

Examiners' Report

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE
in History (8HI0) Paper 2B

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2016

Publications Code 49955

All the material in this publication is
copyright © Pearson Education Ltd 2016

Grade Boundaries

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

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

PE Report 8H10 2B June 2016

The new AS paper 2B, which covers the options of the German Reformation (2B.1) and the Dutch Revolt (2B.2) saw responses from across the ability range.

In general, candidates found Section A, the compulsory two-part source question, more challenging. Some were not clear on what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' which hindered their ability to analyse and evaluate the sources (AO2). In addition, the detailed knowledge that was required to add contextual material to support and/or challenge points derived from the sources was sometimes absent. Some candidates therefore, spent considerable time adding knowledge to their answer that was only peripheral to the enquiry and did not help them with the task in hand. There were also a number of rather generic comments on the nature, origin or purpose of the sources which did not enhance candidates' answers.

Section B, the section in which candidates were given a choice of three essays in order to assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1), tended to be done better. Few produced wholly descriptive answers and most attempted to engage analytically with the demands of the questions. The majority of answers were soundly structured and clearly expressed. They also made some effort to come to a judgement. The most common weakness in this section was a lack of detailed knowledge of the material. Perhaps as a consequence, there was also a tendency among some not to engage fully enough with the specific focus of the question. Some students glossed over, or in some cases ignored, this which seriously impacted on their ability to attain higher marks however strong the remainder of their answer.

Question 1 (a)

Most candidates were able to identify the source as an example of the angry radicalism unleashed in the early 1520s and many used their own knowledge to link this to Luther's challenge to clerical authority in the preceding period. There were some very good responses which were able to point out how many of the criticisms made by Storch may have drawn inspiration from Luther's pamphlets of 1520 or his defiance at Worms even though he never intended his ideas to be taken so far. Weaker candidates tended to paraphrase the source and/or be drawn into assessing why the source was not valuable to the enquiry. It was clear also that knowledge of the Zwickau Prophets and the Peasants' War was lacking for some.

Exemplar

Question 1 (a)

This L2 answer demonstrates some understanding of the source material and adds some contextual knowledge in support of the inferences it draws but would benefit from closer attention to the information in the source and more detailed development of the points it makes.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

(This is for part (a)) Source 1 shows that it was written ~~just~~ before in the same year as the diet at Worms took place between the Catholic Church and Luther. Source 1 is very valuable to ~~any~~ anyone investigating the radicalisation encouraged by Luther about the Catholic Church as it shows that views towards the priests were changing and more people were coming to realise how corrupt the Church was and by Luther nailing the 95 theses to St Peter's door did not help the Church to make their cases. The Source also shows how priests as well as the Church were exploiting peasants which allowed them to become richer and the poor, even worst off. "If ~~he does~~ not hand him ~~them~~ his purse,



(This is for part (a)) "heaven is closed" this from Nicholas Hausmann could also be suggesting about the indulgences, which pope leox used in order to rebuild St Peters church, were being used in order for priests and preachers of the Catholic church more money.

Source 1 also ~~takes about~~ suggest that this was part of the reason for the peasants revolt in 1525. Peasants were annoyed with the difference between the rich and the poor was forever getting wider and that the work from Luther was a sign sent by God to stand up to what they believe in. However, when the revolt broke out Luther was ~~disuse~~ disgusted that the way his work had been interpreted, which resulted in ~~losing~~ losing a lot of valuable support.



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 5 2 0

5
Turn over ►

(This is for part (a)) Overall, the source is very reliable in order to investigate the radicalism encouraged by Luther towards the Catholic Church as it highlights one of the biggest reasons for why so many Catholics turned to Lutheranism which was that the Church was not helping people but in fact exploiting them making it harder for illiterate people to get by during the 16th Century.



Question 1 (b)

There were some very good responses to this question which convincingly challenged Erasmus' criticisms of Luther's conduct of the Reformation in the early 1520s and so were able to come to a valid judgement about the weight of the source to the enquiry. So, for example, many pointed out that indeed Luther had sought the support of the authorities for his ideas but had been met with hostility and/or that Erasmus was blaming Luther for the social and political radicalism of the period which he famously condemned. More still pointed out that Erasmus was a moderate critic and that there many more hostile to Luther, from both sides of the argument. Weaker answers struggled to comprehend that Erasmus was criticising Luther's methods rather than his ideas and lacked sufficient knowledge of developments in the early 1520s. Also, there were a number of rather generalised comments on the nature of the source, a private letter, which on their own, did not help assess its weight.

Exemplar

Question 1 (b)

This answer shows some analysis by making valid inferences from the source material and supporting these with relevant and accurate knowledge. It attempts to weigh the evidence of the source by suggesting ways in which it may and may not be useful to the enquiry. It was given a top L3 mark.

(This is for part (b)) Source 2 has some weight in the critique of Lutheran views in the early 1520's because it was written by a critic: Erasmus to a Lutheran: Philipp Melancthon, explaining some of the faults of Luther. However, it remains vague and only provides the criticism of one person, therefore cannot suffice for an enquiry into Lutheran criticisms.

