Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2024

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

Paper 2: Depth study

Option 2D.1: The unification of Italy, c1830–70
Option 2D.2: The unification of Germany, c1840–71

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2024
Question Paper P71962A
Publications Code 8HI0_2D_2406_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

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.

How to award marks when level descriptions are used

1. Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use the guidance below and their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

For example, one stronger passage at L4 would not by itself merit a L4 mark, but it might be evidence to support a high L3 mark, unless there are substantial weaknesses in other areas. Similarly, an answer that fits best in L3 but which has some characteristics of L2 might be placed at the bottom of L3. An answer displaying some characteristics of L3 and some of L1 might be placed in L2.

2. Finding a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

Levels containing two marks only

Start with the presumption that the work will be at the top of the level. Move down to the lower mark if the work only just meets the requirements of the level.

Levels containing three or more marks

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements *fully*, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- If it only *barely* meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a *reasonable* match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

Indicative content

Examiners are reminded that indicative content is provided as an illustration to markers of some of the material that may be offered by students. It does not show required content and alternatives should be credited where valid.

Generic Level Descriptors

Section A: Questions 1a/2a

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	**1–2**	• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little if any substantiation. Concepts of utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	**3–5**	• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand or confirm matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of utility is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	**6–8**	• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences. • Knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria although justification is not fully substantiated. Explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author.

Section A: Questions 1b/2b

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	**1–2**	• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	**3–5**	• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concept of reliability is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	**6–9**	• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria, with some justification.
4	**10–12**	• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.

Section B

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	**1–4**	• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. • The overall judgement is missing or asserted. • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	**5–10**	• There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. • An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation, and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	**11–16**	• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	**17–20**	• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. • The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.

Section A: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
1a	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. Candidates must analyse the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the reasons why Garibaldi led expeditions to Venetia and Rome in the years after 1860. 1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source: • It indicates Garibaldi believed that Venetia and Rome needed to be liberated from foreign rule ('Rome and Venice are not French or Austrian cities…They belong to Italy alone.') • It indicates that Garibaldi wanted to complete the territorial unification of Italy and could not be at peace with himself until it was ('The work of the rebirth…completed. I shall never rest satisfied') • It indicates that Garibaldi did not trust the Italian government ('agreed to the humiliation of Italy by France, no matter how great that minister was.') • It suggests that Garibaldi thought that only he could take Venetia and Rome out foreign hands and in the appropriate manner ('I shall be in action again!'; 'never work to achieve this with an Italian minister'). 2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences: • Mundy is recounting a face-to-face conversation with Garibaldi and so is able to report Garibaldi's actual views • Mundy based his account on notes he had made at the time of the conversation • Mundy has excellent knowledge of the context of Garibaldi's words because of the nature of his role in events in Italy at the time. 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include: • Garibaldi had 'retired' from the political scene in November 1860, after the meeting with Victor Emmanuel at Teano, but later led unsuccessful attacks on Rome (1862, 1867) and Venetia (1862) • Venetia had been left in Austrian hands as a result of the Villafranca agreement (1859) and Rome was still occupied by France after 1860. Garibaldi blamed Cavour for these compromises • Garibaldi supported King Victor Emmanuel but was always suspicious of the motives of the Italian government.

Question	Indicative content
1b	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. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the nature of the 'Piedmontisation' of southern Italy in the years after 1860. 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: • The report is made by an opponent of the Kingdom of Italy who had a specific interest to paint the policies of the Italian government in a bad light; the Italian troops and ministers are referred to as 'Piedmontese' • The report seems to be designed to draw attention particularly to the mistreatment of the people of southern Italy • It has been written in the immediate aftermath of the events in the south and is clearly responding to the version of events being promulgated by the Italian government, e.g. reference to the official newspaper. 2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: • It claims that the actions of the Italian government are far worse than those of the previous government in Naples ('before 1860… for three days… no arrests.') • It claims that southern Italy is being ruled by an occupying force using terror to enforce its will ('those who will not submit to their demands are simply exterminated'; 'treated as slaves who have revolted') • It implies that the Italian authorities are being underhand in their treatment of the people of southern Italy ('poor innocent villagers… safe return.') • In its use of language ('slaughter') and choice of examples, it suggests that 'Piedmontisation' was universally disliked and negative in its impact. 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include: • In 1860, Garibaldi's take over of the south had been greeted by popular acclaim and the people of the south had voted unanimously in plebiscites to become part of the newly created Kingdom of Italy • The Bourbon government-in-exile sponsored much of the 'brigand' activity in the south. A brutal civil war (1861-65) saw thousands killed, captured and executed summarily and required 120,000 troops to put down • Much of the Piedmontese elite had been reluctant to take up Garibaldi's offer to unify; many in Piedmont viewed southern Italy and its people as a backward region that needed to be forcibly brought into the modern world • 'Piedmontisation' policies included constitutional government, investment in the economy and education, investment in the poorly developed infrastructure.

