



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative B Unit 4

Mark Scheme

2007 examination – June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section C).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:***Either***

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: "What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?". Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid "bunching" of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
 - generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid "double jeopardy". Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

June 2007

Alternative B: Europe in Transition, c1470–1610

A2 Unit 4: The State, Authority and Conflict

Section A: Religious Issues in Spain, 1469–1598

Question 1

(a) Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

How fully does **Source B** support the view in **Source A** about the relationship between the crown and the Inquisition in Spain? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- | | | |
|-----|---|-------------|
| L1: | Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. | 1-2 |
| L2: | Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. | 3-5 |
| L3: | Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. | 6-8 |
| L4: | Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. | 9-10 |

Indicative content

The overall view in Source A is that the Inquisition had the greater authority; they were the ones who ordered Jews to leave initially and this was not confirmed by the monarchs until 1492. This view is confirmed to some extent in Source B with the seizure of Carranza. Level 2 answers should note, however, that the Inquisition did have to ask Ferdinand and Isabella to issue a general expulsion order against the Jews because their action had not been effective and that the issue regarding Carranza became a conflict between Pope and Phillip II, not between Inquisition and Pope, suggesting that the relation between Inquisition and monarchs was positive. Own knowledge will also suggest that, from the reigns of Ferdinand and Isabella, the Crown appointed all leading officials of the Inquisition and thus some working relationship would be expected. Level 3 responses may point out the time lag between the Inquisition taking action against the Jews and the Crown's enforcement/endorsement of the orders nine years later which could suggest some reluctance on the part of the Crown – again pointing to the dependency of the Inquisition on the Crown. Level 4 responses may take the discussion wider to consider co-operation on matters such as censorship and the Index, allowing students to study abroad etc. which began in the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella and continued into the reign of Phillip II. Overall, Source B does support Source A, in that there was co-operation between Inquisition and Crown in taking action against all forms of heresy, but that the timing of this was more the decision of the Crown rather than the Inquisition. The greater conflict for the Crown was with the papacy.

(b) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

'The Inquisition in Spain was a "repressive body" and "terrorised cultural minorities" in the years 1469 to 1598.'

Assess the validity of this view.

(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

This is a synoptic question and candidates' responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the Specification for this particular Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content for each particular question.

From sources: the Inquisition as a 'repressive body' – attempts to remove Jews from Spain, as identified in Source A, in Seville, Cordoba and Aragon by the mid-1480s and supported by the Crown in 1492; in Source B to fears that no one dared to say what they really thought about religious issues but in Source C such activities are claimed in reality to be 'marginal'. In relation to the view that the Inquisition 'terrorised' cultural minorities – there is a claim in Source A that Jews were particular targets, especially those who refused to be baptised as Christians, and a challenge/contradictory statement in Source C that such 'terrorism' did occur but this did not affect cultural progress.

From own knowledge – Spain did appear to be a conservative and repressive country; the emergence of the Jesuits and even of Theresa of Avila caused some opposition. The Jesuits were sometimes seen as a danger as many early converts were 'conversos' causing fears of

Jewish influence; their Exercises were seen as symptomatic of mysticism. St Theresa was denounced by the Inquisition as a mystic in 1575 but reinstated by 1588. This was as a result of the support of Phillip II in recognition of her particular brand of piety as a positive factor in the struggle against heresy. Moriscos were particularly subject to persecution, e.g. in Granada resulting in revolt in 1568; 80,000+ were expelled at that point and all after 1609. Those remaining between 1568 and 1609 were frequently the object of prosecution by the Inquisition, often encouraged by external events such as the victory of the Christians at Lepanto in 1571. However, this was not the case for all communities e.g. in Aragon there was some intermarriage between Christians and Muslims. Protestantism was repressed severely largely in the north near the border – most of those arrested were non-Spanish. The most significant attack on Protestants (Lutherans) occurred in 1558/1559 in Seville and Valladolid led by Inquisitor-General Valdes, culminating in an auto da fe in 1559 and the introduction of the Index in 1559, although this applied only to Castile and not to Aragon.

