

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report June 2010

GCE History 6HI01 B

ResultsPlus
look forward to better exam results
www.resultsplus.org.uk

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com. If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034



ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online tool that offers teachers unrivalled insight into exam performance.

You can use this valuable service to see how your students performed according to a range of criteria - at cohort, class or individual student level.

- Question-by-question exam analysis
- Skills maps linking exam performance back to areas of the specification
- Downloadable exam papers, mark schemes and examiner reports
- Comparisons to national performance

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2010

Publications Code US024060

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

6HI01 B

General comments - 6HI01 Option A/B/C/D/E/F

Once again the current cohort of candidates were generally well prepared, answered two questions without apparently experiencing difficulties with timing, and made a genuine attempt to engage with the question. However, it was noticeable that even well prepared candidates underachieved due to an increase in formulaic answers which did not directly address the specific question asked or show explicit understanding of the key issues. The comments below are intended to encourage both centres and future candidates to improve on past performance.

An important issue which was raised by many examiners this year concerns candidate interpretation of the questions set. Many candidates appear to believe that all the questions on the paper require them to consider the importance of a given factor in relation to a number of other factors. It is important that centres impress on future candidates that this is not the case; if it were, it would reduce the examination to a simple formula. The mark scheme requires an essay to 'present historical explanations and reach a judgement' and this is achieved through a variety of different question stems such as 'to what extent', 'how accurate', 'how far', 'how significant' and 'why'. Although the majority of questions require an analysis of relative importance not all of the questions do. Questions requiring the candidate to analyse relative importance are indicated through the use of trigger words such as 'main reason', 'key factor', 'primary reason', 'due to', 'responsible for' and 'explain'. Questions which do not refer to relative importance require a balanced answer with a counter-argument giving reasons for and against the given statement/factor. Questions which refer to 'significance' or 'importance' can often be addressed using either approach whilst 'why' questions do not require a counter-argument (although this is often present in higher Level answers) but an overall judgement of the different reasons put forward.

The following examples indicate how some students underperformed by misinterpreting the question set:

Question A13: 'How accurate is it to say that Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck were both serious threats to Henry VII's security?' Some saw this as an invitation to deal briefly with the two pretenders before considering other threats to the king's security, including the nobility, the Yorkist rump and the taxation rebellions.

Question A14 : 'How far did Henry VII's financial policies strengthen the power of the monarchy?'. Many candidates wrote about other ways in which the monarchy was strengthened.

Question D7: 'How successful were the Five-Year Plans in transforming Russian industry in the years 1928-41?' Many dismissed the plans briefly before investigating the role of terror and the purges in transforming industry.

Most candidates produced a readable answer with, at the least, some historical knowledge and, at best, a sophisticated analysis. The analytical and evaluative answers at high Level 4 and Level 5 were impressive for their breadth and depth of knowledge, and by their sharp focus on the question. However, a significant number of answers were less directly targeted on the question; these seemed to be answering practice questions, or were a prepared response. As always, there is evidence that candidates were not answering questions on the current paper, but those on the previous one. This often leads to responses which 'relate well to the focus' (Level 4) but not 'direct focus' (Level 5) e.g. in Option E/F Question 5 candidates often referred to Mussolini's rise to power rather than growing support for the Italian Fascist Party. Now that there are ten sample

questions for each option (the four examination papers plus the sample questions) centres might consider it appropriate not to use the most recently asked questions in trial examinations.

A lack of both general and detailed chronological awareness is a growing concern. The importance of covering the timescale in the question is still a discriminating factor between candidates, and is dealt with in the reports on various questions. Candidates do need to be aware of the importance of key dates in the topics studied and, quite simply, the order in which events took place. A failure to understand why the dates in the question have been used led to a significant number of candidates failing to cover the whole period set, and thus to miss out some key events or developments, or referring to the wrong time period altogether.

Perhaps the most significant discriminator between different answers was the range and quality of supporting information. It is impossible for a candidate to frame an analytical response if the evidence offered in that answer is lacking in depth of development or is not directly relevant to the question. The generic mark scheme makes clear that progression through levels depends on the answer displaying two linked qualities; the strength of the explanation or analysis offered, and the range and depth of accurate and relevant material.

Examiners are required to reach a judgement on the quality of communication before awarding their final mark; it is an integral part of the mark scheme. Future candidates should be reminded that slang and argot have no place in an AS History answer; that spelling, punctuation and grammar may influence the quality of their argument; that it is worth learning how to spell the historical terms used in the topics studied; and that abbreviations, and the absence of capital letters, should remain in the realm of text messaging. It is also important to use correct terms when referring to people of different races and cultures.

Question 1

Most candidates were able to describe some features of corrupt activities which were rife within the pre-Reformation Church. Simony, pluralism and nepotism were well known, but most believed that absenteeism applied only to the bishops; in fact, only one in fourteen of German parishes in 1500 had a priest in residence. The poor training of clergy at all levels was not widely mentioned. Many believed that Papal corruption was an entirely separate issue, and there were frequent and detailed descriptions of the sexual immorality of a number of pre-Reformation popes, with Alexander VI being a favourite target. More might have been made of the general condition of the Papacy in the early 16th century. Some answers were unusually vague about the selling of indulgences, and of the role of Johannes Tetzel in spurring Luther into action. Many candidates were aware of the reforming influence of the Humanists, notably Erasmus, and that these had provided an intellectual environment which was favourable to change. Some high level answers also noted that the transition from a feudal to a capitalist economic system within Germany only increased resentment against Papal demands and the paying of tithes. It was encouraging to see that some candidates noted that clerical corruption was a long-standing feature of the pre-Reformation Church about which few had openly complained, and that it was the coming together of a range of different factors and events that sparked the German Reformation. Some candidates were unsure of where to finish their answer and often overran into the 1520s, whereas others quite sensibly finished their discussion with the 95 Theses.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .
 If you change your mind, put a line through the box
 and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 14 | |

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~accurate to say corruption of Catholic church main cause of German Reformation?~~

PLAN

- Popularity of Luther → doctrine of Priest... spiritual equality - social?
- propaganda → simplicity of writing, columns, 300,000 pamphlets
- role of towns → anticlericalism, + more educated
- decentralisation + absentee clerics
- PRINCES
- Nationalism Germany was the Pope's cow
- 'condition of social discontent' → inflation, taxes, population, harvest (17-24)

Rt: main cause : corruption : indulgences (Leo X, Albert of B + John Tetzel) Pamphlets
 relics → even EW.
 uneducated clergy

Erasmus?

(This page is for your first answer.) The corruption of the Catholic Church in Germany has often been regarded as the main cause of the German Reformation. The criticisms made by Luther, most constructively in his three pamphlets in 1520, including the papalists hiding behind three walls; sole interpreters of scripture, immunity from secular jurisdiction and Church Councils, the Church holding the laity in 'bondage' with the sacraments, and the indulgences and good works being collected, exploiting people's faith, show many of the issues that suggest that corruption of the church was at the heart of the Reformation. However, there are also a number of other factors which contribute to the reformation, such as Luther's popularity and gift for writing, helped hugely by the invention of printing, the ^{political} state of Germany at the time and the princes attitudes, as well as the general feeling of 'discontent' among the laymen.

The start of the Reformation could be seen as when Luther published his ninety-five theses against indulgences on October 31st 1517. This suggests that because the reformation began with an issue fully related to the 'corruption' of the Catholic Church, ~~the~~ ^{corruption} was the main cause. Luther's outrage over John Tetzel preaching that 'men need not confess nor lives have a contrite heart', forced him to act against, in his eyes a blatant move to exploit people's faith for the gain of Leo X and Albert of Brandenburg. Luther ~~also~~ did not only focus on indulgences in the beginning, but also on the seven sacraments (denouncing five of them in his second pamphlet; on 'the bondage of the church') and an uneducated clergy. These issues are all related to the corruption of the church and how it had got out of control. The fact that in the third session of Trent (1562-3) all of these issues were tackled by the Catholic Church, proves that they were the main cause of

(This page is for your first answer.) reformation and needed solving.

