

Examiners' Report
June 2012

GCE 6HI01 History B

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. 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 for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. To set up your ResultsPlus account, call us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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 raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2012

Publications Code US032392

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

Introduction

General comments

Examiners reported that many candidates were comfortable with the essential requirements of the examination. They were able to structure their work effectively, provide a range of relevant and accurate material to support the points they were making, and maintain a sustained focus on the question set. At the highest levels of attainment were those who displayed the ability to analyse a range of factors in detail and present a convincing answer overall.

However, there were some candidates who did not do themselves justice overall. A number failed to respond to the specific demands of the questions in front of them. These candidates often focused their answers on material with which they felt comfortable rather than targeting the specifics of the question set. Centres are advised to ensure that candidates are ready to use, and to adapt, the material they have learnt. Most centres use previous questions for revision and preparation for the examination, but they might warn candidates that their paper will consist entirely of previously unseen questions, and that they should be prepared for this uncertainty.

Many candidates became trapped within Level 3 or low Level 4 because of a lack of accurate and relevant exemplification. Most are able to develop some argument in an answer, but assertions must be supported with sufficient evidence to make these points stand up. In addition, they should explain how these points relate to the question, whether in supporting or challenging the premise of the question.

Many very good answers reached high Level 4, but were unable to access Level 5. It is important to note that otherwise strong answers sometimes stayed in Level 4 for one of two reasons. Firstly, the support material offered, while accurate and broadly relevant, was lacking balance in places, with uneven evidence in parts of the answer. A more widespread concern was that some able candidates were unfamiliar with, or unable to use, analytical concepts and terminology used by historians. While most are able to investigate economic and political factors, many were unsure of the precise meaning of, for example, 'social conditions' in Options A and B, and even 'foreign policy' in Options E and F.

It is worth reminding candidates of the importance of recognising the type of question they are answering. While the commonest type is the multi-factored causation question, where it is appropriate to discuss the importance of the stated factor and then various other factors involved, not all questions focus on causation and not all are multi-factored. In Option D, Questions D7 and D11 both asked why an outcome resulted without giving a stated factor. Questions D3 and D8 both focused on the extent of change. Questions D9 and D13 both focused on the nature of change. Structuring an effective answer depends on recognising exactly what you are being asked to do.

One other general point might be worth making: while candidates are often comfortable explaining an outcome in terms of the strengths of 'the winners' and the weaknesses of 'the losers' (for example, in Option D, the white forces in Question D6 and Chiang in Question D2) these do need to be known in detail. There is a tendency to sum up such weaknesses rather blandly so that they could apply to many situations at many times in history. The message is: be specific.

The comments on spelling, punctuation and grammar made in previous reports remain relevant and valid. The literacy curriculum notes that, in a formal setting such as a public examination, appropriate language must be used, and should be free of abbreviations and colloquialisms. It also states that, if a candidate is to communicate effectively, what is written down must be legible. On several occasions this summer examiners could not decipher what might have been key words or phrases, and this inevitably influenced the final mark awarded.

Question 1

There was generally a good understanding of the chief features of the stated factor of humanism. The best candidates were able to describe and analyse Erasmus' role in criticising the Catholic Church, noting the importance of 'ad fontes' and the popularity of many of Erasmus' publications. Many, however, questioned the influence of humanism overall, noting that humanists were willing only to criticise the church from within, and saw the significance of Erasmus' break with Luther in the 1520s. A large number of answers referred to the old saying that 'Erasmus laid the egg that Luther hatched' without explaining precisely what was meant by this. Other reasons for the German Reformation were considered with varying levels of success. Tetzels and indulgences, the poor quality of German parish clergy, and widespread absenteeism were all addressed quite effectively. However, several answers described, sometimes at great length, the moral laxity of the papal court but were unable to link this effectively to the outbreak of the German Reformation. It is worth noting that almost all candidates referred to the heavy papal taxes raised in Germany, but many seemed unaware of what these taxes were, how they were collected, and why the papacy was able to impose these dues. It is also important that candidates have a clear understanding of when the Reformation actually began. Some argued convincingly for 1517 or 1521, but others discussed events in the 1520s and 1530s which really belonged in an answer to Question 2.

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 | <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 first answer.)

~~Strong central g'vment responsible
 lack of for spread of Lutheranism
 in Germany 1521-55~~

Humanist influences responsible for German Reformation?
 the start → but wasn't unpopular?
 - Corruption + unpopularity of Church. ✓
 - Printing Press. ✓ Tetzel
 - Nature of HRE ✓ Jüterborg. PRINCES Fred wrote w/ Erasmus
 - popularity of ideas - outline ideas. ✓ sola scriptura
 - popularity of ideas. ✓ - pop of all believers
 - humanist influences
 ↳ Erasmus 'in Praise of folly'
 More + Fisher martyred for faith.
 → Limited - did not affect average believers

Indulgences

(This page is for your first answer.)

