



# **Examiners' Report** **June 2023**

**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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### 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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2023

Publications Code 9HI0\_2D\_2306\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

## Introduction

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

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

In Section A, the strongest answers were able to develop reasoned and supported inferences based on the sources. Such responses evaluated the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the enquiry on the basis of both the contextual knowledge that was on offer and through an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It is disappointing to note that a number of candidates talked in general terms rather than explicitly addressing the focus of the enquiry. This question requires candidates to use the sources ‘together’. It was pleasing to see that candidates had taken on board the advice offered last summer and relatively few are now attempting to use the sources ‘together’ throughout the entirety of the answer, which last year led to some problems for candidates. However, for 2D.1 and 2D.2 there was much scope to use the sources ‘together’ and there were some excellent answers that benefitted from the direct comparison between the views of Rattazzi and d’Azeglio in relation to Cavour and the variety of factors influencing the unification of Germany in 2D.2. Some candidates used their contextual knowledge to continue to describe events in great detail, rather than using it to illuminate and to discuss the sources. This sometimes resulted in candidates not dealing with the sources adequately. In other cases, candidates might offer up little or no contextual knowledge to support their arguments and analysis. These were not always weaker candidates; some answers were seen that were strong in bullet points 1 and 3 of the mark scheme, but had very little that could be credited for bullet point 2. The impact of this was to hold down the marks that were achievable in this question.

It is important to note that from Level 2 onwards there is an assumption in BP1 that candidates will make inferences from the Source material – ranging from undeveloped inferences to valid inferences to reasoned inferences – and that it is also assumed from Level 3 BP2 that contextual will be deployed to validate those inferences.

In Section B, it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. Weaker candidates either engaged in a narrative approach that made links to the question in the conclusion or alternatively shaped their responses analytically but lacked sufficient substance and accurate contextual knowledge to support the arguments that they were making. More responses were seen this summer that had a tendency to only deal with one side of an argument; some of these were a sophisticated analysis of that one side, showing the links between the issues that were raised, but it is essential that candidates acknowledge the existence of a debate, where appropriate. Candidates are encouraged to ensure that they take the most appropriate approach to answering a question. Candidates should always aim to show the links between the issues raised, not merely to present a list of factors. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology. Equally, the evidence that is presented should come from within the timeframe of the chronology of the question, unless contextually relevant. It was disappointing this summer to note that a number of candidates seemed to have only a weak grasp on the timing of key events.

2D.1 is the most popular of the two Options. Candidates for both Options were generally very well prepared with some excellent knowledge being shown and clear understanding of the second order concepts being assessed in Section B. For 2D.1 both questions were equally popular choices but for 2D.2 Q5 was more popular than Q6.

The circumstances of teaching and learning for the candidates and centre for the 2023 qualification have been particularly challenging and students and teachers are to be commended for the quality of the work seen.

**Please note:** that it is recommended that centres look at a selection of Principal Examiner Reports from across the different options within 9HI02 and previous series to get an overall sense of examiner feedback, centre approaches and candidate achievement.

Centres may wish to refer to the *Getting Started* guide that is to be found on the Pearson Edexcel GCE History website and to specific guidance and training materials that refer to AO2 source evaluation.

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

## Question 1

Candidates were required to evaluate two sources together (Source 1 – an account written by Rattazzi for future publication & Source 2 – a letter written by d'Azeglio) in relation to an enquiry into the role of Cavour in the months before his appointment as Prime Minister of Piedmont in November 1852.

Most candidates were able to select evidence from the sources that referred to Cavour's role in the creation of the *connubio* and his relationship with different politicians of the time, and were able to use their own contextual knowledge to support claims and inferences that could be made. The majority referred to the different emphasis placed or inferences that could be made about Cavour's agency in the creation of the *connubio*, with most pointing out that Source 1 appeared to downplay Cavour's role in comparison to the D'Azeglio's claims of betrayal in Source 2. Most candidates suggested that both authors had vested interests in their discussions of Cavour and felt that Source 1 was more trustworthy than Source 2, as there was less emotion involved. However, some higher level responses suggested that such a personal letter at the height of the *connubio* controversy gave an excellent insight into the machinations of government at the time, despite the high level of feeling. Contextual knowledge was used well, with good knowledge of the political intrigue at the time. Some candidates used knowledge of Cavour's career before and after the period to verify his character. This was rewarded but only if relevant to the point being made. Quite a few responses veered off from the enquiry to provide often long and irrelevant detail about Cavour's actions in the later 1850s and early 1860s. Some candidates also focused on specific elements of the sources, e.g. the press laws rather than on the enquiry itself.

Overall, the Source elicited a wide range of responses from Level 1 to Level 5 and the majority of the candidates were able to access the Sources sufficiently to provide an evaluation. The best responses were able to use the Sources together to discuss the role of Cavour in light of the different perspectives from the Centre Left and the Prime Minister of the time and to make inferences with regard to Cavour's actual participation in the *connubio* and his behaviour at the time.