The corruption of the Catholic Church was hugely important in ~~causing~~ ^{causing} the German Reformation, but it is not entirely accurate to suggest that it ~~was~~ ^{was} the only cause. The development of printing at the time was fundamental to Luther, as without printing, his ninety-five theses would have had significantly less influence. 300,000 Lutheran pamphlets were circulated and this propaganda was invaluable in causing the Reformation. Luther was not the only academic who took advantage of this development, Erasmus although a pacifist and a Catholic, is often seen as helping to provoke the Reformation with publications such as the praise of folly in 1511 (~~was~~ ridiculing the Church) and his Greek new Testament in 1516. ~~He is seen~~ Erasmus is sometimes regarded as the more dangerous of the two reformers, being an insider, and having 'laid the egg that Luther hatched'. Whether they meant to or not, both Erasmus and Luther helped to cause the German Reformation because of the propaganda caused by the printing of their works.

The level of anticlericalism in towns was much higher than anywhere else at the time of the Reformation and therefore, towns are often seen as playing a major role. With large populations living very close together, ideas and 'discontent' were able to spread rapidly and with laymen becoming more educated, ideas became bolder. The Peasant's War in 1525 is a valid example of how one man; Thomas Muntzer was able to whip up the Peasant's by preaching violent and bloodthirsty sermons and ~~so~~ therefore suggest that although the peasants were easily suppressed, the 'air of expectancy' for change, created by Luther had created a population ready

(This page is for your first answer.) to fight. This 'expectancy' and willingness to change in Germany was a fundamental cause for the Reformation, because it is clear that the attitude of the 'people' was in favour of reform.

~~Without~~ Luther and his ideas began the reformation in Germany. The foundations of 'social discontent' were already in place and a feeling of antipapalism was clear (it was believed that Germany was the Pope's own), but ~~with~~ Luther's ideas and publications ~~to~~ set the process in motion. Luther was originally hugely popular, his publication of the 'Doctrine of the Priesthood of all Believers' preached spiritual equality and this was mistakenly interpreted as preaching social equality by the laymen. ~~The~~ At the time of the start of the Reformation, inflation, taxes and population was high and there was a run of bad harvests from 1517-1524. This meant that Luther's ideas were readily accepted and his influence caused the reformation to begin.

However, without the protection of Frederick the Wise, Luther would not have survived. This is a clear example of how political decentralisation and an absentee ruler (Charles V) was extremely conducive to the Reformation. Princes on the whole favoured Lutheranism as they received more money and power from it (Luther supported authority) and so they were also an element in the Reformation in Germany.

There were a number of causes that resulted in the Reformation in Germany. The development of printing, the feeling of discontent and the decentralisation of Germany were important factors in contributing to the Reformation. However, it would be accurate to suggest that the main causes of the

(This page is for your first answer.) Reformation were Luther and his ideas as well as the corruption of the Catholic Church, as the corruption of the Church inspired Luther to begin his attacks on the church.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

A clear plan helped in the subsequent structuring of the answer. There is an excellent introduction which refers in detail to Catholic corruption along with a range of other relevant factors. The content of the 95 Theses is discussed, and these are linked effectively to the third session of the Council of Trent. The printing and distribution of the 95 Theses is noted, with an implied link to the growth of anticlericalism in the towns. Finally, the candidate notes that the protection given to Luther by Frederick the Wise allowed the German Reformation to develop and survive. The candidate is here displaying high level thinking, with a sharp focus and substantial supporting evidence; and written communication is fluently made. This is a high Level 5 response.

Question 2

Questions 1 and 2 proved to be equally popular with candidates. In a question which dealt with the weaknesses of Luther's opponents, Charles V inevitably loomed large in most candidates' discussions. The absence of a strong central government for the whole country was well known, along with the Emperor's attempts to work with rather than against the Princes. Charles' infrequent stays in Germany were mentioned, and there was often extensive reference to the Ottoman threats which occupied the Emperor for many years. Less was made of other Imperial problems, whether in the Netherlands, Italy or even Spain itself. Some answers at the highest level noted that the first session of the Council of Trent coincided with Charles' determination to take action against the Schmalkaldic League, and its defeat at Mühlberg in 1547. Many answers failed to use the whole time frame in the question, with some stopping as early as 1530 and only a few reaching the Peace of Augsburg in 1555. The role of the princes, individually or collectively, was well known, as were their (often selfish) reasons for supporting Luther. Many were aware that Lutheranism developed a momentum of its own, and that the longer it was allowed to continue, the deeper it penetrated into German life. Luther's role in this development was known, especially through his printed works and sermons, but few noted that his death in 1546 was in the end unimportant for the survival and spread of Lutheranism.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer ☒.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	☒	Question 2	☒	Question 3	☒
Question 4	☒	Question 5	☒	Question 6	☒
Question 7	☒	Question 8	☒	Question 9	☒
Question 10	☒	Question 11	☒	Question 12	☒
Question 13	☒	Question 14	☒		

(This page is for your first answer.)

Plan Emperor - Always pre-occupied - Ottoman Empire etc.

Pope - Didn't take the threat seriously enough to respond.

Princes - Didn't follow a united front against protestants.

Church - People fed up of church etc.

But

- Church was weak to begin with - Trent ~~Pact~~ ^{III}.

- Luther was seen as a hero - his strengths. - | Act for different causes too late too lenient.

Lutheranism, by 1555 had spread over most of Germany, and threatened to spread further, into Italy for example. Lutheranism was such a force that by 1555 ~~it~~ ~~was~~ there going the schism which had appeared through Christendom was permanent. But why was this?

(This page is for your first answer.)

Many historians believe the spread and survival were down to weaknesses in the Lutheran position. For example Emperor Charles V, the defender of the secular sword did little to quell the Lutheran danger. He did attempt to silence Luther at the diet of Worms⁽¹⁵²¹⁾, however this did more to publicise his cause. And when the Edict of Worms was announced he did little to enforce it. This is because he was pre-occupied with other matters for example the Ottoman invasion threatening Eastern Europe. Although he took his role as Holy Roman Emperor very seriously he didn't think Luther and Lutheranism was a serious threat.

The Popes also were very flawed. Pope Leo X had very little influence in Germany and as Charles was busy there was little he could do. He sent Cardinal Cajetan and Eck in 1517 & 1518 to disperse of Luther, but again this backfired. Luther was unaffected by ~~their~~ the Cajetan's threats, and Eck only forced Luther to take his grievances against the church to their logical conclusions. ~~He~~ Eck forced Luther to solidify his position, and although Eck scored a technical victory, Luther was no longer seen as a rawing radical but a skilled Theologian. To summarise the Popes little influence and bad reputation in Germany meant he could do little, what did do only strengthened Luthers position and made him more

(This page is for your first answer.)

popular Luther was free to spread his ideas.

The church as a whole was also very flawed. In Germany the papacy was known for "sucking Germany dry", draining money and contributing little. The bishops and priests at their dioceses were on the whole poorly trained, many with little interest in religion, only to better themselves. Many sermons were ill prepared and many could barely read the Bible let alone understand it. Pluralism, where bishops owned more than one diocese to better their income was common, this led to absenteeism where a parish would be unattended for months on end. This therefore shows that Luther was speaking on behalf on the German people, his was just bringing up a long line of grievances. Luther used to weak state of the church in Germany and ~~German~~ German nationalist pride to spread and cement his ideas.

However this isn't to say it was easy for Luther, although at first ~~little~~ he faced little opposition, towards 1530-1555 the Catholics were on the offensive. 1529 the diet of Speyer attempted (but failed) to enforce the edict of Worms. In 1541 at the Regensburg Colloquy, a compromise was sought after with Catholic and Protestant representatives present. Although it was in the end a failure it shows an opposition.

(This page is for your first answer.)

The greatest catholic success came in a victory at the battle of Marburg. Where Charles crushed the protestant resistance, including the league of Schmalkalden. This resulted in the peace of Augsburg which secured some catholic survival in Germany.

