

GCE 2005
January Series



Mark Scheme

History Alternative B Units 1 and 4 *(Subject Code 5041/6041)*

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

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

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

Copyright © 2005 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX.

Dr Michael Cresswell Director General

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 'objectives-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 indiscriminating 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 indiscriminating 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 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.

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 “the Ursulines” in the context of the Catholic Reformation. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. they were a new order for girls and women who remained in the community/at home. 1
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. enabled more women to take up the spiritual life because they could remain at home and give support to the poor and needy; part of the development of new orders, demonstrating an awareness of the need for change in the priorities of the Catholic Church; it was an exemplification of the reforming spirit in the Catholic Church. 2-3

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

Explain how **Source C** challenges **Source B** in its view of the significance of the Council of Trent in the Catholic Reformation. (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 highlights the role of the Council in reforming the Church whereas Source C suggests that it was not all-powerful and was dependent on secular princes as well for support. 1-2
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources with reference to own knowledge, e.g. both agree that Trent brought about some reform and greater clarity especially regarding doctrine. Differences lie in, e.g. Source B’s view that the Council enabled the Catholic Church to ‘regain the initiative’ through clear statements

of doctrine, whereas Source C suggests some dependence on catholic rulers. Source B suggests a church moving forward with renewed vigour whereas Source C suggests that much depended on the establishment of groups like the Jesuits and the education/re-education of Catholics in schools and seminaries. From own knowledge, candidates can support either or both these views by reference to, e.g. individual sessions of the Council and/to its impact in the field, e.g. the clarification of doctrine allowed new orders such as the Jesuits to take a clear message to the people. Some candidates may look at outcomes as well as events to support their answer.

3-5

- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. as at Level 2 and recognises that Source B is considering the specific influence of the place of Trent in the Catholic Reformation, whereas Source C is examining broader issues and particularly identifying those who opposed change, suggesting that the process was not straightforward or speedy. From own knowledge, answers may offer examples of resistance to change, e.g. the need to have a ruler who supported the Council before its decrees could be implemented in that state.

6-7

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

Explain the importance of the new orders, in relation to other factors, in the revival of Catholicism in Europe in the sixteenth century. (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* 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* from 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, answers might be expected to consider the importance of the role of orders such as the Ursulines (Source A). They may comment on the significance the involvement of women. From their own knowledge, they are likely to bring in the Jesuits as the prime examples of educators, missionaries and reformers. Their influence over Popes and the role played at the Council of Trent may also be cited. Through this, for example, they reconverted a great deal of Germany and Poland (Jesuits) and ensured that other countries did not succumb to the Protestant threat, e.g. Italy and France. Against this might be measured, e.g. the role of the Popes who gave impetus through the convening of Trent, the sanctioning of the new orders and the reform of the Papacy itself which set the standards in the latter part of the sixteenth century. The work of Trent, e.g. in clarification of doctrine and identification of acceptable practices (much of this through the influence of the Jesuits), and the provision of a legal structure for change, should also be cited. Some answers may also refer to the work of Charles V and Philip II who clearly, although not always speedily, gave their support to the reinvigoration in different ways in the Holy Roman Empire and Spain. Some might also include the Index through its work in controlling the publication of Protestant works (albeit with mixed success). Answers could conclude, e.g. that the Council and the rulers provided a framework but that the Orders gave day to day support to the ordinary ‘Catholic on the street’.

Question 2

(a) Explain briefly what was meant by “justification depended on faith alone” in the context of the Lutheran Reformation. **(3 marks)**

Target: AO1.1

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. man was saved/redeemed by faith and not good works as stated by the Catholic Church. Some answers may point to Luther’s interpretation of the writings of St. Paul. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. Luther was challenging the concept of justification by good works and human effort rather than by faith/belief. This was a conclusion drawn from Luther’s study of the scripture and made some of the activities of the Catholic Church redundant, e.g. relics, pilgrimages etc. Some answers might relate this to the controversy over Tetzel and the sale of indulgences, although this should not form the whole of the answer. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Luther's attack upon the Church received so much support in the period up to 1525. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. general sense of dissatisfaction with the Church, there were many abuses. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. it coincided with Tetzel's sale of indulgences, it was operating against a background of humanist revisionism, the development of the printing press which spread Luther's ideas widely in both printed and picture form, the support given by some princes who wanted genuine reform or saw that it was to their own advantage, the interest shown by city states to further their independence 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. the printing press was the key because it spread the ideas of Erasmus and Luther's challenge to Tetzel etc; or connects the political and religious motivations. **6-7**

