



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2019

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

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for all papers can be found on the website at:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

Summer 2019

Publications Code 8HI0_2B_1906_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

Introduction

AS paper 2B, which covers the options of the German Reformation (2B.1) and the Dutch Revolt (2B.2) again saw responses from across the ability range. The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory two-part question each based around one source and assesses analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second-order concepts – cause, consequence, change/continuity, similarity/difference and significance.

In general, candidates again found Section A, the compulsory two-part source question, the more challenging largely because many were not clear what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' in the context of source analysis and evaluation (AO2). In question (a), some candidates still waste time by attempting to address how the source is not valuable to the enquiry which is not relevant to this question. More generally, the detailed knowledge that is required to add contextual material to support and/or challenge points derived from the sources was often absent. Also, some candidates continue to make generic comments on the provenance of the sources though more, taking their nature, origin and purpose into consideration, were able to evaluate the use of the sources to the enquiry in each question.

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), still tends to be done better. There were few wholly descriptive answers with most candidates attempting 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. Lack of detailed knowledge of the material continues to be an issue for some as is a tendency not to engage fully enough with the specific focus of the question. Also, there is still a significant number of answers which lack balance in their response to the questions – candidates are reminded that, at this level, there is a requirement that as well as developing the stated factor in essay questions, they also require some development of a counter-case.

8HI0_2B_Q01_a

Most candidates were able to identify from the source that the position of Lutherans in Germany in 1555 was significantly better than it had been thanks to the Peace of Augsburg. There were some good responses which were able to develop the source's establishment of

the principle of 'cuius region, eius religio'. Weaker responses, though aware of the historical context, often paraphrased the source. Also, a number clearly mixed up the Peace of Augsburg with the Augsburg Confessions could not be rewarded for that part of their answer as it is not the focus of part a responses.


Doc ID: 0461000477224

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)) The source 1 is valuable to an historian for an enquiry into the position of Lutherans in 1555 because it is a contemporary document. The source is from the peace of Augsburg, 1555 which was an official declaration made in the name of Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor by Frederick Hapsburg. This is extremely valuable for it is the official statement addressing the religious divide in the empire and the position of both sides. Being a contemporary source as well as law emerging from the Holy Roman Emperor source 1 is extremely reliable into an investigation of Lutherans position in 1555. As well as this source 1 clearly lays out the legal position of both Lutherans and Catholics in 1555. 'Let them enjoy their religious belief' this tells the historian that


4



(This is for part (a)) Lutherans were free to practise without fear of persecution their own beliefs. The source is extremely valuable because it is clear and concise, it was written in law for all to understand. It's simplicity allows a clear outline to be made of the Lutherans position they were free to live in 'peace'. Therefore, source 1 is extremely valuable for a historians investigation into Lutherans position as it gives a clear statement of the Lutherans ability to practise their religious belief... in peace' In conclusion, the source is extremely valuable to a historian enquiring about the position of Lutherans in 1555 as it is a contemporary source, written in official law and clearly states Lutherans position in the Holy Roman Empire.

5

Turn over >



8H10_2B_Q01_b

There were some very good responses to this question. These were able to place the source in its historical context following the Diets of Worms and Speyer and in the light of Charles' renewed concentration on Luther following his problems elsewhere in his Empire. Many also considered the both the Cardinal's position as a Legate and his tone in addressing the Emperor at this vital time in addressing the source's value to the enquiry. Weaker candidates were able to identify the hostility of the Church towards Lutheranism in its content but were largely unable to provide any knowledge of its context. Comments on the source's reliability tended to be generic and/or based on questionable assumptions.

