



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative B Unit 4

Mark Scheme

2008 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 © 2008 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 2008

Alternative B: Europe in Transition, c1470–1610

A2 Unit 4: The State, Authority and Conflict

Question 1

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

How fully does **Source B** support the view put forward in **Source C** of the reasons for the limited development of Protestantism in Spain in the years c1520 to c1560?

(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

Answers at Level 1 will restrict themselves to simple statements, e.g. Source B says that Lutheran material was banned and Source C states that suspected Lutherans were condemned to death. At Level 2, references are more likely to be developed, e.g. Source B suggests that books were being smuggled in and there was much discussion but limited circulation of material; there was more controversy about the influence of Erasmian ideas; Source C states that the Inquisition was active in controlling the spread of Lutheran ideas/heresy. From their own knowledge, candidates could make some statement about numbers persecuted by the Inquisition. At Level 3, comments will be more detailed; candidates may conclude that the sources are useful because they explain that Protestants were small in number in Spain, and Jews and Moriscos were more likely to be the object of the Inquisition's activities. The comment in Source C that Lutheranism was targeted as a focus to ensure that Catholics would feel threatened and therefore more militant, suggests that the authorities were prepared to use the idea of the Protestant threat as long as it could be controlled and be useful to them. Reference to other events in Europe could reinforce this, e.g. the early stages of the French Wars of Religion, the effects of the conflict in the HRE, England's experience etc. and therefore justify the concern of the monarchy to retain purity of faith. Good answers possibly at Level 4 will also have some knowledge of Philip II's personal piety, relationship with the papacy and involvement in the Catholic Reformation, all of which suggest that, although there may be some instances of Protestantism, its influence was limited and controlled.

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

'The religious policies followed by the Spanish monarchs enhanced their authority, but severely limited the social and cultural development of Spain 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 the sources: Source A indicates that Ferdinand and Isabella controlled the Muslims and removed the Jews thus demonstrating their power despite hampering the economic development of Spain. Source B suggests that the crown was able to control the flow of information through banning the importation of heretical books and Source C depicts more drastic action, e.g. auto da fé and crown support of the Inquisition, all these events suggest that the Spanish monarchs were able to enhance their authority. Source D gives extensive evidence of cultural issues. The effects this had are indicated in Source A with reference to 'gaps' in Spain's commercial development and implied in Source B in the sense of an impoverishment of intellectual development; Source C looks more positively at the idea of 'national identity'.

From own knowledge: Candidates might be expected to consider, e.g. in the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella – the impact the Inquisition, the treatment of the Moors and Jews, the end of convivencia, increasing royal control over clerical appointments, control over church revenue and the increasing sense of uniformity; in the reign of Charles I – persecution of the Moors and the Jews; in the reign of Philip II – persecution of the Moriscos, in part a result of fear of a potential Islamic invasion of Spain, culminating in dispersal and deportation, attempting to reform the Church, strengthened by the effects of the Council of Trent, and the more extensive use of the Inquisition. The treatment of Carranza and the introduction of the Index could also be quoted. All of these events reflected the power of the crown over the church. On the other hand, support for the Jesuits could also be seen as a positive move allowing religion to reach the masses.

The effects of these policies/developments on the social and cultural development of Spain could be examined in terms of, e.g. the introduction of censorship; the role of the Inquisition etc. However, even the Inquisition was limited in its operations; most cases heard were about issues such as blasphemy, sex outside marriage or scandal of some kind; most punishments were fines; even cases of witchcraft were not considered to be matters for persecution. There was also a cultural revival and greater social stability than previously which culminated in the reign of Philip II and was reflected in art, e.g. El Greco, architecture, e.g. the Escorial, and literature, e.g. Cervantes, Valdes. In more practical aspects, there were other achievements, e.g. in medicine (Vesalius). ‘Severe’ limitation therefore cannot be sustained.

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**

'The lack of effective Spanish authority, rather than the desire for independence, generated the outbreak of the revolt in the Netherlands in 1565.'

How far do you agree with this opinion?