Erasmus was a humanist scholar whom Luther denied much of his ideas. For this reason, we can expect little criticism of what Luther is saying, but rather how it is said. The tone of his letter is polite, trying to encourage Melancthon to either be more conservative or influence Luther to do so. From my knowledge of Melancthon, I know that his Augsburg confession of 1530 was moderate and less radical as those of Luther. This might suggest the impact of the letter. The timing of the letter is 1524, which is early 1520's, so we cannot doubt its historical accuracy. At the time, the knights revolt, led by Ulrich von Hutten, followed by the peasant's revolt was occurring. This might serve as an explanation for Erasmus's discouraging such radicalism evident at the time. In regards to reliability, I give heavy weight to Source 2.



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 7 2 0

7
Turn over ▶

(This is for part (b)) As for content, Source 2 lacks. It states a "distaste" for Luther's teachings, but uses only "puffed without destroying authority" which tells us sparse evidence on what Erasmus dislikes. He does state "tear hoods off monks" and "priests are married and images torn down" as radical views of Lutherans - referencing clerical marriage and iconoclasm, but fails to note iconoclasm was Carlstadt's idea and that Luther did not directly start the rebellions. Luther himself critiques the peasant's revolt as destroying authority, something Erasmus states Luther is doing "puffed without destroying authority". The main critique of Luther on enquiring historians could gather is that Luther is "violent" and "nobody listens". Luther "exposes their faults" rather than "improving popes and princes". He failed to see "pope Clement was not opposed to reform and would meet him half-way". He expresses hindsight that the way Luther attacked "corruption" was wrong. Erasmus agrees "Christendom is corrupt" but sustains Luther was not "improving" "remedies" and was "causing more harm than he cures" "throwing everything into confusion", thus provides very little weight in enquiring about critics.

As a conclusion, I find that although Erasmus' letter (Source 2) provides a reliable and accurate source, the information is not adequate for enquiring into



(This is for part (b)) The critics of Luther as Erasmus is the only critic mentioned and the only source with actual Lutheran teachings was clerical marriage "priests are married". Iconoclasm and the revolts were largely the fault of radicals like Carlstadt, Jan Mollen and the Zwickau prophets. The main argument seems against Luther's methods which tells us little about, only that it is wrong. Overall, source 2 is mildly weighty in an enquiry into Luther's critics only as it is a reliable and accurate historical source which provides some insight on criticisms against Luther.



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 9 2 0

9
Turn over ▶

Question 2 (a)

Most candidates were able to identify this pamphlet as strongly critical of Alva's rule in the Netherlands and used their own knowledge to develop this with reference for example, to the Council of Troubles and the Tenth Penny. Stronger candidates tended to have more detailed understanding of the period and were able to place the source in the context of Orange's renewed challenge in assessing its value. Others commented on the source's imitation of the Lord's Prayer and inferred the religious motivation of the author. Weaker answers tended to paraphrase the source without attempting to analyse its value or were drawn into discussions of why it was not valuable to the enquiry.

Exemplar

Question 2 (a)

This L3 answer starts well by drawing valid inferences from the source and supporting these with accurate and relevant contextual knowledge. It also makes an attempt to evaluate the use of the source to the enquiry but gets drawn also into the limitations of the source which is not required in Question (a).

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: **Question 1** **Question 2**

(This is for part (a)) Source 3 is valuable to the historian when studying the response of the people to Alva's rule in the Netherlands. We can see from the way Alva is addressed that he is ~~is~~ largely unpopular in the opening line "Hellish father", comparing him to the devil. This was a huge insult to Alva in the 1500's as religion was the most important thing. We can also see a reaction to the Tenth Penny Tax where it states "You take away our daily bread". The Ten penny tax was a permanent tax that Alva forcibly collected ~~on all~~ ^{at 10%} from all sales except land. This was ~~is~~ in order to pay for his army as he had run out of money to pay them and Philip II was unable to ~~is~~ send money as he was fighting a war with the Turkish people. The Tenth Penny Tax would have had a detrimental effect ~~is~~ on the finances of the Dutch citizens, showing a possible link between the quote "You take away our daily bread" as they feel their money has been stolen. Source 3 also mentions

4



(This is for part (a)) ~~The~~ Council of Troubles which ~~was~~ was implemented by the Pope in order to stop heretics. ~~The~~ quote states "his Council, false and bloody". It is described as 'bloody' because of the amount of people ~~it~~ sentenced to execution, such as Count Hoorn and Egmont. Overall 1000 were executed. Source 3 describes the Council of Troubles as making "plunder and murder their daily study." This shows that the people of the Netherlands did not approve of the way people were murdered on account of being heretics as it went against the traditions of the Netherlands which was once a country of religious tolerance and free thinking.

~~The~~ The source is very one-sided, making it a bad source for a historian to use because it only focuses on the ~~the~~ unpopular ~~the~~ actions Alva had done. It is quite biased in its attacking of Alva rather than including a more balanced view; however we do not know the writer as it was sent anonymously. ~~It~~ ^{Source 3} is a pamphlet piece that was widely distributed in Ghent. It is written in imitation of a



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 5 2 0

5
Turn over ▶

(This is for part (a)) Christian Prayer, perhaps targeting those with religious views. It dates to March 1572. The purpose of this pamphlet was to influence the views of the people on Alva, and to make them join the rebels in fighting his rule. Overall, Source 3 is useful to a historian if wanting a negative view of the people's reaction to Alva as it is very one-sided. For a balanced view, it



Question 2 (b)

Good answers to this question clearly identified Orange's mixed motives for returning to the Netherlands in assessing the weight of this source. Using his defensive language in combination with their knowledge of his previous conduct towards Spanish rule in the 1560s and/or his only recent religious conversion, they were able to discuss in some detail the doubts harboured about his intentions even among those close to him. Weaker candidates tended to take the source at face value and to assume, simply because he was writing privately to his brother, that he must be sincere. There was also some lack of detailed knowledge of the issues raised in the source with regard to Orange's religious and political demands especially. Some candidates simply described the course of the Dutch revolt hitherto, without focusing on the specifics of the enquiry.