(This is for part (b)) Source 2 holds a lot of weight for an investigation into the attitude of ~~the~~ the Catholic Church towards Lutheranism. The provenance of the source shows the letter is contemporary within the 1530's. It also reveals that Cardinal Campegiio the writer was the Pope's envoy. This is hugely important as the Pope, as the head of the Catholic Church, influenced and encouraged the attitudes of the Catholic Church throughout the world. This means that, the source contains the opinions and the orders of Pope Leo X at the time, 1530. The provenance also tells us that the source was written before the Diet of Augsburg in April 1530 where Luther and Zwingli present their views to Charles V. The Pope is influential the superior before the Diet creating a predicament in advance ensuring Luther's destruction, or so he hopes. Therefore the provenance of the source reveals it has a lot of weight for an enquiry into Catholic attitudes



Turn over >

(This is for part (b)) The Cardinal goes on to threaten Lutheranism as a whole with a variety of punishments. This gives the source weight in that it shows the Catholic Church's attitude was so strong they wanted to eradicate Lutheranism. He states he will 'excommunicate them if I have to'. This is interesting for two reasons. Firstly, to excommunicate is to condemn and he threatens all who preach Lutheranism with it, Martin Luther had been excommunicated on January 3rd 1521 but this hadn't worked in preventing the movement that the church is willing to excommunicate so many shows their attitudes have turned to panic and anger as they threaten what they believe, their souls. Secondly, 'if I have to' this implies that perhaps the Catholic attitude was flippant or reluctant, Campegiio believes that he will have to excommunicate them as they will return to the Catholic Church at the mere threat of excommunication. Therefore, the source has weight because it



Turn over >

(This is for part (b)) to Lutheranism in the 1530's as it is written by the Pope representative at the time and is contemporary.

The source itself continues to give useful insight into Catholic attitudes to Lutheranism giving the source more weight in the enquiry. Cardinal Campegiio calls Lutherans 'scoundrels' immediately revealing the Catholic attitude to ~~the~~ Lutheranism is one of disdain and disgust. There is no acceptance of Lutheranism and the Catholic Church is staunchly against their teachings. He also states that they are 'all heretics', the Catholic Church had already denounced Luther as a heretic in 1521, before that he had been accused by John Eck in 1517 of the Hussite heresy but here is the first time the Catholic Church announces Lutheranism as a group religion not a small group of heretics. This addressing of Lutherans as 'scoundrels' and 'heretics' gives the source weight in the enquiry as it shows clearly that Catholic attitudes are harsh and disdainful.



(This is for part (b)) Shows us several Catholic attitudes: the willingness to condemn Lutheranism and a flippant attitude believing they aren't a threat.

In conclusion, Source 2 has a lot of weight for an enquiry into Catholic attitudes to Lutheranism in the 1530's. Firstly it is a contemporary source written by the Pope representative making it reliable and close to the heart of the Catholic Church. Secondly it highlights the violent and cruel attitude they had towards it as it develops ~~the~~ they should all be condemned as 'heretics'. Finally, it also highlights the flippant attitude to Lutheranism as the church didn't believe the Lutherans would fight back. Source 2 has a lot of weight because of this.



10

Examiner Comment

In Question (a), the candidate does make an attempt to engage with the content of the source and to make comments with regard to its utility. However, it has little with regard to own knowledge and was awarded a low L2 mark. In Question (b), inferences are made from the source with regard to the Catholic Church's attitude to Lutheranism and supported from the content. Some knowledge is appended with regards to the context of the letter and attempts made to consider the provenance with regard to Campeggio's position and intent. It was awarded a mid L3 mark.

8HI0_2B_Q02a

Most candidates were able to identify Philip II's hostility towards Protestantism in this source from his language and the severity of the punishments he outlined for dealing with heresy. Stronger candidates tended to have more detailed understanding of the historical context and were able to place it against the background Philip's more stern approach to combatting religious disobedience when compared to his father. Weaker answers tended to develop only lightly the content of the source without attempting to analyse its value. A significant number merely described the growth of Calvinism in the 1560s.

Doc ID: 0461000377115

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)) Philip II was a Spanish Catholic King who had also reigned over the Netherlands (Low countries). The source shows his differing religious views as he states in the edict how no one shall print, copy, keep or sell any writings by Luther, Calvin or any other heretic condemned by the Holy Church. He appears firmly against all viewpoints mentioned, however Calvinism and Protestantism were quite popular in the Netherlands. The aim of this essay is to show how source 3 can be valuable to the historian for an enquiry into Philip II's attitudes to Protestantism in the Netherlands in the 1560s.