Source 1 is an account by Rattazzi to Costelli in 1870 after Italy had been fully unified in March 1861. The purpose of the source was to provide Costelli with a historic account of the convening of the Constituent Assembly which happened Oct 1851 to January 1852. The purpose of the source is therefore useful because it gives us a political point of view and outlines that before his promotion to PM in 1852 Cavour was highly significant at forming the constituent. Cavour is described as being the head figure and leading spokesman of the centre right and was therefore indisputably influential in the formation of this alliance that helped to change Piedmontese government. Cavour had previously been minister of trade + agriculture in 1851 and then minister of finance in 1852 before he was made PM in November of that. His work in both these roles conveys his role before PM. The source is especially useful at outlining Cavour's influence in the constituent and the constituent itself was highly significant as the source does it 'brought great services both to freedom and Italy'.

However Source 1 is weakened potentially in its outlook on Cavour because Rattazzi was a member of the opposing side - he was a member of the centre left. Rattazzi exposes his own mistrust and misgivings towards Cavour at the end of the extract: 'I still felt somewhat distrustful as to the extent of liberal and Italian sentiments.' However the extract continues to say how Costelli was closer to Cavour and able 'to remove all uncertainty about Cavour' from Rattazzi's mind. Therefore while Rattazzi's initial feelings and misconceptions may have been removed by Costelli they do slightly weaken the interpretation of the source as it is clear that Rattazzi's loyalties are with Costelli as they were both members of the same political party. This is shown in Rattazzi acknowledging Costelli as most deserving of the success of the conviso: 'Costelli, I remember that the praise for bringing the conviso meeting should largely be yours.' The acknowledgement of the success of the conviso could have been attributed more in Cavour's favour, perhaps by a member of the centre right which was Cavour's own party.

Source 2's strengths ~~are~~ are that it is written by d'Azeglio who was the PM of Piedmont.

previously to Carav. The Source is a private letter written to Rendu who was French. The source is extremely useful at seeing how despite the connivance being largely a success it shows how it was initially received in parliament and how Carav's part in it felt like a betrayal and stab in the back to d'Azeglio. ~~The~~ d'Azeglio puts to the secrecy of the arrangement: 'my own cabinet colleague without ever declaring hostilities had arranged everything privately with Rattazzi. The Source is therefore useful at showing us that previously to becoming PM Carav was regarded as an isolated traitor within his own party. His alliances to d'Azeglio clearly were of huge significance and as a result he didn't feel compelled to seek d'Azeglio's approval or support and this hugely undermined d'Azeglio's position: 'I can't go on much longer. I am just not strong enough.' d'Azeglio remarks he had 'been very cold towards Carav' as a result of the intense feelings of betrayal suggestive Carav worked on his own terms in the months prior to being PM and ~~if~~ due to his pragmatism worked to make any arrangements to straighten Parliament even if it went against his party.

While the Source is undeniably useful at sharing a centre right perspective the letter is to a 'close confidant' and can therefore be argued to be very sensitive on d'Azeglio's part. He feels betrayed by Carver and publicly embarrassed as Carver's speech in parliament <sup>which</sup> was made without his first being informed: 'The speech, in which Carver committed the whole government to the Cannibo, was made without a word to me.' This was a 'very sensitive moment' for d'Azeglio and while his accent and personal experiences are still useful the role of Carver and the success of the cannibo itself are overlooked due to d'Azeglio's raw emotions. The letter is too a friend and is perhaps over exaggerated and is at the end of his own personal political career when he has clearly had enough 'But good God when can I get out of this mad game?'

The Sources are useful as a pair because they show us 2 political perspectives of Carver's actions in the months before his appointment as PM; Rattazzi from the centre left and d'Azeglio from the centre right. Both sources corroborate each other for example Source 1

says how 'the whole plan had already been agreed by me (and 4 men). No one else had known anything about it.' This is expressed in Source 2 as d'Azeglio expresses it was announced 'without a word to me. The Sources are also useful as a set because they are at 2 different time periods so express the perspective change of Caravara's role over time. In Source 1 it is written in 1870 at the very end of the period and is for the ultimate purpose of recording the events of 1851-52. Source 2 is written in the current time period of 1852 and conveys the immediate reaction. It has a different purpose to Source 1 as it is a letter to a 'close confidant' and is therefore arguably d'Azeglio being off unexpressed stress.

In conclusion the Sources as a set are very useful at clearly showing us Caravara's role before his appointment. They are from 2 very different perspectives, with different purposes and written in 2 different time periods. These all make them more useful as a set at understanding Caravara and the significance of the connection which was arguably his biggest advancement in terms of politics in Piedmont before becoming PM.