Luther himself was a strong character at first he gathered social support. Using his strengths as a debater to win the respect of others. He made publications such as the small & large catechisms to relate the everyone, children and adults giving them clear statements on what is allowed and prohibited. He was also politically strong he used the peasants war to rid his reputation as some-one who dislikes authority to show the princes he is on their side. He also persuaded some to abandon catholicism, in pamphlet such as "Concerning the christian nobility" offering an alternative way of controlling religion. Though this shows weakness in princes it shows the catholics faced stern opposition.

In conclusion, the weaknesses in luthers opposition was the main (not only) reason for it's spread and survival. The Pope had little influence and a bad reputation as did the church on the whole, so it was easy to for Luther to build on this. The princes were more involved in profiting themselves than providing a united front. The Emperor was pre-occupied

(This page is for your first answer.)

To take this threat seriously and when he did act it was too late. By 1530 Lutheranism had a solid foundation, thanks to woodcuts, pamphlets, catechisms the people knew how to be Lutheran. The church's bad reputation and poor action made this easy. Weakness of key characters, Charles for example in the peace of Augsburg in 1555, he is not strict enough he allows Lutheranism to survive by giving princes the power to choose religion. All this action was ineffective and too late, this with the strengths of Luther and his powerful supporters (Frederick the Wise) ensured the schism was permanent.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The introduction is not a strong one, and could have focused on the given factor as well as pointing out other relevant matters. There is some secure development on Charles V, with the answer noting the limits of his power within Germany as well as the distraction provided by the Ottoman threat. References to the weakness of the Papacy and the corruption of the Church are either outside the given period or of only limited relevance to the question: these points properly belong in an answer to Question 1. Charles' victory against the Schmalkaldic League and the Peace of Augsburg are relevant but undeveloped points. The answer comes back into sharper focus when considering Luther's own role, and the conclusion is more extensive and focused than the introduction. The answer does have some flaws, notably the inclusion of irrelevant material in the body of the answer. However, it is attempting to answer the question and to analyse a number of reasons for the spread and survival of Lutheranism; and it is supported with secure material which is broadly accurate. Thus a Level 4 award was appropriate.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

There is a broad timescale here, and it is important to cover as much of the chronology as you can. Effective planning is thus essential.

Question 3

There were many very good or excellent answers to Question 3. Most analysed the extent and the nature of the challenge which Protestantism posed to the Catholic Church, and the range of responses which were undertaken. Almost inevitably, most answers focused on the Council of Trent, though some did so to the exclusion of any other factors. The Council's three sessions were described and assessed, and most candidates gave more weight to the doctrinal decisions than the disciplinary procedures introduced for the clergy. Much was made of the papal approval given to the Jesuits, though few went back to the founding of the earlier orders such as the Ursulines and the Oratory of Divine Love. Few candidates discussed the reforms of the Farnese and Carafa papacies. The creation of the Consilium was often mentioned, though its remit and recommendations were less well known. A handful of very thoughtful answers suggested that Catholicism had made little effective progress against Protestantism by 1563. However, Trent and the Papacy had prepared the ground for an effective challenge to its enemies; the Counter Reformation.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 14	

(This page is for your first answer.)

Plan

~~Corruption - nepotism, simony, pluralism, financial abuses (Germany), corrupt Popes.
- people knew no different~~

~~Renaissance~~

~~Other challenges~~

~~Luther~~

The Catholic Church was a very corrupt institution in the 16th century, and caused great dissatisfaction from its followers. However, a number of other factors contributed to the Reformation, and were arguably more important in doing so, particularly Martin Luther.

There were a number of corruptive aspects of the Roman Catholic Church. A number of abuses were carried out, such as simony - the buying and selling of positions, nepotism - appointing friends and family members to positions and with bishops in particular, pluralism and absenteeism were a major issue. Many bishops held multiple ^{dioceses} ~~dioceses~~, causing them to be absent for long periods of time. Germany was the country that suffered most from these abuses; it

(This page is for your first answer.) was politically weak, ~~with~~ being a collection of states with no central authority. This made it an easy target for the Church. Rich Germany families were targeted, and often paid for their sons to be put into positions. There is evidence, particularly in Germany, of resentment towards the Church, as they were the victims of these financial abuses ~~therein~~. They did not agree with what was happening, and were having anti-Papal feelings.

There was corruption ^{within} the Papacy as well. They often behaved like secular rulers, even going into battle on some occasions. There was much criticism from Germany that the papacy was an 'Italian club' - all the Cardinals + Popes came from a small number of rich, Italian families. This also caused resentment in Germany, as the Pope was supposed to be divinely instituted.

These abuses did cause resentment particularly in Germany, as they were the target of much of the Papacy's work. However, these abuses had been going on for years, and it is therefore unlikely that they were the main cause of the Reformation.

Another cause of the Reformation was previous challenges to the church. Wycliffe and Hus were two men who in the 13th century who had reforming ideas, in England and Bohemia. Hus, in Bohemia, is probably more significant as he was closer to Germany than Wycliffe, but neither had a lot of success. They only had a select group of followers, that died out quickly. However, their ideas fed into the ideas of the Renaissance, which was another significant cause.

The writers of the Renaissance, in particular Erasmus, had a large part to play in the cause of the Reformation. They put an emphasis on one's own interpretation of the Bible, which the literate particularly liked. This led to people reading the Bible themselves, in the vernacular, and this resulted in people discovering for themselves what the Bible said. People came to realize

(This page is for your first answer.) That what was being preached ~~was~~ by the Catholic church was fabrications and mistranslations. People began to realise that they did not need to follow the preachings of the Pope + the Roman Catholic church to be good Christians. In addition, the Renaissance even led some people to ridicule the Papacy, following the publication of Erasmus' book 'In Praise of Folly'. The Renaissance was therefore an important cause - many of its ideas fed into Luther's. It has even been said that 'Erasmus laid the egg that Luther hatched':

The first cause of the Reformation in Germany was Luther. His ideas, such as the Bible in the Vernacular, priesthood of all believers, and the abolition of saints days and relics appealed to a great number of people. His ideas were particularly appealing to the literate, who liked the emphasis on one's own interpretation of the Bible, and many saw relics as superstition. He also attacked the secular nature of the Catholic church, which appealed to many who felt the same way. Luther felt that the head of each state should rule the church in their country, and this idea was very appealing to the Princes, as they would gain money and power without giving away any. This, combined with a growing feeling of Nationalism in Germany, caused Lutheranism to spread quickly, therefore making it an important cause of the Reformation in Germany.

In conclusion, the corruption within the church in Germany was not the main cause of the Reformation. Its issues are important, and are the reason that many of Luther's ideas were so popular. The most important cause, however is the Reformation. Though Erasmus would have considered Luther a heretic, many of his ideas influenced Luther, who started the reformation process. It could be argued that, without the Reformation, Luther would

(This page is for your first answer.) *not have had the ideas that he did, and would not have been able to preach them effectively. The conservative nature of the Catholic church was not a new thing, and without the influence of letters, it is unlikely that any change would have taken place.*

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer considers a number of ways in which the Catholic Church responded to the threat of Protestantism in the years to 1563. The answer divides clearly into two parts. In the first section the candidate notes the development of militant opposition to the growing Protestant heresy through the formation of the Jesuits and Carafa's creation of the Inquisition and the Index of Prohibited Books. The other Catholic response is examined through Paul III's policies, in particular the Consilium and the calling of the Council of Trent. Trent's decisions are described, though not in great depth of development. The question is answered in an analytical way, with a reasonable level of supporting detail, though this is not evenly done throughout the answer. Consideration might have been given to early attempts at reform as shown by the growth of several new orders for men and women. The answer was awarded a mark in the middle of Level 4.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

Although this topic is focused on the years c1540-1600, it is important to be aware of some contextual information before that period, especially the new religious orders and the influence of the Humanists.