'Terrorising of cultural minorities' might be discussed particularly with reference to persecution of Jews which was given impetus with the development of the Inquisition; conversos were excluded from some institutions and statutes of 'limpieza' developed to regularise this although more recent evidence suggests that this was not as widespread as once thought. Those who supported 'limpieza' linked Jews with Protestant heresy (large numbers of German Lutherans were descendants of Jews). The main statute was introduced in 1556 in Toledo. However, Kamen maintains that the popes were not particularly supportive of the statute and there are many examples of priests who were conversos being appointed e.g. as chaplains, as members of the military orders etc. In practice, therefore, many Jews held public office and were able to become titled nobility. Another aspect of cultural persecution might be seen in relation to book burning; this was a regular feature, e.g. 1501 all Arabic books burned, 1552 all 'heretical' books ordered to be burned. Once the Index was introduced in 1583/1584 this became more formalised in theory, but in practice was haphazard and inefficient, NB culture is closely linked to religion and reference to religious minorities can therefore be accepted.

1558/1559 is often seen as a dividing line – before this there was some leniency, afterwards Spain was 'closed' to new thought. Good answers will, however, be aware of the exceptions made to the apparently harsh laws throughout the period. Spain remained a diverse society in religion as well as in culture and most people outside towns never had any contact with the Inquisition; even in the towns, its activities were uneven. Current historiography suggests that much of the 'evidence' about it was the result of both Protestant and Catholic fears rather than of hard facts.

Section B

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates' responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 levels of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: *Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply almost to any time and/or place. **1-6**

L2: *Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Option A: The Netherlands, 1565–1609**Question 2**

‘From 1567 to the death of Parma in 1592, Spain failed to sustain control of the Netherlands because of foreign intervention rather than because of weak leadership.’

To what extent do you agree with this view? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

‘Foreign intervention’ came largely from the English and in a more limited fashion from the French. The Sea Beggars might be mentioned but are not effectively ‘foreign’. Orange did have support from French Huguenots and they signed a treaty of mutual assistance in 1568 which boosted morale but did not generate much practical help in the immediate term. Later, the Duke of Anjou gave military support in 1578 and agreed to become sovereign ruler in 1581. This provided the Netherlands with a figurehead but not with victory. Answers should identify English support given e.g. through the treaty of Nonsuch, the Earl of Leicester and financial aid. Its greatest success was to divert Spanish attention to England culminating in the Armada; thus dividing Spanish resources.

With reference to ‘weak leadership’, answers should consider the work and impact of Spanish governors of the Netherlands, e.g. Alva (1567–1572) who was successful in removing the French but failed to resist the Sea Beggars. Alva was less of a politician and quickly antagonised Margaret of Parma; his ‘Council of Troubles’ and use of foreign advisers generated widespread discontent. He imposed heavy taxes and persecuted the native nobility. Although he had a large army, he made limited progress in dealing with unrest. He was succeeded by Requesens (1573–1578) who began by holding peace talks but failed; initially he made progress militarily but was thwarted by lack of finance and mutiny. Parma (1578–1592) regained much of central and southern Netherlands but lost momentum when his troops were requisitioned to support the Armada and besiege Paris. He died in 1592 and Maurice of Nassau was able to take advantage of this and threaten the Spanish in the north. Overall, weak leadership came from Phillip II who did not support his generals effectively/had too much involvement in European affairs to focus just on the Netherlands. Good answers will offer some debate between these aspects. Be aware of extent of reference to ‘English issues’ and that material is directed to the question.

Question 3

'Dutch antagonism towards Philip II in the Netherlands was caused by anti-catholic feeling rather than by a desire for self-rule.'

How far do you agree with this view?

(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

The two issues identified are connected; the Dutch resented foreign rule but found it more of an issue because of the religious differences. However, answers should be able to identify some specific elements relative to each aspect and compare and evaluate their relative influence on their situation.

