes who made their money on the countryside anyway. When the peasants began to revolt, there was a real threat and a revolt turned into a revolution. The economic crisis was very significant and could have arguably caused other factors.

The growth of liberalism across Germany was increasing and the events which transpired because of this led to revolution in the confederation. Liberalism was a mostly middle-class movement that sought to create a democratic government and end to Carlsbad decrees (No freedom of press). Liberals were mostly inspired by the enlightenment and

the French Revolution. Liberalism was a mostly peaceful ideology but in 1846 to 1847 liberals in Baden managed to push through a assembly and liberal legislation. They did this with aggressive demonstrations. This showed liberals all over the German confederation that action can create progress. And coupled with the French Revolution of 1848 which deposed the absolute monarch, liberals all over Germany rallied and demonstrated. These demonstrations often turned violent and produced what turned into a revolution. Without events in Baden proving that progress can be achieved, these liberals would have not played such a large part in the revolution.

The 1848 revolution was due to no single event and was the culmination of multiple factors. The economic crisis of 1846/7 laid the groundwork for unrest in the peasantry, the middle-class nationalists saw the only way to achieve their goal was through revolt and the liberals looked at previous successes and were keen to make more progress. If not triggered by the French in 1848 the German revolution would have likely occurred anyway due to the build up of causes.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response considers some of the relevant key features with regard to causation but these are explained rather than explored.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

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

This is a Level 5 response.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4

Question 5 Question 6

It would be very difficult to state that the causes of the 1848 revolutions had a single underlying cause. The growth of liberalism questioned the leadership of the states and asked why no one who wasn't a nobleman had any power. The growth of nationalism had questioned people whether they were 'Hanoverian or German,' and with the development of the railways helped many understand why that everyone in the German states had very similar cultures. The economic failures in 1846-47 had led to a lot of anger being stirred up by the working classes which led to mass protests, demanding reform, leading to the revolutions. These factors worked together as the nationalist feeling had gained support through a liberalist agenda and the economic failures gave the lower classes a real reason to fight for reform.

The revolution in France in ~~18~~ 1789 showed how the lower classes could gain power through a liberalist agenda. France, to many liberals, was seen as the desirable option as a way of pushing a liberalist agenda. This led to pressure being put on the German states as liberalist gains were made. For example, in Baden in 1846, the press censorship was relaxed and judicial reforms were made. Governments feared that a revolution like the one in France in 1789

would ~~be~~ occur if concessions were not made. The liberalist cause of revolution was in the fact that they saw how effective the French revolution was and that if they replicated it, they would make significant gains. However, they did ~~not~~ need a reason to revolt and that was shown by the economic failures of 1846 and 1847, as well as needing ^a nationalist support in order to have an impact as widespread action would be the only way of forcing the aristocracy to concede.

The growth of nationalism began to soar in the 1840s. Firstly, the development of the railways had boosted the nationalist feeling. In 1835, there was only 6 km of track but 10 years later in 1845, there was over 2,100 km of track. This made ~~some~~ travel much quicker as travelling between major cities now took less than a day. With more people being able to travel, they could see that people in other states were not too different as they spoke the same language and shared many cultures. This increased the nationalist feeling as they became ~~more~~ less parochial since there was no reason to have tensions with each other if they were so similar.

Another source of nationalism was the Rhine Crisis of 1840. The threat of France ~~annexing~~ taking the German speaking land caused national uproar and a sense of German spirit was formed in order to protect themselves from

foreign powers. Songs were sung about the strength of Germany, showing the presence of a nationalist feeling. However, many saw that unification should be carried out through a liberalist government, either a republic or with a constitutional monarch. Many saw nationalism and liberalism as a partnership and that both relied on each other, making it increasingly harder to pinpoint the cause of the 1848 revolutions to a single issue.

Ultimately, the short-term anger of the economic failures in 1846-47 led to the violent revolutions of 1848.