Exemplar

Question 2 (b)

This answer demonstrates some understanding of the source material and includes some sound contextual knowledge (though this is not always focused on the question). Its weakness is that it takes the source at face value and the comments made on utility are generic rather than about the specific purpose of the writer. It is an example of a borderline L2/L3 answer.

(This is for part (b)) Source 6 is a letter from William of Orange talking about the reasons for returning to the Netherlands in 1572 after being in exile in Germany. The source says "never and is not my intention to seek the slightest advantage for myself" and "I am not stubbornly pursuing some foolish notions". This shows that William of Orange was not returning to the Netherlands for his own selfish gain but he genuinely thought that the Netherlands were in trouble and needed to be rid of the Span Habsburgs who were ruling the country. Also, the source says "this whole country and state return to its ancient privileges and liberty". This shows that William of Orange believes himself to be the only person willing to fully commit himself into challenging the role of Philip II and that he wants to restore what the ~~Netherlands~~ "foreigners" ~~is~~ and ~~you~~ had taken away from the Netherlands, for example the freedom of religion. ~~to~~ The quote shows he is returning to the Netherlands to return the Netherlands back to the country it once was, in terms of religion and government.

The source is a letter written by William of Orange to his two brothers in 1573. This means the source is of a private nature as it was not published for propaganda or ~~to~~ for the public's viewing, but just a letter between family members. This could help to give some weight into the reasons why William of Orange returned to the Netherlands as generally, people feel more comfortable



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 7 2 0

(This is for part (b)) talking to family and there is no reason to lie about your intentions when ~~there~~ the only people that will see it are your siblings, ~~meaning~~ This means that Orange may have genuinely been returning to the Netherlands to protect the country's rights and privileges as that is what is said ~~to be~~ in the letter.

However, the letter may not be given much weight as it does not really take into account the local beliefs at that time, and is very one-sided as to what Orange believes to be a problem but nobody else might. For example, ~~at the~~ in 1573 when the letter was written, many people were still Catholic and therefore supported the Spanish.

Although it does not say so in the letter, there may have been other reasons as to why William of Orange returned back to the Netherlands. For example, ~~it~~ he ~~was~~ just returned after the Council of Troubles had tried him for treason and took away his land. This could be an important fact for why he returned as had he not returned, he may have lost his standing as a powerful and rich grandee and he may be being continually tried for heresy and treason, in which he would have no way to defend himself if he was still in Germany. Also, after the execution of ~~the~~ Count Hoorn and Count Egmont in 1568, Orange naturally became the leader of the rebels and the main



(This is for part (b)) nemesis of the Duke of Alva. This meant that to lead the rebels and win the Dutch Revolt, he would have to return. As well as this, as he had converted to a Lutheran (a German Protestant), it meant he had support from the German and the Dutch as well as the French after supporting the Huguenots. This meant William of Orange was in a much more stronger and powerful position to challenge Alva and Philip II in general, which meant that 1572 was the perfect time to return to the Netherlands.

Overall, I give this source a lot of weight as to why William of Orange returned to the Netherlands as it is private and was not used for propaganda and there are many facts that support this, such as the fact that he continued to fight the Dutch Revolt and be the leader of the rebels until his execution. However, there may be other reasons as to why he returned which he denied in the letter, such as his own personal gains from returning at that time.



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 9 2 0

Question 3

This was a popular question and most candidates framed an analytical response related to the success of Luther's challenge in the year 1517-21. The better candidates focused at some length on the mistakes of Luther's opponents and there were many detailed analyses of the failures of both the religious and political authorities to deal effectively with the growing severity and popularity of his challenge before considering a range of alternative factors. Such answers were also able to make links between these factors in coming to a judgement on the reason for Luther's success, how for example, Leo X's seeming complacency may be indicative of the reasons for the widespread anticlericalism in Germany which fed Luther's success. Weaker answers however, touched lightly on the mistakes of Luther's opponents before embarking on what often seemed like a rehearsed set of potential alternatives, often relating to the printing press. There was often little attempt to link these together and conclusions sometimes bore scant regard for the material previously produced.

Exemplar

Question 3

This essay focuses clearly on the reasons for Luther's successful challenge to the Church in the years 1517-21 and covers a range of potential factors in some depth. It is well organised and attempts throughout to evaluate the importance of the material introduced before coming to a judgement. However, it is less convincing in addressing the stated factor in the question, "the mistakes of Luther's opponents", and received a high L3 rather than a L4 mark.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: **Question 3** **Question 4** **Question 5**
Question 6 **Question 7** **Question 8**

In the years 1517-21, Lutheranism grew and flourished as it came into its element and form of religion. From the moment Luther originally put his 95 theses on the castle church on 31st October 1517, Luther became a national hero however it is arguably as to ^{what} the success of Luther's challenge was down to. There are many factors that contributed to success of Luther's challenge included printing press, sermons, Luther himself etc and one may argue one is of ~~or~~ to a greater extent more important.

