Pearson Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2023

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In History (9HI0/2D)
Advanced

Paper 2: Depth study

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

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2023
Question Paper Log Number P72290A
Publications Code 9HI0_2D_2306_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

General Marking Guidance

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

Generic Level Descriptors: Section A

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	**1–3**	• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	**4–7**	• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	**8–12**	• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria but with limited justification.
4	**13–16**	• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.
5	**17–20**	• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/ or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.

Section B

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	**1–3**	• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. • The overall judgement is missing or asserted. • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	**4–7**	• There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. • An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	**8–12**	• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	**13–16**	• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. • The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.
5	**17–20**	• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement. • The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

Section A: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
1	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the role of Cavour in the months before his appointment as Prime Minister of Piedmont in November 1852. **Source 1** 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • As a leading player in Piedmontese politics at the time of Cavour's appointment, Rattazzi had witnessed and been directly involved in events • Rattazzi is recalling the events specifically to provide a record of what happened at the time and so the information provided is quite detailed • Writing in 1870, with knowledge of the role that the *connubio* played in Italian history, Rattazzi may have been trying to give more credit to his own colleagues than to Cavour. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the role of Cavour in the months before his appointment as Prime Minister of Piedmont in November 1852: • It implies that Cavour was involved in political intrigue ('At that meeting, we agreed the basis of this fusion. We then decided… opportunity') • It indicates that Cavour worked on his own with the Centre Left ('The whole plan had already been agreed by we four men… No-one else had known') • It claims that the Centre Left, rather than Cavour, particularly Michel Castelli, was responsible for the successful creation of the *connubio* ('Castelli, I remember that the praise…should largely be yours.') • It indicates that initially Cavour was not trusted by some of those on the Centre Left ('I still felt somewhat distrustful…You…were in a position to know…him better than I was.') 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • Cavour was a Centre Right politician but had particular concerns over the role of the Church in civil life. During 1851, he began to clash openly with those in government opposed to the introduction of the Siccardi Laws • In 1851, Cavour began to look for an opportunity to realign the political situation in Piedmont and opened discussions with Rattazzi, the leader of the Centre Left, which led to the *connubio* • New repressive press laws were introduced to parliament by the d'Azeglio government as part of a compromise to retain the support of the right; Cavour and Rattazzi used this as the moment to declare the *connubio* • Cavour was not a particularly trusted politician; he was seen as being too liberal by the right and as being self-serving and not truthfully committed to Italian nationalism by the left.

Question	Indicative content
	Source 2 1.The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • D'Azeglio, as Prime Minister of Piedmont at the time, was directly involved in, and affected by, the events and so is in an excellent position to provide evidence • D'Azeglio is writing in May 1852, in the midst of the political crisis, and giving a commentary of events as they happened • It is clearly a private letter written to an ally outside of Italy who can be trusted with the information being provided; it is an intensely personal view of events happening at the time. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the role of Cavour in the months before his appointment as Prime Minister of Piedmont in November 1852: • It claims that Cavour intrigued behind the back of his own Prime Minister ('Just imagine! My own Cabinet colleague…without a word to me.') • It claims that Cavour arranged the *connubio* ('whole intrigue had been planned by four individuals.') • It suggests that Cavour took advantage of divisions amongst his own colleagues ('did not want…public…know of our internal…division.') and d'Azeglio's own weaknesses ('my ill-health prevented me from resisting') • It implies that, in May 1852, d'Azeglio will not be able to remain in power much longer ('I can't go on much longer.'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • Cavour was appointed to d'Azeglio's Cabinet in October 1850 and, by 1852, was Minister for Finance, Commerce, Agriculture and Shipping because of his liberal economic position • D'Azeglio was appointed Prime Minister in 1849 with a conservative agenda, but he found it difficult to control the right and the volatile situation led to several different governments under his control • Cavour resigned from the Cabinet in May 1852 before he was formally dismissed by d'Azeglio • The *connubio* created continued problems for d'Azeglio and when his government fell in November 1852, over the introduction of civil marriage, the King appointed Cavour as Prime Minister. **Sources 1 and 2** The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • The sources are written by men directly involved in the politics of the time and from the opposing political groups involved in the events • The sources agree that there was an organised attempt to undermine d'Azeglio's government in spring 1852 and that Cavour was central to the proceedings • The sources corroborate each other that there were four key individuals involved in the political intrigue surrounding the *connubio* • Source 1 suggests that Cavour's participation was encouraged by the Centre Left, while Source 2 suggests that Cavour was the mastermind behind the intrigue.

