

Examiners' Report  
June 2019

GCE History 9HI0 2B

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

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



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2019

Publications Code 9HI0\_2B\_1906\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates continue to engage effectively across the ability range with A Level paper 2B which deals with Luther and the German Reformation, c1515-55 (2B.1) and The Dutch Revolt, c1563-1609 (2B.2).

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

In Section A, the strongest answers were able to develop reasoned and supported inferences based on the sources. Such responses evaluated the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the enquiry on the basis of both the contextual knowledge which was on offer and through an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It is pleasing to note that last summer's advice was taken on board by many candidates and there were fewer examples this summer of candidates suggesting that weight can be established by a discussion of what is missing from a source. The question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and it was pleasing to see that the vast majority of candidates continue to be aware of this requirement. It can be achieved using a variety of different approaches. This summer there was some evidence of more candidates using often extensive contextual knowledge to drive an answer to the enquiry, rather than using it to illuminate and discuss the source. This resulted in candidates not dealing with the sources adequately.

In section B it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. Weaker candidates often engaged in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates are encouraged to ensure that they take the most appropriate approach to answering a question. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology, not merely using the start and end dates as bookends with little consideration of the events between. It continues to be the case that not all candidates have a secure understanding of what is meant by 'criteria' in terms of bullet point 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates continue to explicitly state in the introduction to the essay that they are naming the criteria that they plan to use, when in actual fact they are referring to the issues or the factors that will be discussed in the response. 'Criteria' in bullet point 3 of the mark scheme refers to the basis on which candidates reach their judgement, not the issues that are discussed in the process of reaching that judgement. There was some tendency this summer, in all sections of the paper, for some candidates to replicate the words and phrases of the mark scheme in their responses. It is the application of the requirements of the mark scheme that is crucial.

## **Question 1**

Responses to this question came from across the ability range. Stronger answers were able to infer, from both sources, a number of consequences of Luther's condemnation of the Peasants' War. These included Luther's loss of support from the peasants and his rejection of the ideas espoused by the radicals concerning social and political change. Many candidates were also able to infer the support this implied for a magisterial reformation, supported by princes like George the Pious, and the need for a clarification of Lutheran doctrine, especially with regard to the idea of 'Christian freedom'. These inferences were often supported and developed by a depth of knowledge specific to the period from which the two sources were taken. With reference to weight, the better answers identified the position of Luther, having to reply forcefully to critics in his home town, and of George the Pious as a ruler, who stood to benefit from the application of Luther's ideas. Such observations were used in coming to a judgement about the weight the sources would bear as part of the enquiry.

Weaker answers tended not to engage fully with the content of the sources, a problem caused by rushed reading perhaps but one which stymied candidates' ability to engage with the enquiry. Many wrote extensively about the nature, origin and purpose of the sources, often along stereotypical lines, without attempting to apply this to the content of the sources in coming to a judgement.

Sources 1 and 2 are of considerable value when looking to investigate the consequences of Luther's condemnation of the peasants' war. The Peasants' War took place between 1524-25 and saw a vast number of peasants rising up to convey their grievances with Rome's financial exploitation of Germany, and the questionable behaviour of the clergy. ~~Source 1 comes as a defence~~

Both sources carry a theme that reiterates and reinforces the belief that lower subjects should be subservient to higher authorities. Indeed, Source 1 states "But a rebel attacks the ruler himself, and threatens the exercise of his authority". This line of argument is echoed in source 2; "which All subjects are obliged to obey their rulers in such worldly affairs and commands". These statements hold credibility as Luther had previously mentioned not only in his pamphlets "An admonition to peace" and "Against the robbing, murdering hordes of peasants", but also ~~is~~ with his doctrine of a 'priesthood of all believers', that ordinary subjects were spiritually equal to higher authorities, not socially equal. From this we can deduce that one of the immediate consequences of Luther's condemnation of the Peasants' War was a further clarification of the societal hierarchy by Lutheran leaders. Furthermore, both sources seek to directly address