The source is from an edict that Philip II himself had issued in the Netherlands in 1555. This can support the value of the source as it is something Philip II had issued which can show his attitudes towards Protestants and other religious groups differing to that of his own religious beliefs and how the king had felt uncomfortable ruling a country of which

(This is for part (a)) was not all for what he believed.

The source was written in 1555 and remained in force over the Netherlands in the 1560s as stated, suggesting that although he had ruled over the countries for many years now, he was still lacking to be accepting at all, which links in with how he had essentially neglected the 'Low Countries' most likely due to a lack of understanding and many differences religiously as Calvinism and Lutheranism were spreading throughout.

The text's purpose would be to inform the people / the Netherlands that he is not going to tolerate / be tolerant of them and that they are not allowed to continue under his reign, and if so, they will face execution. This is valuable to the historian as it portrays a great dislike Philip had towards Protestantism and any other religious groups, and it shows Philip's immediate attempts to 'scare' the people into following things how he wanted, away from what they had believed.

Philip's audience was the people of the

(This is for part (a)) Netherlands, especially those who were not Catholics. He conveyed his lack of care for the Low Countries by not bothering to visit and make sure everything is well whilst Margaret of Parma was in charge, of which did not know how to run a country and did not attempt to form any type of religious settlement, but promoted people to stop following what they believe or be punished with death. This shows the source's value in finding out about his attitudes to Protestantism as he barely bothered with the entire country other than threatening them with death for their beliefs and left an 'unqualified person' in charge.

To conclude, the source is quite valuable to the historian for an insight to Philip II's attitudes to Protestantism in the 1560s as the dates show that his attitudes did not become more lenient of these views of religion as the edict remained in force that anyone will be executed for being convicted to any writings by Luther, Calvin or any other heretic. The value comes also from the fact that it depicts clearly his thoughts on

(This is for part (b)) different followings like the ones mentioned, and shows his lack of care to improve the Netherlands' differences, but rather neglect them.

8H10_2B_Q02b

Good answers to this question clearly identified Marnix's Calvinism as a factor in assessing the weight of this source, using it to make valid inferences about his intentions. They were able to make inferences from the source's content about the likely responsibility for the Iconoclastic Fury, and use their contextual knowledge to develop this. Weaker candidates tended to take the source at face value. There was also a tendency to write quite a lot about the course of the Iconoclastic Fury which was not the focus of this question.

Doc ID: 0461000377115

B) The source is an anonymous account of the iconoclastic fury that had occurred in the Netherlands in 1567. The iconoclastic fury is what had happened when churches and religious symbolism (e.g. statues, art) were smashed and broken as some religious ~~viewants~~ (e.g. protestants) believe that religious places (churches/homes) should not worship based on art or statues. The aim of this essay is to use the source (4) to determine how much weight it is given for an enquiry into the responsibility for iconoclastic fury in 1566.

The source is an account of the iconoclastic fury that was published anonymously in 1567 in the Netherlands, although later recalled to be Philip Marnix, a prominent Calvinist. This shows that the source may not be reliable as, as a Calvinist, his religious views may have caused him to have a

(This is for part (b)) different account of things, as he states many ^{from the source} were of the protestant religion but there were 'just as many who weren't'. This may not hold truth value as, being a Calvinist, he may attempt for the view of his religious group to be better than the real situation.

The date of the source is 1567, which is the year after the events took place. This would mean that since the events many people had their explanations to what had went on, affecting and altering the beliefs of the real scope of events. However, due to such close times of events, it may make it more useful for an enquiry.

The purpose of the source may be to reflect the blame from protestant believers who had been blamed onto other parties, such as 'the priests themselves', which makes the source not much useful in finding who was responsible for the iconoclastic fury as it appears to speak in protection and favour of protestants instead of actually speaking on events.

(This is for part (b)) The audience would have been anyone effected by the iconoclastic fury as it seems to attempt to change people's beliefs of who was to blame and say priests may have done it to 'get the authorities to turn on protestants', however the source mentions how 'magistrates sent along their officer to do the work', which is likely to have been the case which other accounts suggest (people were paid to take part and image destroy).

