



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme January 2004

GCE

History

Alternative B: Units 1 and 4

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners**

A: INTRODUCTION

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

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

The revised 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 new 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 AS and 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 and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

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 for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS**Level 1:**

The answer is excessively generalised and undiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and undiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:***Either***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: 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 AO1.1, 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 (AO1.2), 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 (AO2, 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 characteristics: 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.

D: 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.

January 2004

Alternative B: Europe in Transition, c1470-1610

AS Unit 1: Religious change and its consequences in sixteenth-century Europe

Question 1

(a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the significance of “accepted doctrine” in Calvin’s Geneva. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. a statement of beliefs to which all members of the Genevan community were expected to subscribe. **1**

L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. this was set out in the catechism; answers might refer to belief in the scriptures as the accepted word of God, the sacraments were symbolic, the concept of predestination, the central role of the sermon; citizens were expected to follow these beliefs and could be challenged by the consistory court if they failed to do so. **2-3**

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

Explain how **Source C** challenges **Source B** in its view of Calvin’s authority and his methods of establishing the Reformation in Geneva. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full and effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility, will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. Source B indicates that the discipline used by Calvin was “harsh” but Source C suggests that Calvin ‘held back’. **1-2**

L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. both sources agree that Calvin exerted his authority but Source B suggests it was a sustained and far-reaching policy, whereas Source C suggests that Calvin only took extreme action when forced to do so by the resistance. In Source B it is suggested that his work in Geneva was experimental and successful on the surface, but that some success was engendered by fear rather than by belief. In Source C, Calvin is presented as more hesitant to persecute and more anxious to get

the population on his side. Answers might refer to organisational reform, e.g. the Consistory, to support successful control and also to famous cases such as that against the Libertines and the Perrin faction, or of Servetus, to support Source B. In support of Source C, answers might show awareness that most of the work of the Consistory was low-key, working with families and aiming to generate peaceful co-operation in the city. **3-5**

- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. considers that Source C is Calvin's own view in which he is trying to justify some of the treatment meted out to his opponents, that he was aware of the need to gain support and not be too extreme, whereas Source B is a historian's overview recognising that there were differing reactions to Calvin's work; both sources indicate some institutional success but that individuals were not always supportive. **6-7**

- (c) Use **Source A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

Explain the importance of the Consistory, in relation to other factors, in Calvin's success in changing religion and society in Geneva. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *either* on own knowledge *or* the *sources*. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative Content

From the Sources – e.g. the consistory was used as a disciplinary body (A) to promote the Calvinist interpretation of both belief and lifestyle and persistent offenders could be severely punished. Calvin had the support of the Council (B) and their combined success in turning Geneva round can be seen in the fact that his ideas spread, although it has to be noted that support from the people was less forthcoming. Source C suggests a persuasive Calvin who is anxious to convince the opponents and critics but not averse to imposing authority if necessary.

From own knowledge – the church was reorganised through the implementation of the Ecclesiastical Ordinances; the consistory was an active body but was just as often a counselling service as a disciplinary body. It did punish people for their behaviour e.g. for dancing and could discipline pastors to ensure the correct message was being put out. Even Calvin, however, could not dictate to the consistory as there were lay pastors, selected by the council who sat on it. Exclusion had to be the work of the Council and its support was not always immediately forthcoming, as in the Perrin case when he had to wait until 1555 before they agreed to expulsion. Success was therefore a slow process and not necessarily the work of Calvin and/or the Consistory. Popular resistance was also a limiting factor, as in Calvin's unsuccessful attempt to abolish taverns and replace them with religious eating houses. Other factors might include Calvin's own personality, for example, the overall structure he imposed, the desire of the Genevans for change etc.