The ~~out~~ outbreak of the German Reformation was due to a variety of factors over many years which all led to the eventual formation of a new church. Luther was not the first person to criticise the Catholic Church and have different ideas of faith, for example Jan Huss and John Wycliffe, but the situation in Germany in the early 16th Century meant he was not stopped as the other heretics previously had been, which meant his ideas could take root and flourish. One of the reasons for this was humanist influences and criticisms of the Catholic Church, but there were many other underlying and more obvious factors which caused the start of the German Reformation, although there is no fixed point that we can say was the definite start of the Reformation.

Humanist influences on Luther and their subsequent criticisms of the Catholic Church certainly had an influence on the start of the German Reformation. The idea of humanism was the translation of old ~~texts~~ religious texts ~~into~~ in order to study history and ~~use~~ to apply that knowledge to their current situation. These new translations highlighted errors in Catholic Doctrine that had been agreed by the Pope which must have had Luther questioning the infallibility of the Pope, and therefore his authority. Luther was in

(This page is for your first answer.) close correspondance with Erasmus whose most famous works 'In Praise of Folly' was an ironic satire about the corruptions in the Catholic church, which equally must have caused Luther to consider the immorality of the Church and perhaps caused Luther to write his 95 Theses in part. However, Luther hated Erasmus and his ideas outlined in his three Treatises of 1520 had negligible humanist influences. Furthermore, many humanists were martyred for their faith, for example more and Fisher, and it would be incorrect to say that humanist scholars influenced Luther in his rejection of Catholic doctrine. It would also be incorrect to say that humanist criticisms were the cause of the German Reformation, as Luther was the driving force behind the Reformation and he was only influenced by humanist thinking — humanist writings were read by only the educated so the popular Reformation of normal people could not have happened through humanist influences.

There were many other factors which influenced the German Reformation, including corruptions itself within the Catholic church. ~~The Church taxed~~ The church taxed Germany very highly because of its urbanised nature ~~as~~ which meant a higher population density which was easier to tax, and the lack of

(This page is for your first answer.) a centralised monarchy which could limit papal influence. This steady stream of money out of Germany was greatly resented and was even further hated with what it was spent upon - simony, nepotism and pluralism were rife within the Catholic Church which created a very anti-clericalist feeling. This meant Germany was fertile ground for a Reformation as the Catholic Church was thought of so badly, allowing Lutheranism to spread far faster and become far more popular than it would normally have, along with the invention of the printing ^{press}.

Another factor which influenced the start of the German Reformation, and could be argued that it is its most important trigger, was indulgences. Although indulgences were growing in popularity, the ~~seeming~~ ~~immorality~~ immorality of them meant Luther felt compelled to write the 95 Theses, after his congregation travelled to Jüterborg to ~~buy~~ buy indulgences off of Johan Tetzel in 1517. Tetzel took indulgences to such an extreme "could absolve you if you deflowered the Virgin Mary" that Luther felt ~~compel~~ he had to write the 95 Theses in order to protect his congregation from being misled. The popularity of the 95 Theses shows how indulgences were seen as immoral, and this first popularity and interest in Luther meant Luther was able to extend his ideas and people would still

(This page is for your first answer.) wish to read them.

The political nature of the Holy Roman Empire was ~~the~~ ~~for~~ another reason why the German Reformation was able to start. The power and independent nature of the Princes, shown in the 1547-8 Diet of Augsburg and their refusal to start a Swabian League under Charles's control, meant Luther could be protected and there was little Charles V or the Pope could do about it. This meant Luther was confident enough to write his ~~doctrinal~~ works against the Catholic Church, and the urbanised, ~~populous~~ wealthy nature of Germany ~~meant~~ along with the introduction of the printing press meant his first ideas could become hugely popular, popular ~~enough~~ and widespread enough that it could be called a full Reformation and not simply ^{the ideas of a} a heretical German monk.

In conclusion, I do not think humanist criticisms of the Catholic Church ~~were~~ was the cause of the German Reformation - the ~~or~~ ^{main} ~~only~~ cause of the German Reformation was Luther. It was his ideas and works that sparked the Reformation, and although the key idea was indulgences, and the nature of the Holy Roman Empire allowed his ideas to grow in popularity, ~~to~~ the ~~real~~ religion which formed was ~~cause~~ called Lutheranism. The corruption

(This page is for your first answer.) of the Catholic church was ~~certainly~~ certainly highlighted by humanist criticisms but many humanists remained Catholic until death and the same can certainly not be said of Luther.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer has some range and considers humanists, papal taxes, indulgences and conditions within Germany. The answer relates quite well to the question, but lacks balance and clarity in places, notably on the stated factor and German conditions. Mid Level 4.