Question 5

Although no time limit was set for Question 5, most candidates sensibly planned their answers around the years 1559-72. Examiners reported that the quality of responses overall was high. Many decided that it was Philip's inflexible religious policies that were at the heart of his difficulties in dealing with the Dutch, citing in support the Church reforms of 1561, especially the episcopal reforms, and the imposition of the decrees of the Council of Trent after 1563. Others took a broader perspective and felt that the fundamental reason for the outbreak of the revolts was Philip's policy of centralising power in the hands of his regents. This went against Dutch traditions, inflamed the grandees and was at the heart of the opposition which coalesced around William of Orange. The consequences of Alba's rule in the Netherlands were usually explained well, especially the imposition of the Tenth Penny. Many candidates displayed a wide knowledge of the period, and their evaluative analysis of events and personalities took several answers into Level 5.

Put a cross in the box indicating the **SECOND** question you have chosen to answer ☒.
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your second answer.)

Plan

- hard-line - Alva ✓
- Margaret of Parma - no control ✓
- religious - wouldn't tolerate Calvinists ✓
- Bishopric plan ✓
- increase royal role ✓

- spread of Calvinism ✓
- Grondes - Orange ✓
- Philip II himself ✓

(This page is for your second answer.) To a certain extent, the policies pursued by Philip II were responsible for the revolt against his rule in the Netherlands. However, there were a number of other factors such as the growth of Calvinism, the actions of the Grandees and the character of Philip II himself.

When Philip ruled the Netherlands from Brussels from 1555-9, he attempted to increase ~~regard~~ the power of the crown in the Netherlands. He wanted a stronger, more centralised government so that he had more control over the country. This upset the 17 fiercely independent provinces of the Netherlands as they valued and defended their entrenched local privileges. Philip's attempts to deal with the provinces as 1 entity upset them and caused great discontent which was partly responsible for the Dutch revolts.

Another of Philip's policies that contributed towards the revolts in the Netherlands was Philip's decision to leave his half-sister Margaret as regent. She had little experience of government and so he forced her to rule with an inner council of Spanish councillors, the 'consejo' and consult Philip on any decision made. Consulting Philip led to long delays, by which time events had often moved on, such as the 'Letters from the Segovia Woods' shown as by the time.

(This page is for your second answer.) They arrived, events had already moved. The consulta, headed by Granvelle upset the Grandees. They believed that once Philip had left the country in 1559, they would be restored as the regents' principal advisers. However, the consulta upset them as they were once again excluded from all real influence at court. Due to rising inflation, the Grandees' effective income had fallen which rendered them dependent on government posts and increased their resentment of Granvelle.

The Grandees' vigorous and successful campaign against Granvelle not only broke the power of the consulta allowing the Grandees to push through the relaxation of the heavy laws, but inspired the lesser nobles to form 'the Compromise'. Therefore, the actions of the Grandees that were in response to Philip II's policies seriously contributed to the Dutch revolt.

Philip's policies concerning religion were perhaps the most controversial of his policies. The Bishopric Plan proposed the creation of 14 new bishoprics to displace the foreign see that diverted central away from the country. It was unpopular with the ordinary German people as it appeared as though Philip was enforcing Catholicism on the Netherlands.

(This page is for your second answer.) and they feared it would usher in a new wave of persecution. The plan also upset the cardinals who had previously elected bishops, as it transferred more power away from them towards the crown. It also removed a valuable career path from 2nd sons without land of their own as a degree in theology, ~~a new prerequisite~~ as was now necessary to become a bishop, was seen as below them.

Philip's religious policies also included a policy of no-tolerance towards Calvinists which was unacceptable to the religiously tolerant Netherlanders. Also Philip's own piety prevented him from being able to understand or compromise with the Calvinists which was a major cause of the revolts as the repression of their religion provoked outrage among the Calvinists and also the Catholics who didn't see why differences in faith should be treated so harshly.

Perhaps Philip's biggest mistake was the policy of no-compromise that came from the war-faction in Madrid headed by Alba, rather than taking the advice of compromise from the peaceful-faction headed by Albany. Historians cite the ordering of Alba as Philip's biggest mistake as he forced Orange

(This page is for your second answer.) ... into opposition by confiscating his land and gave him the role as figured for the rebel cause.

However, there were other factors that caused the Dutch revolts such as the actions of William of Orange. He used his status to cultivate international allies such as Elizabeth I and the French Huguenots which contributed to the revolts of the Netherlands as the rebels had ^{the} support they needed to pursue their aims in starting the revolts.

The character and disposition of Philip II himself also added to the other factors of the revolts. His distrustful nature refused to allow Margaret a sufficient responsibility to run the country which ~~was~~ led to the formation of the councils and ultimately to the grievances of the provinces which led to the 1st revolt of 1566.

The spread of Calvinism also had an effect on the revolts. The influx of French Calvinist exiles from France was exacerbated by the refusal of the local authorities to condemn heretics. This led to the growth of Calvinist congregations in the southern Netherlands and alarmed Philip contributing to his decision to send the hard-line Alba.

In conclusion, there were a number of different

(This page is for your second answer.) Factors that caused the Dutch revolt including the spread of Calvinism, the character of Philip II and the actions of the Grandees, notably William of Orange. However, the main responsibility for the revolts against Philip's rule fall on the policies Philip pursued. These policies caused great discontent and forced the Grandees into opposition and the Calvinists to rebel against Philip's policy of repression. Therefore, although there were a number of causes to the Dutch revolts, most of these can ultimately be traced back to Philip's policies.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer considers Philip's policies at length and in good detail. The candidate notes the alienation of the grandees with the policy of greater centralisation and the power of the Consulta. The king's religious policies, including the reform of the bishoprics and the intolerant attacks on Calvinism, are examined, and their promotion of confrontation is remarked on. It is suggested that Philip's greatest error, reflected in his policies, was his unwillingness to compromise on his religious or governmental policies. Other relevant factors are addressed, including William of Orange, Philip's personal qualities, and the apparently unstoppable spread of Calvinism. The relative significance of factors is weighed up in the conclusion. There are a few weaker points in the answer; in particular, the role of William of Orange might have been considered in more detail. However, this is a clear attempt to engage with the question and to provide an assessment of the various factors at work which led to the revolts. The quality of communication is effective, and the answer was given a secure Level 5 award.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

Make sure that you are aware of the reasons for the outbreak of the different Dutch revolts. They are not all triggered by the same causes.

Question 6

It was encouraging to see most candidates cover the whole of the given period in the question and, as with answers to Question 4, provide a wide range of detailed information in support of their analysis. Answers were aware of the distractions which meant that Philip II was unable to devote his full attention to the Netherlands. His campaigns against the Ottoman Turks, Elizabeth I and France were known in detail, though there were only a few who referred to the Moriscos revolt in Spain. Other relevant factors were offered, including the growing weakness of the Spanish economy at a time when the Dutch were thriving, especially in the north, and the implications this had for Spain's ability to provide sufficient troops for the Dutch campaigns. Some comparisons were made between the leadership skills of William of Orange and his son Maurice of Nassau, and the importance of the latter was clearly understood. A few noted the significance of propaganda in furthering the Orange cause, and that the popular anthem *Het Wilhelmus* exalted the Orange family as the rightful rulers of the Netherlands.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

There is plenty of secure analysis here of the changing problems which Spain faced over time in the years to 1609. There is a clear appreciation of the Ottoman threat, and the successes and failures of Parma and his forces. A number of other factors are considered, including the role of William of Orange (Maurice of Nassau could have been mentioned as well), and the longstanding hostility shown by the Dutch towards their ruler and his regents. The use of the Council of Blood by Alva, and the persecution of Dutch Protestants, is examined well. There are some effective comments on the geography of the Netherlands and the extent to which it favoured the Dutch against the Spanish. This is an example of a sustained analysis on the question which is supported by a good range of relevant and well-chosen material. There are one or two slightly weaker passages, but overall a clear evaluation of a range of well-chosen factors. A secure Level 5 response.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer ☒.
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your second answer.)