Answers at Level 1 may deal with one issue only, e.g. the role of the Consistory. At Level 2 the range should be extended with some supporting material but the focus may be on religion or society and not on both. Level 3 understanding may be shown through more analytical responses relating to both religion and society and which show some precision and exemplification e.g. the clergy became more disciplined through the work of the grabeau and the general population through the consistory. Responses at Level 4 could consider a wide range of 'ways' and balance religious change against social change. Level 5 judgement may be demonstrated by assessing the extent of success generated by the Consistory as against other factors.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by "humanists" in the context of the early Reformation period. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. scholars who sought to understand religious issues through personal study rather than received wisdom. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. humanists preferred to study the original texts and re-examine their meaning; this meant working in the original language; some went on to challenge accepted beliefs in the light of their research. Some examples may be given e.g. Erasmus, von Hutten, Reuchlin. 2-3

- (b) Explain why Erasmus was an important humanist. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Erasmus wrote and translated many books and texts which influenced Luther. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. explaining the reasons why Erasmus was important; he translated the New Testament into Greek and Latin and these became the basis for later vernacular translations; he saw the Bible as the basis for belief in preference to what the Pope or the clergy said; he wrote books, e.g. *The Handbook of a Christian Soldier*, which were critical of the Church and the Papacy; his works were printed and spread widely; he influenced Luther etc. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. explaining why Erasmus was an important humanist, and prioritises, makes links and draws conclusions about their relative significance, e.g. shows understanding of the impact of Erasmus on scholars, clerics and educated lay people who then began to challenge the monopoly of the Church through debate. **6-7**

- (c) “Dissatisfaction with the condition of the Catholic Church was the most important factor in bringing about the Reformation.”
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative Content

Dissatisfaction with the condition of the Church was an important factor – answers could mention issues such as lack of education of the clergy, nepotism, simony, the sale of indulgences, the failings of Popes who were more interested in their temporal power and other forms of corrupt activity etc. However, other elements such as the development of the printing press were significant as this enabled ideas to spread quickly, in different forms (written comments, woodcuts etc), and strengthened the demand for change. Individuals like Luther were prepared to speak out and he found support amongst some of the German princes. The political climate favoured change with imperial princes seeing the establishment of the reformed faith as a move to independence; towns also embraced the new ideas; Charles V was distracted by conflict with the French in Italy and the Turks; even the peasants saw benefits in a vernacular church. Answers should not go much beyond the mid-1520s as this is a question about the start of the Reformation.

Level 1 responses may well be confined to generalised accounts of abuses within the Church. At Level 2, a more developed review of factors relating to the condition of the Catholic Church would be expected and/or other factors might be briefly suggested. At Level 3, a range of factors will be identified and explained, with links to the generation of the Reformation. By Level 4, a good range of factors will be balanced between issues connected with dissatisfaction with the Church and other factors such as the printing press, Luther, political factors etc. Level 5 responses will generate a reasoned judgement about the relative contribution of the factors identified.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by “new and reformed orders” in the context of Catholic reform. *(3 marks)*

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. entirely new religious orders or some which were reformed to make them better able to fulfil their duties. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. a largely spontaneous development of orders which focused on greater spirituality, contribution to the community for both men and women, mainly in Italy and Spain, dating back to before the Council of Trent. Should give some examples to reach the top of the level e.g. the Capuchins, the Oratory of Divine Love, the Theatines, the Ursulines. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why so many new orders were founded during the Catholic Reformation. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. they were disappointed with existing corruption, the failure to set examples to local communities etc, and took matters into their own hands to bring about reform. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. religious orders already existed in Italy and Spain but had lost impetus; some founders had a religious conversion (e.g. Loyola, founder of the Jesuits, Miani, founder of the Somachi, Neri of the Oratory); others were influenced by war and its effects e.g. the Theatines; others by a desire to serve the community, purify the Church and re-motivate its members e.g. the Ursulines who stayed in the community and educated girls. Many of them involved laymen which gave them a role in the church. Answers which are based solely on Jesuits can get Level 2, provided sufficient depth and appropriate contextual reference is given. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. as above, with understanding that these were spontaneous developments demonstrating the spirituality of the lay people and showing their protest to the Pope about the state of the Catholic Church. **6-7**

- (c) “The Popes, rather than the new orders, were responsible for bringing about Catholic reform.”
Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**

- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative Content

The Popes were theoretically significant for reform as they were the anointed head of the Catholic Church and so could be expected to set the tone and stimulate reform. However, there is evidence that popes in the early 16th Century were more interested in temporal power than spiritual matters and were themselves part of the corruption attacked by the Protestants e.g. Popes sold offices, there was corruption in the courts, the sale of indulgences was a scandal etc. They involved themselves in war to protect their territory; the Sack of Rome may have been the turning point. Should they decide to reform they had the power to do so and this was eventually demonstrated in the calling and the work of the Council of Trent to deal with the threat from Protestantism. Once this decision was made the popes reformed the curia, made decisions about doctrine and organisation, the roles of bishops and priests etc. and began to restore the integrity of the Church. The decrees of the Council of Trent were, however, not fully implemented in many European states as rulers were suspicious of papal interference and some had already succumbed to Protestantism e.g. in the HRE. Although Spain accepted the decrees of Trent, Philip II insisted that his rights were not infringed. Some of the new orders, such as the Jesuits, were more successful through preaching schools etc. They reached the people directly in a way which the Council of Trent could not; their effect was more immediate and initially more widespread, e.g. in Germany, through the work of men like Canisius. Some responses may acknowledge that the Jesuits and other orders had papal approval.

Level 1 responses are likely to make undeveloped statements about the role of the Popes or of the new orders. At Level 2 there may be more detail with reference to the work of either Popes or new orders or both. At Level 3, answers should show understanding of the achievements of both Popes and new orders, but this may be unbalanced. There is likely to be emphasis on the Jesuits in relation to the new orders but some brief knowledge of others would be expected. Level 4 responses will show breadth and balance in dealing with the aspects. For Level 5, judgement may be demonstrated by reasoned judgement based on a developed comparison. Much depends where candidates start their answer. This content is included (it is stated clearly that it related to early 16th Century) to allow candidates to comment that, in the early days of the growth of Protestantism, the Popes were not prepared to reform, but that there was a change around 1530s and eventually with Trent. It is not compulsory for answers to include this but some may use this to challenge the question.

January 2004**Alternative B: Europe in Transition, 1470-1610****A2 Unit 4: The State, Authority and Conflict****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Explain what is meant by “*conversos*” in the context of the religious policies of Ferdinand and Isabella? (5 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. the name for Jews who had converted to Christianity in Spain following attacks upon them. 1
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or from own knowledge, e.g. many of the *conversos* had posts in government and commerce, thus enabling them to buy property; this made them wealthy and created tension between themselves and traditional Christians; this made them a target for the Inquisition. 2-3
- L3: As L2, with developed reference to both the source and own knowledge, e.g. shows knowledge and understanding as in L2, and also understands e.g. that religious tension was generated and eventually led to the expulsion of the Jews in 1492; that the Inquisition was introduced, specifically to ensure the supremacy of Christianity and deal with its opponents, including conversos. 4-5

- (b) Use **Source B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

How fully do **Source B** and **C** explain the relationship between the Crown and the Inquisition in Spain in the reigns of Charles V and Philip II? (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 source 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

Level 1 answers could suggest from the sources that Charles I used the Inquisition personally to suppress heresy and deviance whereas Philip II saw it as a means of social and political control. Level 2 responses could support this with e.g. reference to Charles I and the persecution of Protestants (Source B) and the Illuminists (own knowledge); and both challenge it with e.g. reference to Philip II and treatment of Catholics (Source C) and support it with reference to his introduction of censorship enforced by the Inquisition (own knowledge). The sources, however, do not explain fully the degree to which the Inquisition was independent of/subject to royal authority, suggesting that Charles simply supported it and Philip did not use it for his own political ends. For both monarchs it was clearly a deterrent factor, encouraged to seek out deviants, including wayward Catholics, setting up autos da fe', and enforcing orthodoxy through fear. Such discussions should reach Level 3. Level 4 responses will draw well supported conclusions about sufficiency ranging across the period, considering a wide range of activity, e.g. that the sources highlight specific instances but do not convey fully for both monarchs the harmonious relationship with the Inquisition which enabled it to keep Spain free from any real threat from heresy or deviance.

- (c) Use **Source A, B, C and D** and your own knowledge.

“The Spanish Inquisition, more than any other factor, was responsible for maintaining the religious unity of Spain I the period 1478 to 1598.”

Assess the validity of this view.