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

Question	Indicative content
2	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the reasons why Prussia was successful in unifying Germany in the years 1866-71. **Source 3** 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • It is a private family letter and so is likely to give a genuine account of the situation in northern Germany at the time of the Prussian victory • It was written two days after the decisive battle of Königgrätz specifically to inform von Kügelgen's brother of events as they were happening • The tone and language of the source reflects the immediate response to the situation but is also reflective of the wider consequences. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons why Prussia was successful in unifying Germany in the years 1866-71. • It claims that, with the victory at Königgrätz, Austria was no longer the dominant German power ('Great triumph over the Austrians…cannot be underestimated.') • It indicates the strength of the Prussian military ('represents an incredible mobilisation of Prussian power.'; 'army has exhibited an excellence') • It indicates that there was nationalistic support for Prussia in northern Germany ('fluttering flags and immense rejoicing.'; 'full of visitors from all classes.') • It claims that Bismarck was now in a position to unify Germany ('now the most popular man in Prussia. Everyone sings his praises, even the Democrats.'; 'I hope he…bring…a unified Germany'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • Prussian victory in the Austro-Prussian War resulted in Austria being permanently excluded from political power in Germany and the collapse of the German Confederation • The Seven Weeks' War proved that the Prussian military reforms of the early 1860s had created the most efficient and technologically-advanced army in continental Europe • Although Bismarck still encountered political opposition in Prussia, support for his unification policies increased after the victory in 1866 • German nationalism grew in the wake of the victory in 1866 and was central to the events leading to the war with France in 1870-71.

Question	Indicative content
	Source 4 1.The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • It provides a perspective of the situation in Germany in 1868 from the point of view of someone from outside of Germany and who is able to provide a wider perspective of events • Prince Napoleon may have made the statement with a specific political agenda with regard to relations between Prussia, France and Britain, as in 1868 there was tension between France and Prussia • The tone of the statement suggests that the Prince is providing a measured view of Prussia's role in Germany at the time, despite his concerns about Prussian behaviour in the future. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons why Prussia was successful in unifying Germany in the years 1866-71. • It indicates that Prussia took political control of northern Germany ('federal reconstruction…in the north and the absorption of the smaller northern states into Prussia') • It suggests that Prussia used its economic power ('The *Zollverein* parliament is a step closer to the absorption of southern Germany.') • It indicates that France was worried about future hostilities with a Prussian-led Germany ('reclaim Alsace and Lorraine from France with force.') • It suggests that Prussia profited from a favourable international situation ('of the opinion that absorption…northern states…irreversible'; 'British have chosen to withdraw yourselves from the political arena of Europe.'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • In 1866-67, Prussia became the dominant political power in northern Germany, taking leadership of the North German Confederation and aggressively annexing Austria's north German allies • In 1867-68, Prussia took advantage of its economic power in Germany to constitute the *Zollparlement*, which the southern German states felt compelled to join • Prussia benefitted from a favourable international situation in the years 1866-78, with Britain and Russia not willing to become involved in the affairs of the German states • The final unification of the northern German states with the four remaining independent southern German states came with the victory over France in the war of 1870-71 and the creation of the German Empire. **Sources 3 and 4** The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • Source 3 is a private commentary written from a German perspective while Source 4, although recording a private statement, reveals the thoughts of a foreign power • Sources 3 and 4 together cover a wide range of reasons why Prussia was successful, e.g. military, economic, political, diplomatic • Source 3 is commenting on the event that kick-started the process by which a *Kleindeutschland* was created while Source 4 reflects on subsequent events.