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

Question	Indicative content
2a	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. Candidates must analyse the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the nature of German nationalism in the late 1850s. 1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source: • It suggests that any future Germany unification is unlikely to be achieved through Austria ('dangers…increased by peace concluded between Austria and France.') or from the German Confederation ('defective…constitution') • It claims that only Prussia is in a position to facilitate the creation of a German national government ('the achievement of this objective can only come from Prussia.') • It indicates that the role of German nationalists is to persuade Prussia to take the lead ('We should therefore strive to ensure that Prussia assumes the initiative') • The wording of all four articles suggests that now the only real solution to unification is the creation of a *Kleindeutschland.* 2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences: • As the founding document of the *Nationalverein,* it directly states the aims and objectives of the only organisation dedicated solely to the unification of Germany at the time • It is a public declaration of intent and as such shows the priorities of nationalists in the late 1850s • It was published in August 1859, at a time of growing uncertainty over Austria's ability to continue to dominate the politics of the German state and to defend the German states from threats. 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include: • In 1859, the outcome of the war between France and Austria in Italy was perceived in Germany to have been a defeat for Austria and to open up Germany to a potential future attack from the west • The German Confederation that had emerged after the 1848-49 revolutions was a toothless institution organised for the benefit of the princely rulers and with little opportunity for wider representation • In the 1850s, Prussia had developed into a modern, industrialised nation with the potential to provide strong leadership of a united Germany, but many in government were reluctant to engage with nationalists • By the end of the 1850s, German nationalists had recovered from the setback of the 1848-49 revolutions and were looking to revive nationalist ideals. The growth of the middle-classes in Prussia provided a base.

Question	Indicative content
2b	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. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the relationship between Austria and Prussia in 1864. 1.The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: • It is a confidential memorandum to the Emperor, which suggests that the Count can be candid in his private comments • It is a snapshot of the situation in May 1864 that can give clear insight into the state of relations in relation to recent events as viewed by the Austrian minister • The Count may be over-emphasising the growing power of Prussia in order to persuade the Emperor to make the decision he wants. 2.The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: • It claims that political relations between Austria and Prussia are good ('friendly political relations with Austria') • It claims that Prussia is wilfully obstructing international agreements for co-operation on trade between Austria and Prussia ('deliberately…make it impossible to create the joint…Union.') • It suggests that Austria is losing influence over Germany because of Prussia's economic dominance ('won influence…over many of the other German states.'; 'not sufficiently low enough…to remove their support') • It suggests that Austria may feel threatened by Prussia's economic power ('uncompromising determination'; 'thoroughly exploits'; 'attempting, at all costs…'). 3.Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include: • In February 1864, Austria and Prussia joined together to fight a successful war against Denmark but, in 1863, Prussia had deliberately refused to attend a meeting called by Austria to reform the Confederation • The Prussian *Zollverein* had expanded to include most of the major German states but had never included Austria; in 1864, Austria's permanent exclusion was confirmed • As leader of the *Zollverein*, Prussia was able to dominate Germany economically but also prove its potential as the future leading power in Germany as a whole • In 1864, most of the German states still looked to Austria to provide leadership and Austria was still the dominant political power.