(15 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. **1-4**
- 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. **5-8**
- 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. **9-11**
- 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. **12-13**

- 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. **14-15**

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, answers could identify the work of the Inquisition in maintaining religious unity throughout the period, e.g. Source A indicates persecution of *conversos*. Although this was not pursued to the limit, the suggestion is that there was some success, as complaints are made about the loss of trade and industry as a consequence of the decline of the conversos. Source B looks at persecution of Protestants, Source C at keeping Catholics in line. Only Source D challenges the role of the Inquisition by suggesting that there were other possible factors in limiting the growth of Protestantism such as the geographical position of Spain and the lack of printing presses to produce heretical publications. Own knowledge might confirm the role of the Inquisition throughout the period by reference to the persecution of the Jews, although it was government policy which dictated their expulsion in 1492. Other factors could be the persecution of Erasmians and Protestants by the monarchs and censorship through the Index. However, the almost continuous geographical and cultural isolation of Spain, the impact of the Catholic Reformation from mid-century with respect to the growth of new orders like the Jesuits, the adoption by Philip II of most of the decrees of the Council of Trent in the latter part of the period, the fact that there was no history of early heresy in Spain on which Protestantism could build etc., are all contributory to the possible conclusion that the religious unity of Spain was never effectively challenged.

Answers at Level 1 will probably demonstrate limitations in terms of the timescale covered, depth and range of factors etc. At Level 2, limited use of all sources, brief statements from own knowledge about a number of factors and/or focus on the work of one monarch in relation to the Spanish Inquisition could be characteristic of responses. At Level 3, the predominance of any given factor at particular points in time may be explored. Level 4 candidates may be more confident of making some comparisons and contrasts across the period. At Level 5 answers should demonstrate a confident grasp of a range of possible factors and debate their influence in relation to the work of the Inquisition to arrive at a precise and well supported analysis of continuity/change over time.

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 to almost 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**

“Margaret of Parma rather than Alva was responsible for the outbreak of revolt in the Netherlands by 1572.”

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

Margaret of Parma was Philip’s half-sister and Regent of the Netherlands, and therefore had a vested interest in maintaining order but was inexperienced in government. She might be held responsible because, as Philip’s representative, she did not have complete authority and still had to consult Philip II, so decision making was slow; her powers to consult widely on important matters were restricted by Philip II thus alienating many of the high nobility; she could not deal effectively with noble grievances regarding e.g. the positions they might hold. The problem of the iconoclast riots caused Margaret to ask for help, but by the time it arrived the situation had largely settled. Arguably Margaret had failed to deal effectively with the crisis and the arrival of Alva and a large army sparked opposition to Spain. Alternatively it could be argued that Philip II failed to understand the situation and Margaret, as Regent, was blamed for this, so Margaret resigned.

Alva might be held responsible because he was not prepared to work with Margaret of Parma and for his repressive rule, e.g. through the Council of Blood/Troubles, the arrest and execution of Egmont and Hoorn, the completion of the bishopric plan, the imposition of new taxes e.g. the tenth penny which applied to all and was to be imposed by force, the alienation of the ruling classes which triggered the first revolt led by William of Orange.

Some answers might see Margaret of Parma responsible in the long term because she was too weak and others might see Alva as responsible in the short term because he was prepared to use force and alienated the nobility.

Level 1 responses may focus briefly and without depth on either Margaret of Parma or Alva or may make some general statements about both. For Level 2, some understanding of the circumstances and the difficulties involved for each individual may be discussed. Level 3 responses may attempt a more comparative response and at Level 4 there should be effective analysis and discussion of the political, religious and personal issues involved to arrive at a reasoned judgement. For Level 5, the debate will be sustained, balanced and well supported to sustain the judgement made.

