



Examiners' Report **June 2024**

GCE History 9HI0 2D

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2024

Publications Code 9HI0_2D_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

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, c 1830-70 (2D.1) and The Unification of Germany, c 1840-71 (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. There continues to be an increase this year in the number of scripts that were seen that posed problems for examiners with a lack of legibility of handwriting, some of which were almost entirely indecipherable. Examiners are only able to give credit for what they can read. There did seem this summer to be evidence of a greater number of candidates using the language of the mark scheme in their responses. However, many of these responses were not doing what they claimed to be doing and it was felt that generally this was not a very helpful approach. There was also some evidence this summer of a number of candidates abbreviating words that should not be abbreviated in formal written English, eg the use of gov instead of government. This is not a development that is welcomed.

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 continues to be disappointing to have to note that a number of candidates do not explicitly address the focus of the enquiry, but rather discussed issues arising from the sources in general terms. This question requires candidates to use the sources ‘together’ and most candidates are now able to deal with this reasonably well. Approaches on how using the two sources together do vary, but that is perfectly acceptable, as long as it is present. Some candidates still continue to use their contextual knowledge to describe events in great detail, rather than using it to illuminate and/or challenge and to discuss the sources. This sometimes resulted in candidates not evaluating the sources adequately. In other cases, candidates might offer up little or, on occasion, 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.

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. It continues to be the case that there are a number of responses that have 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 counter argument, 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 continue to 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.

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 a clear understanding of the second order concepts being assessed in Section B. There were some particularly strong responses in Section A to Q1 and examiners noted that many were interesting and enjoyable to read.

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 candidate performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1

Candidates were required to evaluate two sources together (Source 1 – letters written by Cavour to Count Nigra in 1860 & Source 2 – a banned pamphlet written by a radical politician published in 1861) in relation to an enquiry into Cavour’s response to Garibaldi’s expedition to the south in 1860.

There were some extremely strong responses to this enquiry with most candidates not only being able to make reasoned inferences from the Sources but also having considerable contextual knowledge to both illuminate and challenge the veracity of the Sources. There was some very nuanced understanding of the underlying politics within both Sources including the potential subtext of the French reactions to Garibaldi’s expedition in Source 1 and the true bias from which Brofferio’s pamphlet was probably written. There was very little basic evaluation in relation to the letters being written by Cavour himself or the pamphlet being written by an opponent of Cavour but a clear understanding of the historical context in which Cavour was writing and Brofferio was criticising. Most candidates were able to use the Sources together either in shedding light on contrasting elements of Cavour’s attitude – pragmatism or jealousy/vengefulness – or in corroborating events such as the use of the Piedmontese navy and the attempts to prevent Garibaldi reaching the Neapolitan mainland. Better responses were able to weigh up the relative usefulness of the Sources with most coming to the conclusion that, even when taking into consideration the historical context, Cavour’s letters held more weight than the pamphlet. Weaker responses often answered the enquiry, using the Sources as evidence rather than evaluating the utility of the evidence provided in the Sources.

This is a Level 5 responses.

From Source 1 it can be inferred that Cavour was forced to take a pragmatic approach when responding to Garibaldi's expedition to the south in 1860. This can be seen where he states 'the Piedmontese government is in no condition to deal with the enormous unpopularity that arresting Garibaldi would have caused'. Indeed, this can be verified by wider historical context as Cavour was fearful that acting openly against Garibaldi would be a dangerous and detrimental tactic, as it would have upset the National Society in Piedmont who had been so instrumental in helping Cavour during the Second Italian War of Independence. As well as this, Garibaldi was incredibly popular amongst the peasants, which was evident as his initial force of 1,000 men grew to 14,000 by the time he reached the mainland. Hence, this evidence reinforces Cavour's view of the 'enormous unpopularity' which Garibaldi's arrest would have caused, which strengthens the usefulness of this source for the investigation. The ~~to~~ origin of this source is extremely useful for this enquiry as it was written by Cavour himself as the events were unfolding during May and ~~April~~^{August} 1860 as Garibaldi ~~travelling~~^{conquered} through the South. Therefore, it provides insight into Cavour's reactions to the events as they occurred; there is a sense of immediacy to the source which contributes to its usefulness. As well as this, the tone of the source is useful in displaying Cavour's contempt and dislike for Garibaldi and his radical behaviour ~~as to see~~ which can be seen where he refers to Garibaldi's 'reckless escapade'. ~~Thus~~. Thus, it is evident that the tone of this

Source strengthens its utility for this enquiry. Furthermore, the source suggests that Cavour was desperate to regain control of the situation when it says, 'It is my first duty to the King and Italy to do everything possible to prevent Garibaldi's success in Naples'. This can be corroborated by wider context as Cavour sent men to Naples to try and provoke a revolution before Garibaldi arrived to the mainland, so that Piedmont could intervene on the grounds of protecting Naples from unrest. Hence, this supports the statement of the source which gives it more weight for this investigation. The purpose and nature of this source also reinforce its utility, as the nature of the source is personal letters written to Count Nigra, a ~~the~~ close friend of Cavour and his representative in France. ~~As such,~~ the private nature of the letters may indicate that Cavour did not withhold his true reaction to Garibaldi's expedition and was able to be more candid. ^{However,} ~~As well as this,~~ the purpose of the letters was to inform Nigra of Cavour's response who would likely have relayed it to those in France. Therefore, Cavour may have had an agenda to ~~emphasise~~ emphasise his efforts to thwart Garibaldi in order to reassure the Catholic French that Cavour would stop Garibaldi before he marched on Rome. Therefore, the ^{private} nature of the letters as well as the purpose indicates that Cavour was determined to reassure the French and not hold back on his dislike for Garibaldi. Overall, this source has weight for this enquiry as many of its claims can be backed up by wider evidence.

From Source 2 it can be inferred that Cavour intervened in order to hinder the success of Garibaldi's expedition to the south.