(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

Overall authority was in Philip II's name from 1555, but the states were used to exercise power individually (particularism). Overall, there was a Regent/Governor General and 3 Stadholders. Each state had its own parliament and delegates from these parliaments met at the States-General. This was not an effective body, e.g. it only met every 3 years to discuss, e.g. taxation. Decisions had to be unanimous; consequently it often failed to assert authority or make changes. Each individual state parliament could raise troops and taxes. Within states, larger towns also had their own councils, often controlled the traditional merchant oligarchy. In addition each state had its own customs and traditions, taxation systems and often language. The differences generated rivalry and sometimes open conflict. The presence of the Spanish and the growth of heresy added to this mix of discontent. Philip's absence added to the unrest.

The desire for independence manifested itself frequently in concerns about the extent and level of taxation but was possibly fuelled to a higher level by opposition to Philip II. He was perceived as too Spanish but also despised because he was an absentee ruler. The presence of Spanish troops was resisted. His deputy, Margaret of Parma, was seen as inexperienced and incompetent and did not consult widely, working largely with Granvelle. The Dutch nobles used the growing protestant threat as a means of pressurising the Spanish government. The 'bishopric scheme' brought the situation to a head; William of Orange presented himself as willing to lead the protest. The crisis began in 1563 when Orange, Egmont and Hoorne offered their resignations unless Granvelle was dismissed. Having achieved this, the rebels saw the regime as weak and open to attack. The growth of Calvinism gave them a means of exercising their independence and the clash over their failure to suppress it generated open conflict by 1565.

Answers could challenge the question by reference to other factors which generated the revolt, e.g. the effects of inflation; economic depression, the view that all decisions were being made in secret; the particular issue of the Segovia letters; outbreaks of iconoclasm etc. All of these could be said to have created a background of change and uncertainty which fuelled antipathy to the government.

Question 3

'William of Orange was a more skilful politician than he was a military leader.'
To what extent do you agree with this view in relation to events in the Netherlands from 1565 to 1584? (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

As a politician: William provided clear focus for the opposition, e.g. he led c60,000 dissidents; he was well supported in 1562 when he opposed the bishopric scheme as it would increase Spanish authority. He encouraged the withholding of taxes from the Spanish and was instrumental in the removal of Granvelle in 1564; he withdrew from the Council of State and encouraged others to do so. By 1572 he was recognised as Stadholder for Holland, Zeeland and Utrecht; he worked hard to encourage common policies to benefit the region but had to be diplomatic. He took advantage of the Spanish Fury 1576 and the bankruptcy of the French crown to generate the Pacification of Ghent and recognition of the United Provinces. However, he was unable to prevent the division of 1579 on religious lines and the creation of the Union of Utrecht. His assassination in 1584 left the situation still open.

As a military leader: He was involved in several unsuccessful campaigns in 1556/7/8 and emerged as a military leader following action of the Council of Troubles, condemning him and confiscating his property. He led an unsuccessful invasion in 1572 but was unable to gain the promised French help (because of the Massacre of St Bartholomew). In 1573 he did gain the support of the Sea Beggars and control of Holland and Zeeland; he was able to rally opposition around the Sieges of Haarlem and Leiden. He was prepared to use the support of other European leaders, e.g. the Elector Palatine as well as to work with the Catholic leaders of Europe. He also sought the support of Elizabeth I who eventually provided assistance in 1585. He was much criticised for this but may also be praised for keeping the resistance going.

Other factors might also be mentioned as significant, e.g. the Spanish Fury 1576, the Spanish attack on Namur 1577 which aided the cause, but the expectation is that the focus will be on William of Orange.

Question 4

To what extent had the United Provinces achieved political and religious unity by 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

Politically, in 1565, the Netherlands was simply a collection of 17 states under the jurisdiction of Philip II of Spain. Holland was the dominant state. Charles V's earlier attempts to promote some unity through the use of common bodies such as the Council of State and the States-General had met with limited success. Most states referred to their own provincial assemblies and city councils. Regents, who were the ruling group in the towns, resisted any attempts to reduce their authority. The States-General represented the 17 provinces: its members were wary of Philip II and his possible intentions. They saw Philip's relationship with Granvelle as a threat and quickly recognised that Margaret of Parma had limited authority. The arrival of Alva marked the beginning of a revolt which continued to 1609.