complaints from peasants that labelled Luther's alignment with the princes as "harsh". Source 1 claims "Why were they not merciful to the princes and lords who they wanted to exterminate?". This sentiment is repeated in source 2 where Margrave George states "A true Christian may have to endure injustice, but must not do injustice". It is clear from both sources then that the actions of the peasants were deemed as being out of order or "un-Christian". It was important that Luther ~~and~~ his supporters made this distinction as ~~the~~ Catholic opponents had previously stated that Lutheranism would result in anarchy ~~so thereby~~. Therefore we can draw the conclusion that both sources are useful when used in tandem as they give the reader further insight into one of the main consequences of the Peasants' War - a loss of peasant support. We also know this was true as even after Luther's publication of "An admonition to peace", when visiting his home in Thuringia, Luther was bowed and spat on by peasants.

5000 When analysed individually, it is evident that source 1 focuses more on the idea of Luther emphasising <sup>that</sup> his beliefs that do not coincide with uprising and can be viewed almost as Luther clearing his name to ensure princely support. Luther portrays this hardline approach through quotes such as "Rebellion is no joke and there is no evil deed on earth that compares with it". This quote demonstrates the ~~dismay~~ <sup>dismay</sup>



Luther had towards those that rebelled, and furthered ~~the~~ his agenda of gaining princely support. This stance can be seen as valuable as it mirrored Luther's previous viewpoints from his pamphlet "Against the Robbing, Murdering Hordes of Peasants". This response by Luther helped cement the clearest separation between a respectable, registorial reformation that Luther wished to promote, and the radical reformation deemed unacceptable by both Lutheran and Catholic princes. This source provides us with greater context to how one of the main consequences of the Peasants' War came to be - increased princely support. Indeed, immediately following Luther's denunciation of the Peasants' War, key Lutheran princes converted such as John of Saxony, Philip of Hesse and Albert of Hohenzollern.

Source 2 also demonstrates a reclarification of Lutheran beliefs and doctrines being one of the consequences of the Peasants' War. Margrave George states "I command that the Holy Gospel should be preached everywhere" and later adds "It is clearly shown in Holy Scripture". Here these quotes imply an ~~re~~ emphasis on the Lutheran doctrine of 'sola scriptura' and the Bible being the true guide to a righteous way of living. Following the Peasants' War and the period of radicalism involving Carlstadt and the Zwickau Prophets, Lutheran leaders deemed it necessary to update Lutheranism to include clear statements of belief. This resulted in

works such as the publications of the Catechisms in 1529 and the Augsburg Confession in 1530, illustrating that ~~one of~~ Source 2 is immensely valuable in showing us that a strengthening of Lutheran doctrines was a consequence of Luther's condemnation of the Peasants War.

Both sources can be attributed value due to the expertise of the authors - Luther and ~~the~~ Margrave George. Luther was a very respectable ~~or~~ author who gained significant credentials being professor of Theology at the University of Wittenberg. Also, Margrave George was a respected figure of authority. The timing of both the sources ~~as~~ can be called into question however, as although they are written directly after the Peasants' War, they only provide short-term scope for an investigation into the consequences of Luther's response. There also may be elements of bias as both sources come from the same side of the spectrum, instead of allowing us to see direct criticism from the peasants for example.

To conclude, when used together, sources 1 and 2 can be of significant value. They cover ~~as~~ numerous aspects such as the re-iteration of Luther's views on hierarchy and provide minor insight into some of the complaints from peasants that led to Luther losing support in the aftermath of the war.





This response makes a series of reasoned inferences from the content of both sources with regard to the consequences of Luther's condemnation of the Peasants' War. It supports and develops these with well-chosen, precise knowledge which links directly to this source material and helps illuminate what can be gained from them. There is a clear attempt to use the source together. Lastly, the evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria in its evaluation even if this is rather weakly substantiated. It was awarded a top L4 mark.