This can be seen where it states 'he passionately desired its failure'. Indeed, this is corroborated by wider context as Cavour refused to equip Garibaldi's volunteers with guns which meant that they were poorly armed, which supports the viewpoint of the source that Cavour tried to deliberately exacerbate Garibaldi's chances of success. As well as this, Source 2 indicates that Cavour's response to Garibaldi's success was an attempt to take the focus off of Garibaldi to reduce the strength of his impact. This is evident where it says 'now that Garibaldi's name shines with immortal glory in Sicily, all Cavour's efforts are distracted to diminishing its brilliancy'. Indeed, Cavour immediately sent Forni to Sicily after Garibaldi conquered Sicily in order to raise support for annexation to Piedmont. Hence, this strengthens the usefulness of the source as it reinforces the idea that Cavour endeavoured to ~~to~~ return the focus on Piedmont as the successful state rather than allow Garibaldi's personal 'glory' to continue to grow in strength. However, the origin of this source raises questions over its veracity, as it was written by Brofferio and published in 1861. As Brofferio was a radical politician, writing about the expedition to the South after Italy was united ^{according to} Cavour's vision rather than Garibaldi's more radical hopes, he is likely to have exaggerated Cavour's ^{negative response} ~~role~~ due to Brofferio's personal dislike of Cavour's ideology and his aversion to how Italy was united. As well as this, the tone of the source is extremely negative as he refers to Cavour ~~as~~ sarcastically as the 'great diplomat', and the purpose of the pamphlet was to give a 'true' account of Cavour's career and therefore had a clear agenda to belittle and criticise Cavour in order to expose his true

motives. This can be seen as the source was threatening enough to be banned by the Piedmontese government. Therefore, this raises questions over the nature, ~~and~~ purpose and origin of the source, which weakens its usefulness for this enquiry.

When used together, both sources suggest that Cavour felt threatened by Garibaldi's popularity, as in Source 1 Cavour ~~seems~~^{is} concerned about Garibaldi as the 'absolute master' of the situation, whereas Source 2 similarly refers to Garibaldi's 'glory' and 'brilliance'. As well as this, Source 1 corroborates Brofferio's claim in Source 2 that Cavour sought to 'deprive Garibaldi of the chance of glory in Naples', as Source 1 illustrates Cavour's attempts to cause unrest in Naples in order to foil Garibaldi's plans. Furthermore, both sources indicate that Cavour was wary of foreign opinion which informed his response to Garibaldi's expedition, as Source 2 states that Cavour was 'fearful of the messages coming from Paris'. This ~~is~~ supports the reasoning for Cavour's adamant opposition to Garibaldi's actions. As in Source 1 Cavour was writing to his French representative. Finally, both sources show when used together that Cavour was constantly responding to Garibaldi's actions and tried to maintain a pragmatic approach by keeping Piedmont's interests in mind by taking back control of the situation in 'order to make Italy as he wants it to be'. Thus, it is undeniable that it is useful to use both sources together to exemplify Cavour's attitudes and responses to Garibaldi's expedition.

In conclusion, there is value in using both sources together to investigate Cavour's response to Garibaldi's invasion of the south, as both sources indicate that Cavour was determined to act as a barrier to Garibaldi's success, whilst also elucidating Cavour's attempt to appease the foreign power of France and his wariness at Garibaldi's popularity. However, Source 1 has more weight for this enquiry when used on its own due to its origin as it was written by Cavour as the events were unfolding and thus illustrates his immediate reactions, as well as the fact that it can be corroborated by wider evidence. Whilst the claims made in Source 2 also stand up to scrutiny, it is less useful on its own as the overtly critical ^{and negative} tone and its purpose to criticise Cavour on a widespread level indicates that it may have exaggerated and therefore be more limited for this enquiry. Therefore, undeniably it is useful to use both sources together to ^{provide a} complete view of Cavour's response to the expedition.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response considers both Sources in relation to the enquiry about Cavour's response to Garibaldi's expedition to the south in 1860. It makes reasoned inferences that substantiated and deploys contextual knowledge to evaluate the Sources. In particular, it shows an understanding of the values and concerns of the society from which the Sources are drawn to determine the weight of the Sources in relation to each other.



In the conclusion, this response takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement. In judging the utility of the Sources take time to consider how useful the Sources are in relation to each other.

Question 2

Candidates were required to evaluate two sources together (Source 3 – a letter written by peasants from West Prussia printed in a Berlin newspaper in May 1848 & Source 4 – a message sent by Major Huyn of the Austrian Army to the leader of the Austrian government, Prince Schwarzenberg, in March 1849) in relation to an enquiry into the reasons for the success of the German counter-revolutions in the years 1848-49.

There were a wide variety of responses to the enquiry ranging from weaker Level 2 responses, where the Sources were comprehended rather than evaluated, through Levels 3 and 4 – with more evaluation of the usefulness of the Sources often using either provenance or content rather than both – to Level 5 responses that were able use the two Sources together to come to a reasoned judgement as to the utility of the Sources in relation to the enquiry. Some weaker responses confused the counter-revolutions of the period 1848-49 with the revolutions of the period. Although this is a complex period of political history, the period of revolution followed by counter-revolution is a central aspect of the events of the time and the concept of counter-revolution is clearly outlined in the specification in Key Topic 2 BP1, 2 and 3 in relation to the Frankfurt Assembly and events in Prussia and Austria.

The majority of candidates were aware of the events of the counter-revolutions and were able to show how the Sources were useful together in highlighting that the counter-revolutions were successful due to different aspects of conservatism within the German states both from above – the reassertion of the military power of the German monarchies – and below – the wariness towards the urban liberal revolutionaries of the German peasantry. Reasoned inferences were made from Source 3 about the disappointment of the peasantry with the actions of the revolutionaries in Berlin and their treatment of the King of Prussia and from Source 4 in relation to both the strength of the counter-revolutionary forces and the apathy of the revolutionary parliament when confronted by force. Source 4 is a good example of why it is important to read all of the source, as many were able to make excellent use of the phrase 'Power had made its impression.' Most candidates felt that Source 4 carried more weight than Source 3, as it was clearly an official message sent in the immediate aftermath of events whereas Source 3 was a letter of threatening intent that did not come to fruition. Some candidates asserted that Source 3 was of no use at all as there was no peasant attack on Berlin but stronger responses understood that the source could be mined for useful inferences about the reactions of non-revolutionary lower class supporters to the events that were unfolding in Prussia at the time.

Both of the responses below are higher Level responses that show an understanding of the reasons for the success of the counter-revolutions in Germany and use their contextual knowledge to illuminate what can be gained from the content of the source material. Both responses show an understanding of the use of military by conservative forces to re-establish their power after the initial successes of the revolutions in the German states and that there was some disillusion from within the lower classes, as shown by the reaction of the West Prussian peasantry.

Both source 3 and (a) source 4 can give useful insight to the reasons of success of German counter-revolutions in the years 1848-49. They cite the various reasons of failure of the initial revolution (lacking general support & authority) & the contrasting successes of the counter-revolutionaries. The revolution^s of 1848-49 were spread across Germany & were predominantly inspired by liberal & pan-German nationalist ideals. Their failure can be cited & seen by these sources, as appearing from a lack of unity & authority.