Religious issues were brought to a head by the activities of the Inquisition which persecuted on a grand scale, e.g. 600 in 1562, and by the bishopric plan which increased the number of bishoprics and reduced the influence of the nobility in appointments; the outbreaks of iconoclasm in 1566 when 400 churches were sacked in Flanders alone etc. Some of the nobility had links with Huguenots in France and were thus seen as a greater threat by Spanish officials in the Netherlands; they objected to the introduction of the Inquisition which was a significant factor in the Compromise. Phillip did eventually withdraw the Inquisition but there was continued resistance to Catholicism.

On the other hand, self rule could be seen increasingly as an aim – their concept of identity was strengthened by rule by a Spanish king (Charles V had been a Fleming), the presence of garrisons of Spanish Troops, Spanish control of policy making, the nature so Spanish government under Alva in political and economic terms, e.g. the Council of Troubles/Blood, taxes such as the Tenth Penny, the arrest of Egmont and Hoorne, the emergence of Orange as a leader by 1572, who was beginning to see himself as a 'liberator'. The reform of bishoprics led some nobles to see this as a political move, strengthening royal power. However, there was little real sense of nationhood before the mid-1570s; many were particularists, thinking only of issues for their state/town; the presence of the Sea Beggars can be seen as a specific display of self-seeking rather than a move to liberate the Netherlands.

it could be concluded that the Dutch were simply dealing with the immediate problem and had no long-term aims other than to rid themselves of Spanish rulers, whom they saw as particularly obnoxious. On the other hand, once they began to move against Spain, the momentum grew and anti-Catholicism became an important factor. Strong focus on one element or another – e.g. only in the introductions and conclusions would not merit Level 4, but some relevant discussion would open up Level 4.

Question 4

To what extent were the Spanish Netherlands and the United Provinces economically and politically different in the years 1598 to 1609? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Although not officially independent of each other, the two states began to develop differently after 1598.

Politically: the south remained under the control of Spain but had its own internal form of government under Phillip II's nephew, Archduke Albert, who subsequently married Phillip's daughter, Isabella. Spain provided an army and controlled foreign policy but other matters were decided by the Archduke and the States-General. War continued, but more sporadically in the north, concluding in a truce in 1609, made more possible after the death of Phillip II in 1598. The north also had a States-General but this had greater autonomy than the one in the south, eventually declaring a republic after the States-General announced itself as the 'sovereign institution', although the individual state still had power in its armada. The most important official in each state was the Advocate but, gradually, Oldenbarneveldt, the Advocate of Holland, became the most influential.

In economic terms: the south reorganised its economy and the population increased but in terms of wealth it could not compete effectively with the north. At first there was some movement of population into the north which helped to expand the economy of the north. However, the linen, silk, tapestry industries began to grow in the south and some prosperity gradually returned. The north prospered considerably more as trade, particularly with the Mediterranean, grew and routes to the Indies were opened up; industry also flourished, e.g. linen/textiles. The new wealth went into enterprises such as land reclamation schemes; also into further shipping and trade. In 1602 they set up the Dutch East India Company which became one of the most significant trading organisations in Europe.

In 1609, a Twelve-Years' truce was drawn up between Spain and the Netherlands which allowed the separate development of the two states to continue. This was a clear recognition of the differing political circumstances. The north was also economically more effective than the south despite its progress towards recovery. Holland had become the dominant state. Some issues remained between north and south, e.g. there were no guarantees for Catholics regarding worship in the north. Overall, they were set in different ways which reflected some of the issues which had initially generated the conflict.

Option B: Charles V and the Holy Roman Empire, 1519–1556**Question 5**

‘Charles V’s policy towards the princes in the Holy Roman Empire was influenced more by the need to establish his political authority than by his religious authority.’