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:

humanist criticisms:
 Luther, Wycliffe, Jan Hus
Yes - succeeded, 95 theses criticised, indulgences affair
 short term: renaissance
No - burnt at stake, Wycliffe, Jan Hus - failed
 'bones dug up + burnt'

economic
 dissonance
 not clear
 e.g. RSS / political

other factors:
 not just Luther, long lasting discontent: popes, nepotism etc. economic reasons
 primer own concerns

Essay:
 One can see that the humanist criticisms of the Catholic Church did have an impact on the German Reformation, but the extent of this is debatable. Historians have argued for centuries over the impact of Humanist criticisms, but in my opinion the reformation cannot simply be put down to this. There were

(This page is for your first answer.) many other factors which contributed to the Reformation. I think that Humanist criticisms simply strengthened and enhanced the reformation, as opposed to causing it.

However there is one very strong character in the reformation which divides opinion about this: Martin Luther. While not initially a humanist, his ideas evolved to develop humanist characteristics. His role in the Reformation was unparalleled to any other individual and therefore cannot be ignored.

Martin Luther was a monk when he was called to Rome for religious duties. Here, he saw the abuses of the Church. Returning to when he returned he was relocated to Wittenburg where he was made a Professor. Here, he began teaching others the injustices of the Church, ~~his~~ first ~~se~~ one of which was the abuse of indulgences - which has ~~to~~ come to be known as 'The Indulgences affair'. His criticism of the sales of indulgences began in 1517 when he ~~first~~ criticised them.

(This page is for your first answer.) in a sermon in October. This criticism shaped Martin Luther's teachings, and arguably the reformation. Luther believed in 'justification by faith alone' or 'sola scriptura' - the idea that the Bible had authority.

The biggest, and arguably most impactful, criticism of Martin Luther was his 95 theses. In these theses, pinned to the castle church door in 1517, Luther condemned the Church. His theses, intended to spark intellectual debate by Luther, were quickly spread in their vernacular. From this we can see that his Humanist criticisms contributed to the German Reformation as Luther's ideas spread like wild fire. For example, one of the contributing factors to the Peasants War of 1525 was the idea that people felt empowered and capable of taking on such large authorities because of the success of Martin Luther.

However, ~~just~~ Luther is arguably the only Humanist who strongly contributed to the German Reformation. John Wycliffe, a humanist had his bones dug up and burnt.

(This page is for your first answer.) by the Church and Jan Hus was burnt at the stake. These incidences were also long before the Reformation. Their ideas may have some impact on Luther who impacted the reformation, but it is unlikely that they directly impacted the reformation themselves.

However, ~~for the~~ as we can see by the failed attempts of Hus and Wycliffe, the ~~the~~ environment surrounding the time of the Reformation had to be good for it to ever work. An environment appropriate for ~~the Refor~~ Humanist criticisms was the Renaissance period: the time of the ~~Early Modern~~ ~~Witch~~ Reformation. The Renaissance period was a time where people wanted, and were looking for, change. Therefore, Humanist ideals were born out of, and suited, the Renaissance period. Therefore timing is an important factor in ~~the~~ what caused the Reformation also.

To fully understand what caused the Reformation, other mitigating factors must be considered. For example the discontent with the Catholic

(This page is for your first answer.) Church by the laity in Germany. People were ~~even~~ angered by the sheer amount of money they had to give to the Church. People paid tithes, which was one tenth of the annual income, as well as other expenses such as baptisms, weddings and funerals. While it can be argued that these payments could have been avoided if people wanted to, that was borderline impossible due to the paralysing fear of the people in 1517-55. People were terrified of dying with no after life, therefore ^{by} making ~~it~~ these payments, people felt they were buying their way into heaven. This fear contributed to the Reformation in two respects. Firstly, people were upset over payments (time spent paying the Church and working on their fields meant less time working on your own; and in a time of great poverty this was upsetting). Secondly, this contributed to the reformation through Luther. Luther proposed that ~~men~~^{men} had already been predecided by God if you were going to heaven or hell and therefore payments would not

(This page is for your first answer.) help. He proposed that the only authority to believe in was the Bible.

Another factor that contributed was ~~to~~ the Reformation in Germany was the abuses of the Church. Nepotism, absenteeism and the sale of indulgences (mainly by Tetzel) all contributed to people's lack of faith in the Church and therefore the Reformation. In addition to this the corrupt Popes did not help. Julius II was more interested in European aggression (nicknamed the 'Warrior Pope') and Leo X's biggest concern was building the grandest building in all of Christendom with the St Peter's Basilica in Rome. ~~As~~ These Popes showed themselves to care more about monetary concerns and not their spiritual duty. This angered people and led to the Reformation.