Section B: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
3	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that there was little significant challenge to the restored order in Italy in the years c1830-47. Arguments and evidence that there was little significant challenge to the restored order in Italy in the years c1830-47 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The revolutions of 1830-31 were limited in geographical scope and ambition. Initial success was rapidly undermined by internal division and Austrian military intervention • Italian nationalists were weakened by competing visions of Italian unification, e.g. of Mazzini, Balbo, Gioberti • Attempts by Mazzini to organise insurrection were an abject failure, e.g. the Bandieri brothers in 1844, and secret societies, such as the Carbonari, struggled to harness discontent • Conservative rule was enforced by repressive political policies and influenced by Austria. Austria rigorously enforced the Metternich System in its northern provinces • The majority of the population of Italy, particularly the Italian peasantry, was apathetic to new political ideas • Outside of northern Italy, slow rates of industrialisation and the presence of a very small middle class meant that liberal ideas were slow to take hold. Arguments and evidence that there was significant challenge to the restored order in Italy in the years c1830-47 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In 1830-31, the rulers of Modena, Parma and the Papal States were successfully challenged by revolutionaries demanding constitutional reforms; the Duchess of Parma was even forced to flee • Italian nationalism was a growing force, particularly an interest in the cultural *Risorgimento* and appeals to the glory of the ancient Roman Empire • Increasing industrialisation, urbanisation and the growth of modern communications in northern Italy was instrumental in the rapid growth nationalist and liberal political views • In the Austrian provinces of Lombardy and Venetia, resentment of foreign rule manifested itself in the growth of political societies and acts of passive resistance • In Sicily, separatist groups actively worked against the Bourbon rulers of The Two Sicilies in Naples with the aim to gain independence for the island • The election of Pope Pius IX in 1846 boosted revolutionary ideas; his initial introduction of some liberal reforms brought hope to many for a more liberal Italy and, for some, of a united Italy under Papal rule. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
4	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the accuracy of the suggestion that the unification process in the north of Italy in the years 1859-60 was very similar to the unification process in the south of Italy in the years 1860-61. Arguments and evidence that the unification process in the north of Italy in the years 1859-60 was similar to the unification process in the south of Italy in the years 1860-61 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Piedmontese army played a major role in the unification of both the north and south; in the Second War of Independence and in the invasion of the Papal States • Cavour played a major role in unification events in both north and south; it was Cavour's diplomacy that resulted in the Second War of Independence and Cavour's decision to intervene in the Papal States • Garibaldi played a role in both the north and south; in the north, he was a rallying figure for the Second War of Independence and in the south, he was the driving force • The unification process in both north and south was completed and validated by the use of plebiscites • Both the north and south were unified under the leadership of the constitutional monarchy of Victor Emmanuel II. Arguments and evidence that the unification process in the north of Italy in the years 1859-60 was different to the unification process in the south of Italy in the years 1860-61 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The success in the north was dependent on an alliance with a major foreign power, France, while the unification of the south was mainly driven by Italian nationalists led by Garibaldi • Cavour was proactive in achieving unification in the north but was less supportive of events in the south; he tried to prevent Garibaldi's initial expedition and reluctantly intervened in the Papal States • In the north, France played a constructive role in the unification process through its prosecution of war with Austria but in the south, it played a more negative role in its determination to maintain the Pope in Rome • Piedmont had more control over the process in the north than in the south; events were dictated by Garibaldi and it was his decision to 'give' the south to Victor Emmanuel • Piedmont's role in the process was more accepted in the north than in the south, where there was a reluctance to replace the domination of Bourbon rule with Piedmontese rule. Other relevant material must be credited.