Food prices had shot up between 1834/5 and 1843, food prices increased by 40% but between 1835 and 1846, food prices increased by 120%. This had been due to the harvest failure in both years and the potato blight in 1846. The anger caused much of the working class and peasants to join the fight as they, in lack of ~~dis~~ income ~~that~~ was causing them to be hit hardest and by joining the fight, they had very little to lose. The nationalist and liberalist agendas had been very much a middle-class issue which sought to increase powers to the middle-class but not to the poor but these failures led to the poor taking part, enabling the movement to gain physical support in the form of manpower which would threaten governments greatly as they'd seen it before in the French Revolution of 1789 and later in 1830 and 1832.

Overall, it is very difficult to name the single issue that caused the 1848 revolutions. It could be said that they all had popularity at different stages. - the liberalist movement was more popular before 1840 and it had seen liberal gains in the 1830s such as constitutional reform in Bavaria. After the Rhine Crisis, nationalism seemed to ~~catch~~ overtake liberalism as the whole country caused uproar, showing its national support. Eventually, the economic failures seemed to be a tipping point in causing the revolutions and the fact they were widespread showed the nationalist support. Therefore, it was ~~a~~ combination of the three that led to the revolutions of 1848.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Here the key issues are explored and links between them established.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

At the higher levels, valid criteria need to be established in order to reach an overall judgement on the question. A focused conclusion can highlight this - in this case the response has agreed with the statement by demonstrating that different causes were more prominent at different points in the outbreak of the revolutions.

Field Marshal Bismarck engineered the war, and ensured a Prussian victory. This is exemplified by Bismarck's involvement of Austria and Prussia in the Second ^{Schleswig-Holstein} Schleswig War of 1864, in which Prussia and Austria scored a significant victory over the Danes, and regarded at the Congress of Gastein, August 1865. This gave allowed for Bismarck to negotiate an ephemeral and political treaty, in which Austria would give Holstein, and Prussia Schleswig, which meant that, should war break out, Holstein's distance from Austria would allow for its seizure in occupying it (it was owing to its inaccessibility). This also made pro-Austrian activity in favour of the Danes and their independence against the treaty. This was allowed for a ~~few~~ 'canal zone' to be established and realised, as in May 1866 Austria moved Holstein and Schleswig under federal direct control, which Bismarck declared against the treaty and thus occupied Holstein, starting mobilisation, and war. This thus reflects how Bismarck contributed to the war's success owing to the fact that it allowed for its declaration, and engineered its resolution in a way that prevented Austrian loss, allowing the capture of Holstein and also ensuring that Prussia's army was well equipped - owing to the contribution of Bismarck to passing the reforms of the army in 1862, which allowed for the ^{wide spread} ~~wide spread~~ adoption of the special breech-loading rifle. Thus, we conclude that Bismarck's contribution to the victory of 1866 was significant to a great extent.

However, the fact that Bismarck never fought at led the battles such as Königgrätz thus reflects the fact that Bismarck's role was limited in significance, as whilst he could set up the war, he is seen relied upon the Prussian army, agreeing to his significance to a limited extent.

Furthermore, we can also state that Bismarck's contribution to the Prussian victory in 1866 was significant to a great extent, as shown by Bismarck's manipulation of the international situation in a way that ensured Prussian victory. This is exemplified firstly in the 1863 contribution to the Polish revolt's repression in Russia by sending von Alvensleben to St Petersburg and sending Ruzhicki to the revolt in ^{Poland} Hungary. This further dissuaded the Russian Prussia alliance and secured Russian neutrality in the war. This was also in contrast with France, in which the Biarritz Conference in 1865 ensured French neutrality during the war in exchange for vague territorial commitments in return, thus further ensuring the weakness of Austria, and thus a Prussian victory, playing into the French desire for 'aggrandisement'. This was finally in evidence in the 1865/1866 alliance with Italy, in which Bismarck exploited Italian desire for independence from Venice, thus ~~also~~ causing the concentration of Austrian troops on the Italian front* and thus, allowed for victory in 1866 at Königgrätz, and allowing the Prussians to march on Vienna, undefended. Thus, Bismarck's manipulation of the international situation created conditions conducive for a Prussian victory, without which Prussia would face destruction by Austria and France. Thus, Bismarck's contribution to the Prussian victory over Austria in 1866 can be stated to be significant to a great extent, owing to his creating favourable conditions for Prussia over Austria.