This is a mid-Level 5 response. In particular, it evaluates the sources directly by using the provenance to determine the veracity and reliability of the sources and illuminating the content of the source through contextual knowledge and understanding the need to interpret the material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. To reach the top of Level 5 the overall evaluation of the sources could have been more explicit in discussing the weight of the evidence in coming to a judgement.



A strong response often integrates the discussion of the provenance with the content of the material rather than dealing with what can be gained from the source separately from the provenance. Use the provenance to interrogate the sources.

## Question 2

Candidates were required to evaluate two sources together (Source 3 – a personal letter written by a government official from a small north German state & Source 4 – a private statement made by Prince Jerome Napoleon of France to the British ambassador in Berlin) in relation to an enquiry into the reasons why Prussia was successful in unifying Germany in the years 1866-71.

Most candidates were able to select evidence from the sources to show the military, economic and diplomatic reasons for Prussia's success and were able to use their own contextual knowledge to support claims and inferences that could be made. The majority referred to the role played by the Austro-Prussian war and the Zollverein. Most candidates suggested that, despite being from a potentially pro-Prussian perspective, Source 3 was useful in determining military reasons for Prussian success and Source 4 for economic success. Better responses were able to develop the references to Bismarck in Source 3 and to international relations with France and Britain in Source 4. Weaker candidates were often more confident in using Source 3, where they were able to use contextual knowledge about Austria's defeat in 1866 and Bismarck's role in the outbreak of the war. Some candidates just stated that the Sources were not useful because they did not explicitly give reasons but other candidates recognised that the Sources opened up a wealth of inference for them to make about Prussian gains over Austria, Bismarck's role, the level of support for Prussia, the economic unification of Germany and diplomacy. Many responses pointed out that, despite the private origin of both Sources, there were public elements to the nature of the sources as well. Some better responses were able to discuss the potential 'true' nature and purpose of Prince Jerome Napoleon's comments. Most candidates suggested that Source 3 was probably more reliable than Source 4, as it was more candid in its nature.

Overall, the Source elicited a wide range of responses from Level 1 to Level 5 and the majority of the candidates were able to access the Sources sufficiently to provide an evaluation. The best responses were able to use the Sources together to show the wide range of reasons for Prussian success in unifying Germany.

Source 3 provides the historian a great use of the idea of Prussian unity present within the period 1866-1871, as well as the magnitude of Prussian military might in its role of defeating Austria in the 7 weeks War of 1866. Source 3 highlights the "incredible mobilisation of Prussia" which the historian could infer is the technological developments and embracement of industrialisation as Prussia did over this period. Investment in transportation methods such as the railways, which expanded from 50 km in 1836 to over 1,000 km by 1856 not only allowed for rapid mobilisation and transportation of Prussian forces but also encouraging trade ~~at~~ already encouraged by economic organisations like the Zollverein. Thus, ~~the~~ this demonstrates a important factor of why Prussia was able to defeat Austria and then France in 1871, removing barriers to unification through the expansive transportation network established over previous decades. Additionally, source 3 highlights how the "much praised Austrian cavalry was beaten by the Prussian cavalry in every engagement" allowing for an inference that the military strength of Prussia as well as flaws within its opponents' own military was a key component in the removal of barriers to unification for Prussia. Austria's cavalry that had recently adopted "Shock tactics" following the 2<sup>nd</sup> Schleswig War were ~~demons~~ shown to be ineffective, as well as Prussia's use of the Dreyse Needle Gun

which had a much faster fire rate of any other weapon present can be argued to be important factors. As source 3 highlights, "our gains from victory cannot be underestimated." suggesting that the defeat of Austria can be argued to assure no more opposition to a Kleindeutschland solution in Germany. A strength of source 3 can be argued to be its temporal validity, having been written on the 5<sup>th</sup> July 1866 immediately after the 7 weeks war, thus reducing any retrospective alterations. Furthermore, the unofficial nature, with von Kugelgen addressing the letter to his brother reduces the possibility of any ulterior motives such as propaganda usage. Not only that, however, the fact that Kugelgen was a government official allied to Prussia may lead him to downplaying the magnitude of Prussian losses, however his acknowledgement that "our losses are significant" reinforces the usefulness of this source.

There is no doubt that source 4 is of partial use to the historian in analyzing factors contributing to Prussia's success in the unification of Germany 1866-1871. Pierre Jerome makes an insightful remark on the prevalence of political factors contributing to a united Germany, stating that the Zollverein parliament is a step closer to the absorption of Southern Germany. "a political counterpart to the economic might that the Zollverein had held since the 1830s where it already had over 26 million members. The Zollparliament would ultimately transform into the North German Confederation over time, and was

an indication of Prussia establishing itself as the political powerhouse of the German States, a title that Austria had long held through its dominating presence in the Federal Diet. Therefore, this is a valid point made by source 3, highlighting the importance of Prussia's newfound economic strength. Additionally, Terme comments on whether "France can look on quietly and witness this process of absorption quietly" which can be seen to be in reference to Prussia failing to keep to its promise in giving Luxembourg over to France in exchange for its lack of involvement in the Seven Years War, further demonstrating Prussia's skill in international relations that allowed for it to be so successful over this period. A limitation of this source is the fact that it is likely holding in an ulterior motive, with Terme, hoping to sway the British Ambassador into taking a more active role in Europe for the fear that even though "Germany is not an aggressive power now, it may become so in the future." Therefore, despite valid points being addressed, it is important to consider the worried tone attempting to be played by Prince Terme.