Section B: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
3	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether Mazzinian nationalism was a failure in the years 1831-56. Arguments and evidence that Mazzinian nationalism was a failure in the years 1831-56 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Attempts by Mazzinians to lead armed revolutions or coups prior to the 1848 revolutions, e.g. in 1833, 1834, 1844, were abject failures, often being uncovered before implementation, or poorly organised • Mazzini failed to gain either the broad spectrum of support or mass support, which would have been required to unite Italy through a popular movement, in particular he failed to appeal sufficiently to the Italian peasantry • During the 1848 revolutions, the lack of support for Mazzinian ideals meant that he was unable to use the revolutionary upheavals in Italy to unify the disparate revolts or defend the Roman Republic from French intervention • Post-1848, living in exile, Mazzini was heavily criticised by many of his followers and some broke away to form the National Society. Further revolts in Mazzini's name, between 1851-53, failed due to lack of support. Arguments and evidence that Mazzinian nationalism was not a failure in the years 1831-56 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Mazzini's Young Italy movement gained geographically-wide support and the journal he published from exile in France had widespread distribution, allowing his ideas on a democratic, united Italy to gain credence • Early success in the revolution in Rome under Galletti, and the subsequent leadership of the Roman Republic by Mazzini himself, gave Italians some ideas of what might actually be achieved in a united, democratic Italy • Mazzini was not averse to the idea of a united Italy ruled by a constitutional monarch; he had approached Charles Albert pre-1848, and so the National Society's dialogue with Piedmont was not a negation of his ideas • Mazzini remained the figurehead of radical nationalism throughout the period, and post-1849, his ideals of creating a liberated, democratic Italian nation state remained central to nationalism in Italy. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
4	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that Piedmont became a more liberal state in the years 1849-56. Arguments and evidence that Piedmont became a more liberal state in the years 1849-56 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Victor Emmanuel's agreement to retain and strengthen the *Statuto* of Charles Albert laid the foundations for a constitutional monarchy, with parliamentary representation and legal rights and freedoms • Freedom of the press and freedom of assembly encouraged liberals and nationalists from all over Italy to congregate in Piedmont, so creating a dynamic political environment • Parliamentary government was strengthened by Cavour's appointment in 1852 as prime minister and his politics of the *connubio* • The power of the Catholic Church was challenged and the influence of the Church controlled through the Siccardi Laws (1850) and other anti-clerical legislation • A combination of private enterprise and pro-active government policies and investment spearheaded by Cavour, e.g. railway building, free trade agreements, saw the development of a more industrialised liberal economy. Arguments and evidence that Piedmont did not become a more liberal state in the years 1849-56 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Victor Emmanuel was a reluctant constitutionalist and resented the interference of politicians and parliament in his power. The *Statuto* gave him considerable powers, which he chose to exercise, e.g. over civil marriage • The hereditary political and social elite in Piedmont was determined to maintain its power; parliamentary representation remained small and government investment in the economy was often vehemently challenged • The Catholic Church retained its influence and Victor Emmanuel was very reluctant to undermine his popularity amongst the masses by opposing the Pope; Cavour's monastic abolition bill (1855) created a constitutional crisis. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
5	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which the Orsini Affair was significant in the developments leading to the outbreak of the Second Italian War of Independence. Arguments and evidence that the Orsini Affair was significant in the developments leading to the outbreak of the Second War Italian of Independence should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Italian nationalist, Count Orsini, succeeded in drawing international attention to the cause of Italian independence through his unsuccessful attempt to assassinate the Emperor Napoleon III in Paris in January 1858 • In the aftermath of the Orsini Affair, Napoleon made a decision to change his foreign policy in relation to Italian independence by offering assistance to Piedmont in its desire to liberate northern Italy from Austrian rule • Napoleon III claimed his decision to support Italian independence had been swayed particularly by a direct emotional appeal made to him by Orsini in a letter written before Orsini was executed • The direct consequence of Napoleon's decision to assist Italy was the secret meeting with Cavour at Plombières and subsequent agreement that France and Piedmont would prosecute a war in northern Italy against Austria. Arguments and evidence that the significance of the Orsini Affair in the outbreak of the Second Italian War of Independence was limited/other developments were more significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Orsini Affair was merely an excuse used by Napoleon to justify a decision that he had already signalled to Cavour in 1857; his decision was more to do with the belief that assisting Italy would boost French prestige • It was Cavour's diplomacy during the Crimean War and the subsequent Congress of Paris that had laid the groundwork for French interest in helping Piedmont to liberate Italy from Austrian influence • It was the secret Pact of Plombières with France that made war between Piedmont and Austria almost a certainty; Piedmont finally gained the support from a foreign power that it needed to challenge Austria • Piedmontese actions finally provoked Austria into declaring war in April 1859, e.g. Victor Emmanuel's '*grido di dolore*' speech (January 1859), the mobilisation of forces on the border with Lombardy (March 1859). Other relevant material must be credited.