Question 3

Assess the relative importance of religious and political issues in William of Orange's resistance to Spain in the period 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

Answers would be expected to look at key points/events in William's career and offer some debate/conclusions about motivation. Religious issues should be self-evident but may overlap with political; political issues could link to concepts of independence/resistance/national identity. Issues raised might be: William's support for the campaign to have the heresy laws relaxed after the withdrawal of Granvelle – possibly political because of recognition that the existing laws could cause tension, violence etc., but also religious because it was a matter of 'freedom of conscience'. He also gave his general support to the Compromise, probably for the same reasons; the iconoclast fury led to an apparent change of heart and William supported pacification because he feared the collapse of authority; on Alva's arrival, William initially fled the country, afraid of reprisals. However, the act made him a rebel and politically opposed to Alva's regime, and the invasion of 1568 seems to support this. By 1567, William's subsequent conversion to Lutheranism was probably political to help raise allies against Alva; between 1572 and 1576, his actions in Holland and Zeeland, e.g. in restoring local privileges and tradition rights and building a power base, suggest continued political motivation; his later conversion to Calvinism also indicates political causes; his original intention to allow full religious toleration was thwarted by religious extremism and William made a political decision to accept Calvinism as the dominant faith. Although he continued to work for tolerance after 1567, William probably saw political independence from Spain as a means of resolving the religious issue; his political experience, however, led him to support the appointment of heads of state for the rebel provinces. By the time of his death in 1584, the Netherlands had neither political independence nor religious freedom.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be thin and insubstantial comments on or brief outlines of events. At Level 2 there may be some focus on identifying either religious or political issues in William's actions. By Level 3 there should be some awareness of the interplay of these two factors and selection of material to support this. Level 4 responses will recognise the difficulties of isolating motivation and offer a balanced interpretation. Level 5 will offer a sustained discussion of relative importance, with reference to context, personality and actions, which recognises the interconnections between these two aspects.

Question 4

How far do you agree that foreign intervention rather than the difficulties facing Spain explains the success of the revolt of the Netherlands by 1609?

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 France, Germany and England, often at the invitation of the rebels and their leaders. It was inspired by religious and economic motivations (England), religious and political motivations (Germany and France). Involvement of other powers began as early as 1568, when Orange invaded with a German army, and in 1572, when he had the support of both the Germans and of Admiral Coligny of France. However, in 1572 it was the independent action of the Sea Beggars who achieved most with the capture of Brill. Answers might be expected to focus more on the period after 1577 when a series of foreign ‘governors’ were appointed to lend credibility to events – the Archduke Mathias in 1577, Anjou in 1578-83, the Earl of Leicester (1586). Although they were sometimes incompetent and ineffective as military and/or political leaders, occasionally they brought in more substantial help, e.g. Anjou’s army relieved some of the towns besieged by Parma. His ambitions, however, also caused problems and he attempted a coup. The most successful intervention probably came from England responding to the Armada in 1588 and in the 1590s in providing substantial military help to Maurice of Nassau.

The difficulties of Spain are well known; Spain was fighting on foreign soil and regarded as an interloper imposing heavy taxes etc; they were increasingly faced with financial limitations (bankruptcy) leading to mutiny, withdrawal etc. The geography of the Netherlands also defeated them and the diversions they faced with regard to other aspects of policy, e.g. the withdrawal of Parma in 1588 to deal with the Armada. Where these difficulties coincided with foreign intervention as in 1588, and the emergence of sound political and military leadership in the Northern provinces under Oldenbarneveldt and Maurice of Nassau the Spaniards had to accept defeat. The truce of 1609 was an acceptance that they could no longer continue their efforts. However, despite their extensive problems the Spaniards sustained a lengthy conflict in the Netherlands and it is possible to claim that without the intermittent support given by other states and individuals the rebels may not have been able to hold out.

At Level 1 answers may make limited references to either or both foreign intervention and Spanish difficulties. At Level 2, these issues may be dealt with in greater depth but limited balance. At Level 3 comparison of the nature, timing and outcomes of foreign help and Spanish problems could be the focus. Level 4 responses should be wide ranging and directly comparative and sustained. Level 5 response will be identified by the judgement exercised throughout a sustained comparative analysis of differing effects.

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

How successful was Charles V in asserting his authority in his Burgundian and German lands in the period up to 1540?

In your answer you should refer only to the Knights' War 1522, the Peasants' War 1524-5 and the Ghent revolt 1539-40.

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

These 3 events came about for different specific reasons but were all representative of the struggle for authority and religious and political unity within the Habsburg territories. It is possible to draw some comparisons and contrasts between them and candidates should be rewarded for this as well as for recognising the linkages between issues within each event.