To conclude, the source is not very useful in an enquiry into responsibility for the iconoclastic fury, but much rather points the blame at others (priests) and away from protestants, which may have been due to Marnix's Calvinist views. The source, while useful, does however speak on something other accounts do, which is how some people may have been paid to do the iconoclastic fury and destroy all images and art.

Examiner Comment

In Question (a), the candidate does make an inference from the source and supports this with a quote from the source content. There is some general background knowledge included and an attempt to consider the utility of the source. It was given a L2 mark. In Question (b), there is an attempt to consider the point of view of the author and, again, some knowledge of the background of the Iconoclastic Fury but the candidate does not engage convincingly with the source's content. It too was awarded a L2 mark.

it wasn't just anti-papal feeling but other reasons like ~~and~~ the increase of nationalism, the fact that the Holy Roman Empire all showed one Pope and ~~the~~ the Church in Italy was corrupt; one again caused discontent with ~~the~~ the Catholic Church, also, it could be said that it was ~~due~~ the rise of humanism that had caused discontent with the Catholic Church, as it was the humanists who had shed light upon the issues ~~about~~ with the Catholic Church. ~~By~~ In fact it could be argued that it ~~isn't~~ hasn't for the protestant humanists, ~~near~~ the German people wouldn't even know how exploited ~~the~~ they were being, or ~~the~~ the behaviour of the Pope. The ~~pro~~ Papal ass, was an example of a book written by humanist Omulize, basically made fun of the Pope and exposed him, ~~the~~ the reason it was anonymous, other examples are letters of obscure men by Ulrich von Hutten and ~~peas~~ peas of folly by Erasmus, ~~or~~ ~~from~~ ~~the~~ ~~paper~~ 95 theses ~~theses~~ by Luther, all these pamphlets were anonymous, therefore, ~~the~~ the Church couldn't just place blame on any of the humanists, and they continued writing. ~~These~~ ~~pro~~ The German people would read these books criticising the Catholic Church, ~~and~~ ~~also~~ and &

15

Turn over >

obviously be discontent with the Catholic Church, Furthermore, it was Luther's 95 theses ~~that~~ that had caused the most damage for the Catholic Church, it spread like wildfire, thanks to the printing press there were around 3.1 million copies ~~of~~ of Luther's theses by the time he'd died, therefore the printing press could've been another reason, ~~the~~ ~~was~~ ~~discontent~~ ~~with~~ discontent with ~~the~~ the Church, as if it wasn't for the printing press, ideas of the humanists, criticising the ~~the~~ the Catholic Church wouldn't have been spread.

Overall, although anti-papal feeling did ~~cause~~ cause a lot of the discontent with the Catholic Church ~~as~~ ~~it~~ such as ~~the~~ the ~~the~~ the engaging hypocritical behaviour of the Popes, and ~~secular~~ ~~men~~ their prioritizing of the secular leader over the ecclesiastical leader, I believe that it ~~was~~ ~~the~~ the rise of humanism that had been the main cause of the discontent with the Catholic Church. ~~As~~, if it wasn't for humanist writing pamphlets about the exploitation of ~~the~~ ~~the~~ the people's finances and the bad actions of ~~the~~ ~~the~~ the popes, there wouldn't ~~have~~ ~~been~~ been any discontent with the Catholic Church.

16

Examiner Comment

This response includes evidence of anti-papal attitudes in Germany and of other relevant factors like the influence of humanism. Where it is less convincing is in its ability to link these more directly to the growth of anti-clericalism. It was awarded a high L3 mark.

8H10_2B_Q04

The best answers to this question provided evidence of both Luther's character and his abilities in addressing the success of his challenge to the Catholic Church during this period. Some cited his debate with Eck to support his bravery and stubbornness for example, while also referencing his background as a scholar and/or his debating prowess to support his abilities. This was balanced by a range of alternative explanation for Luther's success, notably the printing press. Some candidates tended to gloss over the requirement to address Luther's character and abilities and scored less well. Some were imprecise of the dates in the question and described the Diet of Worms for example.