- (c) "After 1525 the support of the princes was the most important factor in consolidating the German 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 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

Lutheranism did spread because of the support of the princes, e.g. it received protection from Frederick the Wise and later from Philip of Hesse. This was quite clearly expressed in the form of the Leagues of Torgau (1526) and Schmalkalden (1531). Once princes committed themselves, their subjects followed. However, some princes were very much opposed and were prepared to resist, e.g. the League of Dessau and, of course, Charles V himself. Lutheranism would not have been successful had the Protestant princes not been prepared to fight for their beliefs/political convenience. Even their failure at Muhlberg did not stop the momentum and the principle of *cuius regio eius religio* 1555 at Augsburg recognised the achievement of the princes.

However, there were other factors, also after 1525, such as the power of the printing press, the role of the cities, the influence of Erasmus in the initial stages, the personal influence of Luther, the fact that Charles V was diverted by the Turks and could not deal effectively with the princes etc.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by “the Consistory” in the context of Geneva under Calvin. **(3 marks)**

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the group of pastors and elders who maintained Church discipline and supervised morals through the court structure of the Consistory. **1**

- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. this was the most radical aspect of Calvinism, had the power of excommunication and could hear a range of cases; often also resolved disputes between citizens; the most significant element of Calvinist structure. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Calvin was successful in establishing Protestantism in Geneva by his death in 1564. **(7 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Geneva had been in turmoil before he arrived so he was welcome, the way had been cleared to some extent by Farel, his predecessor, and he had a strong personality. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the event through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Calvin's reputation as a leader and preacher, the structures he imposed, e.g. the Consistory, the grabeau, the Academy (which provided the teachers of the future), his willingness to tackle the opposition, e.g. the Perrin faction, his theories of providence and predestination 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. as above and shows understanding that Geneva had invited Calvin to generate reform so he had the authorities on his side, that efficient organisation and the establishment of a clear structure was the key. **6-7**

(c) "Social rather than religious change was the greatest achievement of Calvin in Geneva."

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

Geneva had been subject to the teachings of Farel before the arrival of Calvin, so an element of protestantism was already present in Geneva. However, Calvin did continue to make changes, e.g. his emphasis on predestination, and, although this was not wholly new, his

belief in the importance of the Bible and of the sacraments and the central role of the Church in the lives of Christians. Against this might be set his broader achievements and failures, e.g. in terms of the morality of the city through the work of the Consistory, the loss of personal freedom, attempts to control what people wore and how they used their leisure time. Some answers might also consider attitudes towards women and children and problems of poverty. His support for education through the founding of the Academy was significant. Economic issues, particularly the development of a capitalist approach, might be raised, although there is limited modern debate on this issue.

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

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

How fully do **Sources C** and **D** explain the relationship between Philip II and the popes with regard to control over religious affairs in Spain? *(10 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 will restrict themselves to simple statements, e.g. Source C suggests good relations, e.g. ‘preferable to have the papacy on his side’, whereas Source D suggests poor relations, e.g. ‘Philip clashed with the Popes’. For Level 2, answers might suggest that both sources agree that Philip had ‘authority’ and ‘influence’, e.g. Source C states that the papacy wanted to keep Philip on side to assist in struggle against Protestants and Turks and Source D that Philip accepted changes decided by the Council of Trent – all suggesting that there were reasons to co-operate. Own knowledge might support this, e.g. Philip was keen to reform the Church as shown in his adoption of the Tridentine decrees, the banning of Protestants and Erasmians, support of the Inquisition in dealing with heretics and the Spanish Index. To achieve Level 3 answers should begin to move towards a conclusion, e.g. either that the sources are useful, e.g. they show a working relationship between Philip II and the Pope – Philip II needed the Pope’s spiritual support and the Pope needed Philip II’s practical support. Or it could be claimed that the sources are limited; the sources contradict each other, e.g. Source C suggests that relations were good but Source D indicates that they clashed over a number of issues, including political matters (foreign policy). Own knowledge could be used to test this in practice, e.g. the Pope was excluded from religious affairs in Spain – Philip amended the Tridentine decrees, made his own appointments, tried to get Spanish nominees elected as Pope, insisted on his rights to scrutinise papal bulls and decide whether they would be published in Spain. At Level 4 a conclusion should be reached about relative sufficiency in relation to the issues, e.g. uses some of evidence quoted in Level 2 and Level 3 but concludes that as Source C is an overview, Source D relates to specific examples of attitudes