* and allowed for diversion of Austrian forces at Chiavenna, thus allowing for an easier, swift seven weeks' war in the North and border with Prussia.

However, we can also agree to the contrary and state that the ^{role of} Prussia

Austria's weaknesses

However, one can alternatively state that Bismarck contributed to Austria's weakness, in his exclusion of Austria from the Zollverein, thus removing ^{her} her economic growth, as well as his attempted removal of Austria in 1862's bilateral trade agreement with France, inhibiting Austria's economy and preventing vital army reforms. Thus, Bismarck also significantly contributed to Austria's weaknesses.

Finally, one can also state that Bismarck's ~~ambitions~~ contributions to the Russian victory over Austria in 1866 were significant to a limited extent only, as shown by the general significance of the Russian armed forces. This is shown by the fact that, while Bismarck could ~~not~~ ^{not} the success of 1866 against Austria, he could not win it without the expertise of the Russian army. This is exemplified by its general superiority of the Dreyse needle gun, which could fire 5x faster than the Austrian 'mineral' rifle, and could also be fired while crouched and reloaded, a primary feature of defensive warfare (as a result of its breech loaded) as well as rapid firing (breech loaded rifles). These were used by Field Marshal von Moltke to great effect against the nature of Austria's shock tactics, and as a result saw 44,000 Austrian casualties sustained (5x more than Russia) as a result of the defensive advantage of the Russian weaponry. Thus, this reflects the significance of the Russian army in the victory of 1866, allowing for the overwhelming victory of Königgrätz, and forcing the Austrian army to retreat to Vienna, thus allowing for a quick 7 weeks' victory. ~~Without the~~ ~~expertise~~ ~~of~~ the Russian army, and its ~~defeat~~ ~~clear~~ ~~to~~ the nature of the Austrian army, as 1866 could never be attained, and as such,

The influence of and significance of Bismarck's contribution to victory is limited.

However, the fact that it was Bismarck, in 1862, who pushed over the constitutional crisis 1860-1862, and allowed for the passage of army reforms reflects the significance of Bismarck and how his contribution reached into all areas of the Prussian victory of 1866, creating international conditions conducive to Prussian victory. Thus, his significance and the Prussian victory can be stated to a great extent.

In conclusion one can state that, whilst there were other factors that contributed towards the Prussian victory of 1866 over Austria, including the

the relative weakness of Austria and the influence of the Prussian army, the fact that Bismarck played a role in all of these areas, as stated in part, reflects the significance of his contribution. This is also shown by his strategy of the war, and his ensuring that the international situation was manipulated such that victory was attainable, reflects Bismarck to be the most influential and significant factor behind the success of 1866. Whilst however the Prussian victory was not unconditional, and the Prussian army and Austria itself played key roles, Bismarck's contribution can be stated to be significant towards Austria Prussian victory and Austria in 1866 to a great extent.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response is well organised with a clear development of the key issues relating to Bismarck's contribution to the victory over Prussia in relation to other issues.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Always try to use the beginning sentences of paragraphs to drive forward the discussion of the question asked.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should aim to develop valid inferences supported by the arguments raised in the sources, not merely paraphrase the content of the sources.
- Inferences can be supported by reference to contextual knowledge surrounding the issues raised by the sources.
- 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.
- Candidates should consider 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 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 in order to make the structure of the response flow more logically and to enable the integration of analysis.

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>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