The Knights' War 1522-23 was ostensibly a quarrel between Sickingen (Imperial Chancellor) and von Hutten with the Archbishop-Elector of Trier, which took place against the background of the Diet of Worms. Sickingen and Hutten attacked the lands of Trier. Charles V had to support Trier against Sickingen and von Hutten despite the fact that the latter had supported him in his election campaign and Trier had opposed him. This was the result of the support given to Luther at Worms by Sickingen and von Hutten and Charles could not allow his decisions regarding religion to be challenged. Neither could he allow his political initiatives to be thwarted; the Diet had agreed vital issues regarding the Regency Council which gave Charles powers over appointment of its members and convening of the Council. It did, however, sour relations between Charles and the knights. The Peasants' War 1524-5 started as a religious revolt but with strong socio-economic causes; it was both a protest against rising taxation and a campaign for greater equality. Luther attacked the peasants and so ingratiated himself with the princes, thus generating a powerful group challenging Charles V on religious issues and ensuring that the Edict of Worms could not be enforced against Luther. Charles' absence from the HRE at this point was also crucial. The princes gained more authority which Charles resisted, generating conflict with the Schmalkaldic League which was to last until 1555. The Ghent revolt (in the Netherlands) was a rebellion against taxation partly raised to pay for the struggle against the Protestants in Germany and resulted in a loss of self-government. Charles maintained his authority here but the revolt was symptomatic of the strains within Charles' monarchy.

Each of these incidents challenged Charles in terms of his political authority and except in the case of Ghent in religious issues. He was most successful in asserting his political power in the Ghent incident but less so in 1522 and 1524 in Germany. Here, however, he alienated influential groups which limited his actions against the Lutherans later. In religious terms Charles failed to address the problems in Germany because he wished to reinforce his

political authority; unfortunately this also declined as some princes adopted the Lutheran cause.

At Level 1, answers will deal with one or more incidents briefly and make some assertion about success. For Level 2, there should be reference to all three incidents although not necessarily equally. A sound analysis with reference to outcome in terms of religious/political consequences could be expected for Level 3. Level 4 could offer assessments of success regarding Charles V's authority and Level 5 responses will provide an effective overview which evaluates comparatively Charles V's success in both political and religious aspects.

Question 6

“Rivalry with Francis I throughout the period 1519-1547 was central to Charles V's difficulties in the Holy Roman Empire.”

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

Answers should consider the impact of events in Italy and Germany to respond thoroughly to this question. Issues which could be raised are: e.g. in the 1520s the Protestant movement in HRE gained momentum but Charles was busy in Italy fighting the French, e.g. at Pavia in 1525, 1529 at Landriano; his success led to hopes that the Pope would call a General Council and the granting of the Recess of 1530, although in fact this led only to the formation of the Schmalkaldic League by the German protestants, and was put on hold in 1532 when the Pope's niece married the son of Francis I. After 1530, Francis I began giving subsidies to German protestants and drew closer to the Turks (1535); this drew in another significant power and meant that military attacks in the east were sometimes co-ordinated with French attacks in the west as in 1539 – Charles V had to lift all restrictions imposed on Protestants so that they would assist against the French. However, there were also occasions when Francis and Charles acted together to deal with the Protestant threat, e.g. in 1544 when both called for a General Council; this gave Charles breathing space to gather forces which defeated the Schmalkaldic league at Muhlberg in 1547. This success was however reversed when the Pope and the Catholic princes withdrew their support for a new league because they were becoming afraid of Charles' success. By 1552 the new king of France, Henry II, was in league with the Protestant princes and the result was defeat for Charles at Metz, withdrawal from the war and ultimately the abdication of Charles.

Answers at Level 1 may give an outline account of the events in the HRE in the period with some reference to France. For Level 2, the account should be thorough and linked to the consequences of French actions. At Level 3, the approach will sustain a more analytical discussion and at Level 4 some assessment of the significance of French activity still be

offered. For Level 5, clear evaluation of the impact of relations with France should allow the construction of a sustained, well directed and supported analysis.

Question 7

“Political rather than religious issues divided the empire.”