One may argue that to a great extent the mistakes of those who opposed him led to the success of Luther because ultimately if they were able to suppress it may not have grown. One of the people who opposed Luther was Charles V and to a great extent he made a lot of mistakes when it came to dealing with Luther. Time after time Charles V was frequently



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 1 3 2 0

absent from the empire due to his
conflicting priorities in other parts such
as Spain, France and so he was at
for many times not within the empire
to sort out the issues for example after
the Diet of Worms in 1521 he had to
quickly return as Spain were revolting
and so he had to see the restoration of
order as well France were invading Navarre.
thus he did not focus on the Lutheran issue.
Also he ~~was~~ made mistakes in the form
that he frequently looked over Lutheranism
in order to get what he wanted in the form
of troops and money as did his grandfather
Maximilian in who was Emperor before him
for example Maximilian looked over Lutheranism
when he was trying to secure votes for
his grandson's election therefore as a
result of these mistakes Lutheranism was
able to expand and grow in great term as
in some sense it had freedom in which
as well related to the ~~of 39~~ Capitulation
Charles had to sign before coming
therefore meaning in some sense he was
restrained in his power and so contributed
to the success because Lutherans



challenge grew.

However, another may argue that the mistakes of those who opposed him was not as great ~~that a great extent~~ important also to a greater extent was the printing press. Arguably the printing press was two fold. Elizabeth Kintner argued the press precipitated the Reformation. Undoubtedly, ~~but~~ the success of Luther's challenge owes a lot to the printing press because it allowed his ideas to be widely circulated and spread as well as translated thus making his idea open to everyone not just the educated elite. During these years many of Luther's works were in print making up roughly 90%. His 95 Theses went through three editions in 1517 and a further 13 later on. The printing press also catered for the fact that 95% of the population were illiterate and unable to read. They produced woodcuts of his ideas in which Robert Scribner argues of their importance is that "They were like guns, cheap, crude and effective." They also made use of the fact that it was



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 1 5 2 0

a very visual period, people were used to seeing 'flat gault' or glass windows, images etc.

One may argue that to a greater extent than the first factor the printing press was more crucial to the success of Luther's ideas because they allowed many people to see & see and read about Luther's ideas as ultimately without the press the 95 theses would have stayed on the church wall or and just become a local phenomenon. However, on the other hand, the press may not be a great ~~ext~~ to a great extent important because many of the woodcuts were anti-Catholic polemics and not Lutheran works. Also 4,000 copies of a pamphlet sounds impressive until you realise it's only one per 3,000 people in 'The Empire'.

Although ^{to a less extent} the printing press ~~was~~ was not as important it could be argued that Martin Luther himself was to a greater extent more important as to the success of his challenge. Luther himself was charismatic and persuasive on paper he wrote in a way that ordinary



people would understand and at the end ultimately a boring writer would not have attracted an audience and so it could be argued he himself helped in the success of his challenge. In addition he had a receptive audience which would have massively helped as people were willing to listen to his ideas as they had grievances and so wanted change.

Therefore one may argue that the extent to which Luther himself contributed to the success was great because ultimately Luther must have had something special about him to make people listen to his ideas as many people before had raised grievances and were not listened to. However on the other hand ~~some~~ ^{Andrew Peters} argues that if "Luther had died it would not have ended the reformation" and so he argues that the Reformation would have been a success with or without Luther.

Moreover one may state that sermons was a ~~to~~ a greater extent the most important factor in creating the success of Luther's challenge to the Catholic Church as during



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 1 7 2 0

These years, Luther delivered many sermons in which transformed people's view. During his lifetime he delivered over 6,000 sermons, many of which he printed so that they could be delivered by humanist and other scholars. Sermons were of great importance so much that many cities spent funds on hiring preachers in who would deliver a sermon from a solemn opening to a shattering climax. Many people would come from all around to watch these. Andrew Petegree details ~~the~~ states that "sermons were the key weapon in disseminating Luther's idea." This refers to the fact that 95% of the population were illiterate and so through sermons they were able to understand and interpret Luther's idea thus ~~also~~ contributing greatly to Luther's ~~early~~ success of his early challenge.

Therefore one may argue this factor was to a greater extent more important than the others because it allowed many more people to hear and understand Luther's beliefs and so causing more people to support him leading to his success. However one may state that it was not the most important reason.



Overall, all of these factors contribute greatly to the success of Luther's challenge to the Catholic Church and even however one may argue other contribute to a greater extent. One may state that the mistakes of those who opposed him was to a greater extent more important in causing his success because ultimately if Maximilian and Charles hadn't made mistakes to begin with and instead had just suppressed Lutheranism and condemned Luther from the start, it would not have been able to grow and develop into a widely supported religion.



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 1 9 2 0

Question 4

There were only a handful of responses to this question which was focused on the extent to which Lutheranism had established doctrinal and institutional separation from the Catholic Church by 1530. Most struggled to come to terms with these demands and tended to describe the course of Luther's challenge during the 1520s. A very small number had knowledge of the development of the schism in the 1520s either with regard to the development of Lutheran beliefs or how far reformed congregations had spread across Germany by 1530.