Leadership of the revolt was mainly in the hands of William of Orange who believed in the importance of unity to win the struggle. The Pacification of Ghent in 1576 which sought to generate unity between states broke down by 1579. More successful was the 1581 Act of Abjuration which rejected the authority of Spain and Philip II by the northern provinces. William's assassination in 1584 meant that political authority in the north passed to Maurice of Nassau and by the 1590s and the end of the conflict; he controlled territory which extended to the border with Germany, named the United Provinces. Political unity was subsequently generated through the work of Oldenbarneveldt, the States General and individual Stadholders but was by no means complete by 1609.

In religious terms in 1565, the boundaries of the Catholic dioceses of the Netherlands overlapped into France and Germany. The bishopric scheme devised to generate greater unity, increase the numbers of bishoprics, redraw the boundaries and allocate revenues generated substantial opposition and was seen as a precursor to the introduction of the Inquisition and subordination to Spain. Further opposition was generated by Philip II's decision to eradicate Calvinism, provoking iconoclasm and general disorder. The greatest support for Calvinism was initially in the south encouraged by the flight of Huguenots from France. Hedge preaching and the influence of the Sea Beggars encouraged its spread. The Pacification of Ghent in 1576 supported heresy edicts and allowed Protestantism in public in Holland and Zeeland and the process gained momentum. The final establishment of Protestantism was dependent on the political outcome of the struggle and the 12 year truce in 1609; open Catholic worship was forbidden and the United Provinces and religious division between the United Provinces and Spanish the Netherlands.

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

‘The German princes, not Luther, were the real threat to the stability of the Holy Roman Empire.’

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

The princes were necessarily a political threat to any Holy Roman Emperor but in this period the additional challenge of Lutheranism, and the involvement of some of the princes in this, posed a dual problem. There were c300 princes. In constitutional terms the princes, through the Diet, could make demands. They did this with Charles V, e.g. requests in 1519 and 1521 for the restoration of the Regency Council, the right to appoint a proportion of its councillors; in practice, none of his edicts were implemented because he needed the princes to support him in this. When he did manage to set up a strengthened Regency Council in 1548, they still opposed him and it was unsuccessful. The protestant princes formed the Schmalkaldic League to fight for religious change; in this case the Catholic princes supported Charles but the consequent struggle destabilised the HRE leading to chronic warfare, financial issues and Charles V's eventual abdication in 1555 'a broken man' despite his victory at Muhlberg, he also had to rely on the princes to deal with the Knights', War and the Peasants' Revolt in the 1520s.

Luther was a significant threat because Charles was absent from the Empire when Luther was most active and he had the support of a number of influential princes. Because Luther was attacking the Catholic Church, Charles, regarding himself as the secular leader of the Church, perceived him as particularly dangerous and that it was his duty to combat this. Luther's use of printing and preaching to spread his ideas made him particularly dangerous; he attracted attention, not just from the princes but also from the towns and the more rural areas, with consequences as seen in the Peasants' Revolt. Luther was therefore both a political and a religious threat. In terms of his international standing and the security of his other dominions, it was important to Charles that he dealt with Luther effectively.

In effect the two problems were inter-related. Unfortunately, Charles had limited help from, e.g. the Papacy, which was too embroiled in secular affairs, or from the French with whom he was fighting a bitter war. The Lutheran threat may be perceived as greater because it attacked Charles' fundamental role as HRE in all its aspects.

Question 6

'The Ottoman threat to the Holy Roman Empire was both persistent and dangerous.'
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 threat could be regarded as persistent because it lasted throughout Charles V's reign from the 1520s onwards, inspired by the concept of Holy War. It was dangerous because the Ottomans came so close so quickly, e.g. capturing Rhodes in 1520, Tunis in 1534, Nice in 1543, patrolling the coast of Italy in 1552. It was also dangerous because it was a dual attack, by land and sea.

The threat remained persistent because the Holy Roman Empire received limited or no help/support from neighbours who regarded the Holy Roman Empire as a threat; some were willing to ally with the Ottoman Empire as in 1543 when the French combined with the Ottoman fleet to capture Nice; the Ottoman victory at Prevesa in 1538 gave the OE control in the Eastern Mediterranean. On land, Belgrade was attacked in 1521, the Hungarians were defeated at Monaczin in 1526 and the Turks were at the gates of Vienna by 1529. The Turks had an efficient army, supplied as a consequence of the timar system.