Plan

~~Reasons by Phillip - angered natives by granting Sp influence
normal people because of foreign
- changing Dutch constitution / bi-topics
- taxation
- religion~~

~~Plan - Competing demands - Ottoman > in early years
- French civil war later "
- Wars vs. England~~

~~Other factors - WoD's leadership
- strength from support, lack of Alva etc
- Terrain~~

Answer

The competing demands of Spain undoubtedly played a large part in its failure to regain control of the Netherlands from 1572-1609,

(This page is for your second answer.) when the 12 year truce was announced. Spain was heavily ~~not~~ involved in many other conflicts, including wars against the Ottoman Empire in the Mediterranean, the French and the English. All of these ~~draws~~ ~~Spain~~ meant ~~Spain was more~~. Spain's attention could not be fully focused on crushing the Dutch revolts. However other factors unquestionably contributed towards the lack of Spain regaining full control; William of Orange led ~~the~~ the revolters well, and the poor Spanish ~~was~~ foreign policies meant the revolters gained great support. ~~This~~ ^{They were also} was aided by the support given to William by Queen Elizabeth I and protestant princes in Germany (William was the son-in-law of the Elector of Saxony, so this earned him support).

Because of the might of the Spanish Empire under Phillip II, it is widely accepted that had Phillip focused all his attention on crushing the revolters in the Netherlands he could have done so. However the cause for crushing the Dutch rebellions would have been greatly helped had Phillip been able to ~~lead~~ ^{lead} the affairs in Holland - live in the low countries, and thus lead the affairs. However this was not possible because of the threat posed by the Ottoman Empire in the Mediterranean. The Ottomans were looking to gain full control of the Mediterranean, and had this been achieved Spain and Phillip II's territories would have been greatly exposed. This meant Phillip had to focus on ~~leading~~ ~~the~~ countering the Turkish threat, ~~and~~ and this ~~led~~ ~~Spain~~ ~~for~~ hampering the Spanish control and leadership of the Netherlands. ~~he could not do~~

Another competing demand was ~~at a later time~~ several years later, when the Duke of Parma was in charge of running affairs in

(This page is for your second answer.) The Netherlands. Parma had proved successful throughout the 1580s in regaining Northern territories of the Netherlands for Spain with his army, and was looking as though Spain could once more exert full control over the Netherlands. However ^{just} when he ~~4~~ could have scaled up his attentions, the Duke and his armies had to increasingly focus on matters of ^{war} in France, diverting his ~~own~~ military power to France instead of the Netherlands. This allowed time for revolts to re-strengthened at a time when the ~~the~~ rebelling northern territories were vulnerable, and probably could have been completely retaken by Parma had he decided to focus his efforts on the Netherlands. The lack of ^{Spanish} military power going towards the Netherlands was exacerbated by tensions with ~~the~~ Protestant England and Elizabeth I in the 1580's, which culminated in the Spanish Armada's intended invasion in 1588. This again drew military power away from the Netherlands.

There were however other factors in the failure of Spain to regain full control. William of Orange led his forces very well, using his ~~knowledge~~ superior knowledge of the low countries to his advantage (an example being in 1574, when he ordered the piercing of dykes around the city of ~~Kaples~~ Leiden to flood the land, and stop Spanish forces).

The revolt was also greatly helped by the widespread support it had generated, and the hatred of the foreign Spanish rule. This was exacerbated by the 'Council of Blood' initiated by the Duke of Alva and continued to a lesser degree by Requesens - this was the persecution of thousands of Dutch protestants, and this further honed the Dutch people against their

(This page is for your second answer.) Spanish leaders, making them war change. Support was also greatly given by because of Phillip's insistence that there should only be one religion - Catholicism - allowed in the Low Countries. He regarded Protestantism as heresy, and as such turned many many Dutch people against him, evidence being the rebelling Calvinist iconoclasts (Calvinism had spread rapidly throughout the 1560s).

Spain's failure to regain control can also be attributed to the geography of the Netherlands. Large expanses of the land were marsh and bog land and bogs, while many great rivers ran (and run) throughout Netherlands. These factors greatly hampered the ability of Spanish armies to move quickly, while William used the rivers to his advantage by fortifying crossing points, further slowing down Spanish forces.

In conclusion, I believe the competing demands of Spanish Spain were responsible to a large extent for Spain's failure to ~~re~~ regain control of the Netherlands, but the competing demands were not the only reasons - other reasons were the aforementioned ~~lack of~~ leadership skills of William of Orange, widespread support for William's cause and for religious toleration, and the geography of the Netherlands slowing down Spanish forces. The competing demands were so important as without ~~the~~ Spanish military power needing to be diverted to the Ottoman threat, France and England, Spain could have focused purely on crushing the Dutch, and because of Spanish force might this would have been very likely. The Dutch would have been crushed.

Question 7

While most candidates were aware of the regional variations in the witchcraze of 1580-1640, many were unable to focus strongly on the given factor of the importance of central government control. A considerable number decided that, since Germany had a very weak central government, the intensity of persecution was considerable throughout the German states. This approach did not take account of the fact that a strong ruling power in the larger states, where the Carolina was usually enforced, meant that persecution was often more slight. Conditions in the largely lawless border regions was mentioned, especially northern Italy and the Franco-Spanish borderlands; and the breakdown of central government in England was cited to explain Hopkins' East Anglian persecution during the Civil War. Candidates also considered areas where strong central government militated against major persecutions, with Spain being the favourite example. There were many candidates who considered the given factor in one or two paragraphs before launching into what appeared to be prepared answers on the witchcraze in general; this was also a feature of many answers to Question 8. These made points such as the role of religious and economic change and the stereotypical view of women, but often had little specific detail to underpin the points being made. Higher level answers kept their focus on the question and considered other reasons for the intensity of persecution, notably the role of individuals such as Balthasar Nuss and James VI of Scotland. These answers, as with those for Question 8, often brought in some impressively detailed case studies in support of their argument.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer .
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 14	

(This page is for your second answer.)

The witch-hunts largely coincided with an extremely tumultuous time in European history. The Reformation provided a split within Europe between Protestants and Catholics, and ~~severed~~ severed many ties with central government, especially in Germany. Even in countries not directly affected by the Reformation there was ^{usually} a ~~substantially~~ larger number of ~~with~~ witch-trials in villages and small communities than in cities.

The witch-hunts were arguably a culmination of many superstitions and tensions between villages and villagers which were ~~set~~ ignited by the catalyst which was the Reformation. Many witch-trials have been shown to have been in rural areas and ~~concentrated~~ between villagers. A case

(This page is for your second answer.)

study from Germany in 1587 describes a midwife who was put to trial for delivering a stillborn baby to a local family. After torture she gave an undeniably false confession of witch-craft and was put to death. Germany in this period was in tumult and had very little centralised control over the many principalities. Although the prosecution ^{itself} was always conducted by a judge, it was generally a local judge, who would have been what ~~the~~ historian Ronald Hutton describes as "sitting on the bubble of hatred as it burst", just as intertwined as any other in village affairs and fearing for their own lives.

Although many witch-hunts were carried out in Protestant areas there were also hunts in Catholic heartlands of France and Spain. One case in particular in the Navarre region of Spain near the French border ^{between 1609-14} was incredibly interesting. In this case village tensions were brought to the fore in supposed sightings of neighbours attending sabbat. Children were made to say that ~~the~~ local rivals of their parents were witches ~~and~~ and were influencing their dreams. This is another case of a village distant from central control. The case was in fact brought

(This page is for your second answer.)

to the high court in Madrid where the charges brought against several villagers were eventually ruled inadequate by Salazar, one of the three judges assigned to the case. It could be that in areas where there was more centralised control there was also a greater amount of literacy and rationality.

However there was not a complete lack of interest by central government. James VI of Scotland travelled to the continent in the ~~late~~ ^{late} ~~early~~ 16th century, and on his return he became so paranoid of witches that he commissioned the Berwick witch-trials of 1590. Although he used these as a ~~device~~ ^{means} by which to execute political rival Bothwell, this is undoubtedly a clear example of authority promoting witch-hunts. The original "witch-hunt handbook" - the *maleus maleficarum* of 1486 was also written by Catholic inquisitors.