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

It can be argued that Luther's character and abilities were the most important factor for his success of his challenge to the Catholic Church. Luther can be argued to have little concern for those who criticised him or bullied him into recanting his views. For example, Cardinal Cajetan frequently bullied Luther at the Leipzig Debates to withdraw his views. However, this method made Luther ~~bold~~ bolder and more strong willed, ~~was~~ hence more likely to push his views to be even more aggressive. As a result, Luther's character and ability to remain strong meant ~~in many~~ the probability of him succeeding was made stronger, as he wouldn't allow critics such as Cajetan and John Eck to cloud his judgement in any way. Despite ~~a~~ this, Luther's character and abilities may not be the ~~sole~~ reason for his success, as there were ~~an~~ alternative external factors that contributed to his success.

On the other hand, it could be considered that

13 Turn over >

but the reaction of the church had the most importance for Luther's success into the ~~early~~ challenge of the Catholic Church. The ~~rest~~ overall church reaction can be depicted as a slow reaction. For example, in October 1517 when Luther sent the document to Albert of Mainz listing his criticisms with the Church, Albert failed to reply. As a result, ~~because~~ the failure to reply prolonged the affair even longer, and ~~was~~ ~~the~~ ~~created~~ an and urged Luther to take his views even further. ~~This created~~ ~~creates~~ ~~each~~ ~~more~~ importance for the factor, as Luther didn't have any boundaries to prevent him succeeding. In addition, the Leipzig Debates ~~implied~~ ~~created~~ a significant amount of success for Luther also. The discussion between Cajetan, Eck and Luther ~~was~~ ~~one~~ attempted to shift the focus away from Luther's main issue of indulgences and onto ~~his~~ other criticisms. This allowed Luther to develop ~~his~~ ~~own~~ ideas he had previously never thought of before and allowed him to look at ~~a~~ ~~his~~ ~~old~~ ideas from a new scope. Ultimately, the church reaction was an important contributing factor to Luther's success, as they failed to

14

silence him, making him push his ideas even further. On the other hand, it also must be noted that the Church wasn't the only figure who failed to silence Luther, as Charles V also failed to deal with as he was already preoccupied with the Ottomans. As a result, ~~the~~ although the church had a lot of power, the Holy Roman Emperor had even more, therefore Luther's success cannot be blamed fully on the Church as Charles failed to stop him ~~and~~.

Additionally, it can also be argued that the support Luther was granted was also important in contributing to Luther's success. ~~He~~ ~~had~~ ~~support~~ Luther's main support system was from the Augustinian Order, ~~who~~ ~~was~~ ~~the~~ ~~main~~. This gained success for Luther's challenge to the Catholic Church, as the Augustinian order were the main reliant for the Diet. This allowed Luther to have support during debates. In addition, Luther also had support from Frederick the Wise, the elector of Saxony. Frederick's high and important position within German government, meant his support

15 Turn over >

for Luther was crucial, as this allowed high up members of society to gain Luther's trust and support his decisions within the diet. On the other hand, this may not be the main reason for Luther's success against the Catholic Church, as prior to 1520, his support system began to decline.

In conclusion, ~~the~~ importance of Luther's character and abilities in the success of his challenge to the Catholic Church, ~~was~~ weak compared to the reaction of the Church. Despite Luther being popular and likeable, the Church failed to react quick enough to prevent Luther from developing, which consequently allowed him to succeed as he didn't have anyone urging him to stop.

16

Examiner Comment

This response includes evidence of anti-papal attitudes in Germany and of other relevant factors like the influence of humanism. Where it is less convincing is in its ability to link these more directly to the growth of anti-clericalism. It was awarded a high L3 mark.

8HI0_2B_Q05

There were fewer answers to this question but some good responses which clearly understood Luther's reasons for condemning radicalism and were able to evidence his clear need for princely support but also his genuine desire for a peaceful and gradual reformation, avoiding the theological radicalism of the Zwickau Prophets or Carlstadt for example.

Doc ID: 0461000573464

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

In the 1520s, Martin Luther condemned radicalism in many kinds. In this essay I will examine whether this condemnation was mainly to ~~rescue~~ secure the support of the German princes or due to genuine theological disagreements.