Exemplar

Question 4

This response does not address the conceptual focus of the question and instead simply describes the course of Luther's challenge to the Catholic church. Some relevant knowledge is included and an unsubstantiated judgement is reached but the answer remained in L1.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: **Question 3** **Question 4** **Question 5**
Question 6 **Question 7** **Question 8**

By 1530 Luther had established a clear and significant Lutheran Church. As he had many supporters and made the German people aware of the clear corruption amongst the papacy in Rome.

In 1517, Lutheranism started when Luther released the 95 theses. He pinned to the door of St. Peter's in Rome stating that there was an extreme need for reform in the church by exposing the corruption going on in the church. Priests were living lavish lifestyles by tricking innocent people into paying for time off purgatory with grievances, which clearly did nothing and the money was going into the priests' back pockets. Priests also were not remaining celibate and were sleeping with ~~the~~ prostitutes. Luther even said himself, every corner you turn ~~the~~ in



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 1 3 2 0

Some there is a prostitute. Due to the printing press in Germany at this time, people all over were able to get a copy of the 95 theses opening their eyes to what was going on in Rome and what all the money they were spending was going to, gaining him many followers.

In 1518, Luther had his debate with Cajetan, talking about what was allowed and not allowed in Germany at this time. One year later in 1519, Charles V was elected Holy Roman Emperor, however due to him being distracted by external threats Luther was able to have more of influence over Germany without facing as much conflict.

In 1520 Luther wrote the three pamphlets. The first was in German written in August denouncing the Christian Nobility. The second was written in September in Latin calling the pope 'Antichrist' and Rome 'Babylon'. The third was written in November where Luther did not have such extreme views.



The three pamphlets gained Luther popularity amongst Germans as he was starting to be recognised by people and becoming a known figure throughout Germany.

In 1522, Luther wrote the New Testament giving his followers some

In 1521, Luther was excommunicated and went into hiding in Wartburg Castle by Frederick the Wise. Also the edict of Worms and the Loci Communes was also released, giving Lutheranism more power. Luther really started to get a grasp on a ~~new~~ stable church in 1522, when he wrote the New Testament really giving people something to go on and read as scripture where it was interpreted properly without the corruption of the church.

In 1524-25, it was clear Luther had started to revolutionise people's thinking as there was a peasants' war, where the poor wanted justice for what had been happening in



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 1 5 2 0

Rome. Also ~~an~~ Luther could spread the word more especially in 1527, during the sack of Rome when Charles' army invaded Rome, attacking women and children so Charles' attention was on that giving Luther free reign to keep protesting without being interrupted, also in 1529, Charles' attention was diverted again to the siege of Vienna when the Ottoman Turks invaded and were stopped at the gates of Vienna.

Overall, ~~§~~ By 1530 Luther had a fully established church with a great following, he was given free reign also due to Charles V's (The Holy Roman) attention was diverted to external conflict therefore Lutheranism was not contained leading a full established separate Lutheran church.



Question 5

This was another very popular question and again, most candidates were able to frame an analytical response focusing on Charles V's failure to combat Lutheranism by 1555. There were many very good answers who were able to analyse in some depth the way in which Charles' problems outside Germany (in Spain or with the French and the Turks) directly impacted on his inability to muster sufficient strength to destroy Lutheranism at key points during his reign as Emperor. They were also able to make links between the various factors discussed and use these to come to a reasoned judgement, how far for example the extent not just of his inheritance but also his dynastic ambitions played a role in his failure, notably after the defeat of the Schmalkaldic League. Weaker answers touched lightly on Charles' difficulties outside Germany or tended to lack chronological range on the matter, many not extending past Charles' absence from Germany during the 1520s. There were also many candidates whose discussion of Charles' failure lacked range and/or depth in their knowledge: they were able to identify potentially relevant factors, the role of some German princes for example, without building on them to construct a convincing response.

Exemplar

Question 5

This answer shows only limited analysis of the features relevant to the question and is clearly lacking in both range and depth of relevant knowledge. Its conclusion has only limited substantiation. It was given a L2 mark.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4 Question 5
Question 6 Question 7 Question 8

Charles V was the Holy Roman Emperor when Luther was preaching. Charles V was from the long line that is the Hapsburg family and he had extreme wealth, hence being elected. Charles V hated Luther and everything he was about, he saw Luther as a threat to him and as someone who could potentially bring him down and even the Holy Roman Empire too.

Due to Charles V being from the Hapsburg family he also had a lot of land outside Germany, because of this Charles V was often away abandoning his post as Holy Roman Emperor and not being able to keep an eye on Luther and what he was doing.

Although Charles V was away from Germany a lot he also had little power as the Emperor. Although from outside the



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 1 3 2 0

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4 Question 5
Question 6 Question 7 Question 8

Charles V was the Holy Roman Emperor when Luther was preaching. Charles V was from the long line that is the Hapsburg family and he had extreme wealth, hence being elected. Charles V hated Luther and everything he was about, he saw Luther as a threat to him and as someone who could potentially bring him down and even the Holy Roman Empire too.

Due to Charles V being from the Hapsburg family he also had a lot of land outside Germany, because of this Charles V was often away abandoning his post as Holy Roman Emperor and not being able to keep an eye on Luther and what he was doing.