Source 4 argues that a reason for the success of the counter-revolutions in the years 1848-49 can be credited to the military authority of the counter-revolutionaries (& the lack of military authority for the initial revolutionaries. This is best demonstrated in the quotes, "most of the soldiers occupied the entrances to all the offices," &

"~~They~~ ^{bitterly angry} (Members of Parliament) all accepted the situation. Power had made its impression." The quotes show that the counter revolutionaries had imposed the conservative constitution of Franz Josef through the occupation & suppression of the revolutionary ~~of~~ parliament. The ~~excess~~ liberal revolutionaries failed to resist & "all accepted the situation". It is clear that the liberal revolutionaries lacked military authority to impose their ideals & as referenced from Source 3, lacked general support from parts of the public to form their own military militia. The strength of the counter-revolutionaries military is a clear reason, outlined in Source 4, for their success. It is further reinforced by the fact that Prussian & Austrian ~~to~~ armies refused to swear oath to the liberalist & nationalist Frankfurt Parliament. Therefore Source 4 could be greatly useful to an historian investigating the ~~excess~~ reasons for the success of the counter-revolutionaries, ~~it gives~~ giving insight to their military ~~and supremacy~~ & therefore ~~supremacy~~ ^{revolutionaries} over the liberal ~~authorities~~. However,

The source comes ^{from} ~~ess~~ a ~~noted~~ Austrian military major to the Austrian ~~as~~ just minister. It is likely that the major is ~~to~~ exaggerating the success of the Parliamentary takeover & the extent that the Members of Parliament were suppressed in order to further his own career. An exaggerated success would improve his own perception & so the true extent of ~~liberal~~ counter-revolutionary success may be overstated. However, the source remains reliable as it does not indicate a ~~to~~ failure of ~~the~~ counter-revolutionaries & ~~so~~ the major is unlikely to entirely lie as it would compromise his entire career if the truth was revealed. Therefore, ~~to~~ Source 4 still remains greatly useful to finding out the reasons for counter-revolutionary success 1848-49.

Source 3 is useful in investigating the reasons for success of the German counter-revolutionaries in the years 1848-49, due to the division & isolation of the liberal revolutionaries. Source

3 indicates the liberal revolutionaries to be ~~widely~~ unpopular as it states, "We peasants are not going to feed you any more or be ruined by you & your revolutionary brotherhood." The quote clearly indicates that the liberal revolution failed to attract the support from the wider peasantry. The liberal revolution was Source 3 also shows that the liberal revolution was under the threat of starvation from the counter-revolutionary farmers, which would have destroyed both the morale & the effectiveness of the liberal revolution. As Source 4 highlights, without army control, the liberal revolutionaries couldn't control the general peasantry & so counter-revolutionary sentiment in the peasantry could be openly expressed, further supporting & causing the success of the counter revolution. Historical evidence reinforces his point as even the liberal revolutionaries themselves lacked unity with divides occurring between Prussian & Austrian liberals over a letter

Kleindeutschland or Grossdeutschland decision as well as the left liberals retiring from the Frankfurt Parliament over its decision to approve Prussia's Danish peace treaty. Such divide among the liberal revolutionaries & the peasantry, the success of the counter-revolutionaries could be more easily achieved. However, ~~this~~ Source 3 derives from a letter from ~~peasants~~ ~~from~~ ~~the~~ agricultural area of West Prussia.

Although their sentiment is obvious, it may be confined to only that region & not represent broader counter-revolutionary feeling across Germany. ~~the~~ Source 3, although a powerful insight to how the counter-revolution succeeded through general ~~peasant~~ peasant support & threatened food supply to the liberal revolutionaries, can only be useful to some extent due to the limited nature of the Source.

Source 3 & Source 4 can be

compared to give a greatly useful insight to the successes of the counter-revolutions between 1848-49. Both arise from different areas of Germany (West Prussia ~~and~~ Vienna) & so indicate that counter-revolutionary sentiment was somewhat widespread & successful across Germany. However, the sources indicate different causes & for counter-revolutionary success. Source 4 promotes the argument that counter-revolutionary success was militaristic & broadly a state response to liberal uprising. This is because of the use of the military & reflects nothing of the feeling of the wider public.

Instead Source 3 prompts an idea of general refusal of the liberal revolution ~~or~~ by the peasantry. It is, however, more likely that Source 3 gives better reasoning ~~to~~ counter-revolutionary success in Germany as in Prussia Friedrich William IV initially accepted liberal reform & once liberal sentiment had ~~been~~ declined he instated his authority with the army.

In conclusion a historian could make great use of Source 3 & 4 to investigate the reasons for the success of counter-revolution in the years 1848-49. Although both are somewhat limited by their nature, they can be combined to give a powerful insight to general public sentiment & the authority of counter-revolutionaries. Historical evidence may better reinforce the point reflected in Source 4 but both sources are useful to understand the failures of the liberal revolutionaries & therefore the success of the counter-revolutionaries.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Here the responses identifies Source 4 as highlighting the use of the military and Source 3 as highlighting the divisions amongst the liberal revolutionaries.



The response here evaluates Source 4 before Source 3 and then goes on to discuss the usefulness of the Sources together. It does not matter in which order the Sources are evaluated – they can be evaluated in numerical order or vice versa or evaluated together throughout.

Please see the introductory comment above.

Source 3 would be useful to a historian to investigate the reasons for success of German counter-revolutions in the years 1848-9 to a good extent. This is because lower class members of society had been suffering under the ruling elites, and the source shows a strong and real desire for change. The quote "We peasants are not going to feed you any more or be ruined by you" which I can infer means that ^{peasants are reminded of} ~~peasants feel they are~~ ^{the new republican power in Berlin.} ~~being treated as a servant by the aristocracy, and refuse to produce their food for them.~~ This would be useful to a historian because this frustration can be backed up by the German 1846-7 economic crisis. I know that there was an extreme potato famine between 1845 and 1849.

This would have made potatoes and other typically affordable foods too expensive to buy and thus ~~thousands of peasants'~~ ^{triggered a desperate "ransack the Prussian State Treasury" as mentioned in} ~~fact it would be more likely to be looted.~~ This shows a ^{the same} success of German counter-revolutions because it highlights

the anger and threatening response from ^{anti-revolutionaries} ~~the newspapers~~. This is useful due to over fifty Prussian farmers refusing to sell their produce to ~~the elites due to high taxes under aristocratic rule~~ ^{any members of the 'Hoch Rentier' as lower classes disorganised on how Prussia should be run.}

