Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2023

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

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com 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 2023
Question Paper Log Number P68777A
Publications Code 8HI0_2D_2306_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

General Marking Guidance

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

Generic Level Descriptors

Section A: Questions 1a/2a

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
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 Victor Emmanuel II's attitude towards the *Statuto*. 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 that Victor Emmanuel was begrudging in his acceptance of the *Statuto* ("my father granted institutions…which are quite unsuitable…but…both gave our word and I will not break it.") • It indicates that privately Victor Emmanuel hoped to overthrow the *Statuto* ('he will say confidentially, 'I am waiting only for the right moment to change everything.'') • It claims that Victor Emmanuel is hostile towards the liberal elements of his constitutional monarchy ('does not like the existing *Statuto*, nor does he like parliamentary liberties, nor a free press.') • It suggests that Victor Emmanuel's public attitude towards the *Statuto* cannot be trusted ('He just accepts…temporarily as a necessary evil.'). 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: • The report was written by a foreign observer who would have had a relatively objective view of the attitude of the King • The report would almost certainly have been confidential and so the Ambassador would have been able to write frankly about the King's statements • The report was written three years after Victor Emmanuel's acceptance of the *Statuto*, so providing sufficient time for the King's true feelings to become known. 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: • King Charles Albert initially agreed to a constitution, or *Statuto,* in 1848 as a consequence of the revolutions in Italy, and Victor Emmanuel agreed to retain the *Statuto* on his father's abdication in 1849 • Victor Emmanuel had to be persuaded strongly by the Austrians and his new Prime Minister, D'Azeglio, to accept the *Statuto* at all • The *Statuto* established a constitutional monarchy in Piedmont with a parliamentary system and granted political and civil rights along with freedom of the press.

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 reasons why Cavour resigned as Prime Minister of Piedmont in July 1859. 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: • As an eye-witness to events in the immediate aftermath of Cavour's meeting with Victor Emmanuel II, della Rocca was in an excellent position to be able to gauge Cavour's state of mind at the time • Writing almost 50 years after the events, della Rocca's recollections may have been influenced by his knowledge of the subsequent significance of the events of July 1859 • The tone of the commentary suggests that della Rocca was sympathetic towards Cavour's position. 2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: • It indicates that Cavour was angry with the proposed settlement and felt let down by the French in particular ('speaking out against Victor Emmanuel and everyone…promises were promises and ought to be kept') • It indicates that Cavour was unable to persuade others in power in Piedmont to continue fighting ('as military men, we refused', 'since the King…inflexible') • It implies that he was disillusioned by events ('leave the work half done…years of effort frustrated.') • It suggests that Cavour resigned because he could just not get his own way ('…we refused', 'would not listen to argument…the King…inflexible'). 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: • At Villafranca, the negotiations proposed the loss of Nice and Savoy, a federal state under the Pope and Austrian retention of Venetia, rather than creating an independent Kingdom of northern Italy under Piedmont • Cavour's meeting with Victor Emmanuel II regarding the peace settlement at Villafranca, from which Cavour had been excluded, was known to have been confrontational • Cavour had spent the previous seven years creating a diplomatic environment that favoured Piedmont becoming the leading power in the creation of an independent Kingdom of northern Italy, e.g. Crimean War • Piedmont had suffered defeats by Austria in the First War of Independence in 1848 and the Piedmontese military believed that to continue the war without France would have led to defeat.

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 obstacles to the growth of liberalism in the German Confederation in the 1840s. 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 the traditional ruling class had contempt for new political ideas ('springing up like weeds', 'one can be easily convinced', 'should only be allowed to come into existence') • It indicates that liberal political associations would be subject to thorough investigation by the authorities ('Before each association is set up…must have knowledge') • It indicates that liberal political associations would be subject to tight regulation ('applying the powers of strict control', 'authorised by the government'). 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: • Metternich was speaking as Chancellor of the dominant conservative state of the German Confederation and, as such, his views on political ideas such as liberalism were significant • The purpose of Metternich's comment would probably have been to emphasise to his fellow ministers in private the threat posed by liberalism and to indicate the means necessary to prevent its growth • The comment was made in the mid-1840s at a time of growing political discontent and interest in liberal ideas. 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: • Metternich was the dominant politician in the German Confederation in the 1840s and the 'Metternich System' of regulation and control was used to undermine the growth of new political ideas • Metternich and other German leaders used a network of spies across Europe to infiltrate and inform on political associations • Regulation and censorship meant that liberal organisations were limited in membership and were often secret in nature, making it difficult to spread ideas.