Although Charles V was away from Germany a lot he also had little power as the Emperor. Although from outside the



Holy Roman Empire it seemed like Charles had power he didn't. There was no imperial army for the most part other than one Maximilian had created and to do anything Charles had to ask the Princes - he relied on them heavily which the Princes came to realise more and more.

I don't think that Charles V failed to suppress Luther was because of what he was dealing with outside Germany. I think that the reason Charles V couldn't suppress Luther was because one he had little power and two because Luther was hugely popular, he had a huge following and not just of peasants but of important people such as Frederick the ~~wise~~ Wise. Charles V also failed to get the ~~Princes~~ Princes to turn against Luther and without their support there was little he could do. At this time also states in the Holy Roman Empire began converting to Lutheranism further solidifying Luther's place and power. The reason Charles V couldn't suppress Luther also was because what he was



teaching many people and peasants
-agreed with Compton was a huge issue
at the time and because it had built up
for so long when luther came along it all
sort of imploded.

There was a small element of ~~Charles~~
Charles V problems that he faced outside
of ~~the~~ Germany the reason he couldn't
suppress luther because alot of the time
he wasn't there to see first hand what was
happening and I think he missed a few
key opportunities to suppress luther that he
didn't fully ~~the~~ take advantage of, one
being The ~~peasants~~ war in 1525 at this
time luther lost alot of support and
could have been suppressed then.

Finally I believe that Charles V's
failure to suppress lutheranism in the
years 1521 - 1555 was not caused by the
problems he faced outside of Germany
although that was a minor issue I don't
believe it affected and caused the failure
to suppress luther I think it was a failure
because luther was popular and had alot



of support not just from peasants but
from nobles, princes ~~and~~^{and} most importantly
Frederick the wise. Charles V had little
power and he couldn't get any Princes on
his side which was the ~~king~~ ^{king} on the
case so his ~~failure~~ failure to suppress
Luther.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



Question 6

This question had a range of responses. The better answers were able to discuss Philip II's responsibility for the growing unrest in the Netherlands in some depth, detailing his seeming contempt for the traditions of government and his insistence on obedience especially with regard to religious matters. Some were also able to consider Philip's responsibility for the decisions taken by Margaret of Parma and Granvelle as part of this analysis, before going on to look at alternatives, the responsibility of the Grandees or the growth and aggression of Calvinism in the period for example. Weaker answers lacked the knowledge to come to a convincing conclusion and there was some lack of precision with regard to the dates in the question, several answers referencing Alva or the Sea Beggars.

Exemplar

Question 6

This essay clearly attempts to analyse matters relevant to the question and includes mostly accurate and relevant knowledge. It is also well organised. However, it lacks depth generally, especially with regard to Philip II's actions, and its judgement is brief and lacking in conviction. It was given a low-mid L3 mark.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4 Question 5
Question 6 Question 7 Question 8

Unrest in the Netherlands from the years 1563-67 was minimal compared to later, but still existed to some amount. In this essay, I will argue that factors other than Philip played a pivotal role in causing unrest.

Philip II's actions did cause large amounts of unrest in regards to his stance against the privileges in particular. This means that Philip saw himself as an advocate of God and was able to do what he wanted with the country. For example, Philip tended to ignore the grandees, which is the opposite of what his father used to do, causing discontent amongst the highest nobles. Also, Philip ignored the Netherlands after his last visit and didn't visit it again, instead placing his half-sister as regent - which made his authority less dominant over the Dutch people, who grew weary of Philip's demands. This means that Philip's lack of physical presence and his alienation of the Dutch people was a main reason for the general unrest happening.



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 1 3 2 0

On the other hand, religion played a significant role in causing the unrest compared to Philip. This is because it was the basis of the majority of Dutch people's lives and when tampered with, caused an uproar. An example is the divide between Protestantism and Catholics growing due to the Spanish Inquisition, which handed the Dutch Protestants into oppression which caused unrest. Furthermore, the iconoclastic fury of 1566 was also a main cause of unrest as it pitted the Catholic Spanish loyalists against the Dutch criminals who smashed Catholic churches. This conveys how religion forced the hands of many of the dissenters as it was a clear gap between the people and the Spanish monarch. Philip's actions weren't as significant when faced with this factor.

Also, another factor that made Philip's actions less of a significant cause is the role of the Grandees and William of Orange. They were the foundation of the unrest as they were the most powerful nobles and were beginning to dissent against Spanish rule. For example, the leading Grandees supported the 400 lesser nobles that signed the



compromise and this solidified the resolve of the lower nobles into enforcing the compromise and applying pressure to Margaret of Parma. Also, William and the rest of the grandees staunchly opposed Alva's arrival in 1567 - bringing with him 70,000 men - and eventually left the States General, openly withdrawing their support of the crown. This is a more significant factor than Philip's actions as it's examples of the Dutch nobility speaking out against Spain, bolstering the unrest into higher levels.

Finally, one more factor outside of Philip's actions is Margaret of Parma, who was made regent of the Netherlands and ruled to act when ~~needed~~ necessary to curb the unrest. For example, she made the unrest worse in 1566, when she branded the country as heretics to her half-brother, causing more trouble in the long-term. The butchering of Parma also caused in to the added nobles demands in the 1560s compromise, giving the unrest more fuel to burn on and granting it more reason to carry. Compared to Philip's actions, Margaret's ineffectiveness was a major factor when considering unrest between those years.