## **Question 2**

There were a number of very good answers to this question. These were able to use the evidence of both sources to make a number of inferences about the reasons for Parma's success, including his political and diplomatic skills in persuading Philip II to make the concessions outlined in the Treaty of Arras, and both Parma's military achievements and Orange's weaknesses from Source 4. These inferences were often supported and developed by a depth of knowledge with relation to the political and religious situation in the Netherlands in the period outlined in the question. When considering the weight of the evidence, many noted the strengths and weaknesses of a treaty as evidence, also the obvious pro-rebel and anti-Orange bias of Source 4.

Weaker answers tended not to engage fully with the content of the sources, a problem caused by rushed reading perhaps but one which stymied candidates' ability to engage with the enquiry. Many wrote extensively about the nature, origin and purpose of the sources, often along stereotypical lines, without attempting to apply this to the content of the sources in coming to a judgement.

Sources 3 and 4 in conjunction with one another possess a strong basis for a historian to investigate the Duke of Parma's success between 1577-84. Source 3 is an extract from the Treaty of Arras, proposed by the Duke of Parma himself, and reveals his understanding of Dutch concerns, whilst source 4 is a pro-Arras / Spanish pamphlet criticising William of Orange whilst drawing attention to the Duke of Parma's success. These two together offer insight into Parma's success as a statesman, and a general.

Source 3 reveals the ability of Parma to manipulate and understand the Dutch people of the south, suggesting a reason for his success. The ~~line~~ first line agrees 'to preserve the Roman Catholic faith... prosperity of the country.' This shows a clear promise aimed to unite people against the rebels. This idea is reinforced by a similar line in source 4 that 'Madame sincerely wishes ~~the~~... harmony between the provinces.' Indeed the mostly Catholic south had remained loyal to Philip II, with the states-general not wishing to commit treason, whilst also there were concerns over the damage to the economy. This latter element particularly derived from the 1576 sack of Antwerp by mutinous troops, which had angered southern ~~the~~ Dutch people to the extent of putting aside differences with the rebels in 1576. It also alludes to Parma's strategy to take Antwerp in 1584 - by constructing a bridge ~~is~~ trade was restricted,

leading to ~~some~~ Antwerp's capitulation. Such suggestions of Parma's understanding of the situation are the focus on recruiting and appointing natives as troops and advisors respectively, whilst reversing Alva's taxes as these were not in force in Emperor Charles'. These issues, which had consistently led to dissent, were thus being addressed by Parma, thus making them useful ~~to~~ ~~invest~~ a historian investigating his success.

The utility of Source 3 is further increased, as not only is this an extract from a treaty, a reliable and ~~an~~ insightful source, but it was proposed by Parma himself. This enables a clear insight into his ~~main~~ perspective between 1577-84. Composed in 1579, it thus contains the reasoning ~~for~~ for further success by 1584, though it must be borne in mind that a treaty amongst the pro-Spanish southern provinces does not reveal an insight into the weaknesses of the rebels. Whilst this would also be of use, it does not undermine Source 3's utility. However, one thing to consider is that the treaty itself was purposed to encourage unity against the rebels, and so ~~can~~ ~~over~~ could exaggerate the ~~the~~ willingness of Philip II to compromise on elements such as 'privileges and customs,' or withdrawing troops. Nonetheless source 3 has a large amount of use to a historian, when the background and content are examined, and it is further reinforced by source 4.

Source 4, as an anonymous pamphlet, can be seen to be anti-rebel propaganda, and thus biased with the potential for hyperbole. However this is not to undermine its utility as the points made are



direct and reinforceable. The rhetorical question 'How many times... time to fight' immediately raises the point that William was more a statesman than a general. Although his capability in uniting Calvinists and those who just wanted autonomy amongst other groups is not to be understated, militarily he saw less success. Source 4 ~~about~~ makes reference to the siege of Maastricht, a clear reference to <sup>Parma's</sup> ability to capture towns through a series of swift sieges. It was these comparatively swift sieges which enabled him to spend less than any other governor-general. Further, the direct criticism of Orange, as would potentially be expected by a source aimed to dissuade the revolting provinces, can be linked to Parma's renowned military leadership. Orange not engaging 'the Duke of Parma in battle' or remaining 'paralysed within the walls,' not only ~~shows~~ reveals the source's ~~only~~ own purpose, but further hints at the fact that Parma was a ~~renowned~~ famous commander, who the rebels were reluctant to fight. These points show source 4's reliability, which is important to a historian.