Furthermore, Source 3 quotes "Your city of robbers' caves will be abandoned in a hundred places at once" again this shows how the poorer classes revolted by using physical violence

through each other, depicting the success of revolutionaries taking Berlin.
~~towards the Prussian government. I can infer this as~~
a Berlin newspaper - despite being biased towards the
revolutionaries - would not print something with no
truth to it. I can back this quote up because the 1848
European revolutions inspired Germany's 'March' revolution -
the Berlin military killed around 250 people forcefully
dispersing crowds. Overall, source 3 is useful because it
explains ^{*} ~~the reasoning behind the lower classes' resentment~~
~~of the government and explains how they plan to revolt.~~
~~However, you could argue it fails to detail any successes.~~
~~Although, being a source from 1848, it was also written~~
~~using primary research, enhancing the credibility of evidence~~
~~collected at the time. However, if anti-revolutionaries were so~~
~~angry, the revolution was successful. I know this because Prussia~~
~~introduced a more liberal constitution in 1850.~~
Therefore, counter-revolutions failed.
Source 4 is useful because it shows the success of the
Austrian military in keeping the Austrian ~~elite~~ ^{of}
elites in power. ~~power~~ The quote "Manifesto of Emperor
Francis Joseph was then needed to the globe" ^{implies} ~~implies~~ that
the ruler of Austria had consolidated his power. I can back
this up because I know that the royal families were in
charge of Austria in the time period 1848-9. However, the
source ~~is biased~~ ^{also mentions} because it mentions that the parliament
had to be moved to a different location, suggesting that
~~despite revolutionary pressure~~, revolutionary pressure wanted
to create a more liberal constitution. Overall, this would
be useful to a historian because it shows that

The revolutionaries were successful in creating a new constitution, implying that parliament felt pressure to change legislation. It also mentions how revolutionaries successfully re forced Austria to use military force against them, implying they were threatening enough to receive harsh resistance in the form of an oppressive constitution and military violence.

The quote "agreed command to dissolve the Parliament" can back up these historical events, as the Austrian parliament needed to be safe from the 1848 revolution that spread across Europe. The source is useful because it explains a moving of parliament away from Vienna - the biggest revolutionary target in the country due to its status as capital.

Sources 3 and 4 can both be used to investigate the success of German counter-revolutions. Source 3 shows that despite the lower classes being associated with revolutionaries - many peasants supported the existing parliament in Berlin, mentioning "Your liberty has forced the King of Prussia to flee the country." However, it fails to mention the 1850 more liberal Prussian constitution.

Source 4 builds on this as it also details the powerful escaping revolutionaries, but shows a success of counter-revolutionaries as "Power had made its expression" regarding that despite masses of parliament fleeing revolution in 1848.

they remained in power.

In conclusion, source 3 shows how ~~different classes~~ ~~and states~~ ~~views~~ counter-revolutionaries were planned, however ~~wholly~~ doesn't detail the effectiveness of ~~emproassards'~~ attempts at quelling the Prussian revolution. Source 4 shows the success of counter revolutionaries, and is also useful to the historian as it ~~is~~ mentions a conservative's new manifesto remaining official, and members of parliament being in charge shows no change to the states gov. Thus, highlighting the failure of counter-revolutionaries, ~~as I know~~ ^{however} Austria's parliament in 1849 disregarded the 1848-9 Frankfurt Union's failed attempt to establish a united German government. This means that source 4 is useful, but limited as it doesn't mention this information as its a major factor in the creation of Austria's new parliament.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Please see the introductory comment above.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

It is important to select material from the Sources to substantiate reasoned inferences.

Question 3

Of the two Italy questions, Q3 was the less popular. Candidates were expected to determine the extent to which they agreed with the statement that, in the years 1830-58, Italian liberals and nationalists had as much success as they had failure.

There were some excellent answers to this question and there were very few responses below Level 3. Candidates generally used the statement as a basis for discursive and exploratory analysis of the successes and failures of the Italian liberals and nationals. Weaker responses tended to generalise about revolutionary ideals and rarely ventured beyond 1849 but gave some good explanations of the successes and failures of the 1830 and 1848-49 revolutions. Stronger responses were able to distinguish between short-term successes and longer-term failures with an awareness of legacy of the 1848-49 revolutions segueing into the politics of the 1850s, with the growth of constitutional government in Piedmont and the development of the National Society. Overall, there was some excellent knowledge shown and responses were often differentiated by the ability to show nuanced differences between liberalism and nationalism and by coverage of the whole time period.

This is a Level 5 response.

In the years 1830-58, Italian liberals and nationalists faced many failed revolutions such as the revolutions of 1830-31 as well as the 1st war of independence however this was followed by a period of great ~~such~~ success as Piedmont grew into a major Kingdom and was on the victorious side of the Crimean war. Overall, it is clear that the successes outweighed the failures in this period as success can be seen ~~as~~ in the sense of progress from before the event to afterwards.

The 1830-31 revolutions marked the first major attempt of revolution across the Italian peninsula in the name of unification. ~~The uprising in Tuscany managed to scare Duke Leopold II into exile and~~ In Tuscany, the Duke wanted to become the most prominent figure in northern Italy and as a result initially allowed revolutionary attempts by secret society nationalists such as Enrico Miele and Ciro Menotti. The reason this was a success was due to the fact that the movement helped create the idea of a unified Italy: Risorgimento. Previously, the major powers had made it clear that they preferred the small regions of Italy as less of a threat ~~to~~ their dominations of the peninsula. Therefore the revolutions in states like Tuscany created the idea that the peninsula could be a state. Furthermore,

revolutionary figures like Mazzini created secret ^(created in) 1831 organisations like Young Italy, focusing on a unified Italy through violent insurrection. These events were major successes as they led to new cultural movements such as the musical compositions of Verdi, about the suffering of slaves, representing the struggles of the Italian people and in turn this laid a foundation for future, successful revolts. On the other hand, the movements of the 1830s could be seen to have limited influence and limited success for Nationalists as they were limited to the small middle classes. Peasants and working people were more focused on surviving the malaria outbreaks killing 10% of the south annually than supporting liberal ideas. As a result, secret societies that caused those revolutions were only made of middle class teacher, military officers, doctors, writers and other similar professions. Even at their peak, groups like the Carbonari only managed to gather 60,000 members in Naples, a small part of the over half a million people living in the area and considering King Ferdinand had a permanent standing army to crush revolution. For this reason the comparison between the Italian peninsula before 1830 and after shows a very similar picture and if anything, only served to heighten the awareness of powers like Austria to the threat they faced, therefore meaning liberals and nationalists had more failure than success.