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 1 5 2 0

In conclusion to some extent, Philip II's actions was a main factor for the unrest, however it is a slight cause in relation to more important factors such as religion and the grandees.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



Question 7

This attracted only a small number of responses and most were poor. Rather than consider the significance of Parma in the recovery of Spain's position between 1577 and 1584, most described, in general terms, the course of the Dutch revolt in this period.

Exemplar

Question 7

Though this answer appears to have an analytical focus, is clearly organised and attempts to reach a judgement, it badly lacks relevant knowledge and relies instead on vague assertion. It was given a L1 mark.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: **Question 3** **Question 4** **Question 5**
Question 6 **Question 7** **Question 8**

Plan:

- Very experienced with large military forces
- Could be threatening toward Dutch protestants (food shortages, killings etc)
- People began to fear him ✓
- Catholic
- Mother was ^{half} sister to the king (Phillip), meaning he was related to royalty. ✓

The duke of parma had a fairly significant role in the restoration of the Spanish rule as a result of many factors. These factors ranging from simple things such as his Catholic beliefs all the way up to much more complicated factors such as his royal relation.

A large reason for his significant role in the restoration of the Spanish rule was simply fear. The Dutch protestants largely feared the Duke of parma for a number of reasons, one of the main being his relation of Phillip, the Spanish



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 1 3 2 0

and Dutch king. This relation would have scared the people to have any confrontational behaviour towards Parma for one of two reasons. One, they could not confront Royalty or two, anything said would very easily get back to the king himself. This small more complicated factor would have made Parma's authority increase, therefore, resulting in a much smaller chance of anyone confronting him or his authority, consequently meaning the restoration of the Spanish could begin.

The more complicated factors such as Parma's military experience as well as his way of ruling in Phillip's absence was also very closely working factors. Parma's great military experience and understanding could have possibly intimidated the Dutch people, therefore suggesting that he would not have been approached by anyone, again, most likely out of fear. They may have began to fear their lives if something they had actually said had offended the Duke in any way. As a result of this it could be suggested that Parma was a good ruler and this would have meant he had had a very significant part in the restoration of Spanish control.

The other factor that could have linked to the Spanish gaining back their ever so lost control could have been



the lack of strong leaders of the revolt. With William of Orange's absence over the past few months and Egmont and Hoorn's assassinations, the Netherlands had no leg to stand on and began to fear death if they had spoken up, much like Egmont and Hoorn.

The ~~if~~ disappearance of Orange and assassination of Egmont and Hoorn could well have been another factor linking to the restoration of the Spanish control due to the lack of leadership to keep the revolt going strong and successfully. It would have left a gap ~~and was~~ that the Spanish could have quickly filled.

As well as this gap being filled by the Spanish, on Orange's return they would have already had the best control and Orange's lack of military experience would have shown. Therefore, putting Parma in his element. Parma would have out fought him, and due to an array of much better tactics.

In conclusion, the Duke of Parma have the largest influence and significance on the restoration of Spanish control. His talents, relations and fear factor out did any of factors - lack of



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 1 5 2 0

leadership, confidence and experience of the Dutch people.



Question 8

There were many good answers to this question which focused very well on Spain's increasing difficulties and how these impacted directly on its ability to deal with the Dutch revolt. Such responses included detailed examples from across the time frame of the question, for example how the unsustainable ambitions and financial problems of the Spanish monarchy required the diversion of Parma's forces during the campaign against England in the 1580s and caused the successive mutinies of Spanish troops in the early seventeenth century. They then went on to consider a range of alternative factors, the impact of Maurice of Nassau particularly or the growing economic strength of the United Provinces, before coming to a judgement. Weaker candidates tended to have little detailed knowledge of Spain's position during this period and were far more comfortable discussing other factors in the success of the Dutch revolt. While still relevant, they did not, as a result, meet fully the conceptual focus of the question.

Exemplar

Question 8

This answer satisfies all the criteria for a L4 mark. It sustains an analysis of the issues raised in the question, is impressively detailed throughout with a range of specific examples to illustrate the points made and establishes valid criteria in coming to a judgement. As a result, it was given full marks.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: **Question 3** **Question 4** **Question 5**
Question 6 **Question 7** **Question 8**

The Treaty of Antwerp, signed in 1609 between ~~the~~ Spain and the United Provinces signified the de-facto independence of the United Provinces from Spain, the Dutch revolt's ultimate success. However, I believe that the success of the revolt was due to foreign intervention, by countries like England or France, not the apparent declining power of Spain.

Spain's economic frailty between 1585-1609 can be seen as the main reason for the revolt's success, as Spain's inability to consistently pay its troops was the cause of many military setbacks. The Spanish Armada cost 2/3rds of the Habsburg Empire's annual income to build and its destruction at the hands of the English in 1588 can be seen as a huge waste of money. Also, Spain's inability to pay its own troops due to multiple bankruptcies cost Spain many military victories. For example, ~~the failed capture of the Island of Bomme~~ in 1599 caused the Spanish due to Spain being unable to pay its troops, the capture of the



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 1 3 2 0

Island of Bomme^{in 1599}l failed, ~~is~~ as the Spanish troops
mutinied and sold the towns they had
captured back to the Dutch. Also Phillip III was
a spendthrift, who spent 4 times as much on
court (2 million florins) than his father!
These misuses of money led to Spain being
unable to pay their troops, which in turn, meant
that their troops wouldn't fight for them, costing
Spain to lose their advantage over the Dutch, granting
them success after success.