Like source 3, the pamphlet was published in the middle of the given period 1577-84, offering use for the latter years, even if not for those before to a great extent. Though the source is propaganda and has an anonymous origin, the detail and insight, particularly with the description of Orange as 'sowing as much discord as possible' is clear. This aids its reliability, whilst the similar purpose to source 3 ensures that a historian can make a sustained and co-ordinated judgement on the reasons for

Parma's success.

In summary sources 3 and 4 are of great use together for the historian to investigate Parma's success between 1577-84. Though each is written after 1577 to early 1579, they offer insight into Parma's nature which led to his success in <sup>those</sup> prior years. Furthermore, with each source being pro-Spanish and with a purpose of affirming this or discrediting the rebels, they offer particular merit alongside one another, as well as reinforcing one another. These reliable sources here each show and reveal Parma's characteristics as statesman and military leader, in contrast to Orange as only a statesman, and are thus useful together to investigate his 1577-84 success.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response confidently interrogates the evidence of both sources with regards to Parma's success. It makes reasoned inferences and supports these with contextual knowledge which illuminates, and discusses the limitations of, the evidence of the sources. Lastly, it uses valid criteria to evaluate the use of the source material to the enquiry and there is a clear attempt to take into account the weight the evidence will bear in coming to a judgement. As a result, it was given a low L5 mark.



### **Question 3**

The better-performing candidates in this question had considerable knowledge of Luther's debate with Eck and of other significant factors in the development of Luther's challenge to the Church in the years 1517-20. Many were able to evidence how the debate forced Luther to go beyond his initial criticism of indulgences and to develop a more rounded criticism of the Church and its teachings, seen in the Reformation Treatises of 1520. They also noted how Eck's association of Luther with Hus at Leipzig hastened his denunciation, and eventual excommunication, by Leo X. These answers were balanced by a discussion of a counter-case, which often included the weakness of the reaction of his opponents in encouraging Luther's challenge, with the best being able to evidence the complex interaction of events in coming to a judgement.

Less strong answers tended to describe rather than analyse Luther's debate with Eck and/or to stray into descriptions of Luther's life and ideas both before 1517 and after 1520. Other answers lacked range and depth of knowledge, and/or omitted consideration of the debate with Eck at all.

## PLAN

significant - allowed him to do more research

- character - go back + research

not - condemned self a heretic - Jan Hus

- excommunication followed -

- restricted development

The Leipzig debate of 1519 between Luther and Eck can be argued to be hugely significant in enabling Luther to develop his challenge to the Catholic Church, mainly as it allowed him to reconsider + delve deeper in his research. It did however effectively condemn Luther a heretic, ~~and~~ restricting his ability to play the role of a figurehead of the German reformation, as his excommunication quickly followed. This therefore argues that the Leipzig debate may have restricted ~~his~~ the development of his challenge.

Through Luther's debate with Eck in 1519, Luther was able to argue his case, and attempt to justify his ~~pe~~ arguments for the development of his ideas. It

was soon into the debate that Eck was able to switch the focus away from Luther's objections to indulgences, and on to the broader topic of the authority of the Pope. The pressure that Luther faced to answer to Eck's claims caused him to, arguably, make much more extreme claims than that of the views he already held. Due to Luther's own character, having his eyes opened to these extreme views resulted in him going back to the bible and doing more research in an attempt to justify himself. This mainly ~~was~~ occurred due to the fact that he was not the kind of person to step down if he believed that he was correct, and in this case, Luther had strong views that he was certain of. This pressure that Eck placed on Luther, and the dramatic turn of the debate that Luther did not foresee, can be argued to be a turning point in the development of his ideas, as prior to this event, Luther's objections to papal authority was restricted to indulgences only, being critical of their basis in the scriptures. This debate can be described as the trigger ~~of~~ for Luther widening the scope of his ideas and extending his criticisms of the papacy, becoming a much wider argument of the fundamental scriptural basis for both the papacy and papal ~~curia~~ <sup>curia</sup> of cardinals and archbishops. Therefore,

This debate can be argued as being hugely significant in creating the foundations for the future Lutheranism faith.