A significant difference between the two sources is the level of authority that they both possess. Although Kingdgen possesses some as a government official, this is dwarfed by the political authority that Prince Terme has, which can be argued to provide more use to the historian as a

result. However, the purpose of source 3 in its benign intention of merely providing a description of Prussian victory rather than the secondary motivations Jencks may have in persuading the British Ambassador to support France is another defence that instead leads credit towards source 3. Despite this, both sources hold similarities in highlighting the Nationalist forces responsible in German unification, with Jencks discussing the "30 million united under Prussian influence" and Kugelgen how his "house has been full of visitors from all classes" demonstrating a nationalist ideal.

In conclusion, both sources are of use in investigating reasons for German unification, hence the limitations that source 4 possesses in its ultra-nationalist views as well as the ~~strong~~ convincing nature of industrial and military might outlined in source 3 makes it ultimately more convincing.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a high Level 5 response. It uses the sources to make reasoned inferences about the reasons why Prussia was successful in unifying Germany in the years 1866-71 and validates them with use of contextual knowledge.



Always try to make inferences from the content of the source material. The mark scheme refers to the historical skill of making inferences from Level 2 onwards – progressing from making undeveloped inferences to reasoned inference that can be supported from the source and illuminated from contextual knowledge.

### Question 3

The question required candidates to respond to the suggestion that there was little significant challenge to the restored order in Italy in the years c1830-47.

There was some good knowledge of the period c1830-47 shown by candidates and most who answered this question were able to deploy their knowledge of the 1830-31 revolutions, the growth of nationalism and the attitude of society towards calls from liberals and nationalists for change. Many concentrated on the failures of those wanting change rather than also discussing the strengths of the restored order, which often meant that evaluation of the extent to which there was challenge difficult. As indicated in the Introduction, many responses effectively accepted the statement without evaluating the extent of the challenge to be able to discuss the focus on 'little' significance. The best responses were able to justify their agreement with clear awareness of the strengths of the restored order under the aegis of Metternich but in relation to the small gains and the growing reputation of Mazzini and others. There were a small but significant number of responses that included knowledge from 1848 but most were able to keep within the bounds of the date period of the question.

In 1815 the Treaty of Vienna restored the monarchies in Austria resulting in the restored order. This was challenged in the 1831/32 revolutions as well as by secret societies and nationalist organisations such as Young Italy. However, none of these challenges were significant, due to the strong oppression from Austria which did not allow any of these challenges to gain momentum.

↑ One challenge to the restored order was the 1831/32 revolutions. These occurred due to unrest caused by the oppressive rule of the Austrians in Modena and the Pope in the Papal States. Modena fought against oppression from the Austrians, inspired and encouraged by the French revolutions and their fight for freedom. They believed that France would come and support them, but Napoleon made it very clear that French troops would only be used for France. The uprising in

Modena was easily crushed by Austria as they lacked support and power. Another revolution occurred in the Papal states due to his oppressive rule and began with more success, a ~~new~~ constitution was set up in Bologna and the Pope's power wavered. However, the French came and put an end to the uprising, restoring the Pope's power because Napoleon ~~is~~ needed to be seen supporting the Pope due to the majority of France being Catholic, he did not want unrest in his own country. This gives evidence for challenge to the restored order, however it was of little significance due to the fact they were easily controlled and ended by more powerful countries such as France and Austria, who benefitted from the restored order.

A further challenge to the restored order is the formation of secret and national societies. One secret society that formed was the carbonari, who were against Austrian oppression and held meetings to discuss how they would deal with this and organise uprisings.

The first established national society was Young Italy, ~~established~~<sup>founded</sup> by Mazzini in 1831. This encouraged romantic ideas of unity, where Italy would be together again and worked on removing foreign opposition such as Austria, from Italy. ~~However, the problem with these~~ This shows a challenge to the restored order as they did not want the separate monarchies ~~ruled~~ ruling Italy, rather they wanted a united nation free from Austrian oppression. However, the problem with these organisations is that they were limited to the north, where there was more education with higher literacy rates. It failed to include those in poverty who made up the majority of the Italian population, especially in the south, and so ~~the~~ the movements failed to mobilise the masses. Therefore, although the Carbonari and Young Italy show a challenge to the restored order, they are not significant as few people took part, lessening the impact.