There were some successes, e.g. Doria seized ports in Greece in 1532 and ultimately France came to an agreement with the Holy Roman Empire to avoid fighting a war on two fronts i.e. the Peace of Crepy in 1544.

The greatest danger, apart from the loss of some ports, territory etc was the involvement of Charles V's enemies and particularly Francis I who agreed an alliance with the Turks in 1536 and 1544; this incursion into 'Christian Europe' by 'the infidel' was a severe threat to Charles' role as defender of the Catholic faith and, in particular threatened the existence of various Christian communities, e.g. on Rhodes. It was also a threat to his title of Holy Roman Emperor and made communications between Spain and its Mediterranean empire, especially in North Africa, difficult; it also made trade difficult and threatened the naval bases of Tripoli and Oran.

At best the threat could be said to be more persistent than dangerous; it diverted the Holy Roman Empire, although ultimately the Holy Roman Empire had to accept that they could not overcome Ottoman power in the Eastern Mediterranean.

Question 7

'Charles V was a courageous but unsuccessful Holy Roman Emperor.'
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 V could be seen as courageous because he was determined to hold on to his empire at all costs, e.g. he saw the need to keep the princes in order to maintain religious unity and was not afraid to challenge and fight them, e.g. at Muhlberg; he was ready to tackle the problem of heresy 'head on' and was prepared for discussion, e.g. at the Colloquy of Regensburg, and to make alliances, e.g. with Francis I (who was otherwise a great enemy); he ceaselessly urged the Papacy to take action against protestants; he never abandoned the concept of 'cuius religio, eius religio' which underpinned his view of the relationship between the ruler and ruled. He also had a vision of his empire and of his role as arbiter of central Europe and a need for a defence against the Ottoman Empire. His whole life was spent dealing with problems as they arose; he was prepared to travel extensively to maintain his empire.

He was unsuccessful because he failed to combat Lutheranism fully but he was hampered by his other problems, which often appeared at the same time, e.g. just as the princes were forming the Schmalkaldic League, he was faced by an attack from the Turks. In addition, some of Luther's supporters were his greatest subjects, e.g. Philip of Hesse, and he lacked effective support from the weak and worldly Papacy. Ultimately he also lost the battle against the Protestant princes because he did not understand the strength of their religious belief. Even his Catholic supporters did not wish to see him become too powerful as they feared for their political safety. Ultimately he failed because he was dealing with too many problems at once. Charles himself had a deep sense of failure particularly because he saw religion becoming of lesser importance than politics.

Answers to this question should be wide ranging to access as many aspects of Charles' reign as possible. Some may lay heavy emphasis on his abdication, but this in itself is an indication of his courage in his convictions. Much of his work led to the reform of the Church following the Council of Trent; he had also kept the Turks at bay.

OPTION C: Suleiman the magnificent, 1520–1566**Question 8**

To what extent do you agree that Suleiman the Magnificent had established a strong state in both political and religious terms by 1566? (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

Political – Suleiman was an ambitious ruler who was regarded as a good leader by his peers; he had proved through the law of fratricide that he was the strongest and most able son, fit to take the throne and was generally adulated by his people; no subject was allowed to challenge his authority. He was assiduous in attention to affairs of state, working with his ministers and the Divan; he paid attention to the economic and material development of the state. When land was seized from enemies it was distributed to the soldiers etc and could be redistributed on his death (so there was always the possibility of social advancement for his subjects). He was aware of the value of displays of wealth and power and used such exhibitions regularly to accentuate his success and power. He worked politically, largely through the Grand Vizier but gave approval (or not) to all major issues. He had built up a strong army, recruited from slaves, according to custom, and based on the timar. These Soldiers proved themselves in battle almost continuously as the OE advanced during the second half of the century. His successes against the West, e.g. at Belgrade, Vienna etc bolstered his authority. The use of slaves also gave a strong power base; they identified with the state and had no effective means of challenging its authority.

Religious – the focus given by the Muslim faith was effective, although non-Islamic people were allowed to practice their faith and were therefore more readily incorporated into society at a certain level. Many otherwise persecuted groups, e.g. Jews, found a refuge in the Ottoman Empire and could be self governing under the 'millet' system. Different groups lived side by side. Occasionally, extreme measures were taken, e.g. in 1537 it was decreed that all those doubting the Prophet were unbelievers and were to be executed, but this was unusual; the main strictures on non-Islamic people were that they had to wear distinctive dress and were not allowed to carry weapons. Otherwise they had land (although not owned) and there was little segregation. In relation to European states at the time, the OE was reasonably tolerant of difference.