The election of a new pope: Pope Pius IX, in 1846 however, gave hope to the nationalists again. The writings of politician Gioberti suggested an Italian State led by the Pope and this gained a strong following due to the large catholic population, especially among the poor, therefore succeeding where earlier movements felt short. Further suggesting that nationalism might make a difference, the new pope lived up to Gioberti's hopes and immediately released 2000 political prisoners held on papal land and also removed century old press censorship. This coupled with revolution spreading throughout Europe led to Charles Albert of Piedmont amassing an army of 16,000 to be joined by ~~20,000~~ over 10,000 troops from the papal states and very catholic kingdom of Sicily and Naples. With this nationalism had hope and defeated the Austrians in Lombardy at the battle of Goito, seizing one of the four crucial quadrilateral forts. This was a major success for nationalism as in comparison to 1846, in 1848, Piedmont had expanded into Lombardy as well as gained the support of new governments in Tuscany and the Grand Duchies of the north. Additionally, Leopold II of Tuscany had granted a constitutional monarchy, ending absolute rule and this was followed by both Piedmont and the papal states with Charles Albert introducing the Statuto Albertino in 1848. This was not only a success for nationalism but also liberalism as it paved the

way as Mazzini and his followers hoped, towards a democratic republic. On the other hand, the 1st war of independence cannot entirely be seen as a success as in 1849, the Pope's Papal Allocution demonstrated that the ideas of ~~some~~ Pius as a liberal Pope were mistaken. The Allocution blamed Piedmont for a war against another catholic nation (Austria) and suggested that General Durango had led the papal troops without permission. Furthermore, he stated that the Papacy had no desire to lead a united Italy. The significance of this is that ~~the religious nation~~ many of the soldiers fighting did not want to disobey the Pope and so most of the Neapolitan and Papal armies returned and Gioberti's movement lost all momentum. The biggest example of this failure can be seen in the devastating defense in Custoza and Novara that led Charles Albert to abdicate in favour of his son Victor Emmanuel II. Overall, therefore while the constitutional gains of the Statuto helped the liberal movement, this did not outweigh the failures as Italian nationalists seemed to face a harder struggle than before the 1st war of independence. The comparison between 1830 and the end of 1849, showed again that while revolutions could occur, it was not widespread enough or popular enough to ~~even~~ create significant change and as a result the successes and failures of liberals

and nationalists balanced out.

One small success of the revolution however was the new king in Piedmont, who appointed Count Cavour as Prime Minister in 1852. He oversaw a dramatic change towards the kingdom leading the nationalist movement by 1858. As previous minister of trade and agriculture, he understood the importance of industrialisation infrastructure and built over 2000 kilometres of railway and the first canal in the peninsula. This was a major success, leading to a 300% increase in international trade in the 1850s. The reason this was a success for nationalists was due to the fact that foreign powers began noticing Italy more, especially the Emperor of France, Napoleon III who was sympathetic to the nationalist cause having fought in Rome in 1831. Having abandoned the idea of 'Jura de sea' meaning 'go it alone', the nationalist movement realised that foreign support was the only way to expel Austrian dominance in the northern regions and as a result it is clear that the rise of Piedmont was a major success as a foundation for this ~~movement~~ to happen. Evidence of this success is clear at the Congress of Paris, where Cavour, only a Prime Minister of a state was given a seat alongside powers like France, Britain and Prussia. This was crucial in leading to the Pact of Plombières between Cavour and Napoleon as it began their

close diplomatic relationship. The pact of Plombières was a major success for nationalists and liberals as it gave Italy the manpower and firepower to attack Austria and create their own Italian state. However, the 2nd war of independence was seen as a failure by other nationalists. The risorgimento idea of self-determination led by figures like Mazzini, Misisy and Manin ended and pride in Italy was damaged for many who saw the pact as a sign that Italy was too weak to determine its own ~~own~~ future. This was a failure for liberals and nationalists however it is still clear that successes outweighed the failures as unlike previous years of revolution, the Italian ~~pe~~ landscape was much ~~clearer~~ ~~was~~ to a unified nation afterwards. The events directly led to both the annexation of central states and ~~the~~ Lombardy was gained from Austria, marking major success for nationalists even in 1858 as this was the trigger for these events and clearly paved a route towards unification.

In conclusion, in the years 1830 to 1858 ~~Italy's~~ liberals and nationalists did not have as much success as failure but far more. From small cultural changes at the beginning of the period to major expansions in the north, the period saw a clear change from disjointed reactionary monarchs

towards connected regions with liberal politics and nationalist aims



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response has used a chronological approach but has sustained an analysis throughout. The response is centred on both success and failure whilst also differentiating between nationalism and liberalism. The responses ranges across the whole time period with sufficient depth to address the demands of the question within the timing allowed by the examination.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

When using a chronological approach it is important to ensure that the whole time period is covered and that the response does not stray into being a narrative description of what happened. Planning a response is always advised and this is particularly true for a chronological approach.

Question 4

Candidates were expected to determine the extent to which they agreed with the statement that, in the years 1861-70, internal factors were a greater obstacle to the consolidation of the Kingdom of Italy than were external factors.

Many of the responses to Q4 were an absolute pleasure to read with some very nuanced approaches to the concept of internal and external factors. References to the Papacy and to irredentism were acceptable as either internal or external factors as long as the rationale for using them as such were explained and there were responses that referred to different aspects of the Papacy in relation to both. Weaker responses described or explained the obstacles to the consolidation of the Kingdom of Italy but many of these were strong in BP2 of the mark scheme. Some of the stronger responses argued that although the external influences of Austria and France continued to interfere in Italian matters during this period the gaining of Venetia and Rome by the end of 1870 meant that it was the internal factors, particularly Piedmontisation, that proved to be the most significant obstacle. There was some excellent knowledge shown of the period that was well selected and deployed in forming coherent and logical arguments.

This is a Level 4 response.

In the years 1861-70 there were many internal factors ~~leading~~ as obstacles towards the consolidation of the kingdom of Italy ~~to~~ and these internal factors were indeed greater obstacles towards consolidation than external. That is because in order to attack the external factors, the internal must be sorted ~~already~~ 1st and the internal factors were the underlying obstacle.

^{one} Internal factor as an obstacle towards ~~the~~ consolidation of the kingdom of Italy was the Brigands. The Brigands were ex bandits who lived in mountains during the Napoleonic war. The Brigands did ~~not~~ not want to join conscription and therefore would consist of ex Bourbon soldiers, ~~ex~~ convicts etc. They would live by ~~to~~ robbery and were a real internal factor towards a unified Italy. By 1868, the Brigands had about 82,000 people and were therefore attacked by Piedmont. Piedmont attacked the Brigands with a force of 120,000 soldiers. The Brigands war brought more casualties than any other war/battle for unification in Italy.

The significance of the Brigands war shows that Italy were far from unification as it was internal fighting. This also demonstrates why internal factors were a greater obstacle towards consolidation of the Kingdom of Italy because the soldiers had to fight against the Brigands rather than the French or Austrians. The French occupied Rome with an army of 20,000 until 1864 and they also came back in 1867. The Austrians kept control in Venetia ^{until defeated by Italy + Prussia}. These ^{Prussia} were the external factors that ~~kept~~ were obstacles towards unification. Therefore, in order for Italy to fight the French in Rome, they had to defeat the Brigands.