Despite this, there is also the argument that the Leipzig debates of 1519 were a restriction placed on the development of Lutheranism and Luther's challenge to the Catholic Church, making it not such a significant event. This arises from the fact that, in the later stages of the debate, Luther was seen to effectively condemn himself a heretic in stating that he agreed with some of the views of Jan Hus, an imperial outlaw who had been declared a heretic in the years prior. After going back and doing more research on the claims that Eck was making about him, Luther came to the conclusion that a number of ~~the~~ <sup>the claims he was making, had</sup> ~~these~~ ~~had~~ scriptural basis, and therefore he agreed with them. By publicly declaring this, alongside his extreme views on the authority of the papacy, stating that they had no scriptural basis, Luther had named himself a heretic for presenting a challenge to the Catholic Church, ~~and~~ ~~alongside~~ this, instead of recanting his views to avoid any consequences of his actions, Luther instead developed them, leading to the 1520 ~~condemnation~~ ~~panel~~ ~~excommunication~~ excommunication threat that was presented to him,



arguably designed to stop the development of his ideas. Furthermore, the existence of this papal bull of excommunication and Luther's status as a heretic made it a large risk for people to show support of his ideas, otherwise they too would be named a heretic and excommunicated. This arguably led to a decline in support for Luther's challenge to the Catholic Church, making it hard for Luther to develop his ideas on a large scale and create the same form of reformation that he thought was needed.

Overall, despite the Leipzig debates effectively condemning Luther a heretic, making it hard for those sympathetic to show support for his cause, Luther still managed to take this opportunity to deepen his research and explain himself and his views. This condemnation as a heretic did not prevent Lutheranism from developing, and meaning that these debates were a significant turning point in his challenge.



This response confidently discusses the ways in which the Leipzig debate was significant in the development of Luther's challenge to the Catholic Church before also considering the ways in which it may have damaged the Lutheran cause. However, it does not consider in any detail any alternative factors which may have been significant during this period and this lack of range kept it at the top of L4.



## **Question 4**

This was a popular question and there were, again, many strong answers. There were some very impressive close analyses of the role of the Schmalkaldic League both before the defeat of 1547, in protecting and encouraging the growth of Lutheranism, and after the defeat at Muhlberg, in reviving the Lutheran cause with French support. These, often very convincingly, linked directly to the reasons for the signing of the Peace of Augsburg in 1555. Of course, many answers balanced this with a consideration of other factors, most notably the mistakes of Charles V and the Papacy in the years leading up to 1555. Some, often less convincingly, ranged back as far as the 1520s without making a direct link between these events and the conclusion of the Peace.

Weaker candidates often knew little of the Schmalkaldic League or the Peace of Augsburg. Though they were able to discuss a number of other reasons for the survival of Lutheranism, many answers did not range much further than the 1520s.

Arguably, without the Schmalkaldic League, Charles V would not have been forced to accept the territorial existence of Lutheranism with the Peace of Augsburg, given that it attracted secular leaders to the faith and legitimised it. However, the conservatism of Lutheranism and the military and political preoccupations of the Emperor must also be considered.

Firstly, it is possible to argue that the Schmalkaldic League led to the Peace of Augsburg given that it significantly increased the number of Lutheran territories from 1531 - 1546. That is, by offering the secular leaders a respite from papal taxes and the political leverage over Charles V (and his attempts to increase his power at their expense), membership of the League (and Lutheranism) rose from an around 15 initial members to 35 seven years later. ~~Natural~~ This arguably meant that ~~within three years~~ Charles was unable to wage war against the Lutheran states until the 1546, when he was free from conflicts with the Ottomans.

and Francis I (given the size of the League), whereas without the League, he ~~was~~ could have crushed Lutheranism and therefore would not be in a position in 1555 in which he would have to agree to the policy of "in cuius regio, eius religio" given that Lutheranism had ~~grown so much~~ spread so much. Indeed, his inability to wage war against both the League and the Turks / Turks is demonstrated as he was forced to grant the League de facto recognition until 1546 as he was afraid it would ally with Francis I.