It could be said that these strengths were a factor of the way in which the Ottoman Empire had developed and not due to Suleiman or his government; however, he was wise enough to continue and develop them. Acceptance of diversity, in particular, gave flexibility and strength.

Question 9

'Effective administration, rather than charismatic leadership, was the secret of Ottoman domestic success.'

To what extent do you agree with this opinion?

(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

Administration – was based at Constantinople, which was also a commercial centre where wealth was created and could be accessed. Suleiman was a good judge of men and chose the best man for the job, e.g. his Grand Vizier. There was a strong civil service and legal system to underpin daily life; civil service had up to 7 years training and were paid according to a merit system, the best rising rapidly through the ranks; subject nations were not necessarily repressed and were often involved in their own government; the legal system often took account of the customs and needs of the different peoples in the Empire. The main source of 'officials' was slaves (the *dvershime*) or levy of Christian children. They were taught appropriate skills such as reading, writing and mathematics but also were trained in, e.g. horsemanship, archery, painting and artistic skills – many rose to be provincial governors. The head of the administration, the Grand Vizier also had some responsibility for foreign affairs; the linkage between this and domestic affairs was a strength. There were no hereditary offices and the Sultan and his Vizier were free to choose the best for the job.

Charismatic leadership emerged from the power of the Sultan who had no strong, hereditary nobles snapping at his heels. His authority also partly came from success in expanding the empire, from the requirement for him to be able to interpret Islamic Law, and from his required talent for display. He was in the enviable position of having no rivals for the throne and was the wealthiest person.

Suleiman was also very good at marketing himself and his empire's strengths; there was much ceremonial, e.g. he began to sit at a higher level to his ambassadors, advisers etc he adopted symbols of a crown and a sceptre. He was often compared to his great predecessors – Darius of Persia, Alexander of Macedonia etc.

However it could be said that Suleiman had advantages – there were no rivals to the throne because of the tradition of fratricide, he was the wealthiest person and so it was hard for him to be challenged; and these were the expectations of a Sultan at this time. Had he not been successful militarily, however, it is difficult to suggest that simple display would have conferred power and authority; the 'display' was possible because of his achievements.

Question 10

'The Ottomans' failure to dominate the Mediterranean was due more to their own weaknesses than to unity of the western powers.'

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

The Ottomans did have an impressive record in the Mediterranean up to 1566; they had taken Rhodes in 1522, which was an important link East/West and North/South and was the home of the very militant knights of St John enabling them to attack shipping; in 1534, they took parts of North Africa, e.g. Tunis (a Spanish ally) and Egypt; in 1534 they destroyed the combined fleets of Venice, Spain and the Papacy at Prevesa. By 1540/1 they were overwintering in Toulon with the agreement of the French king (as part of his battle against the Habsburgs); and by 1560 they had smashed the European fleet at Djerba.

However, by 1566 they had lost Malta and were eventually defeated at Lepanto in 1571 by the combined efforts of Spain, Venice and the Papacy. Although the fleet was rapidly rebuilt they never again came as close to the domination of the Mediterranean. Barbarossa had been the key to Turkish domination of the Mediterranean. His death in 1546 had resulted in a slow down despite the talents of his replacement, Dragut.

Alternatively, the western powers were not a consistently unified force, either on land or at sea. The French and the Habsburgs were too strong as enemies to unite long term against the Ottomans, having fought against each other for much of the first half of the century. The Turks did rebuild their fleet rapidly and recaptured Cyprus; they retook Tunis in 1574 and had captured Morocco by 1578.

Internal factors tended to continue to weaken the Ottoman Empire, e.g. there was growing intrigue at court, particularly the influence of the harem which influenced the choice of advisers etc. Inflation also reached the Ottoman Empire and taxation grew which weakened the timar system, led to higher taxation and hampered economic growth. An alternative view suggests that by the 1570s, awareness of the Ottoman Empire was high in the Mediterranean (a kind of demonization) and they were viewed, because of their past plundering activities, as a serious threat and thus resisted more strongly.