Luther's reaction to the Peasant's War serves as proof of his desire to secure the support of the German Princes. Luther's initial response, in his pamphlet 'Against the bull of the Asses and the peasants, was a moderate one. Luther initially blamed the Princes for the events of the revolt, yet still condemned the peasants for their use of violence. However, in his pamphlet 'On the Rabbing and Murderous Hordes of Peasants' Luther harshly condemned their actions, calling for the German Princes to use some force to deal with the revolt. This political conservatism came as a shock to many of the laity and, in the wake of the execution of 180,000 peasants, greatly reduced Luther's popular support. However, Luther's denouncement of radicalism being used in his name gave the German Princes a

*From ~~the~~ * From April 1524

great level of faith in him - likely leading to future instances of religious toleration, such as the Peace of Speyer in 1526.

Although this action may have been influenced by the reaction of the German Princes, some historians believe that Luther published his second pamphlet for other reasons. Firstly, April 1524 was the most violent month of the revolt up to that point and Luther may have published 'On the Rabbing and Murderous Hordes' upon realising the true scale of the conflict. Also, between the two works Luther turned German towns speaking to peasant leaders. He found that, despite their use of his writings and image, he was aggressively pursued by many groups of rebels. This may suggest that Luther published his second pamphlet upon realising that peasants were not followers of Lutheranism and he therefore viewed them as expendable.

Another reason that Luther denounced radicalism was due to genuine theological disagreements. In March 1522 Luther felt it necessary to return from Exile at Wittenberg, delivering his 95 inconvient theses to discredit the teaching of the radical Carlstadt and Muntzer. Among his disagreements were anabaptism, the use of violence and iconoclasm and the role of

religious change. For example, in ^{December} 1521, Muntzer and the Zwickau prophet delivered the first mass wholly in German, something Luther did not attempt until 1526. This shows that Luther condemned radicalism in order to prevent his reformation from being condemned by those with fundamentally different beliefs.

In conclusion, although Luther's condemnation of radicalism did result in added support from the German Princes, I believe the main cause of his actions were his political conservatism and his devout belief in his theology - something was being hi-jacked by the radical reformation.

Examiner Comment

This mid L4 response addresses, in some detail, the differing reasons for Luther's condemnation of radicalism in the early 1520s, including consideration of his need for princely support. Though it does come to a judgement which is supported by the essay, this is more weakly substantiated.

8HI0_2B_Q06

This was a popular question and there were some good responses which confidently analysed the ways in which the executions of Egmont and Hoorn contributed to the growth of opposition to Alva's rule. Against this, many candidates argued that other actions taken by

Alva were equally or more responsible, for example the Council of Troubles or the institution of the Tenth Penny. Weaker answers lacked precise knowledge of the period, particularly the executions of Egmont and Hoorn, and ranged beyond the dates specified in the question.

Doc ID: 0461000377100

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

The executions of Egmont and Hoorn was a big factor for why Alva's rise in the Netherlands was opposed during 1567-73 because Alva executed them soon after becoming governor-general of the Netherlands because of regent Margaret of Parma fleeing. He ordered their execution under the name of King Philip II to assert his authority and show an example of what would happen if you go against the king. The execution of those two grandees caused public ^{up} not because they were part of the most influential grandee families in Netherlands and were at the centre of government as members of the Council of State which was a body who were policy-makers for the Netherlands. The executions also emerged surviving grandee William of Orange as Alva's rival and opposer and the people of the Netherlands turned to him to defeat Alva.

Firstly, the execution led to William of Orange planning an invasion in 1568 to remove Alva and he wanted to attack on four fronts and try to split Alva's army up and try to gain support of the people of the Netherlands. However, ~~then~~ ^{orange} underestimated Alva's Spanish troops

11 Turn over >

and the fact that the Southern provinces were Catholic and pro-Spain. This led to some of Orange's troops getting kidnapped and exposing his plans under cover, this and a failure of communication led to the invasion of 1568 failing and even though it put pressure on Alva, it did not affect his rule. Orange then tried a second invasion in 1572 to remove Alva, this time better planned by Drake sending letters and pamphlets out to drum up support and show Alva's bad deeds. This invasion was more successful and meant orange now controlled Holland and Zealand which were northern provinces which were hard to reach for Alva as they were naturally guarded by rivers and lakes which would have to be crossed. This seriously opposed Alva's rule as Calvinists now controlled the North.