// NP.

It could be argued that the leaders of the imperial estates ~~actually~~ would have converted in the same number without the League, as Luther's ideas appealed to their humanist education (not just economic / political grievances); for example, his emphasis on the sole authority of the scripture was ~~more~~ quite synonymous with ~~ad fontes~~ ~~the~~ ~~scripture~~ ~~for~~ ~~humanists~~. However, it is likely many converts to Lutheranism through the League were motivated by self-interest ~~rather~~ rather than the ~~genuine~~ religious ideas of Luther given that the leaders of the League agreed to the Augsburg Confession, which was intended to be acceptable to the Catholic Church (at the Diet of Augsburg) and therefore had vague definitions and allowed for broad interpretations, ~~even~~ meaning secular leaders inclined towards the old religion could still join the League, even if they were not an evangelical Lutheran.

Naturally, the Peace of Augsburg was also an extension of the Peace of Passau and Charles' failure to uniformly implement the Augsburg Interim. Although the Schmalkaldic League was dissolved after the War of 1546-47, it did arguably provide the groundwork for a Protestant alliance under Maurice in 1551 and a League similar to the Schmalkaldic League in 1552, which arguably convinced Charles that the reformed territories were too united to be 'divided and ruled' by any further military / political efforts to enforce the Interim or proselytize these states. However, it is possible that had Charles not been chased out of Tyrol, his hereditary Hapsburg lands and into Italy by the Protestant princes in 1552, he would not have needed to secure a temporary peace with them and suspend the Interim ~~which had been planned to be enforced in southern imperial cities successfully~~; rather, he could have continued to enforce the Interim like he had been doing in southern imperial cities. Therefore, ~~thus~~ ~~therefore~~, ~~naturally~~, ~~this~~ ~~group~~ ~~of~~ ~~Protestant~~ ~~princes~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~a~~ ~~direct~~ ~~result~~ ~~of~~ ~~this~~ ~~though~~ ~~based~~ ~~under~~ ~~the~~ ~~Peace~~ ~~of~~ ~~Augsburg~~ did however have its roots in the League, although not entirely, as Maurice had previously been allied with Charles.

Overall then, the evidence suggests that the

Schmalkaldic League allowed for the spread of Lutheranism  
from 1531 - 55 ~~architecture~~ and the Peace of Augsburg,  
given ~~reasons~~ that it brought leaders to the faith and  
united them as a ~~wiblog~~ alliance.



This answer considers the ways in which the Schmalkaldic League contributed to the signing of the Peace of Augsburg, looking at both longer and short-term factors. It lacks however, any detailed consideration of wider factors which may have contributed to the Peace being concluded and therefore, was awarded a top L4 mark.

## **Question 5**

This was the more popular question and it was often answered very well. Such responses evidenced, in some depth, both Alva's failures and rebel strengths, and linked these convincingly to Alva's eventual dismissal. The very best answers were able to weave these factors together in coming to a judgement noting, for example, how Alva's failure to prevent the seizure of Brill by the Sea Beggars directly impacted the chances of Orange's invasion.

At the lower range of responses, there appeared to be little real knowledge of the period beyond the Council of Troubles and the Tenth Penny with the strengths of the rebels ignored completely. Some candidates strayed into the reasons for the outbreak of the Dutch Revolt in the 1560s, a reminder that precision over chronology and key dates is most important to attain the higher levels.



Alva's failure to defeat the invasion of 1572 is evident in his replacement with Requesens. His own failures in the form of his extremely unpopular policies and poor strategy played a significant role, however the strength of the rebels in their campaign led by Orange and assisted by the Sea Beggars also played an important role, however Alva's failures were more significant overall. In order to assess this reasons for failure we must examine what made the 1572 invasion so <sup>\* military</sup> successful, what the feelings of the Dutch <sup>success</sup> population were, <sup>\*</sup> and also compare it with the reality in 1588 to see if Alva's time as governor general was significant.