Spain's military blunders must also be considered
as a major factor because these mistakes allowed
the Dutch time that they desperately needed to ~~regroup~~
regroup and reorganise in order to defeat the Spanish.
Phillip II's decision to send Parma and his 60,000 men
to meet up with the Armada, in order to lead an
invasion of England, which failed with the defeat
of the Armada in 1588, ~~also~~ caused the campaign
against the Dutch to stall, which allowed them to
reorganise and reform their military and its
tactics, which proved far more effective against the
Spanish troops, at the Battle of Bergen - op - Zoom
in 1588, which was the first serious defeat the Spanish
suffered.

The same happened again in April 1592, where Parma



was sent with 20,000 men to capture ~~the~~ Paris to prevent the French Protestant, Henry of Navarre, from becoming King of France. This again gave the Dutch time to act, causing Alva's last gains in the Netherlands, Zutphen and Haarlem, to be lost to the Dutch. These mistakes allowed the revolt time to organise effective military resistance against the Spanish forces, ~~allowing~~ handing the advantage back to the Dutch after Parma's successful campaign earlier on.

However, Maurice of Nassau, William of Orange's second son, played a ~~major~~ ^{vital} role in the revolt's success, as his re-organisation of the military allowed the revolt to continue to defy the military might of Spain. Maurice reformed the Dutch army, standardising equipment for ~~effective~~ ^{efficient} resupply, regular payment for his troops and his new battalion size of 550 men created a sense of ~~cameraderie~~ camaraderie in his new standing army, which, along with his new 'pike & shot' tactics, proved very effective against the Spanish. For example, Maurice's new army defeated the Spanish at the Battle of Mookerpoort in 1604, killing 2500 Spanish troops. His expertise at siege warfare meant that he could counter-attack the Spanish and ~~the~~



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 1 5 2 0

15

Turn over ▶

capture their towns instead, reversing the ~~1595~~.
In May 1591, Maurice captured Zutphen after only 5 days of siege and then Deventer in June 1591 after only 10 days of siege! Maurice's military prowess denied the Spanish victory time and time again against the Dutch, eventually leading to peace in 1609.

Foreign intervention's role is prominent in the revolt's success, because it diverted the ~~Spanish~~ ^{Spain's} attention from the Netherlands to other areas, causing them to divert vital ~~to~~ men and resources. The Treaty of Monsuech, signed in 1585 between England and the United Provinces was basically England's declaration of war against Spain by supporting the revolt. England provided 6000 men, under the command of the Earl of Leicester and then Sir Francis Drake, along with 600,000 florins a year to the Dutch to support them fight Spain. England was also able to distract Spain's forces from the Dutch in 1588, with the Spanish Armada threatening an ~~English~~ invasion of England, which was also successfully defeated in the same year by Sir Francis Drake, which caused Parma's diversion to give the Dutch time to reorganize. The invasion of France in 1592 also distracted



the Dutch campaign led by Parma, again. ~~as~~
That invasion was also a waste of resources
as Henry of Navarre converted to Catholicism,
uniting France against Spain, all of which
allowed the United Provinces time to grow and
increase their level of resistance, preventing
Spain from achieving victory over the revolt.

In conclusion, I believe that the success of
the Dutch revolt in the years 1585-1609 was
in fact largely due to foreign intervention,
not Spain's declining power. This is because
intervention in England and France caused
Spain to have to divert ~~out~~ men and resources
from the Netherlands, which, along with the
multiple ^{of} defeats these new fronts caused
Spain, allowed Maurice to increase the
effectiveness of Dutch resistance to Spain's
might, ultimately leading to their formal independ-
-ence in 1609.



P 4 9 9 5 5 A 0 1 7 2 0

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

Section A

- Questions can be asked on any of the Key Topics in the specification
- Read the sources carefully with regard to the specific demands of the questions
- Avoid paraphrasing the sources - instead make valid inferences relevant to the question
- Back up these inferences by adding relevant contextual knowledge from beyond the source to explain or expand
- Move beyond generic or stereotypical comments on the nature, origin or purpose of the sources - look at the specific stance and/or purpose of the writer
- In (a), avoid writing about the deficiencies of the source when assessing its value -concentrate instead on what it adds to the enquiry
- In (b), be prepared also to make valid suggestions about the sources' limitations when judging its weight to the enquiry

Section B

- Questions can be asked on any of the Key Topics in the specification
- This is a Study in Depth so it is vital to have precise and detailed knowledge of the issues to score well - you are required to have both range and depth in your answer
- Questions can be asked by targeting any of the five second order concepts - cause, consequence, continuity and change, similarity and difference, significance
- Pay full attention to the stated focus of the question - explain this fully as well as considering alternatives
- Be sure to respect the time frame in a question - make sure that the material you use is both relevant and covers the chronology as fully as possible
- Try and show links between the issues raised in your answer, especially in coming to a judgement