and conflicts and therefore the sources have different but equally valid attitudes. Most historians suggest that the power of the Crown in Spain in relation to the Church was greater than that in any other Catholic state. However, answers might also show awareness that neither side wanted to break with each other – Philip was basically too pious and the Pope too practical.

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

“Financial and political motives were overwhelmingly important in shaping the Crown’s policies towards religion in Spain in the years 1469 to 1598.”

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

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

L2: ***Either***

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

Or

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

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

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

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

Indicative content

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

From the sources: Source A stresses the religious issues for Ferdinand and Isabella – the crown was in need of cash and could have allowed the Jews to stay in return for a large sum, but they chose to expel them despite this. This is stressed again in Source B, where the crown acted against all non-Christians or deviants such as Erasmians. However, Source C suggests both financial and political incentives as a means of mutual support for both the Pope and Philip II in their joint aim to assert the supremacy of the catholic faith. This is reflected also in D, with increased emphasis on the political aspect, given Philip's desire to maintain control over the church in Spain himself rather than accede any power to the Pope.

Own knowledge might suggest that much depended on the circumstances of the ruler and the level of authority they could exert, the state of their relations with the Pope and the internal and external threats they faced in the religious sphere. For Ferdinand and Isabella, their appointment of Cisneros reflects their concern for the religious health of the Church, but in addition their determination to appoint their own clergy generated a clash with the Papacy. The war against Granada was political (annexation of territory, security for Castile and Aragon) but also religious because they regarded the Moors as infidels. Ferdinand's policy against the Moors in Aragon was probably economic in the first instance, but became more important politically and they were ultimately expelled under Charles I.

Arguments could be put forward for identifying Charles I's policies as more fundamentally religious in motivation, e.g. he had alumbrados arrested because they criticised Catholic practices, he supported the Inquisition in its persecution of the limited number of Protestants in Spain and it may have been very significant in preventing the growth of a Protestant threat. However, by 1558, to be a protestant was an offence against the state, suggesting something more than religious motives. For Philip II the rebellion of the Moriscos in 1568 was both religious and political; fears of links to the Ottoman Turks and the length of the rebellion led to resettlement on a large scale and attempts at religious conversion to maintain the unity of Spain. His own personal piety may explain his willingness to use the decrees of Trent to impose reform upon the Spanish Catholic Church but he was not prepared to see his existing rights infringed. His staunch support of the Inquisition and reform of the clergy may also have been a reflection of his desire to control the Church in Spain, rather than allow the Pope to do this. He usually ignored papal edicts and would not allow his subjects the right of appeal to Rome. The case of Perez may also be cited as Philip II using the Church purely for political reasons.

Section B

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

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

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: *Either*

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

Or

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

L2: *Either*

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

Or

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

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

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

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

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

“Economic and financial matters, rather than religious issues, were the cause of widespread revolt in the Netherlands by 1572.”

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:

Economically, the Netherlands was generally developing – it was a key centre of banking; there was well developed trade with the Baltic especially in the western provinces; Holland was one of the richest states and saw itself as important. However, customs barriers at provincial borders caused difficulties, taxation was heavy and had caused opposition, e.g. the Ghent revolt of 1539–1540, the textile trade was in difficulties, and the bad harvest of 1564 compounded the situation; there were frequent clashes between rich and poor in towns; anti-Spanish feeling grew.