Alva's inability to defeat the invasion of 1572 was largely a result of his extremely unpopular economic and religious policies which strengthened determination to resist his rule. Alva was extremely unpopular due to his hardline Catholic policy and Spanish aims.

His decision to implement the Council of Troubles ('Blood') in September 1567 undermined the openness of Dutch society and cemented Dutch opposition toward him. The Council operated on a system of denunciations and sought to try heretics. 12,000 Dutch civilians were summoned, 9,000 tried and 1,000 executed. This created a culture of fear, exacerbated by the execution of Egmont and Hoorn in June 1568 and caused the Dutch to feel as if they had lost their civil liberties and privileges. Also in terms of policy, Alva's attempt to introduce the Tenth Penny tax also made him considerably unpopular. After the States General rejected his plans for this extremely high, permanent tax in March 1569, he ordered troops to forcibly collect the tax in the spring of 1572, without ~~obeying~~ the permission of the States General. This completely unparliamentary action increased opposition as when the Sea Beggars invaded in 1572, there was huge popular support across Holland and Zeeland, largely motivated by

hatred of Alva. ~~The~~ ~~Oppos~~ Popular  
dissent like this need not been evident  
in the 1568 invasion which failed  
demonstrating how important Alva's  
policies were in strengthening Dutch determination  
to resist his rule.

Alva's failures can also be seen in terms of  
his poor strategy and tactics, leading him  
to be unsuccessful in defeating the  
invasion. When Revolt broke out in the north,  
after the Sea Beggars established a foothold in  
Brill, fighting broke out with Alva's forces.  
However, Alva made the mistaken decision  
of withdrawing all his forces <sup>from the north</sup> to focus  
on Maastricht (June 1572). Although  
they did eventually succeed in taking Maastricht,  
this allowed the revolt to be  
consolidated in the North and strengthened  
support there with Sea Beggars gaining  
more support and power. This made it increasingly  
difficult to attack, especially given that  
the topography of the north was difficult  
terrain to fight in. Alva made further  
mistakes by brutally executing ~~these~~ <sup>the</sup>  
Dutch in areas he re-conquered. For



example in november <sup>and december</sup> of 1572 he put Zutphen and Naarden to the sword, committing huge atrocities that convinced the Dutch that diplomacy and negotiation was not possible, strengthening their resolve to resist. Therefore, Alva's poor tactics were significant in stopping him from defeating the 1572 invasion.

However, the strength of the rebels must also be taken into consideration. When the Sea Beggars invaded Brill on 1 April 1572, establishing a foothold allowing them to take Flushing of 22 April, they demonstrated great strategic military skill, as these areas allowed them a base from which they could attack leading to successful taking of fortresses Ammerdon and Veere, later in April. The Sea Beggars reputation as unruly pirates allowed them to gain support as Dutch civilians felt pressured to submit. Furthermore, they successfully exploited the poor economic and social conditions (trade was slow and unemployment was high).

which allowed them to offer the prospect of pay and food to locals looking for work. ~~Finally~~ The role of Orange as a figurehead and leader also added to the strength of the rebel cause as his status as sovereign (of minor principality of Orange) and his popularity as a prominent stadholder, gave a great sense of legitimacy and justification to the revolt, encouraging more people to join. He also produced ~~free~~ propaganda which he released in April and June, during the revolt, encouraging the Dutch to join the revolt, enhancing the impact of their invasion. Therefore the strength of the Dutch rebel campaign was significant ~~as~~ as it resulted in military successes and encouraged more people to join the revolt.



helped to trigger Orange's invasion, but more importantly, was the reason so much of the population joined in revolt, ~~increasing~~ reducing his capacity to defeat the invasion. Although Orange and the Sea Beggars were significant, their importance was ~~all~~ more in triggering the invasion. ~~in~~ <sup>in</sup> 1568, they now had popular support which ~~did~~ explains why Alva originally faced as difficulty putting down the 1568 invasion but struggled with the 1572 invasion. Finally ~~the~~ Alva's unsuccessful strategy cemented his failure to defeat the invasion.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

In considering Alva's failure to defeat the invasion of 1572, this response confidently examines both his own failures and the strengths of Orange's rebels. In coming to a judgement, it validly explores the reasons why Orange may have had more success in 1572 than he did in 1568, attributing the growth in popular support for rebellion in this period to Alva's actions. It was given a low L5 mark.