However, the execution of Egmont and Hoorn ~~was~~ ^{was} not the only reason people opposed Alva's rule during 1567 and 1573 because Alva's blood council set up in 1567 was a judicial body of which he was the head, and enforced heresy laws and relied on denunciations from members of the public. The accused were then tortured and executed, this method was done so the population feared Alva and stuck to the heresy laws and did not take part in Catholicism.

14

This as a result caused provisions and others to have and oppose Alva as he was religiously prosecuting people just because of their faith. The compromise of nobles were lesser nobles who felt sympathy for people who were being persecuted for their faith even though majority of them were Catholic. Things like this existing shows not everyone agreed with the strict heresy laws. This showed opposition to Alva who was simply carrying out the instructions of King Philip II to enforce heresy laws and maintain peace. Alva's aggressive policy towards the people of the Netherlands also caused ~~people~~ ^{people} to oppose him because he was trying to adopt a Spanish system in the Netherlands.

People of the Netherlands also disliked Alva's tenth penny tax which was a permanent ten percent tax on all sales except for property. The States-general of Netherlands rejected this as he did not see it as ~~worth it~~ ^{worth it} as it would cause public discontent, however Alva needed to do this as he had no financial backing from Spain because of Philip's war with the Turks and Alva needed to pay his mercenaries or they would not fight alongside him. Alva decided to march with his troops in the towns ~~and~~ and demanded people pay the tax, he did this without the

15 Turn over >

States-general's approval and as a result his actions were not successful and led to people hating him and opposing him, Philip was unwilling to remove him as Margaret of Parma's request. He only acted when provinces sent representatives to Spain to personally complain to Philip about Alva's actions.

As a result, the execution of Egmont and Hoorn were not the only reasons why Alva's rule faced opposition during 1567-73 because other factors such as his aggressive policy towards the Netherlands, his Council of Troubles and his Tenth Penny tax also caused people to resist him. The Council of Troubles caused provisions to dislike him and a majority of the population. The Tenth Penny tax failed and lost him the most of the States' general and led to formal complaints to Philip regarding his actions.

16

Examiner Comment

This candidate does attempt to link the executions of Egmont and Hoorn to the growth in opposition to Alva's rule in the Netherlands before looking at alternative factors including the roles of the Council of Troubles and the Tenth Penny. However, a slight lack of conviction regarding the stated factor kept it at the bottom of L4.

8H10_2B_Q07

There were few responses to this question and generally, candidates struggled to evidence the change or continuity in Spanish policy during this period with any degree of confidence. Many described the policy of Alva rather than that, for example, of Parma in the late 1570s and few scored beyond Level 2.

8H10_2B_Q08

Though many candidates were able to discuss reasons the growing power of the United Provinces during this period in terms of Maurice's military successes or Spanish weaknesses, fewer were able to evidence the contribution of the main factor in the question, the establishment of the Dutch East India Company. That said, the better answers did, noting for example, not just the financial contribution made by the company's profits but also the manner in which it boosted the international status of the Republic.

Doc ID: 0461000377750

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

PLAN NO. it wasn't the most important factor but was good.

- ✓ Spain was poor due to wars w/ Dutch + Turks
- Dutch were angry → continued after War of Assassination
- ✓ Philip II died in 98 → Philip III was over the war + signed the 12 yr. treaty to temp. end war + restart trade.

~~This inaccurate to say that the formation of the Dutch East India Company~~

Without a doubt, it is incorrect to say that the formation of the Dutch East India Company was the most important factor in the growing power of the United Provinces during 1584 and 1609. Arguably it is a good and relevant factor that did play a role in the growing power however, it is not the most important and other factors played more significant roles. Such as Spain being bankrupt following the war with the Turks, the fact that ultimately the Dutch were extremely angry with the refusal of Philip to compromise on religion and also Philip II's death in 1598 and his successor Philip III.