~~However after James' Berwick trials of 1590 there seemed to be a general abandonment of witch-persecution by authority, and by 1600~~

(This page is for your second answer.)

~~However authority~~
Although central government played some role in promoting witch hunts during various stages between 1580 and 1650, it was predominantly in areas such as Germany where there was a lack of central government control where witch-hunting was the most severe. Therefore it is useful to subscribe to the historians Thomas & Macfarlane's view that ~~the~~ the witch hunts were mainly a product of local tensions, ~~and~~.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer has a focus on witchcraft and the persecutions, but does not address very strongly the given factor of central government control. There is some reference to intense persecution in rural areas, with a village in Navarre as an example, but this point is described rather than explained. James VI and the Berwick trials are more relevant and detailed. Overall, the answer is on the topic rather than directly addressing the question, but there is some understanding of the focus of the question. Material is descriptive but it is lacking in depth overall. The answer was awarded a secure Level 3.

Question 8

Many answers decided that the spread of information on witchcraft referred only to printed material. Most referred to the *Malleus Maleficarum* of 1496, though its influence had waned considerably well before 1580. Better use was made of the *Demonolatreiae* of 1585, especially the information it provided on the Sabbath. Fewer candidates mentioned other ways in which information on witchcraft was spread. Frequent sermons on the subject were probably more influential than written texts, while many gained an insight into witchcraft through the public reading of charges against the accused. Differentiation was often achieved by the quality of supporting information drawn from candidates' course of study. Those who had studied particular cases in depth usually performed better than others who drew on less specific information.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The introduction places the given factor into a broader context. The candidate notes the importance of the educated elite's views on witchcraft, and questions the importance of printed texts such as the *Malleus*. Instead, some weight is given to the trial processes themselves, when ordinary people became aware of the charges levied against individuals. In considering other factors, the answer highlights the importance of changing legal systems, and the use of torture in many regions to extract confessions and the names of accomplices. The conclusion challenges the terms of the question, and emphasises the importance of changing judicial processes. This is a strong answer which analyses both the given and other factors in some depth before coming to a reasoned conclusion. Supporting information is detailed, and has been well chosen. A secure Level 5 response.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer .
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 14	

(This page is for your second answer.)

The spread of information on witchcraft and witches was ~~not~~ undoubtedly key in ~~explaining~~ increasing the persecution of witches. However, to say that it was the main reason for this would be a great overstatement and incorrect. In fact, the role of changes to the judicial system, the attitudes of judges themselves, the use of torture, millenarianism and ~~the~~ the need for an explanation for the dire social and economic conditions being faced by the peasant population were all as important, if not more, than the role of the spread of information.

The views on witchcraft were formed primarily as a result of the spread of information regarding witches and witchcraft. They formed their beliefs ~~with~~ regards to what they had read. Quotations from the bible appeared to endorse witch hunting ~~and~~ passages such as Exodus, as did passages of Greek and Latin the

(This page is for your second answer.)

literature. Elite views, formed on this basis, was what convicted a witch, as ~~these~~ witches were usually brought to trial ~~on the basis~~ by peasants, but, for the most part, it was the elite who were the judges and who made the decisions. ~~In addition,~~ Further literature, read by the majority of elites did, therefore have an effect on conviction rates as it assured judges that witchcraft was a real threat.

In addition, ~~the~~ books and pamphlets ^{which were} published at the time and widely circulated, endorsed witch hunting and again warned people of the reality of witches. The Malleus Maleficarum, published in 1486 and reprinted over 20 times by the mid 1500s, was again widely read by elites. This and other published works also ~~helped to~~ corroborated with and added to ideas about the cumulative concept of witchcraft, ~~that~~ of which the central belief was ~~was~~ that of the sabbath, which witches were supposed to fly to and where sexual activity was thought to take place. However, despite the numerous reprinting of the Malleus Maleficarum, this did not correspond with an increase in trials following its publication. This suggests therefore, that the spread of information through such publications was not as influential on persecution rates than it

(This page is for your second answer.)

initially appeared

The spread of information at trials was, however, very important for increasing persecution rates. It was at trials that the elite and popular views merged, and this meant that the views of both the common people and the elites were added to and changed. If peasants picked up elite beliefs, they would have more reason to accuse ~~some~~ more people, perhaps of a conspiracy instead of maleficium. At trials, the proceedings and conclusions were read out, ~~so that~~ allowing the merging of ideas. In addition, the written proceedings were often read by other judges, allowing them to get more information regarding witchcraft and increasing the chance of their trials resulting in conviction*. The spread of information in this way was, therefore, key in increasing persecution rates in more than one way.

However, the intensity of persecution rates was not solely dictated by the spread of information. Judicial changes were vital for the witch hunts to become intense, as the shift from the accusatorial to the inquisitorial system ~~also~~ removed any chance of guilt for the person who accused someone of being a witch. This meant people could accuse others a wizard, heresy, ^{or for} vindictive or

(This page is for your second answer.)

selfish reasons without facing the possibility of being accused themselves. In England, where ~~the system~~ the system did not change in this way, hunts remained small and few ~~to~~ large hunts occurred. England also used a jury of untrained, ordinary people instead of a singular judge, which therefore had an effect on conviction rates.

The classification of witchcraft as a 'crimen exceptum'; a special crime which required special rules and to which normal rules did not apply, allowed the use of unregulated torture. This greatly increased prosecution rates, and if people ~~were~~ thought the person they intended to accuse was ^{more} likely to be prosecuted, they ~~would~~ be more likely to accuse them. 95% of those tortured were convicted, whereas in England, where torture was not used, less than 50% of those accused were convicted. Because ~~torture was~~ witchcraft was a crimen exceptum, ~~the~~ the rules meant to regulate the use of torture were not applied. One woman reviewed 56 separate torture sessions, and small children and older people were also tortured, which was, strictly speaking, illegal. In Ellwangen, south west Germany, a woman of 70 was tortured for names of accomplices, and they were tortured for names, until the hunt.

(This page is for your second answer.)

spiralled out of control. Over 260 people were ~~over~~ accused between 1644 and 1652, and even a priest and a judge were accused. This suggests that the torture was much more important in increasing the intensity of the hunts than the spread of ~~heard~~ information.

While the spread of information did help to increase the intensity of witch hunts, it cannot be said to be the major factor. ~~is~~ The use of torture, as in Ellwangen, which was related to the legal changes and classification of witchcraft as a 'crime exception' was more important. As Leach states: ~~whether~~ the witchcraft "was essentially a judicial operation", which implies that the judges themselves and the judicial changes were more influential on hunts than the spread of information.

*It was ~~how~~ at trials that the common people picked up ideas of conspiracy and at the sabbath. How else could they accuse people of such things?



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Information on witchcraft came in many different forms. Find out the importance of other printed works as well as the Malleus Maleficarum.

Question 9

Most candidates appeared to be well versed in many aspects of Tyrone's rebellion, with many answers focused on the differing leadership given to the rival armies. Tyrone's expert leadership in the years to 1598 was well documented, and the significance of the heavy defeat he inflicted on the English forces at Yellow Ford was understood. In comparison, Essex's tactics and overall strategy were seen as disastrous. The planting of garrisons in the south weakened his main force, making it unfit to carry out any successful campaigns in the north. Many candidates suggested that the appointment of Mountjoy marked the turning point in the rebellion, with his vigorous leadership being the main contributory factor behind Tyrone's defeat in 1602 and his surrender the following year. High level answers went beyond the role of personalities and military campaigns to consider the growing support which Tyrone gathered through the 1590s. Several noted that Yellow Ford was followed by substantial risings against English rule throughout Ireland, which seriously threatened Elizabeth I's control of the island.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer refers briefly to Tyrone's leadership of the Irish cause, a point which could have been developed more extensively, and to the long-standing grievances of the Irish people which fuelled the rebellion. The incompetence of Essex's campaign is compared with the more determined actions taken by Mountjoy, and the importance of the Irish victory at Yellow Ford is set against the English success at Kinsale. The failed Spanish intervention at Kinsale is mentioned, though Spain's subsidies to Tyrone were more significant in the long term. There are some interesting reflections on the distractions which Elizabeth I had to deal with at home and abroad. The answer has an analytical focus in places, but there are some passages where narrative predominates. Nonetheless, material offered is detailed and accurate, and there is an attempt to draw conclusions overall. A high Level 4 response.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your first answer.) The Tyrone Rebellion was led by Hugh O'Neill, the O'Neill and Earl of Tyrone, a Gaelic Irish man who had been brought up as an English nobleman. He was an excellent soldier and leader and also sly. He was able to take resources from the English, by requisitioning them, for example he used lead to make bullets for his rebellion. One of the reasons the English found it so hard to put down the rebellion was Tyrone's leadership.