## **Question 6**

The best answers to this question were able to evidence a number of ways in which religion impacted the success of the Dutch Revolt in this period, before going on to judge its significance alongside Maurice's military successes, Oldenbarnevelt's political skills or the decline of Spanish power. Therefore, many pointed out how the influx of protestants from the south in the 1690s strengthened both the economy and society of the United Provinces, for example, or how their religious stance encouraged vital agreements with England and France in the 1580s and 1590s.

Weaker responses often had some knowledge of the reasons for rebel success in these years, but they lacked an appreciation of the impact of religion as a factor and tended to lack both precision and detail.



beliefs. Although some may argue that Elizabeth did this for her own protection it still benefited the Northern Provinces and it was driven from religion on her side as well as the Netherlands. The Elizabethan alliance strengthening the view that religion was significant in securing the <sup>united</sup> Provinces independence. Elizabethan alliance also led to her declaration of war against Spain allowing the rebels in the North get the upper hand as the Spanish fought about five Spanish Armada.

The fact that the Spanish Armada happened to defeat Elizabeth, which didn't succeed, and the Spanish were not in the Netherlands, <sup>(Oranges son)</sup> ~~Nasme~~ <sup>could use</sup> this to his advantage. Along with the French <sup>alliance</sup> ~~alliance~~ that the Spanish troops also had to take part in, making their presence in the Netherlands limited. This also made the Spanish army lack in funds, meaning them declare bankruptcy again, weakening their position in the Netherlands. This strategy as a whole benefited the Northern provinces in becoming united as the Spanish army were proving unsuccessful and unable to be funded - this led to them leaving their post also ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> paid back, undermining ~~their~~ <sup>their</sup> power.



in opposition was Nassau ~~was~~ who also proved proven to be very tactical in his sieges and military success, who paid his troops, making it difficult for <sup>the</sup> Spanish to fight back. This also aided the Northern provinces.

Another Oldenburch success politically, in terms of foreign policy (Dutch) and trade enabled the northern provinces to grow economic strength. The Dutch Indian Company was opened up, education grew and they were overall succeeding. People from the South ~~were~~ began migrating to the North in search of work, <sup>\*1</sup> growing the population from about 26,000 to none than 70,000. These successes made the North stronger, in contrast to the South who were struggling. Allowing easier access to independence.

~~In essence, the Dutch religion~~

In essence, religion was definitely the driving force for the independence as if religion wasn't an issue there wouldn't be the Spanish armada, weakening the Spanish's army. Although as proven, it wouldn't have been simply possible without <sup>Nassau</sup> ~~proven~~ military success and Oldenburch's political strategies making the north strong again.



\*1 emphasising there desperation <sup>and</sup> ~~in the south~~ lack of power emerging



There is some consideration of factors relevant to the question in this response and knowledge deployed which demonstrates some understanding of its conceptual focus. However, there is a lack of depth to the essay and its judgements lack conviction. It was awarded a mid L3 mark.

# Paper Summary

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

## Section A

- Candidates should go beyond paraphrasing the content of the sources to draw out reasoned and developed inferences
- Candidates should move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature/purpose and authorship of the source by, e.g. looking at and explaining the specific stance and/or purpose of the writer
- Contextual knowledge should not be used to list all the information that is missing from the sources, unless omission was the aim of the author
- Contextual knowledge should be linked to the material provided in the source
- Candidates should make use of the sources together at some point in the answer.

## Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure the second order concept is correctly identified; candidates need to be aware that not all questions demand a factor/other factors approach
- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues rather than merely present a list of factors.

## Grade Boundaries

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

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