In religious terms, the growth of heresy was significant – it spread from Germany in the reign of Charles V. The scheme to counteract this created 14 new bishoprics in the reign of Philip II and led to fears which were not all connected with religion; fear of the Inquisition and persecution but also of the strengthening of royal authority. In addition, the growth of Calvinism and Anabaptism, an outburst of hedge preaching and iconoclasm, heightened tensions. Granvelle was forced to leave by 1564 because of his failure to handle the situation effectively. Protestant and other nobles objected to Philip II’s demands for a hardline policy. Alva’s arrival, despite the fact that Margaret of Parma had begun to resolve some of the problems, and his actions compounded the situation, e.g. by billeting soldiers, setting up the Council of Troubles, execution of Egmont and Hoorne etc.

Both factors will probably be seen as contributing to the revolt, economic issues possibly as a long term factor and religious issues as a more immediate cause – but the action taken by Spain’s representatives may have unwisely heightened the tension and led to the actions of the Sea Beggars and the spread of revolt.

Candidates may know more about religious issues than economic matters, or vice versa, but consideration of both is necessary for reward at Level 3 and above. By Level 4, they should be able to make some links and comparisons, leading to a substantiated judgement at Level 5.

Question 3

To what extent was Parma's failure to re-establish Spanish authority in the Netherlands by 1592 the result of political rather than military issues? (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

Parma was a popular successor to Don John of Austria; a diplomat, soldier and strategist. He became governor of the Netherlands in 1578 at a point when the north and south were dividing; confirmed in 1578 by the Union of Arras and in 1579 by the Union of Utrecht. He established his authority and base in the south by, for example, dealing fairly with the rebels in the southern states e.g. rebels were executed but their relatives were allowed to inherit their estates; this resulted in a return of nobility to the Spanish cause. Nevertheless by 1592, he had failed to regain the Northern provinces.

Military issues – Parma campaigned from 1582 and captured major ports in 1583, Ghent and Bruges in 1584 and Brussels and Antwerp in 1585, giving sound control of the south and central Netherlands. By the late 1580s his campaign was slowed because of the need to support the Armada (1588) and the Catholic League in France (1590). Stalemate ensued because of Philip II's political decision that England's support for the Netherlands (through Leicester) should be stopped. He was also hampered by lack of funds and mutinies which became more regular after 1585 (5 mutinies 1572–1576, 37 from 1589 to 1607).

Political issues – Parma's conciliatory approach to Protestants allowed their free migration to the northern provinces, taking with them their wealth, economic understanding etc. – ultimately they contributed to the economic resurgence of the North enabling it to survive and overcome southern opposition. Parma was also hampered by Philip II's refusal to agree to any religious concessions to the rebels; Parma was prepared to be more tolerant than Philip II's principles would ever allow him to be; religious concessions would have been a strong argument for peace with the north.

Good responses to this question should debate between the military and the political aspects but may also debate the issues within them. Parma was an excellent soldier and strategist and should not have lost the war, but was hampered by Philip II's priorities, such as the Armada and intervention in France. On the other hand the north was more prosperous and possibly had more unity of purpose.

Question 4

To what extent was the emergence of the United Provinces by 1609 more the result of political rather than religious factors? (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

Religious factors – these were a significant element in the issues leading to the outbreak of conflict, e.g. the emergence of Calvinism, iconoclasm, Philip II's belief that religious repression was necessary and that the majority would support this, Alva's implementation of the bishopric scheme etc. The leader of the rebels, William of Orange, started out as a Catholic, but opposed persecution and championed freedom of conscience. He was prepared to lead Calvinists against Spain. Other prime movers such as the Sea Beggars were more clearly motivated by religion. Calvinism did appeal to both the rich and the unemployed; by 1571 a Calvinist synod had been held in the Netherlands and an organised church did develop. The States-General was not prepared to accept Don John's proposal in 1576 that the Catholic religion should be re-established and war began again. In the latter part of the conflict, 40,000 protestants left the south for the north indicating that they saw it has a less hostile environment. However, the number of Calvinists in the Netherlands was never more than 10%, although their influence was greater and there were divisions, e.g. between Calvinists and Arminians which were only resolved in 1618. The Governors appointed to the northern states during the conflict varied from Catholic (Anjou) to Protestant (Leicester). Both Henry III and Elizabeth I were asked to take over after the death of William of Orange. Not all states/towns were religiously united, e.g. Groningen became part of the United Provinces although it was Catholic. Alternatively, Philip II was driven by religious as much as political factors and Alva's persecution made martyrs of the protestants.