~~A~~ ~~challenge~~ A challenge ~~that~~ to the restored order began arising

from 1846-7, as tensions increased across Italy. In 1846, a new Pope, Pius IX was put in place and there was a hope that he would be liberal as he released up to 2000 people from prison in the Papal States. However, it soon became clear that he would continue the oppressive rule of the former Pope, causing disappointment and unrest at his new absolute rule. This unrest was further exaggerated by a poor harvest in 1847, which left many people starving and increased tensions around Italy as population was rising, making it harder to feed people. This tension was growing and would eventually lead to a great challenge to the restored order, however uprisings were not yet occurring and so it would remain accurate to say that there was little significant challenge to the restored order from 1830-47.

An important factor making it clear that no challenge to the restored order could be significant was the power of the Austrians. ~~The~~ Austria had a military base in Italy, the

quadrilateral, which enabled them to keep a large army in place, should they be needed to put down any uprisings or revolutions, hence the 1831/32 revolutions ended so swiftly. As long as Austria had power over the north, little could be done to significantly challenge restored order. It would only be with the help of foreign powers such as France and Prussia that Italy would be united. However, as this was the peak of Austrian power, from 1830-47 little could be done to challenge them, and the restored order which they supported.

Overall, there were challenges to the restored order from 1830-47, including ~~re~~ the 1831/32 revolutions and organisations such as young Italy, as well as oppressive conditions. However the foreign powers, especially Austria, ensured that the challenges to the restored order remained insignificant and no changes were made.



This is a mid-Level 4 response. Key issues relevant to the question indicate some exploration but they are dealt with almost as a list of key issues that either show challenges or lack of challenge to the restored order with a summary conclusion at the end but without clearly applying criteria to establish the extent of challenge. There is sufficient knowledge to meet most of the demands of the question.



To create a sustained exploration of the focus of the question always try to discuss the specific wording of the question, here 'little significant challenge'. A discussion of the extent of the impact of challenges to the restored order would allow for an overall judgement that discussed criteria for judgement.

## Question 4

The question required candidates to determine whether the unification process in the north of Italy in the years 1859-60 was very similar to the unification process that took place in the south of Italy in the years 1860-61.

There was some excellent knowledge shown in the responses for this question and some very interesting responses that were a pleasure to read. Candidates answered this from different perspectives and used different themes to discuss, most of which were relevant. When determining similarity, candidates focused on such areas as the role of Piedmont, the role of France, the intervention of foreign powers, the nature of the process (war, plebiscites, populist etc), the role of individuals and the political situation in 1861 itself. Some responses were not always logical and coherent, particularly in the discussion of the role of France or Cavour, but many were able really to analyse and explore (Level 4 and 5) rather than analyse and explain (Level 3). The contribution of Piedmont and the role of individuals were often dealt with very well indeed. There was very little description of events. The best responses were those that focused on the wording of the question to determine whether the two processes were 'very' similar.

The unification process in the North of Italy 1859-60 was certainly very similar to the unification process in the South in 1860-61 in terms of Piedmontese political involvement. In both cases the Italian nationalist played a role, although in the South Garibaldi took had a direct geographical impact through military action, whereas in the North the national society had a political impact through plebiscite organisation and peaceful revolutions. The biggest difference between the unification processes of the North and the South was the level of involvement of foreign powers, who directly contributed to Northern unification but had an indirect influence on Southern unification.

While Piedmont ~~also~~ similarly contributed to both Northern and Southern unification, their influence in the North was far more significant and had been a long-term endeavour. Cavour had ensured Piedmontese stability and improvement, as well as attracting foreign allies through investment in infrastructure. In 1855 he modernised the Port of Genoa, and in 1857 he built the Cavour Canal and began work on the Mont Cenis tunnel,

all with the financial aid of French bankers such as Rothschild and Lafitte. 280 million French francs were invested in Piedmontese railway in total. As well as making Piedmont an economically viable base on which to unify the North, combined with involvement in Crimea in 1855, it gave Piedmont the diplomatic standing to achieve the Pact of Plombières and secure a French ally, ~~who wanted to~~. In contrast, Piedmont's involvement in the unification of the South was highly last minute and short term, demonstrated by the fact that Cavour tried to have Garibaldi arrested before he could arrive in Sicily. The terms of the pact of Plombières also reveal that unification of the South was not planned. Nevertheless, they had a diplomatic, political involvement when they marched through the papal states to Naples and met Garibaldi at Teano in October, unifying the South with the North. ¶ For both northern and southern unification, Piedmont's infrastructure was necessary in order to make unification viable, and Piedmont's diplomacy led to the involvement of foreign powers which indirectly or directly impacted both unification processes. While they ~~was~~ led to the action of Nationalists in the North, Piedmont was reacting to Nationalist action in the South.