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 impact on the German states of the 1848 revolution in France. 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: • As a young political activist in 1848, Schurz's memories of the events of February 1848 are likely to be particularly vivid • Schurz is writing in the early 1900s, over 50 years after the event, and so in hindsight he may have chosen to emphasise the significance of the revolution in France • As a prominent politician, Schurz wrote his memoirs for publication and would have considered the material to be included with this in mind. 2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: • It indicates that, in Bonn, the news of the revolution in France created a sense of excitement and anticipation ('since the French had acted, something…must happen here', 'a political earthquake') • It implies that revolution in France gave a boost to German nationalism ('the day had arrived for the establishment of 'German Unity'') • It suggests that the news of the revolution in France gave many the confidence to challenge traditional authorities ('demand… the Emperor of Austria', 'In the Prussian capital, the masses surged upon the streets.') • It suggests that the revolution in France was of fundamental significance in kick-starting the revolutionary fervour across Germany in 1848 ('news rushed in upon us from all sides like a roaring hurricane'). 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: • The 1848 revolution in France saw the overthrow of the monarch Louis Philippe and the creation of the Second Republic; initial measures taken centred on political, civil and economic rights • The revolution in France sent shock waves across Europe as a whole, at a time when political discontent was on the increase • Political discontent was already on the rise in the German states and, in Baden, actions designed to force the radicalisation of the 1846 constitution essentially coincided with the revolution in France • In February and March 1848, revolutionary activity took place across Germany forcing the traditional rulers onto the backfoot, with most introducing, or at least contemplating, constitutional reform.