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

Question	Indicative content
5	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that the most significant feature of the economic and social development of Germany in the 1840s was railway building. Arguments and evidence that railway building was the most significant feature of the economic and social development of Germany in the 1840s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In the 1840s, there was a rapid expansion of the railway system across all of the German states, which meant that by the end of the decade it was possible to travel continuously west-east and north-south by train • The building of the railway network itself encouraged new industrial growth, e.g. steel production, locomotive production, and new railway-related occupations • The railway network encouraged the industrial development of Germany as a whole by transporting raw materials and finished products and encouraging international trade, e.g. through access to the Rhine ports • The railway network encouraged urbanisation by transporting people from rural areas to the towns and cities, and facilitated urban living by providing access to agricultural produce • Railway building led to social improvement and social change, e.g. it facilitated developments in education and culture, the growth of the middle classes and challenges to rural conservatism. Arguments and evidence that there were other more significant features/the impact of railway building was limited in the economic and social development of Germany in the 1840s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The specific development and modernisation of Prussian industry and agriculture led to Prussia becoming the dominant economic power in Germany • The Prussian *Zollverein* was the predominant agent of economic development: the customs union facilitated internal trade across Germany and encouraged international free trade so boosting farming and industry • Industrialisation affected economic growth and social change; new manufacturing technologies put Germany at the forefront of centralised production and helped create an urban working and middle class • Urbanisation had a profound effect on the social structure in Germany, as city life undermined the social control of the *Junker* class, and on social interaction, providing increased opportunities and experiences • Economic division between rich and poor was a key feature, leading to new class divisions and the rise of social discontent; this was particularly evident in the economic crisis of the mid-1840s • Railway building only economically benefited significantly a small number of the middle classes and the presence of a railway network was not able to prevent the disastrous food shortages of 1846-47. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
6	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the political situation in Germany in 1851 was very similar to the political situation in Germany in 1840. Arguments and evidence that the political situation in Germany in 1851 was similar to the political situation in Germany in 1840 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In both 1840 and 1851, the German states were mainly ruled by hereditary rulers from the same ancestral line or were governed by the same ruling group • In both 1840 and 1851, Austria was the dominant German political power with German rulers deferring to the Austrian Emperor. Austria had made its position clear in the humiliation of Prussia at Olmütz in 1850 • In both 1840 and 1851, the German states were only united politically through membership of the German Confederation • In both 1840 and 1851, there was a belief amongst some, mainly the educated classes, in Germany that a unified German nation was a desirable ambition • The political representation that did exist in 1840 and 1851 remained in the hands of a small elite, mainly from higher social classes, who were unwilling to share power and were politically conservative. Arguments and evidence that the political situation in Germany in 1851 was different to the political situation in Germany in 1840 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • As a result of the upheavals and demands from political revolutionaries in the 1848-49 revolutions, in 1851 many of the German rulers governed through some form of constitution, even if it was very conservative • Austrian dominance was not as certain in 1851 as it had been in 1840; the events of 1848-49 has shaken Austrian confidence and the events at Erfurt in 1850 were an indication of Prussian ambition • As a result of the 1848-49 revolutions, the German Confederation had had to be reconstituted and was a different re-iteration of the Confederation than in 1840 • In 1840, Metternich was the linchpin of Austrian and conservative control over Germany but in 1851 he was no longer in power, having been ousted during the 1848-49 revolutions • When he came to power in 1840, Frederick William IV had suggested that he might consider future political reform, but in 1851, having been profoundly impacted by the events of 1848-49 and forced to accept some elements of constitutionalism, he was determined to lose no more power • In 1840, most nationalists and liberals looked to constitutionalism and popular representation as the main way to achieve their aims. In 1851, the crushing failure of 1848-49 meant that many looked to different ways, in particular many nationalists began to look to Prussia to unify Germany. Other relevant material must be credited.

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