Tyrone was also well-supported which gives credence to another reason, which is Irish resentment towards England's over-harsh rule. The methods used to keep the peace in Ireland were overly brutal and targeted Catholics while helping protestants, and as most of Ireland was Catholic, this was angering many to the benefit of few. The

(This page is for your first answer.) Irish were also unimpressed with English claim to any rule over Ireland since Henry VIII decided to declare himself its king.

The English force assigned to defeating the rebellion was also incompetent, led by the Earl of Essex, sent by Elizabeth to get rid of him. Essex was a loose cannon who, rather than fight Tyrone as had been demanded, met with him on a bridge and arranged a truce. ~~However, the~~ This may have been a reason for poor English control over Ireland as as soon as Essex had been executed for mounting a rebellion and Lord Mountjoy was put in his place, the rebellion was far more efficiently dealt with by employing scorched-earth tactics so that the Irish guerrilla fighters were unable to draw new recruits or feed their men.

However the guerrilla tactics had worked until then and may have played a part in how the Tyrone rebellion was as difficult as it was to stop. A decisive victory was won at the Battle of Yellow Ford, where the Irish used their superior knowledge of their surroundings

(This page is for your first answer.) to trap the English in a kind of natural basin and attack from behind. This, though, translates to a lack of knowledge outside their local area, and Mountjoy was able to gain his own victory at Kinsale where the Irish were lost and retreated across some water, until the English cavalry discovered a ford and cut them down.

The reason they had gone to Kinsale in the first place was a belief in Spanish support. The Irish believed the Spanish, another Catholic nation, would support them by means of a supply of troops, but the troops could not land in Ulster, the rebels' normal location, so Tyrone had to march hundreds of miles in sub-zero weather to reach Kinsale, and his soldiers were unable to stand their ground. On the other hand the resiliency of belief in Spanish support may have been right as Tyrone had on many occasions written to King Philip II of Spain, talking about their shared Catholicism and anti-English agendas and asking for troops. Tyrone's 'army' was made up of local militiamen whose training he rotated, but even doing that the army was less numerous

(This page is for your first answer.) than the English one.

Another reason for poor English control may have been the fact that England and Queen Elizabeth I had other problems to worry about, such as the risk of attack from Spain (with whom England was at war, resulting in the attack of the Armada in 1588 and various trips to Cadiz to sabotage the building of ships) directly, and a poor harvest which caused starvation and inflation, as well as unemployment, resulting in a Poor Law having to be passed, as well as the burning issues of monopolies being sold, resulting in Parliament and Elizabeth, having little time to worry about the rebellion in Ireland, resulting in its delegation in management to the incompetent Essex.

All things considered the real reason for the English failure to control Ireland during the Tyrone rebellion was the lack of advantages for the English where the Irish had many, not least the relative abilities of their leaders, O'Neill and Essex respectively, evidenced by the fact that the tables turned after somebody more competent was put in the place of Essex.

Question 10

There were too few answers to allow for a meaningful report.

Question 11

Many answers were focused on the religious factors which led to the outbreak of war. These noted the importance of the Peace of Augsburg, and of the whole Counter Reformation period, in fostering divisions between the European states. Candidates were also aware that the trigger for the outbreak of war was the offer of the Bohemian crown to the Calvinist Elector Frederick, and its implications on the balance of religious power within Germany. Some candidates struggled to get beyond the religious dimension of the conflict and made only limited references to other factors. Better answers were aware of the role of great power politics in causing the war, citing the growing territorial ambitions of France and Denmark, and later of Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden. Others saw the continuing breakdown of Imperial power within Germany as of central importance. The best answers were aware of the significance of 'militant Roman Catholicism' in the outbreak of the war, and showed a good empathetic understanding of the importance of religion in the mid-17th century.

Put a cross in the box indicating the **SECOND** question you have chosen to answer .
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your second answer.)

Plan: Militant Catholics:

Degeneration of Prague 1618 shows potential
unhappy

Fred Vth Max of Bavaria Catholic
Sweden enter and Denmark
But England + Saxony?

Dynasty: Denmark, Sweden

Ferdinand invade Bohemia as Habsburg land
But Max of Bav?

Territory: All countries entered for land

(This page is for your second answer.)

It can be argued that the main cause of the Thirty Years War was because of Militant Catholicism. However many countries actually entered the war to stop Habsburg dominance and also many of the countries entered because they wanted land out of the war. In this essay I will argue that the main cause of the war was territory however many of the countries who entered used the Militant Catholicism as an excuse to get involved.

It could be argued that Militant Catholicism could be blamed for causing the war. The war started after the Defenestration of Prague in 1618 when the protestants protested about the inequality of protestants and Catholics in the Bohemian government. This Defenestration shows that the war was caused by militant Catholics as they were being unfair which meant the protestants were angry and therefore wanted change. As a result Frederick V who was a Calvinist was offered the crown of Bohemia in 1619 because Bohemia was 90% protestant however as Ferdinand was a Catholic he was very much against this happening and so he invaded Frederick

(This page is for your second answer.)

V's land of the palat Palatinate which Keyser shows us that the war was started because of militant Catholics in the empire. ¹⁶¹⁸ Both ~~to~~ Denmark (1625) and Sweden (1630) enter because they want to defend the protestant states in the empire and this shows that the war was caused by militant Catholics. Maximilian of Bavaria was a strong believing catholic and he got involved in order to defend catholicism which shows the war was caused by militant Catholics. However if the war was entirely caused by Catholics why did Saxony, a protestant state, fight against another protestant state in 1626 at the Battle of White Mountain. Furthermore England never got involved and if the main cause was the Catholics it must be questioned why England (Protestant) never got involved. Therefore in conclusion it can be argued that yes some countries and states entered because of the militant Catholics but as shown by Saxony and England maybe there was another cause of the Thirty Years War.

It could also be argued that the war was caused by the Habsburg dominance of

(This page is for your second answer.) The time and therefore many countries and states entered to stop the Habsburg dominance. Denmark and Sweden are two prime examples of this point as they both entered because they wanted to end Habsburg dominance in Northern Germany. Furthermore France entered in 1635 because they were scared of Habsburg encirclement after the Peace of Prague in 1635. However if the war was entirely caused by Habsburg dominance why did the ^{Austrian} Habsburgs leave the Spanish Habsburgs to fight alone in the war? Furthermore Maximilian of Bavaria was a Wittelsbach who traditionally hated the Habsburgs and it can therefore be seen that maybe the war was not ~~caused by~~ the major cause of the war.

It can certainly be argued that the Thirty Years War was caused by greed and territory. This is seen by the fact that every country that entered the war wanted land which therefore shows that greed was a major cause of the war. Examples of this point include Maximilian of Bavaria who wanted another electoral vote and also more land in Germany. Both Sweden and

(This page is for your second answer.) Denmark entered the war to gain land in Northern Germany because they wanted to expand their empire. This reason shows that the war was caused by greed. Furthermore the spark that started the war which was when Frederick accepted the crown of Bohemia shows that the war was caused by greed because Frederick wanted to gain his more land (Bohemia). France also entered because of self interest because they want to protect their own region. The fact that the war was ~~is~~ caused by greed is summed up in 1647 when Frederick Sweden accept a payoff from the Emperor to stop them from taking Prague. The fact that the war was caused by greed would also ~~be backed~~ show the why in 1648 the Austrian Habsburgs left the Spanish Habsburgs and this was because they didn't want to lose more land. It can therefore be argued that the Thirty Years War was caused by greed and self interest because every country entered in order to gain more land.