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 the statement that, in the years 1830-47, the main reason for the lack of progress towards Italian unity was the weaknesses of the nationalists. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1830-47, the main reason for the lack of progress towards Italian unity was the weaknesses of the nationalists should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Italian nationalists were divided as to the means and methods to be used, so preventing united action, e.g. competing nationalist programmes were advocated by Mazzini, Gioberti and Balbo, the use of secret societies • Mazzinian nationalists were disorganised, e.g. the failed invasion of Piedmont in 1834; by the mid-1840s, Mazzini, in exile, was widely criticised for a lack of communication with nationalists in Italy • The idea of a national identity, as a characteristic of the *Risorgimento,* was based on the culture of the classical Italian language, but differences in dialect and very limited literacy made its dissemination difficult • Many nationalists, including Mazzini, were reluctant to harness the support of the masses and, in particular, viewed the peasantry with suspicion, so alienating potential popular support. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1830-47, other factors were responsible for the lack of progress towards Italian unity should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The rulers of the Italian states were determined to maintain the restored order and implemented suppressive policies against nationalist associations, such as Young Italy • Austrian influence over the Italian peninsula was particularly effective, with the 'Metternich system' supporting an effective network of police surveillance and the Austrian military available if necessary • Italian localism and separatism were a strong feature of Italian political and social life that undermined nationalism, e.g. in the 1830 revolutions local leaders in Modena and Emilia did not unite with those in Papal States • Until the election of Pope Pius IX in 1846, the opposition of the Papacy to nationalist ideas, even those of Gioberti, was particularly influential in undermining support for nationalism. 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 whether, in the years 1860-61, the most significant development in the process of Italian unification was Garibaldi's decision to take Rome. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1860-61, the most significant development in the process of Italian unification was Garibaldi's decision to take Rome should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Garibaldi's decision threatened Piedmont's leadership of the unification process and forced Piedmont to intervene in the Papal States to prevent foreign intervention from France, and possibly Austria • As a result of marching its army south to confront Garibaldi, Piedmont was able to bring the majority of the Papal States under its control militarily and politically, so expanding the territory ruled by Victor Emmanuel • The failure of the French or the Austrians to react to the situation with military force was a triumph for Cavour and legitimised Italian unification under Piedmont within European diplomacy • Piedmontese success led to the joining up of 'nationalist' forces from the north and south, and Garibaldi's agreement to hand over the south to Victor Emmanuel. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1860-61, other developments in the process of Italian Unification were more significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Garibaldi's expedition to, and successful conquest of, Sicily was the foundation stone for the take-over of southern Italy by nationalists • Garibaldi's invasion of Naples and the overthrow of the Bourbon monarchy removed the greatest obstacle to the union of northern and southern Italy • Garibaldi's meeting with Victor Emmanuel at Teano led to the proclamation of the Kingdom of Italy • The plebiscites held in 1860-61, in central and southern Italy, allowed Piedmont to claim a popular mandate for the creation of a unified Italy under the rule of Victor Emmanuel. 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 how accurate it is to say that Italy became a united nation in the years 1861-70. Arguments and evidence that Italy became a united nation in the years 1861-70 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In 1861, the Kingdom of Italy was created, encompassing the majority of the Italian Peninsula • The Kingdom of Italy was a constitutional monarchy with a capital city and, during these years, developed a centralised system of government, military, and administration • In 1866, the Austrian-controlled province of Venetia was ceded to the Kingdom of Italy in the wake of the Austro-Prussian War • In 1870, the withdrawal of French troops, as a result of the Franco-Prussian War, led to annexation of the city of Rome; Rome replaced Florence as the capital city. Arguments and evidence that Italy did not become a united nation in the years 1861-70 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • There was much resentment in the South of the perceived dominance of Piedmontese laws and institutions in the new kingdom; 'Piedmontisation' was actively resisted in the 'Brigands' war', 1861-65 • Deep economic and social divisions existed between the more developed, urban industrialised north and the under-developed, largely agrarian south • *Irredenta* areas still existed, e.g. South Tyrol, Trentino, and many Italians still looked to regain the areas of Nice and Savoy, ceded to France in 1859 • The Papacy remained an obstacle to unity throughout the period, and, even with the take-over of Rome in 1870, Vatican City remained independent and the Pope refused to recognise the legitimacy of the Italian kingdom. 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 on whether the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament (1848-49) was mainly due to its lack of a military force. Arguments and evidence that the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament (1848-49) was mainly due to its lack of a military force should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Frankfurt Parliament was forced to rely on the armed forces of the rulers of the German states to carry out functions, such as collecting taxes • The Frankfurt Parliament was unable to defend Schleswig-Holstein from Danish attack without the offer of Prussian military intervention • A lack of a military force meant that the Frankfurt Parliament was unable to defend the sovereignty of Germany from claims to land from non-German nationalities, such as the Poles and the Czechs • The Frankfurt Parliament had no means to deal either with internal challenges from radical revolutionaries or the counter-revolutionary resurgence of the German princes and Austrian Empire. Arguments and evidence that the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament (1848-49) was due to other factors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Lengthy internal disagreements over the nature of German unification and the new German constitution within the Assembly undermined the consolidation of the Parliament • Internal divisions between middle-class liberal and radical deputies within the Assembly weakened the legitimacy of the Parliament. Legitimacy was further weakened by a lack of working-class and peasant representation • The role of Prussia and the Prussian king undermined the authority of the Parliament, particularly Frederick William IV's rejection of the leadership of the new *Kleindeutschland* constitution • The recovery of Habsburg authority by the end of 1848 signalled the resurgence of conservative forces within Germany. 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 whether, in the years 1852-66, the most significant economic development in Prussia was the expansion of the railways. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1852-66, the most significant economic development in Prussia was the expansion of the railways should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Heavy industry benefitted from railway expansion; railway building itself created a demand for heavy industrial goods, such as steel, and the railways could transport raw materials for heavy industry, such as coal • The railway network allowed the transportation of agricultural produce and consumer goods across the disparate Prussian lands, bringing increased availability, which in turn stimulated demand • The railway system expanded by 4,000 miles during this period, bringing a reduction in transport costs, which, in turn, brought down the cost of manufacturing and manufactured goods • Railway expansion was predominantly state funded, which created a strong relationship between the Prussian government and Prussian industry. Arguments and evidence that other economic developments in Prussia, in the years 1852-66, were more significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The continued expansion of the *Zollverein* among the German states at the expense of Austria provided a large internal free market. The *Zollverein* could negotiate trade agreements with foreign powers • The development of the banking industry provided a financial infrastructure for both private and state investment in economic ventures • Growth in industrialisation led to increased availability and consumption of goods; traditional heavy industries introduced new technologies and newer industries, e.g. chemicals, food processing were developed • Increased state intervention in the economy as a whole encouraged economic growth, e.g. direct investment, beneficial tax incentives, agricultural reform. 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 extent to which Bismarck was responsible for shaping the process of German unification. Arguments and evidence that Bismarck was responsible for shaping the process of German unification should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Bismarck furthered German unification by harnessing the influence of Prussia, e.g. 'blood and iron' speech on becoming Minister President • Bismarck engineered the three major wars – against Denmark (1864), Austria (1866) and France (1870) – that led to the unification of Germany • Bismarck's diplomacy created the international environment in which German unification could be achieved without foreign intervention, e.g. gaining French goodwill in 1865 but establishing French isolation in 1870 • Bismarck exploited many of the opportunities for the advancement of German unification which occurred in the period after 1861, e.g. vacancy for the Spanish throne (1868). Arguments and evidence that Bismarck was not responsible for shaping the process of German unification should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • A lack of significant industrial development in Austria in relation to Prussian industrial development, meant that Prussia could take advantage of the economic and political situation in Germany in the 1850s and 1860s • The development of the *Zollverein* as an economic unity provided a blueprint for unification under Prussia • It was the impact of army reforms, combined with a strong military performance on the battlefield, that was responsible for Germany's unification through Prussian military victory and its consequences • The international situation in the 1860s was favourable for the creation of a *Kleindeutschland* solution to German unification, e.g. Britain and Russia saw Imperial France as a greater threat than Prussia to the balance of power. 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