How far do you agree with this view? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

On accession: there were weaknesses in both his political and religious authority. Although Charles V was elected as Holy Roman Emperor (1519), he was limited politically, not just by those who were the Electors, but as a result of the weaknesses of previous rulers and the ambitions of the princes (Electors and lesser princes). His predecessor, Maximilian, had attempted reform but had failed and Charles, his grandson, had to face a contested succession. As a result, Charles was forced by the Electors to agree to the *Wahlkapitulation*, which restricted his authority further, e.g. he could not declare war without the agreement of the Electors. Added to this were the growing issues regarding religion. In religious terms, Charles saw himself as the secular head of the Church; neither Popes nor princes were fully supportive if this in view of the Lutheran explosion. Answers should consider the relative influence of each of these factors in Charles’s policies and response to events. Good answers will be aware of the overlap between the two issues when religious concessions were made for the sake of political support and vice versa.

The Lutheran problem is likely to loom large in most answers but should not form the whole. Some references might be made to, e.g. the issues at Worms where Charles was personally challenged by Luther who had the support of Frederick the Wise, one of those who had voted for Charles as Emperor; the Diet of Speyer, 1526, when the princes gained the right to control religion in their lands (if briefly); the failure of the Colloquy of Muhlberg in 1529; the subsequent struggle which led to the victory of Muhlberg 1547 and the Augsburg Interim 1548 but later to the failure of compromise and the subsequent Diet of Augsburg in 1555. Although Charles saw this as a great disaster, the agreement was restricted to Lutheranism and maintained the status quo in Catholic states. It restored peace after a decade of fighting.

Charles had to settle the religious issue before he could deal with external political threats, e.g. from the Turks; occasions may be quoted where he gave concessions in order to do this, e.g. his agreement to the Confession of Augsburg 1530. However, he took a more active approach, e.g. in 1547 when he defeated the Schmalkaldic League at Muhlberg. However, ultimately, he was defeated by the princes and their French allies and had to admit overall defeat at Augsburg.

Question 6

‘Francis I of France was a dangerous rival of Charles V, both politically and personally.’
How far do you agree with this view? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Charles and Francis were contemporaries and rivals, ruling large territories; they were ambitious in different ways, seeking to expand, e.g. Charles into Burgundy which was in the possession of France, and both of them into Italy; consequently they clashed continuously in what became known as the Habsburg-Valois wars which lasted until 1559. Although Charles was potentially the most powerful as the ruler of Spain and the Holy Roman Empire, his territories were less cohesive, divided by the ambitions of the German princes and the growth of Protestantism and constantly threatened by the advances of the Turks in the east.

Personal rivalry – Francis I saw himself as a cultured, Renaissance prince encouraging scholarship and the arts; Charles, also young, was a more austere character, often seen as ugly and awkward; although well-educated, he had limited time to devote to the arts. Both were devout Catholics, but did not feel enough sense of solidarity to join forces to repress Protestantism. Both were competent soldiers and determined to assert their influence in Europe.

Politically – both saw themselves as ‘absolute monarchs’. However, Charles V, although his territories were greater in size than those of Francis I, and they surrounded France, they were politically less coherent and, in religious terms, divided into Protestant and Catholic camps. The main arena for their rivalry was in the Habsburg-Valois wars focused largely on Italy where Francis I had claims to, e.g. Milan – this was dangerous for Charles V as it diverted him from the struggle with the princes and the Lutherans in the Holy Roman Empire and against the Ottomans, e.g. in 1529. However, Francis was defeated on several occasions, e.g. Pavia 1525, Landriano 1529. The death of Francis in 1547 removed a dangerous opponent, although his son Henry II continued his father’s policies. Initially, however, Charles’s victory at Muhlberg gave him some breathing space.

There was a threat, but one which was kept at bay; the political threat was probably the most dangerous but it was sharpened by the personal differences of the two rulers.

Question 7

'The degree of unity in the Holy Roman Empire and its effectiveness as a power in Europe were both greatly reduced by the end of Charles V's reign.'

To what extent do you agree with this view?

(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Despite the extent and the apparent authority of the Holy Roman Empire in 1519, there were inherent internal weaknesses, e.g. multiplicity of states, princely rivalries, etc. and some strengths e.g. common religion, strong rulers, its geographically central position in Europe. It was seen either as potentially powerful and a threat because of its size or as potentially weak and surrounded by rivals such as France, Spain and the Ottoman Empire.