Another internal factor was the economic state of Italy. This Carver died of Malaria in 1861 and Italy were in 2.75 B ^{lira} worth of debt. This doubled within 4 years due to the unifying of smaller states. This therefore demonstrated that Italy were in a state of economic struggle following unification and made the consolidation of the Kingdom of Italy look negative. This would be the problem even if external factors were gone. In order to industrialise and repay foreign loans, Italy introduced Flour tax in 1865 and also grist tax in 1868. This upset the people of Italy and worsened the standard of living within Italy therefore worsening the public opinion.

on a consolidated kingdom of Italy. However, it could be argued that much of this internal debt was a result of external wars demonstrating the significance of external factors as it was spent on Italian military.

As well as that, following Cavour's death in 1861, another internal factor being an obstacle towards consolidation of the kingdom of Italy was the political ~~stability~~ instability. Following Cavour, there were 5 prime ministers - Ricasoli, Rattazzi, Farini, Minghetti, La Marmora. All could not fill the boots of Cavour and were not really acknowledged by the king Victor Emmanuel and they also lacked political discipline. Therefore, political instability was an issue towards the consolidation of the new kingdom of Italy, as it showed Italy were not internally powerful.

A final internal factor would be the actions of the Pope. Ever since 1848, the Pope Pius IX was against nationalism and unification as it would result in a loss of temporal power. In between the years 1861-1870, the pope did lose temporal power. This was an obstacle towards consolidation of Italy as it did not have the Pope's recognition. When Rome was eventually taken due to the Franco-Prussian war, the Pope

was still against the Kingdom of Italy. The Pope had been an internal factor within Italy for decades and it only recognised Italy as a whole in 1929. This shows that the Pope was a clear internal factor that obstructed the Kingdom of Italy.

In conclusion, external factors cannot be underestimated. Austria still being in Venetia required ^{many Italian} ~~230,000~~ men to defeat them with Prussia in 1868. However, only 25% of the Piedmontese army reached the front ^{and Italy were humbled by Austrian forces with less men.} line. This shows corruption and a lack of organisation within internal Italy. As well as that, France were a significant external factor blocking Italian unification due to their occupation in Rome all the way up until 1870. However, the Franco-Prussian war saw France withdrawal of troops in 1870 which allowed Italy to invade following the opportunity. It is however significant that Italy overcame both external factors with the help of foreign countries. For example, Prussia defeated Austria in 1868 after Italian humiliation and this is how Venetia was given to France and then ~~Prussia~~ Italy. Despite having more soldiers than Austria, Italy were not experienced and this shows internal weakness. Also, Italy could only take Rome when France retreated men showing that they were not willing to take on France. Therefore

I do strongly agree with the statement that internal factors were a greater obstacle to the consolidation of the kingdom of Italy than external factors and that is due to the pure amount of internal factors Italy had to deal with. The Pope and Papacy, the Italian economy, the Brigands, the political instability all held Italy back and acted as an obstacle to the consolidation of the Kingdom of Italy. These problems had to get resolved before Italy could be seen as a strong European kingdom.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response meets the requirements of a Level 4 response. It analyses key issues relevant to the question, although treatment of internal and external factors is somewhat 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.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

When exploring the key issues relevant to the question, rather than creating a list of different points – one internal factor, another internal factor, a final internal factor, and then leaving the evaluation to the conclusion – try to discuss the issues in relation to each other in the main body of the response.

Question 5

Of the Germany questions, Q5 was more popular than Q6. For Q5, candidates were expected to determine the extent to which they agreed with the statement that economic factors were more significant than political factors in explaining the declining power of Austria in Germany in the years 1852-66.

Most candidates were aware of the position of Austria within Germany at the end of the period 1848-52 and at the end of 1866 and were able to use their knowledge of economic and political factors to explain Austrian decline. There was no need to introduce other factors. Responses that only wrote about a list of different factors were not addressing the question but those that discussed another factor as being more important than both economic and political factors, eg military, were rewardable at the higher levels. In questions where factors are being compared, responses are more likely to be relevant if candidates analyse those factors/key features highlighted in the question. Some weaker responses described or explained how Prussia was stronger than Austria rather than concentrating on Austria's economic and political situation or analysing why Prussia was able to take advantage of Austria in the economic sphere. Some of the stronger responses suggested that economic factors were more impactful over the long term but that in the 1860s political factors were as strong as economic factors, with the emergence of Bismarck's Prussia as a politically confident state. Candidates have good knowledge of the period and are aware of the key features of the situation in both Austria and Prussia.

This is a Level 4 response.

In this essay I will ~~test~~ be discussing whether the economic factors were more significant than political factors in explaining the leading power of Austria in the years 1852-66. ~~As well as~~ As well as economic factors I will be using ~~some~~ indicators such as liberalisation and Unification to support my answer. Prussia ~~had~~ At this moment of time, Prussia managed to switch its position, and become the dominant super power itself in Austria.

One reason as to why I agree with this statement, is due to the fact that the Prussian's Zollverein gave it such a favourable economic advantage over Austria. Operating with multiple states and different markets Prussia was able to grow and solidify its economic dominance through the Zollverein. By having cheaper import and export fees Prussia was able to profit off its strong relations with other German states such as ~~Hanover~~ Baden. By having these strong working relations, Prussia would increase the amount of trade per annum significantly more than Austria. Also by being on a free trade spectrum, compared to Austria's protectionism, Prussia allowed itself to become a much more significant

powerhouse due to its economic advantage, and cheaper
funds, therefore its economy grew rapidly. Furthermore,
with the use of its geographical location of being
access to water, and its growing railway development,
Prussia could also make overseas much quicker,
Cheaper, and essentially compell to Austria, who had
to rely on the economies of its surrounding countries to
be able to make, thus explaining Prussia's
dominance and signifying Austria's Zerfall.

However, one reason as to why I don't agree
with the statement is due to the appointment
of Bismarck in 1872. ~~By the introduction of Bismarck~~
~~and his realpolitik movement~~, whilst the Zollverein
might have been the first economic shift in dominance
between the two countries, the introduction of Bismarck
and his realpolitik approach sparked a change in
political shift as well. Bismarck's aim was to make
sure that Austria suffered greatly at expense of
its own failure's. By ~~oversteering~~ Bismarck knew
of Austria's weakness ~~politically~~, furthermore with
their military oversteering on a backwards economy.
Bismarck was able to capitalise on factors which
declined Austria's sphere of influence, persuading
foreign leaders to trust him instead of Austria,
summarises just how his influence alone, persuaded

Countries such as France and Britain to become his allies, which can be seen as much more significant as being economically strong, because if superpowers such as Britain and France weren't frightened by Bismarck and his spine of iron, then they would never have become allies as there would have been no need to.