In both the Northern and Southern unification processes, Foreign involvement had a significant impact. However, this was far more influential in the North when France had a direct impact on geographical and political unity with their military aid. For example, at Solferino the Italian forces didn't reach <sup>the battle of</sup> Magenta until nightfall when most of the fighting had been done by the French, and similarly at Solferino the French were largely responsible for the 21 000 Austrian casualties. As well as this geographical positive influence on unification, ~~the~~ Napoleon III also controlled the pace and extent of unification, by agreeing to ~~only give + cede~~ ~~back~~ stop at Lombardy and leave Venetia with the Austrians at the Treaty of Villafranca in July 1859 and the Treaty of Zurich in November. On the other hand, in the Southern unification process <sup>foreign powers</sup> ~~they~~ had a far less significant role. British gunboats allowed Garibaldi to safely land in Sicily, indirectly contributing to his conquest of the South and Geographical unity. The fact that King Ferdinand II of Naples couldn't count on Austrian reinforcements due to the Northern unification process and fighting the French also contributed <sup>indirectly</sup> to Garibaldi's success. Clearly, the role of foreign powers was far more important in terms of northern unification.

but in both processes it <sup>similarly</sup> enabled the Italian Nationalists to have more success.

While Italian Nationalists played a role in both unification processes, they had a far more significant, direct impact over Southern unification. In the North, the National Society carried out peaceful revolutions in Modena, the central duchies, and a provisional government was set up in Modena and Parma run by Farini. However, he ran all major decisions through the Turin government, making the role of Nationalists heavily influenced by Piedmont. ~~Although they were only able to carry on~~ Furthermore, the French military support prevented Austria from crushing the revolts, and the Treaty of Turin was what allowed the National Society to coordinate annexation to Piedmont. In this way, for the North, the role of Nationalists was less important than Piedmont or foreign powers. In contrast, in the South, Nationalists had a direct impact on Geographical unification. Garibaldi arrived in Sicily in May 1860, with ~~100~~ 1200 supporters, a figure which grew with Piedmontese reinforcements, peasants and the Mafia. He beat a Neapolitan force of 20 000 before crossing the straits of Calabria in August and becoming Dictator of Sicily and Naples with his now 60 000 volunteers. Clearly, ~~Garibaldi was~~

For Southern unification Italian Nationalists were ~~more~~ ~~to~~ had the most significant direct impact of on Geographical unification. However, there was low resistance in Naples - one battalion surrendered to 6 Garibaldini who were lost, likely a result of Austrian preoccupation with France. Although for both unification processes foreign involvement enabled their success, this was to a far lesser extent in the South. One similarity however is Italian nationalists both contributed to Geographical unity, and through the participation of Piedmont, political unity.

In conclusion, the biggest similarity between the two unification processes is the involvement of Piedmont in the organisation of political unity, although they had planned in the long term for the north while had to react in the short term for the South. The biggest difference is that in Northern ~~unity~~ ~~geo~~ unification, geographical unity was achieved primarily through <sup>the involvement of</sup> foreign powers whereas in the Southern unification process it was through the actions of Italian nationalists.



This is a Level 5 response. The candidate has chosen specific themes to discuss rather than describing or explaining the process – there is a sustained discussion as to whether the process in the South and the process in the North were very similar. The argument is well-organised with a logical cohesion and the different themes being discussed are used to move across paragraphs with both the introduction and the conclusion evaluating the extent of similarity.



Strong responses often have an introduction which clearly shows an understanding of the conceptual focus of the question and outlines argument that is being made.

## Question 5

The question required candidates to determine whether railway building was the most significant feature of the economic and social development of Germany in the 1840s.

Most candidates had a sound knowledge of the economic and social development in the 1840s, although some did use less relevant knowledge of the situation in Prussia in the 1850s. The majority of candidates were able to discuss railway building in relation to other features such as urbanisation, industrialisation, the *Zollverein*, social and economic divisions and the growth of the middle class. The best responses were aware that the question required a discussion of the relative impact of railway building in relation to other features rather than just an explanation or description of other features with a judgement made solely in the conclusion. Some responses argued that railway building was of great significance both in the creation of wealth and in its impact on society, while others argued that the *Zollverein* had a greater overall impact geographically. A significant number of responses referred to political developments but for these to be relevant there needed to be some discussion of the link to economy and society of the 1840s.

During the 1840's, the German confederation <sup>and</sup> underwent significant economic and social developments which led to greater co-operation between states and an increase in overall power/size. These important ~~developments~~ <sup>features of economic/social</sup> developments consisted of railway building, the Zollverein and ~~industrialisation~~ urbanisation in towns.

When analysing which of these ~~factors~~ features was the most significant they must be critiqued on whether they led to greater co-operation between states or not. <sup>as this was a key issue in Germany</sup> In my opinion, I disagree to a fair extent that the most significant feature was railway building, as whilst it led to growth, it was underpinned by the Zollverein.