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

Question	Indicative content
6	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement extent to which the supporters of radical ideas made progress in Germany in the years 1840-47. Arguments and evidence that the supporters of radical ideas made progress in Germany in the years 1840-47 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • From 1846, liberals, socialists and nationalists were able to take advantage of the social and economic discontent caused by economic distress to gain greater popular support and influence the outbreak of demonstrations • Liberals made some constitutional progress, e.g. the Grand Duke of Baden introduced a liberal constitution in 1846 • Liberals became more confident in spreading their ideas. Liberals in Offenburg and Heppenheim published manifestos in 1847 and liberal newspapers were established, e.g. *Die Deutsche Zeitung* • Nationalist sentiment increased across the German Confederation during the Rhine Crisis with France in 1840 and again over Schleswig-Holstein in 1846, and the Prussian *Zollverein* was viewed as symbolic of nationalist potential. Arguments and evidence that the supporters of radical ideas did not make progress in Germany in the years 1840-47 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The conservative rulers of Germany, particularly Austria and Prussia, were determined to prevent the spread of revolutionary ideas, particularly the threat of liberalism, by repressive measures and censorship • The 'Metternich System' was successfully employed to undermine revolutionary organisations through the use of espionage and the use of saboteurs • On his accession in 1849, Frederick William IV of Prussia showed some interest in moderate reforms but this was not maintained. He dissolved a disastrous *Landtag* meeting in 1847 in the face of liberal demands • Support for radical organisations remained small, with many supporters coming from the middle-classes and students. The German peasantry showed particular antipathy and even opposition. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
7	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that the counter-revolution in Prussia was the main reason for the collapse of the 1848-49 revolutions in the German states. Arguments and evidence that the counter-revolution in Prussia was the main reason for the collapse of the 1848-49 revolutions in the German states should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Within eight months of the Prussian revolution, Frederick William IV had regained the initiative and, by December 1848, had effectively brought it to an end; this gave optimism to rulers in other states • Any semblance of the Frankfurt Assembly using the Prussian army as a defence force was destroyed by the military takeover of Berlin in December 1848 • The counter-revolution gave Frederick William IV the confidence to reject outright the offer of the leadership of a *Kleindeutschland* by the Frankfurt Assembly and, in so doing, effectively brought the Assembly to an end • In 1849, Prussian troops were at the forefront of the counter-revolution in other states, e.g. intervention by force in Saxony and the Palatinate. Arguments and evidence that there were other reasons for the collapse of the 1848-49 revolutions in the German states should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The revival of Habsburg power in Austria • Divisions amongst the revolutionaries in the Frankfurt Assembly slowed down the decision-making process so preventing the revolutionaries from taking advantage of the potential to create a united Germany • The lack of sustained popular support; initial support had been often fuelled by social and economic grievances that the new governments were not in a position to remedy and harvests were better in 1848-49 • Many middle-class revolutionaries, who had often led the initial stages of the revolts, became disillusioned at the development of more radical activity and were tempted by the promises of reforms from counter-revolutionaries. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
8	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that the most significant consequence for Prussia of the defeat of Austria was Prussian territorial expansion. Arguments and evidence that the most significant consequence for Prussia of the defeat of Austria was Prussian territorial expansion should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The annexation of the north German states that had fought in the war on the side of Austria created a continuous Prussian state stretching across the European continent from France to Russia • The expansion provided Prussia with the extra resources and manpower to further consolidate its economy and develop its position as a major European power • The Schleswig-Holstein question that had brought political instability to northern Germany was ended through Prussia's formal annexation of the two Duchies • The consolidation of Prussian territory meant that France now viewed Prussia more as a likely adversary than as a future ally. Arguments and evidence that there were other more significant consequences for Prussia of the defeat of Austria should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Treaty of Prague removed the influence of Austria over Germany, so paving the way for Prussia to lead a unified *Kleindeutschland* • The defeat led to the creation of a North German Confederation, which included Saxony, dominated by Prussia; this Confederation would become the blueprint for Prussia's eventual leadership of the German Empire • Austrian defeat forced the four independent southern states into a defensive alliance with Prussia that would potentially give Prussia security in any future war with France • The success strengthened Bismarck's political position by enabling him to develop a relationship with the newly formed National Liberals that would become the basis of support for future Prussian policies. Other relevant material must be credited.

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