Political factors – the states had no real political unity except in name before or after the revolt; in the early days the rebels were weakened because they were attempting to involve all the Netherlands in the revolt. Although as early as 1581, the Act of Abjuration had rejected the authority of Philip II and set up an oath of obedience to the states, it was widely expected that the resistance to Spain would collapse on the death of William of Orange. However, the limited diplomatic support gained by William of Orange from England, Scotland and the Palatinate suggests some external recognition of an independent state. Archduke Mathias was prepared to concede a ceasefire on 1607 with the northern states which would recognise Dutch sovereignty; Spain under Philip III also wanted peace so that he could concentrate on issues in the Mediterranean. The truce of 1609 (for 12 years) gave international recognition to the states as a republic.

This is a broad question and answers are not expected to go through all events of the revolt but to be selective. Good answers will be able to indicate where these motivations are particularly apparent and have significant impact on the course of events.

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

Question 5

“Charles V, in his efforts to assert his authority over the princes, was motivated more by religious than by political concerns.”

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

Charles V's rule is often seen as the transition period between the religious and the secular ruler. He was personally very pious and also influenced by his Chancellor, Gattinara, and by his concept of a universal empire. These issues often resulted in personal conflict as well as that with the princes.

Religious issues affecting relation with the princes were, for example, his repeated attempts to bring the Protestants back into the fold, e.g. at Worms 1521, at the Diet of Augsburg 1531, at the Colloquy of Regensburg 1541; he wanted to persuade rather than force and, although he frequently denounced heresy, he tolerated it in practice, hoping to persuade the Pope to call a General Council of the Church; as late as 1541, theologians at the Colloquy of Regensburg debated for several months before Charles accepted that no compromise could be found. However, he was not prepared to concede toleration, which he regarded as a sign of weakness.

Charles V's political concerns might be explored through the effects of princely conversion: the acquisition of Church lands provided princes with more income; a prince could make decisions independently of the Pope or bishop, e.g. regarding appointments of clergy. If this were the case, then the next threat might be to the authority of the Emperor. His frequent absences from the Holy Roman Empire made this a greater threat than if he had been permanently resident. More serious, however, was the conflict which then arose between Protestant and Catholic princes, e.g. through the formation of Leagues such as Dessau (1525-catholics) and Torgau (1526-Lutherans) leading to the possibilities of open conflict between the two groups; this threat was exacerbated by 1531 with the drawing up of the Augsburg Confession and the formation of the Protestant Schmalkaldic League (which had the support of Luther).

Additionally, responses might consider other matters related to the governance of the Holy Roman Empire, e.g. the size and structure of some princely territories (many had been consolidated over time and had efficient tax collection systems, their own provincial parliaments), their growing rights to control law and order and the allegiance owed to them by knights and peasants. Against this might be set the Holy Roman Empire's rights to territories, and particularly the Emperor's powerbase in Austria, his role as supreme judge and his right to set the agenda and use the veto at meetings of the Diet.

Question 6

“The Habsburg-Valois rivalry prevented Charles V from resolving political and religious issues in the Holy Roman Empire.”

Assess the validity of 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 are not expected to focus on the detail of the Habsburg-Valois rivalry but on its role as a distractor. The Habsburg-Valois rivalry was an extended conflict between France and Holy Roman Empire largely based in Italy until 1530 and on the eastern boundary of the empire. Focussing attention on this, although still resident in Spain until 1529, meant that in political terms Charles had to rely on a regent in the Holy Roman Empire (his brother Ferdinand), he was not accepted as Holy Roman Emperor by Francis I (until 1529), the functions and composition of the regency Council meant that Charles only controlled 5 out of its 22 members; even by 1522 when the council was controlled by Ferdinand, it could not enforce its decrees and Ferdinand relied upon, for example, the Swabian league to maintain law and order.