Firstly, railway building was shown to be relatively significant as it <sup>expanded across states</sup> expanded economies. For example, between 1840-45, there was huge growth within railways as they expanded across many states. This meant that trading of goods was now ~~much~~ <sup>far</sup> greater.

and occurred between multiple states in the German confederation, as they now had the opportunity to expand economies between states through fast trading e.g. niche markets like 'soft fruits' grew significantly. This then led to greater economic co-operation between states meaning states within Germany felt greater unity together. Whilst it could be argued that this trading was mainly only prevalent in the North and less in the South as Austria maintained an economic sphere of influence over southern states, it nonetheless still helped improve co-operation, even if slightly limited in the South. Therefore, railway building was a relatively significant feature, but not the 'most'.

Then, the Zollverein is demonstrated to be the most significant as it underpinned co-operation and railway building between states. For example, by 1836 the Zollverein covered an area of 26 million people in the confederation and this number only increased by the 1840s. As the Zollverein was a free trade customs union, ~~this~~ this shows how states were extremely inclined to trade with other states due to

the benefits that free trade offered them e.g., no tariffs. This therefore meant the Zollverein led to increasing economic co-operation between states and also underpinned railway building, as no states would've been inclined to invest in railways for trading if they weren't given the economic benefits <sup>of free trade</sup> that the Zollverein offered. Therefore, whilst it can be said the Zollverein was limited as Austria remained separate from it, it nonetheless still had a tremendous impact and can be considered as the 'most' significant feature.

Finally, ~~the~~ the development of urbanisation within industrial towns is shown to be a slightly significant feature as it led to increased co-operation amongst the public. For example, public events like the Lower Rhine festival grew to become more common. ~~These~~ These events developed in highly condensed urban areas, which meant ~~that~~ public citizens began to socially interact more and spread ideas between them. This is also helped by urbanisation helping to increase literacy rates amongst the public, meaning they could effectively vocalise their opinions better and read newspapers like the Rheinisch Zeitung. This therefore led to

greater conversing amongst the public and greater co-operation. However, whilst it led to co-operation in the public, this was largely localised to that specific urban area meaning it had little effect at increasing co-operation between states. Therefore, urbanisation is only a slightly significant feature.

In conclusion, I ~~think that~~ disagree to a fair extent that railway building was the most significant feature of the economic and social development of Germany in the 1840s. This is because, whilst it help expand economies to improve economic-co-operation between states, ~~the~~ the actual building of the railways only occurred due to <sup>states'</sup> ~~the~~ attraction <sup>to</sup> of free trade abilities in the Zollverein, meaning railway building would've never occurred without the Zollverein.



This is a mid-Level 4 response. There is explanation and some exploration of a number of features of the social and economic development in Germany in the 1840s, including the given feature of railway building. There is sufficient knowledge to meet most of the demands of the question. The overall judgment makes some pertinent points with regard to the question under discussion. However, if these points had been made directly in the main body of the response, then a more sustained exploration would have been seen.



When addressing the focus of the question rather than writing about the key features or issues try to explore and discuss the significance of the key features in relation to each other.

## Question 6

This was the less popular of the two essay questions but was still attempted by a significant number of candidates, most of whom were able to bring some impressive knowledge to the question. The question required candidates to respond to the situation that the political situation in Germany in 1851 was very similar to the political situation in Germany in 1840.

Most candidates were aware that the question required a comparison of the situation in 1840 to that of 1851 and most pointed out that, despite the revolutionary fervour of 1847-48, there was little outward difference in the political situation; Austria was still the leading state with Prussia subordinate, the German Confederation was still in existence and conservative government was the norm. The best responses were able to take this outward similarity and test whether the situation was, however, 'very' similar and came to the conclusion that the events of the 1840s had led to differences that were sometime obvious and at other more nuanced. Reference was made to the subtle shift in relation between Austria and Prussia, the fragility of Austria and the extent to which conservative governments co-opted elements of liberalism and, particularly, nationalism to survive. Most responses used knowledge of the 1848-49 revolutions to support their arguments but the extent to which this was relevant depended on the links being made to the political situation in 1840 and 1851. Some weaker responses described the events of 1848-49 with only implied relevance. There were some very enjoyable and interesting responses to read.

The situation in Germany politically <sup>in 1851</sup> can be considered as similar to the one in 1840. Austria in the 1840s was the dominant state politically and in 1851 it further demonstrated ~~some of~~ its <sup>continued</sup> superiority with the Punctation of Olmütz. However there were ~~other~~ changes that had occurred like the revolution in 1848 that can be said to have had an impact on the political situation in Germany. ~~the~~ On the other hand on the whole the situation was similar politically as it remained the German Confederation in both 1840 + 1851 with Austria being dominant politically and nationalism at a low.