How valid is this judgement on the Holy Roman Empire in the reign of Charles V?
(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’ might encompass the form of government/nature of power and its distribution; the relations between princes and emperor; attitudes towards authority etc. References re ‘religion’ could include the role of the Catholic Church; the influence of the Protestant movement. The role of the monarch and of the princes overlap both aspects. Answers might, e.g. note that Charles V worked for both political and religious unity; political unity as represented in his person and as emperor, and the loyalty that was owed to him by the princes and as expressed in the institutions of the empire, e.g. in the Regency Council. The Council set up in 1521 was, however, mistrusted by both princes and HR Emperor and suppressed in 1530. The Swabian League was another experiment which was short-lived. Charles tried again in 1548 with a proposal for a league which could enforce order through an army and be paid for by the princes and cities, i.e. to be protection for them as well as the emperor. It never materialised, not because the princes did not want protection but because they feared an army would be turned on them. The movement for unity from above in politics across the empire was short-lived. Some concept of unity amongst princes was expressed in the Schmalkaldic League, formed partly because Charles V was perceived as a tyrant, but that was also shattered at Muhlberg.

Religion – the Catholic church with Charles as its champion (as stated in his coronation oath) was a strong unifying factor in the HRE before 1520 through its common institutions and faith. This unity was initially shattered by the Reformation. Nevertheless both Catholics and Protestants each saw their faith as a unifying factor and sought to preserve and extend it through political control, e.g. through the decisions made by individual princes and town councils. Progress in the struggle was sometimes made e.g. temporary truces made in the face of threats from Turks and from Henry II of France ultimately generated greater solidarity amongst protestants. Within each state it was a unifying force as each prince sought to establish the faith of their choice, and this situation was confirmed politically at Augsburg in 1555. In some respects the unity generated by religious confession was stronger than that generated by politics alone. However, within the HRE as a whole religion was divisive as Protestantism grew.

Answers at Level 1 may be a brief commentary on religious or political issues within the HRE. Level 2 responses should make some links to unity/difference and dissension, but will

deal with each aspect in isolation. Level 3 answers should provide a more thorough analysis of each aspect with effective comments on how events furthered unity or created division. Understanding of the interplay between them and the effects in terms of greater unity and division should merit Level 4. Answers at Level 5 will use their knowledge to assess and evaluate the ways in which and the extent to which the empire had become more politically and religiously united or divided by 1555.

Option C: Suleiman the Magnificent, 1520-1566

Question 8

“Skilled administrator”

“Successful military leader”

Through which of these roles did Suleiman the Magnificent the more enhance his authority in the Ottoman Empire? *(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

There seems to be no doubt that Suleiman was highly regarded by contemporaries as a skilful administrator, e.g. he chose his officers well (e.g. Ibrahim Pasha as Grand Vizier) and did not hesitate to have him killed when Suleiman thought that he had become too dangerous; he chose Moslem-born men to staff the civil service, took care to be seen to consult the Ulema (Muslim scholars and lawyers etc) and dispensed justice; introduced legal changes and developed new law codes to deal with e.g. robbery, drunkenness; devised rules to ensure payment of acceptable levels of tax and introduced the concept of balancing the budget; he was known as ‘kanuni’, the law-giver. However, some of these changes were costly and food shortages and inflation affected the latter part of his reign.

Suleiman was, personally, also a successful military leader – e.g. he captured Belgrade in 1521, carried out a successful attack on Hungary in 1526 and eventually establishing a puppet state under Zapolya. He advanced on Vienna in 1529 and although he did not capture it, he generated sufficient panic in Europe to ensure that the Turks were regarded as formidable enemies. However, by 1547 the frontier stabilised. Suleiman also advanced eastwards and advanced as far as the Persian Gulf. His army was perceived as well disciplined and loyal. Answers may also include references to seapower but his was more the work of Barbarossa than Suleiman.

Answers might conclude that his authority was most enhanced by territorial gains; certainly this acquired land for the sipahis to hold as timars – these men not only then fought in his army but were also responsible for law and order in their areas. However, it could also be argued that without the base of an effective administration the army could not have achieved so much.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and narrow in focus, with little attempt at balance between the aspects. Level 2 responses may provide more depth and range of information with some links to the question. Level 3 answers should consider the issue of authority and Level 4 answers will make comparative assessments between the two elements. Level 5 responses will be distinguished by their consistent address to enhancement of authority and well supported judgement, which may differentiate between the two aspects.