In religious terms, the delay caused by the conflict in Italy meant that the Lutheran problem was not resolved in its early stages. Although Luther was condemned as a heretic, it did not prevent the princes taking Protestantism as their faith, cities converting etc. and reducing the network of support that Charles/Ferdinand could expect. In turn this rebounded on political issues, e.g. the princes in the Diets divided on religious grounds, it was difficult for agreement on policies to be reached and the Emperor had to barter, destroying his authority. By 1530 when Charles returned to the Holy Roman Empire political and religious issues had fused further, e.g. with the conversion of a large number of influential princes, the Schmalkaldic League etc. Success against the French enabled Charles to call for a General Council to sort out the religious problem and turn his attention to the princes, resulting in victory at Muhlberg. This was however short-lived and Protestant alliances with Henry II resulted in further conflict in the 1550s and Charles V's abdication.

Not all of these difficulties can be blamed on the struggle with the French. Other factors might be, for example, Charles' obstinacy in remaining in Spain until 1529 yet failing to give Ferdinand full authority or guidance on policy; Ferdinand devoting himself increasingly to affairs in the east of the empire; the weaknesses/corruption of the Papacy, the natural ambitions of the princes, the threat of the Turks (although there was some collusion with the French in the mid 1530s). Candidates should be able to arrive at a supported judgement which includes a range of factors.

Question 7

“By 1555, Charles V had failed entirely to achieve either political unity or religious peace in the Holy Roman Empire.”

To what extent do you agree with this opinion?

(20 marks)

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Political unity – this should be considered in relation to both structural and practical matters. Candidates will no doubt point out that there was limited political unity when Charles was elected Holy Roman Emperor. Structurally, a good deal of power resided with the princes – their lands were becoming more geographically compact, feudal methods were being replaced by modernised governments with, for example, permanent councils to advise, systems to impose and collect taxes, judicial authority and often the existence of local parliaments. Practically, there were tensions, e.g. peasants resented the heavy taxes imposed to pay for these institutions, knights rebelled as their authority decreased, and princes were just as likely to challenge each other, form leagues etc. However, Charles V and his government might be seen as the overarching authority providing some form of unity through his ability to summon Diets and act as supreme judge; the use of leagues to deal with challenges to his authority, e.g. the Swabian League. The Regency Council of 1519 was used by Charles V during the 1520s to identify and assert his authority and the Imperial Chamber Court was used to prosecute Protestant princes; the Imperial Diet communicated royal policy.

Religious peace – Charles became Emperor at a time of religious challenge; he took his title of Holy Roman Emperor seriously and he intended to keep the Holy Roman Empire Catholic. By the end of his reign, however, *'cuius religio, eius religio'* meant there was religious division, but less conflict. In the intervening period Charles' determination to root out heresy failed because of the nature of his territory, the appeal of Lutheranism to differing sections of the community and the distractions offered by the Habsburg-Valois rivalry and the Turks. Peace was therefore reluctant and did not include any others but Lutherans and Catholics. Charles' disappointment was clearly expressed in his refusal to attend the negotiations in person.

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

“Suleiman’s power within the Ottoman Empire was challenged more by religious groups than by the military elites.”

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

Religious groups – answers are likely to explore the range of religions represented in the empire, e.g. Jews, Greek Orthodox, Catholics, Sunni and Safavid Muslims. Approx 60% of population was Muslim. It was generally accepted that non-Muslims were not forced to convert and so represented an alien culture within the Ottoman state, possibly with very different political views. Recognition should be given, however, to the fact that they were controlled through the *millet*, which allowed them to govern themselves under the auspices of their religious leader, acting in a political role. A range of laws were instated to restrict their ability to interfere or challenge the Ottoman state and they had to wear distinctive dress, attend the mosque once per week etc. Some of these groups arrived because they were captured in war (*devshirme*) and some because they sought refuge. Many contributed to the Ottoman Empire through expertise, e.g. in agriculture, science, trade and so were welcome. Many of the boys collected under the *devshirme* system were regarded as tax payments and served in the army or the civil service, eventually making a significant contribution to the administration and defence of the empire. Within Islam itself, deviance was not so welcome; fanaticism was not approved and occasionally individuals could be a threat.