Firstly the political situation in Germany in 1840 can be considered to be similar to the one in 1851. If we look ~~at~~ from the perspective of Austria for example who was the most dominant state in the 1840s politically. Through the influence of people like Metternich, ~~who was~~ similarly in 1851 Austria had shown that it still was very dominant politically. This was shown by the

Austria won as it managed to gain the support of many more states, the majority, in its views for a <sup>Gross</sup> ~~klein~~ Deutschland than Prussia. Prussia's Union Plan for a Kleindeutschland wasn't supported in comparison. Further in the Punctation of Olmütz in 1850 Austria ~~showed~~ had a massive diplomatic victory over Prussia, with the backing of Russia it got Prussia to abandon its Prussian Union Plan. This provides evidence of Austria's strength politically and how in ~~the~~ 1840s and 1851 Austria was the dominant state politically in Germany.

On the other hand the political situation in Germany could be considered to be very different in 1851 to the one in 1840. This is due to the 1848 revolutions that occurred. The political climate of Germany changed ~~after~~ ~~not in~~ ~~was~~ ~~massive~~ in certain ways after it. The feudal system was gone by 1851, whilst in 1840 it was an important part of how the states

were ruled, with the peasants being all agriculturally and obeying the leaders of the states. Further after the revolutions of 1848 the monarchs realized that they had to ~~metre~~ modernise their leaderships in some way to accommodate the changing times. Further ~~there~~ was ~~more~~ ~~as~~ Germany after 1848 didn't have people such as Metternich. In 1851 he was gone. He was a vital influence in ~~the~~ 1840 in ensuring that the people were controlled, suppressing liberalistic ideas. By the use of things like the Carlsbad Decrees. However this oppressive censorship was less evident ~~to~~ in 1851.

However ~~and~~ people although there were some changes to the political climate after the 1848 revolutions, ~~it still~~ by 1851 it could be argued that it was still similar to that of 1840.

Although there were many liberal concessions in 1848 ~~as~~ as a way to appease the revolutionaries, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ 1849 a lot of these were reversed and there was even less liberalism

then before. So it went back to how it was in ~~the~~ 1840 by 1851, the political situation was similar.

~~Now~~ ~~the~~ ~~over~~ ~~head~~ Further we could say that ~~the~~ 1840 and 1851 were similar times politically in terms of nationalism. In 1840 nationalism was ~~a~~ something that some wanted and others were less enthusiastic, but it didn't seem feasible at the time. Although nationalism in 1848 was very high and in 1849 with the Prussian Union Plan it seemed feasible that there would be some unifying ~~of~~ politically by 1851 this was not so. In 1851 the German Confederation was returned to how it was before the 1848 was with the Puncturation of Olmütz destroying ideas of Prussian Union Plan. And Austria wasn't able to enact its Grossdeutschland plan so it remained as the German Confederation, the same as how it was in 1840. ~~Also~~ Also with the Failures of the Frankfurt Parliament to bring

about unification it further brought down peoples belief in a potential unification that there was in 1848. Although they did end up making a decision on a constitution it was too late and was not accepted by the states. So in 1851 nationalism was not its ideas was not at a low, similar to that of 1840, it was there but lacking in strength. So politically the views were similar in both 1840 and 1851.

To conclude the political situation on the whole was similar in 1851 to that of 1840. Although there were some shifts due to the 1848 revolutions ~~on~~ in its entirety the situation had more similarities than differences. Austria remained the dominant state politically in both 1840 and 1851 and Germany remained the German Confederation with each state having its own influences politically ~~in~~ in both 1851 and 1840.



This is a low Level 5 response. The response engages with focus of the question throughout and explores the extent to which the political situation in 1840 was similar to 1851. There is a clear awareness that what is required is an understanding of what the situation was like in 1840, what the situation was like in 1851, what was similar and what was different. There is some nuanced understanding of the changes in the relationship between Austria and Prussia and that although the situation might have appeared similar, this was not necessarily so.



When addressing a similarity or difference question it is always a good idea to plan your answer so that you can see nuances in the situation. Quite often questions refer to very similar, markedly different etc and it is the subtleties of the situation that often determine the extent of similarity or difference.

## Paper Summary

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

### Section A

- Candidates should read the question carefully and ensure that they directly address the focus of the enquiry in their comments
- Candidates should aim to draw out reasoned and developed inferences that go beyond comprehension and summary of the sources
- Candidates should read the caption carefully so that they can make full use of it when evaluating the sources
- Contextual knowledge should be used to illuminate and discuss what is in the source, rather than provide an answer to the enquiry. Long descriptions of linked events are unlikely to gain much, if any, credit
- Candidates should ensure that their responses address the demands of all elements of the mark scheme.

### Section B

- Candidates must provide precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses generally lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues rather than merely present a list of factors
- Candidates should ensure that they deal with both sides of an argument where the question requires this.

## **Grade boundaries**

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

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