Question 9

How far do you agree with the view that economic issues rather than religious differences dictated relations between the Ottoman Empire and Europe? (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

Economic issues exemplified in the desire for land, trade etc. provoked conflict, e.g. re the spice trade. The Ottomans used the desire of the west to trade to bargain politically as in the French alliance and war with Venice; the consequence of this was to deepen military and political conflict with the Habsburgs. Both sides needed the revenue (customs duties) from trade to enable them to develop internally and to fund their armies. Even Dutch merchants competed to secure commercial privileges. Much of this benefited the Ottomans commercially and thus contributed to their ability to sustain their campaigns on land and at sea against the Habsburgs.

Religious differences, Moslem versus Christian, were also a powerful factor as it served to define the OE and European states as different. Both claimed to rule empires in which the rulers were not just the political leaders but also the religious focus – Charles V as *Holy Roman Emperor* and chief defender of Catholic Europe and Suleiman as a devout Muslim warrior (*ghazi*) and leader of a state organised for and profiting from religious wars. Charles V might have defeated the Protestant Reformation and kept the HRE Catholic if he had not to campaign constantly against Suleiman in Eastern Europe and at sea. Not only did this take men and money away from the European conflict, it allowed the Lutherans to demand concessions from Charles in return for support, e.g. in 1534 when Charles agreed to the ceding of Wurtemberg to the Protestants so that he could get on with organising the attack on the Turks in the Mediterranean.

Answers might argue that religious difference was the more powerful force because it gave clear definition to the two sides; and Charles V saw the Ottoman threat as greater than that of the Protestants who were also Christian. However, this argument does not hold universally because the French appeared willing to compromise their religious integrity to gain an ally against Charles V and economic advantage.

Answers at Level 1 may focus on brief descriptions of relations between the OE and the west rather than motivation or generalised statements about motivation. Level 2 responses could

limit the discussion to either economic or religious issues, offering only thin analysis or descriptions of events. Level 3 responses may offer coverage of both aspects with more detailed analysis of events. For Level 4, understanding of the connections between religion, economic issues and the HRE and OE should develop the analysis. At Level 5, well supported judgement of the more influential factor will be the focus of the response.

Question 10

“The Ottoman Empire was divided socially and politically: only the authority of the Sultan held it together.”

How valid is 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

Answers could confirm that Ottoman society was clearly divided by social rank in the sense that status was determined by role, e.g. the religious hierarchy was the elite with the slaves at the bottom and craftsmen in the middle ranks. A further distinction was between slave and free man, and by religion (Jew, Christian, Moslem). However, it was possible to ‘rise in the ranks’ by merit and slaves could become powerful ministers, e.g. the grand Vizier often came from this class, so divisions were not necessarily permanent. In the political sense, the structure of the government was divided by task, as exemplified e.g. in the administrative corps which operated under the Grand Vizier, the Divan and Ulema which acted as law makers and the judiciary. The Sultan acted as the executive. Although the power of the Sultan was extensive as a lawmaker, executive and soldier, he was often absent on campaign apart from the period 1543-8 and was not therefore always present to act as a unifying force. An alternative view might be that the system operated because of the very divisions which ran through it; the varying responsibilities of its population gave them all a distinctive role, and religion; jobs were handed down within families providing expertise and continuity. A further argument could be made that the Sultan himself contributed to disunity rather than unity; under Suleiman faction grew at court encouraged by his favourite wife, and daughters were married off to consorts who then contributed to faction. In this way, Suleiman behaved more like a European monarch.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to offer brief descriptions of Ottoman society and/or government. A Level 2 response may focus more on division in society and politics with some understanding of the role of the Sultan. For Level 3, analysis could focus on the role of the Sultan as the unifying factor, whereas Level 4 answers will also consider the arguments against. Level 5 answers will be able to develop well supported relevant judgements to arrive at a focused and evaluative response to the question.