Finally, another reason as to why I don't agree with the statement is due to the fact that a cry out for unification is what ~~is~~ significantly improved Germany's position over Austria. Austria, ~~the~~ rejected ~~influence~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~rest~~ for all German affairs, was suffering from the lack of prosperity Russia had. ~~The~~ ~~rest~~ The growing German cohesiveness, annexing more and more states, ~~is~~ was proving how significant ~~the~~ unification was to people. With the removal of Austria, a kleindeutsche solution was ~~being~~ going forward, ~~but~~ ~~not~~ due to Austria's inability to put itself forward, it lost major influence over ~~any~~ any states waiting to unify. Unification had been a growing nationalist movement throughout the 50's and 60's, the question was always just how? Bismarck's influence links up here again especially when considering he influenced the king of Prussia not to attend a meeting which could have unified Austria and Prussia. With unification being such

an important factor for most Germans, and Austria's inability to help provide this, it only makes sense as to why their influence declined throughout 1850's and 1860's.

In Conclusion, I disagree with the statement. ~~While~~ While it must be said that economic factors played a key role in Austria's decline, especially with the ever-growing Zollverein Customs Union, factors such as Bismarck and Unification were much more significant overall. Without Bismarck and his key influence over Russia and international affairs, Prussia's reputation as a European Superpower would never have reached the peak that it did, nevertheless that quickly, and furthermore, the influence of the desire to unify Germany has been important for decades, and with Austria unable to take part in this due to their exclusion from German affairs, it just calls to the fact that influence has been lost and forgotten about.



In this response, there is an analysis of relevant key issues concerning the declining power of Austria in Germany. However, at times the emphasis is more on Prussia's growing power rather than the situation in relation to Austria. At Level 4, bullet point 4 states that in a few places it may lack coherence and precision and here the paragraph on unification is relevant but lacks some coherence and precision as to when and what is specifically being referred to.



Think carefully about the focus of the question – here the focus is the declining power of Austria. The role of Prussia is very important to the focus but make sure that the evidence being used clearly always comes back to the focus of the question.

Question 6

Candidates were expected to determine how accurate it was to say that, in the years 1866-67, Prussia achieved complete domination over Germany.

Stronger responses were aware that the focus of the question was about developments in Germany in the years 1866-67 and the extent to which Prussia was able to establish control over Germany rather than a question focused on the reasons why Prussia was able to win the Seven Weeks' War. These responses concentrated on the wording in the question relating to 'complete domination' and were able to assess Prussia's position at the beginning of 1866 to its position at the end of 1867 using knowledge of the Seven Weeks' War, diplomacy in the aftermath of the War, the development of the *Zollparlament* and the North German Confederation, and Prussia's relationship with the southern states. Many high L3 and low-mid L4 responses were more focused on the reasons why Prussia was able to dominate and focused on events well before 1866-1867 rather than the specific time period. Some responses also went beyond 1867 and were relevant only if related to an analysis of whether Prussia had achieved 'complete domination'. Many candidates suggested that Prussia had gone a long way to achieving domination and was now clearly the leader of a form of a *Kleindeutschland* but was not yet completely dominant.

Both these responses move into Level 5 because they clearly focused on the question asked, ie they focus on the extent to which Prussia came to dominate Germany in the years 1866-87, rather than the reasons why. The second order concept being assessed here is the extent of change that was seen over the course of these two years. The responses have used evidence that is covered in Key Topic 4 bullet point 1 of the specification including the Treaty of Prague; the annexation of north German states; the North German Confederation; Prussia's relationship with south German states; the creation of the *Zollparlament*, as well as the Seven Week's War.

Italy also mobilising its troops against Austria. Bismarck saw Austria's weakness as going against coalition too he occupied Schleswig. This eventually war broke out with Austria and Italy, then Prussia. Prussia domination came from so destroying Austria, which saw 44,000 deaths of Austrians at the Battle of Sadowa, this was largely due to Prussia's Dreyse Needle gun which had a fire rate which was 5 times faster than Austria. The treaty of Prague Prussia's dominance over the second largest rival German state of which was stopping Prussia from having complete domination over Germany, was also seen with Bismarck's great international affairs skills as he was able to gain domination over Austria in the 1866 Austro-Prussian war by causing the great super power not to side with Austria. Italy was promised territory in Venice of Austria if they supported Prussia in a war and the other great super power France was also offered territorial gains if it remained neutral. Thus we can see how Prussia's dominance over the ~~most~~ ^{second} largest historically largest Austrian German state in a victory at war illustrates how it can be fully argued that Prussia was able to gain domination.

~~What~~ Additionally, with the treaty of Prague that actually ended the war, it can also be argued that Prussia gained complete domination as it theoretically wiped the Austrians away from the German politics. This is because the treaty demanded that the German Confederation would be abolished.

150 this meant that Austria (already excluded from the Zollverein),
was no longer influence German politics as it could in the
past. Moreover, one may even argue that the Treaty of
Prague which concluded the 1866 war, was a
a sign of Prussian dominance, with the creation
of the North German Confederation was. This was an alliance
of the North German states in Germany who would support
each other if either of them want to war. Realistically it was
the great success of a unified German federal state of Germany
which was to be ruled by Prussian dominance gives
the fact the North German Confederation was signed. Confederation constitution
was signed by ~~the~~ all members which saw the role of
Chancellor offered to Bismarck and the Emperor to King William
of Prussia. Thus, ~~it can be~~ Prussian dominance as a result of
the Treaty of Prague can be argued the Prussian dominance
was in fact truthful, ~~but to claim~~, because it made Prussia
the leading state in political matters as since Austria was excluded
from politics and they controlled the North German Confederation.

Additionally, another argument for why Prussia was absolute
dominating the Germany by 1866-1867, was due to the
annexation of German states who had fought against Prussia
and lost. These included Hanover, Frankfurt, Hesse-Kassel and
the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein became part of Prussia.
Thus due to the power of Prussia rising through annexation of
German states, she was dominant over Germany as she was little

rival states left ~~for Prussia to~~ to oppose.

Indeed, the argument that domination over Germany in the 1866-1867 is clearly apparent, it's not totally accurate to claim it was complete domination as many constraints to domination persisted. First of all, the Treaty of Prague indeed consolidated Prussian dominance but not total given that Prussia merely excluded Austria from German procedures, but didn't claim dominance over them directly. Whilst Austria did lose some territory in the South with Venetia, this went to France, then ceded to Italy, not to Prussia. Prussia refrained from taking complete domination over Austria, despite pressure from the King of Prussia to destroy Austria, as Bismarck didn't want to cause upset with foreign powers, or create a bitter sweet revenge feeling from the Austrians to side with France in a potential war. Thus, we can see how dominance was completely over Austria, even with the internal struggles with Austria they were able to prevent the Southern German Catholic states from joining the North German Confederation.