Degree of unity – apparent political unity seen to be in the person of Charles V as Holy Roman Emperor. There was growing economic strength and Charles's own sense of duty was significant politically. Lutheranism was growing (Diet of Worms, support for some princes such as the Elector of Saxony, the threat of the Knights' War and the Peasants' War) but the Diet of Speyer in 1529 and the battle of Muhlberg in 1547 seemed to confirm the overall authority of the Emperor and Catholicism. However, this promise of unity was soon dispelled as, e.g. Lutheranism was increasingly seen by some princes as a means to further their own authority; the alliance between Maurice of Saxony and Henry II of France and the advance of the Turks in the east led to Charles's defeat by the prince. The humiliation of the Peace of Augsburg, 1555, allowed princes to decide the religion of their state; finally Charles V abdicated. The unity which had previously existed through his person was now purely political rather than feudal in character.

Effectiveness as a power in Europe – Charles V saw dynastic marriage as a peaceful means of maintaining and extending the power of the Holy Roman Emperor in Europe, e.g. his daughters were married into the Portuguese royal family, his brothers and sisters were married into the families of Denmark, Hungary and Portugal. Despite this, and to a degree because of this, Charles found himself embroiled in wars against the Valois in Italy and against the Turks in the Mediterranean. He had spectacular successes against the French, e.g. Pavia 1525, leading to the capture of Francis I, the Treaties of Madrid and Landriano recognising Charles V's dominance in Italy, eventually confirmed at Chateau-Cambresis in 1559. He also fought a protracted war against Turks both on land and sea; on land the outcome was indecisive; Hungary was the main area of conflict. At sea, there was no decisive confrontation after Prevesa in 1538 but the effect on other issues, e.g. rivalry with France, internal conflict in the Holy Roman Empire can be seen in his overall failure to resolve the political and religious problems. However, the fact that he kept the Holy Roman Empire intact to 1555 can be seen as a success.

Option C: Suleiman the Magnificent, 1520–1566**Question 8**

‘Suleiman the Magnificent’s personal qualities, rather than his systems of government, enabled him to rule without serious opposition.’

How far do you agree with this view?

(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6

L2: 7-11

L3: 12-15

L4: 16-18

L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Suleiman is undoubtedly seen as one of the most able Sultans of the period and therefore his personal qualities are significant. As an individual, he was thought to be firm, sober, liberal and just – dubbed ‘the lawgiver’ (kanun); the administration of justice was seen as the most important function of the government – his role was to confirm and approve all judicial decisions; he was also admired for personal qualities – as a sober, humble, hardworking, good Muslim. He was considered a good military leader; his successes included the capture of Belgrade and defeat of Hungary at Mohacz, attacks on Vienna, the seizure of Rhodes. These successes reinforced support for him at home. He chose good officers, e.g. his muftis (legal experts) and his Grand Vizier, Ibrahim. Towards the latter part of his reign he may have fallen more under the influence of others, e.g. executing Ibrahim on advice from his favourite wife, Roxelana, but he was generally perceived as a good ruler.

Systems of government were in place which also limited opposition. Many leading politicians were slaves, e.g. the Grand Vizier – promotion was solely on merit and fratricide allowed the removal of potential opponents; land (timars) was only granted to loyal supporters and never became their property, reverting to the Sultan on the death of the holder; many of the legal systems took note of the needs/customs of the diverse population so there was limited need for repression; the military and administrative classes were exempt from taxation and so felt supported by the government; many of the peasantry were treated more fairly than their European counterparts – still subject to feudal demands. However, there was no serious opposition to Suleiman during his reign because, for example, there was no aristocracy or middle classes to support opponents. His overseas successes (land and sea) continuously generated support; his demonstrations of power through ceremonial, buildings etc. reinforced the concept of state and loyalty of the people. Above all, Suleiman was prepared to take necessary action even against those who had formerly been his friends/favourites if the security of the state was at risk, even executing two of his sons.