~~Therefore~~

Therefore in conclusion it can be argued that the Thirty Years War was caused

(This page is for your second answer.) ~~was~~ by greed and self interest because the fact that every country that entered entered for land shows this is the major cause of the war. Countries entered the war for land but they used the fact of the Militant Catholics as an excuse as they didn't want to say they entered for land. Therefore greed was the main cause of the Thirty Years War.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer considers two factors at length and in some detail; the religious origins of the war and the ambitions of the participants. Religious differences are explained by the conflict between the Catholic Emperor Ferdinand and the Calvinist Elector Frederick V, which led to other states taking sides based on their religious complexion. The territorial ambitions of the participants are dealt with in depth, notably those of Denmark and Sweden, both of which aimed to challenge the growing Habsburg domination of central Europe. This is an analytical response which was awarded a secure Level 4, but it should be pointed out that the candidate does not always stay within the chronology set by the question. An answer dealing with the outbreak of the war is required, and the entry of France into the conflict in 1635 is therefore not entirely relevant.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

The Thirty Years War covers a very complex set of events. You will find it easier to remember the course of events, and their dates, if you plot them on a simple timeline.

Question 12

Question 12 was much more popular than Question 11, and attracted candidates who displayed a secure understanding of the chronology of events and the shifting balance of power. Many felt that Ferdinand II was unwise to issue the Edict of Restitution in 1629, which the German princes saw as the start of an attempt to re-establish Imperial power. Many candidates were unsure whether the intervention of Gustavus Adolphus in 1630 was motivated by defensive or offensive considerations, but noted that Swedish involvement extended the war until 1635. French involvement from 1635 not only extended the war considerably, but also broadened its geographical scope to include much of western Europe. An accurate chronology over the twenty year period given in the question differentiated between candidates, with the best framing their answer around the key milestones which shaped the course of the war up to 1648.

Question 13

Many answers had a narrow focus, providing a detailed and relevant account of the various acts which made up the Clarendon Code; the limited range of material offered usually limited these answers to Level 3. Better answers concentrated on Clarendon's loyal service to Charles II, with some good contextual references to the years before 1660. His role in the framing of the Declaration of Breda, and his powerful involvement in shaping the Restoration settlement, were both well known. Only a few investigated his difficult relationship with parliament, but preferred to focus on his failures in foreign policy, most notably in the handling of the second Anglo-Dutch War. Those who were able to stand back and make a confident attempt to weigh up his career as a whole accessed Level 5.

Question 14

Many candidates who knew and applied their detailed knowledge of the period produced a good analysis of factors. These were able to assess the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis, and noted that the Whigs were driven by anti-Catholic feeling but also by a fear that the Restoration monarchy was drifting towards absolutism on the French model. These two factors also informed their assessment of the reign of James II, thus producing a secure analysis which was awarded Level 4 or Level 5. Less successful were answers which could describe a number of events such as the Popish Plot and Monmouth's Rebellion, but which failed to analyse their significance. Some answers, which were inevitably self-limiting, dealt only with the reign of James II. It was surprising to see that many answers failed to make any reference at all to the invitation sent to William of Orange, or to the events of the Glorious Revolution of 1688.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The introduction is not well focused, and is descriptive rather than analytical. The section on fear of Catholicism makes many relevant points, but is broadly descriptive and makes many points without considering their significance. Three other factors are offered, but two of these, the fear of absolutism and the Stuarts' belief in Divine Right, are almost identical. The answer is thus attempting to analyse the situation within the given timescale and does consider a number of relevant factors. These qualities point towards Level 4, while the lack of balance in places and some free-standing descriptive material led to a final mark within the mid-Level 4 range.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer ☒.
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|-------------|---|-------------|---|
| — | Question 1 | ☒ | Question 2 | ☒ | Question 3 | ☒ |
| — | Question 4 | ☒ | Question 5 | ☒ | Question 6 | ☒ |
| — | Question 7 | ☒ | Question 8 | ☒ | Question 9 | ☒ |
| — | Question 10 | ☒ | Question 11 | ☒ | Question 12 | ☒ |
| — | Question 13 | ☒ | Question 14 | ☒ | | |

(This page is for your second answer.) In the years 1678-88 England had two monarchs, Charles II (1660-1685) and James II (1685-88). The Parliament had worried about Charles being Catholic and had attempted to exclude James II, who was openly Catholic, from the throne in three exclusion Parliaments. There was much opposition from the Whigs in Parliament, who wanted to exclude James. The fear of Catholicism was a large reason for opposition to the Stuart monarchs, as the main religion in this time was Anglican and therefore Catholics were persecuted and feared. The Test Act of 1664 prevented Catholics from holding public office or becoming an MP. This shows Parliament were afraid of Catholics gaining power and beginning a rebellion. Plots such as the Popish Plot in 1678 encouraged fear of Catholics as it showed

(This page is for your second answer.) They were a potential threat to Parliament and England. Even though the Popish Plot was falsified by Titus Oates, Parliament were still alarmed of the Catholic threat. Parliament were suspicious of Charles II being Catholic, as he had married Catholic Catherine of Braganza and also been less enthusiastic about passing laws which punished Catholics. Parliament tried to exclude ~~part~~ James II from the throne on three separate occasions (1679, 80, 81) and instead have Protestant William and Mary on the throne. Charles refused and an exclusion bill was defeated in the House of Lords. James II was openly Catholic and became King in 1685. The birth of his Catholic son, James Francis Edward Stuart, alarmed Parliament as this meant England would be ruled by a Catholic monarch for many years to come. The people of England were also afraid they would be persecuted by a Catholic monarch, as had happened in Mary Tudor's reign. Other plots such as the Rye House Plot 1683 promoted more fear of Catholicism as people saw Catholics as ruthless and inhumane.

(This page is for your second answer.) However there were other reasons as to why there was opposition to the Stuart monarchs, such as Parliament's fear of Charles or James reigning as an Absolute monarch. This fear was increased when Charles ruled from 1681-85 without Parliament. Parliament had introduced the Test Act, but had no way to enforce it which meant it could be easily ignored. Parliament were not willing to not be called and so when James II became king they worked hard to limit his power and give themselves more control.

A further reason of why the Stuart monarchs faced opposition was that of an uncertain foreign policy as Parliament and Charles often disagreed over alliances and enemies. The ^{Third} Anglo Dutch wars ~~1662-64~~ and ~~1672~~ (1672-74) was also very expensive to fund. Charles signed the secret Treaty of Dover in 1670, which meant Charles would get money for turning England Catholic. This also gave England an alliance with France, which was not Parliament's aim.

A final reason is that both Charles and James were strong believers of divine

(This page is for your second answer.) right, which meant they were less likely to listen to Parliament or take orders from them. This caused much opposition from Parliament and was shown in 1688, when William of Orange invaded, Parliament were not concerned about supporting James as they had different views and made it impossible for Parliament to agree with James.

In Conclusion the fear of Catholicism was the main reason there was opposition to Stuart monarchs as this set a large conflict between Parliament and Charles / James. The fact that the monarch was Catholic meant that they would allow have differing views on religion, finance and foreign policy. This made it impossible for any agreements between the monarch and Parliament and would eventually lead to Absolutism, as it is in other Catholic countries such as Spain and France.

In conclusion, as one of the examiners commented in his final report, "Able candidates wrote articulately and coherently and demonstrated a logical mind as well as good linguistic skills. Weaker answers were characterised by poor sentence construction, spelling and poor writing skills, which was a limiting factor in some answers where candidates clearly knew their history but struggled or failed to produce a coherent readable response."

Grade Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	40	35	30	25	21
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code US024060 June 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