Additionally, there was lots of compromise needed for Prussia to form the North German Confederation, which undermined Prussia's complete dominance. For example, Saxony, despite being a powerful enemy to Prussia in 1866, and close ally to Austria, was allowed to remain independent and join the North German Confederation. The King of Saxony was allowed to keep his throne, making a semblance of equality with Prussia showing that there

was not complete domination. Even though, it was largely due to Bismarck not wanting to have too many disposed kings in Europe and it was bordering Bohemia, it showed complete domination was not prevalent due to the compromises.

Additionally, in 1867 Prussia's complete domination was completely undermined by the Zoll Parliament which was an initiative to allow the South German states join negotiations in Reichstag when matters of Zollverein occurred. This plan backfired as the joint delegates from the South requested special elections ~~undermined~~ made it a lengthy difficult process. Also the South German Catholic states also had heavy distrust over the organisation as they saw it as Prussian dominance. It was finally over after an election resulted in 49 against union with 35 for showing that from rest of South of Germany & Prussia could not get complete dominance. Whilst Bismarck knew that if ~~it was~~ Prussian dominance, a fully unified Germany would come by war, it still showed that Prussian dominance over Germany in 1867 was not a complete domination.

In conclusion, whilst it is clear that the wars in 1866 and events surrounding this followed showed Prussian dominance, it was not complete. There ~~was~~ Prussia still ought to gain influence over the Southern states and had allowed Austria to not be destroyed allowing them to exert influence.



The organisation of the argument here is at Level 4 but the focus on the question and the deployment of knowledge moves it into Level 5.



Always read the question carefully for the time period of the question and consider the demands of the question in relation to second order concepts being targeted.

Please see the introductory comments above.

★ Prussia clearly ^{attempted to} highlight its ~~dominance~~ ^{dominance over the German states} between 1866-67 after the Seven Weeks War ~~off~~, defeating Austria. This signalled the end of the Confederation and Prussian hegemony, however it can be argued that Prussia did not gain complete dominance in this period due to the reluctance of the Southern German States to join ~~to~~ a unified Germany and politically it failed to unify the states. ★ However overall Prussia can be seen as dominating Germany due to the Treaty of Prague and the North German Confederation, and the Zollverein economically and politically attempted to unite Germany. ~~which can be seen as a success due to the German Unification in 1871 and the military unity, due to the alliance.~~ ★ There is ^{clear} dominance over Germany, ~~seen~~ ^{achieved} by Bismarck who ~~enabled Prussian hegemony due to his vigorous foreign policy.~~ ★

Prussia achieved complete domination over Germany in this period due to their success in the Seven Weeks War

in 1866 against Austria. This success represented a power shift and Prussia no longer had to rival Austria in the confederation ~~and~~. At the Battle of Sadana ~~is~~ during the 7 weeks war Prussian dominance was represented as Prussia ferociously beat Austria, and Austria had ~~5x more~~ five times more casualties than the Prussian army. Prussian success led to the Treaty of Prague in 1866, ^{negotiated by Bismarck} which saw the end to the confederation and Austria were forced to recognise Prussian dominance over the German states. Also a military alliance was made between Prussia and the north German states, ~~strongly~~ joining this alliance signalled to a new federal German Empire, under Prussian dominance. Prussia was able to produce such a vindictive treaty due to the power they gained after their success against Austria, representing their dominance and power over the German states who now feared Prussia after Austria's defeat. The German states were now forced to look to Prussia as the head of the states due to the Treaty of Prague, highlighting the evident dominance of Prussia in this period.

However it can also be argued that Prussia did not achieve complete dominance over the German states in this period, due to the German Unification only being completed in 1871. This suggests

that the German states were only convinced of Prussian dominance after their defeat of France, in 1871. Reluctance was shown in these periods by the German states to not form a unified Germany under Prussia. When the northern German confederation was formed following the Treaty of Prague, Saxony was reluctant to join the Confederation and only accepted when Bismarck invited them, allowing them to maintain their monarch. Furthermore states were forced into the new northern German Confederation, threatened by ^{high} war indemnities; highlighting ~~Prussia~~ their reluctance. Also in the Zollparlament formed in the Reichstag there was a vote for a unified Germany. 41 voted against union and 35 for union. ~~The~~ The 41 votes were from south Catholics who still distrusted Prussia, highlighting a divided Germany, not completely dominated ~~by Prussia~~ by Prussia, ~~and not~~ politically.

On the other hand Prussia can be seen as ^{achieving} complete ~~domination~~ domination over the German states, politically and economically. The Zollverein already represented a kleindeutscher solution with Prussia as its head and by 1854 Hanover and Oldenburg had joined the ~~confederation~~ Zollverein, leaving only Austria and two other states isolated.

Economically this union unified the German states and the Zollverein could negotiate international treaties and with international governments, under Prussian leadership. The Zollverein thrived and also politically unified ~~the~~ the German states under Prussian leadership through the Vollparlament and Vollbundestag. Which contained states that were not yet in the North German Confederation but who were in the Zollverein, which discussed matters ~~to~~ involving the Zollverein. Debates were in the Reichstag or the Bundesrat where the north German confederation members were not. ~~The North German conf~~ Furthermore this highlights Prussian dominance encouraged by Bismarck, a master planner of unification in this period, ~~then~~ and in 1870 when Prussia went to war with France so did the rest of Germany, due to the military alliance he negotiated. ~~The~~ Prussian ^{complete} dominance was ~~achieved~~ ^{achieved} politically ~~and~~ economically in this period, due to the Zollverein, ~~and~~ ~~North German~~ ^{however Prussian Confederation} complete dominance failed to be achieved politically due to the reluctance of the South Catholic States to accept a union under Prussian leadership.

In conclusion Prussia did achieve ~~complete~~ dominance over the German states in this period due to the Zollverein and its success in the Seven Weeks War, however ~~only~~ complete dominance was only achieved

after Prussian success in the Franco-Prussian War, triggering German unification in 1871; where the southern states accepted Prussian dominance.

✘ However they did not achieve complete domination by 1867, complete domination was only achieved after the Franco-Prussian War signalling German unification under Prussian leadership.

✘ Complete dominance can be defined as complete submission of the other German states to Prussian power, and references ^{complete} dominance politically and economically.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

There is some good analysis in this response with references to Prussian success in the Seven Weeks' War as representing a power shift in Germany. There is a focus on the exact wording of the question in reference to the extent to which there was 'complete domination'.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

When questions use qualitative or quantitative phrases it is important to focus on the wording in reaching an evaluative judgement, here the extent to which Prussia gained 'complete dominance' over Germany.

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 explicitly address the focus of the enquiry rather than merely discussing the issues raised by the sources in general terms
- Candidates should aim to go beyond comprehension and summary of the sources by developing reasoned inferences that are fully discussed
- Candidates should read the caption and 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 three bullet points that are assessed in this section of the paper.

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 presenting 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>