Question 9

To what extent did Ottoman success in the Mediterranean owe more to Barbarossa than to Suleiman the Magnificent? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Ottoman success in the Mediterranean was a remarkable achievement with the capture of Rhodes in 1522, Tunis in 1534, the capture of Egypt, the victory at Prevesa in 1538, overwintering at Toulon in 1540–1541, attacks on Malta etc. These activities destroyed/limited European trade, complicated the Habsburg-Valois rivalry and also limited European attempts to deal with the Ottoman Empire because they were fighting both on sea and land.

Barbarossa's role was as admiral of the Ottoman fleet in 1533. By 1534 he had gained Tunis and Egypt. Initially his fleet was not able to compete in open warfare with Spain but there were constant raids on North Africa, Southern Italy and Venice. Between 1537 and 1543 there were constant attacks on Southern Italy. In 1538 he destroyed the combined fleets of Venice, Spain and the Papacy at Prevesa, thus confirming Turkish power in the eastern Mediterranean. In 1542–1544 his fleet reached France, where it was allowed to over-winter in Toulon, signifying his alignment with Francis I. Barbarossa died in 1545; however, Charles V did not sign a peace treaty with Suleiman until 1548, suggesting that Barbarossa was not the only factor in Ottoman success.

It was a political decision to appoint Barbarossa as commander of the fleet for which Suleiman was responsible. Without Suleiman's alliance with Francis I, the use of Toulon as a base in Europe could not have been negotiated; this was consolidated formally in 1543. Suleiman's awareness of the political situation in Europe and the religious crisis dividing governments in Europe was also important in his decision to pursue this alliance. In addition, Suleiman was aware of the superiority of the Christian navy, the significance of Rhodes and the need to find an ally who could reinforce the effects of the land campaigns. The economic strengths of the empire under Suleiman could also be perceived as significant, as demonstrated in his ability to employ Barbarossa.

Good answers will evaluate the contributions of these two individuals, but will also see the link between them and possibly show understanding that the political arm could not have succeeded without the sea power contributed by Barbarossa.

Question 10

'The differing religious and national groups within the Ottoman Empire were a source of strength rather than of weakness.'

To what extent do you agree with this view of the Ottoman Empire in the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

This is a wide-ranging question which should allow candidates to make good use of their knowledge. Reference to political structures, social systems, religion, economic developments, overseas expansion etc. might be made. The question requires some balance in the treatment of the suggested characteristics and between internal and external affairs.

Strength might be seen in, for example, the coherent organisation of the Ottoman Empire enabling it to operate successfully despite the differing religious and national groups within it, e.g. the distribution of land which did not give ownership in perpetuity but enough stability to encourage those who lived on the land to make good use of it; the toleration of different religions and practices extending to Jews as well as Christians, the availability of high office, e.g. as provincial governors, in the army and even as Grand Vizier, to all who were capable, even slaves, to rise to the top as anyone else, e.g. to become Grand Vizier. Although there were ranks and classes, for example the *reaya* (workers), soldiers and administrators, they were open to all of appropriate ability. However, the basic function of this system could be seen more as a means to generate order and provide workers rather than a genuine attempt to encourage a sense of unity amongst the diverse inhabitants of the empire. There is evidence that many of these forced immigrants retained strong links with their native countries; this could be seen both as a weakness and a strength for the Ottoman Empire.

Weaknesses – there was freedom to worship within differing communities and internal discipline could generally be applied according to religious/cultural laws except in major criminal issues. However, specific religious groups did dominate certain professions, e.g. Greeks/Christians were largely shipbuilders/fishermen, Jews were largely traders and Muslims went into the professions or were farmers. Society was hierarchical and the most important were the religious elites, thus highlighting difference. In legal terms, there were differences in the way in which the law might be applied in different provinces, generating some inconsistencies.

Overall, acceptance of difference seems to be the hallmark; and despite apparent weakness, generated a commitment to the state e.g. the timars provided the soldiers for defence and the skills of other groups contributed to the wealth of the state. Traditional social structures which gave people their place in society without reference to religion generated loyalty and order, contrasted with European states going through the upheaval of the Reformation and Catholic Reformation; this made the Ottomans appear more united and purposeful than Western states.