13 Turn over >

It can be argued that Philip II's death in 1598 was one of the most important factors in the growing power of the United Provinces. This is because Philip was replaced by Philip III who was not as appeared to war as the previous king and the nobles of the United Provinces used this to their advantage in an attempt to reach an agreement with the new king in the hopes that their would finally be a compromise on religion and the removal of Spanish forces from the United Provinces. The United Provinces were successful in doing so (Philip III) didn't really have much choice but to accept the United Provinces due to the Pacification of Ghent ~~and Spain~~. So, Spain and the Netherlands were able to reach an agreement known as the Twelve Year Treaty which caused a Truce on the war between them and also made agreements for trade between both for at least twelve years.

Another factor which can be seen as more important than the Dutch East India Company is that as a result of the ongoing war in the Netherlands but also a war in the Mediterranean with the Turks, ~~the~~ Philip was forced to declare bankruptcy meaning Spain had no money and therefore unable to pay his troops. This helped the United Provinces grow power as due to trade throughout the Dutch Revolt especially in Antwerp.

14

(one of the richest cities in Europe) they had money and also forces and were able to keep defending themselves and also retake land that had been previously ~~overrun~~ invaded by Spanish troops and therefore regain control over numerous of the low countries without any major or significant threat from the Spanish. The United Provinces were able to regain control of a majority of the low countries although were unsuccessful with Holland or Zeeland.

It can also be debated that the Dutch's anger towards ~~the~~ Spain was a more important factor in the growing power of the United Provinces as after the 1580s, a large majority of people in the Netherlands opposed Spanish rule. The opposition was so strongly held that even after the assassination of William of Orange, the Dutch continued to rebel and demand for Philip to compromise. The Spanish rule had become so highly opposed due to the Tenth Penny Tax and events such as the sacking of Antwerp that the Northern and Southern provinces (who had not really seen eye to eye) signed the Pacification of Ghent which saw them join up in the same aim of dealing with the Spanish rule within the provinces, they also agreed to temporarily put religious disagreements on hold to achieve this. It also meant Spain had less support with the provinces than they did before as both the

15

Turn over >

North and South joined forces, significantly increasing the power of the United Provinces (its what united them) against Spain.

In conclusion, other factors such as the pacification of Ghent, ~~the~~ Spain declaring bankruptcy and Philip's death are all more important factors in the growing power of the United Provinces in the years 1584-1609. Arguably the Dutch opposition to the Spanish rule ~~increased~~ increased was the most important factor as following the assassination of William and Orange, ~~because~~ the rebels could have 'died down' but after so long, the opposition was so strong it continued.

16

Examiner Comment

The obvious weakness of this response is any real consideration of the role of the Dutch East India Company in the growing power of the United Provinces during the years 1584-1609. The candidate also drifts from the period in question on occasions. That said, it does have sufficient focus by looking at other significant factors, for a mid L3 mark

Paper Summary

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

Section A – Question (a)

- Read the sources carefully with regard to the specific demands of the questions
- Prioritise making valid inferences relevant to the question using brief quotes to highlight your reasoning
- 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
- Avoid writing about the deficiencies of the source when assessing its value – concentrate instead on what it adds to the enquiry

Section A – Question (b)

- Read the sources carefully with regard to the specific demands of the questions
- Prioritise making valid inferences relevant to the question using brief quotes to highlight your reasoning
- Back up these inferences by adding relevant contextual knowledge from beyond the source to explain, expand upon or challenge its evidence
- Be aware that the author is addressing a specific audience and purpose
- Try to distinguish between fact and opinion by using your contextual knowledge of the period
- In coming to a judgement, take account of the weight you may be able to give the author's evidence in the light of their position or purpose

- In assessing weight, it is perfectly permissible to consider what has been, perhaps, deliberately omitted from the source – however, simply stating that a source is limited because it does not cover other events or developments does not establish weight as no source can be comprehensive.

Section B

- Questions can be asked on any element 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 to access the higher levels
- 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 – aim to explain this fully before considering alternatives to give the answer balance and enable you to come to a judgement
- 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