Military groups – some overlap here through the tribute exacted from other national and religious groups. Answers are likely to conclude that Janissaries were most significant (often coming from the *devshirme*) in exerting influence over political decisions; could be a liability when not involved in war-almost generating a demand for continuous conflict; evidence that they looted cities; also known to try to force their will on Suleiman, e.g. may have been responsible for Suleiman raising the siege of Vienna in 1529; Sultans needed their support before taking up the position and they continuously demanded gifts as the price of loyalty; they were answerable only to the Sultan. Responses should include some reference to the Sipahis, recruited from the Janissaries, who acted as the Sultan’s bodyguard. They were allocated land from which they collected taxes to support themselves and paid the rest to the government; however, they never owned the land, although there was some expectation that it could be taken up by sons. They were also expected to maintain law and order on the land they occupied.

The evidence suggests that the military, although essential to the Ottomans were a threat because of their training, specific role and influence; whereas the threat from other religious groups was contained more easily, although even here there were extremists who had to be controlled.

Question 9

“Suleimann’s attacks on the west were motivated by the desire for territorial expansion rather than by the idea of ‘holy war’.”

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

‘Holy war’ against Christendom might be seen in the drive to the west – to Belgrade, Rhodes, the defeat of Hungary, the siege of Vienna, perception of Charles V and the Holy Roman Empire as enemies. Also ‘holy war’ to the East against Shi’ite Muslims and the Iranian dynasty. It was the duty of all Muslims to extend ‘the abode of Islam’ without necessarily seeking forced conversions – this ‘toleration’ is seen through the institution of the ‘millet’, i.e. the establishment of self-governing communities under the leadership of their own religious leaders who were responsible for the good behaviour of the community. They had inferior status, e.g. could not carry weapons. It is also seen in the fact that religious exiles were allowed into the Ottoman Empire, e.g. Jews expelled from Spain and in Suleiman’s alliance with Francis I of France. Indirectly, the Turks may have waged ‘holy war’ because they were taking advantage of religious divisions in western Europe to further their ambitions. Europeans also tended to describe conflict in terms of ‘holy war’ – the Knights of St. John defending Rhodes saw themselves as fighting against the ‘infidel’.

‘Territorial ambition’ might be a better term to describe the motive for their rapid progress through the Crimea, Transylvania, Hungary and North Africa – there was no reticence about attacking territory owned/populated by Muslims as well as Christians. Motivation for attacking the Knights of St. John in Malta could also be ascribed to the view that the Knights were pirates who disrupted trade with Egypt. Malta was also a strategic prize in its own right because of its position in the Mediterranean. Their conquest of Hungary in 1526 allowed John Zapolya to remain in control for payment of tribute – they were simply seeking a way through to the west. It could be argued that there was no need to for the Turks to pursue a ‘holy war’ to weaken their enemies in the west – the Lutheran and Calvinist reformers were already doing this for them by diverting attention and resources. Above all, the Turks rarely settled in any regions they attacked.

Question 10

“Despite the apparent political and military strengths of the Ottoman Empire, the potential for its decline was stronger.”

Examine the validity of this judgement.

(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 strengths might be seen as: the leadership qualities of Suleiman, the autocratic method of government which meant the Sultan’s word was law; the security of inheritance as a result of the law of fratricide – so no disputes about succession; the support from the Ulema and the religious community (as opposed to the divisions in Europe); the use of ‘slaves’; the propaganda demonstrating the power and wealth of the Sultans which generated support for the regime.

Military strengths: seen in issues such as promotion by merit, a constant supply of recruits through the devshirme system, the training which lasted up to 7 years; the restrictions on land ownership by soldiers unless they were Muslim; no land could be passed on at death but was redistributed thus ensuring continuing loyalty (although this rule was occasionally broken as when the island of Chios was taken in the Aegean).

However, much did depend on the personality of the Sultan (Suleiman received widespread support largely because of his attention to propaganda, public works etc at home); military loyalty depended on expansion and once this became more difficult as it did after the reign of Suleiman, dissatisfaction could become an issue. The determination of the Europeans to resist was also important; internal quarrels reduced this resistance in the period of study at certain times, e.g. because of religious divisions and Habsburg-Valois conflict. Once the Ottoman Empire was faced with war on two fronts (Europeans and Persians) their efforts had to be spread more widely. There were also limits to the campaigning season and they never got beyond Vienna, except for a short period over wintering in Toulon, courtesy of the French. Some historians also consider that as early as 1565 there were indications of decline, e.g. problems in administration, raising troops etc.