The monetary concerns of the Princes however also led to the Reformation. ~~The~~ Princes wanted not only to prevent a schism in their state to make their ruling easier

(This page is for your first answer.) but an absolutist monarch (like many of the governments in Europe at this time) benefited of course from spending as little money as possible. therefore a break with Catholicism and therefore a ~~break~~^{cease} fromⁱⁿ payments appeared.

To conclude the extent of the German Reformation in relation to Humanist criticisms can only be considered key when in combination with other events such as time period or the dissatisfaction with the Church.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer here attempts an explanation, but is not always in focus. The influence of humanism is not strongly developed, and there is some lack of clarity on the Renaissance. Broadly accurate and relevant material: high Level 3.

Question 2

There was quite a lot of variation in what candidates defined as the lack of a strong central government, with some seeing the role and power of the princes, and the status of the imperial cities, as an entirely separate issue. Many were aware of the Wahlkapitulation imposed on Charles in 1519, and pointed out that, with no standing army to call on, Charles was unable to take any independent action against Lutheranism in its early years. The personal or religious motives which accounted for princely conversions in the 1520s were described effectively, along with Charles' attempts to tackle Lutheranism at the first and second Diets of Speyer. While most answers referred to the formation of the Schmalkaldic League in 1531, few noted that this meant that religious change in Germany had to be defeated by force, as shown at Muhlberg in 1547. In considering other relevant factors most noted Charles' distractions elsewhere in Europe and beyond, and pointed out that the Emperor spent very little time in Germany in the 1520s and 1530s; and that when he was finally able to address religious issues in the 1540s Lutheranism had become firmly established in many states.

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 | <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 first answer.)

lack of a

Strong central government for the FIRE
 Spread of Lutheranism 1521-1555.

1521 - edict of worms, fred

1522 - courtstadt, knights war

1525 - peasants war, fred wise dead,

1528 - diet of Speyer, more time, no charles, league of

1530 - Augsburg confession, melancthon, 6th months.

1531 - foundations of Schmalkaldic league

1555 - Peace of Augsburg.

1529 - marburg colloquy, philip of Hesse
 utraquism. house.

The lack of a strong central government can easily be seen as responsible for the spread of Lutheranism during the period 1521-1555 as Charles was distracted with battles between France and also the Ottoman empire he was barely in Germany to ~~to~~ oversee the radical changes taking place. Yet, ^{as in any case} we must consider other factors such as the ~~p~~ power of Luther's message and ability to spread it as well as

(This page is for your first answer.)

the already growing feelings of nationalism and anti-clericalism across the country.

Therefore we must be able to judge just how far lack of strong central government was responsible for the spread of Lutheranism through 1521-1555.

One of the greatest events demonstrating the lack of strong central government in Germany is the event of the Edict of Worms in 1521 and the prince's actions that followed. When Luther was requested ~~to~~ in front of Charles he knew his chances of coming back alive were slim as Jan Huss, a reformer with similar ideas to Luther had been burnt for heresy after being summoned to the Empire however this case was different. Charles was only 19 when made emperor after Maximilian I and was 21 at the Edict of Worms. As he was still relatively ~~to~~ new he would do anything to gain support from the prince's so let Luther leave Worms as an outlaw.

Fredrick the wise then 'kidnapped' Luther and kept him safe at his castle in Wartburg. Charles made no attempt to

(This page is for your first answer.) defend Europe. The lack of central government was therefore crucial in letting Luther and the princes spread Lutheranism during 1521-1555.

However on the other hand the lack of central government was not all to blame for the rapid spread of Lutheranism. Due to the abuses of the clergy ~~and~~ there was already a wide spread feeling of anti-clericalism across the country. Priests were often accused of nepotism, simony, pluralism, not following their vows and exploiting the lay people through things such as tithes. Having to pay money to the church (10% every ~~not~~ month) and being conned into buying indulgences (when later discovered to be worthless through Luther's ideas of Sola fide) angered the laity. Their money was going to the building of St Peter's Basilica and the Bishop of Mainz to pay his debts. The people ~~there~~ of Germany were never going to benefit from this. Therefore when Luther's ideas spread, not only by the power of the princes but through Luther's writings

(This page is for your first answer.)

and his fantastic public speeches people were quick to adopt these new ideas. The spread of nationalism ^{and humanism} as ^{more} people were attending university and becoming independent meant that separation from the church and corrupt ideas were also greatly welcomed.

In conclusion the lack of central government played a key role in the spread of Lutheranism through 1521-1555 as Charles ~~is~~ was rarely there the princes and Luther had more opportunity to gain support with out imperial restriction. Yet on the other hand Luthers ideas were already set to be greatly welcomed due to the growing feeling of nationalism. Therefore although Charles' absence did help greatly it was not the only leading factor in the spread of Lutheranism from 1521-1555.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer relates well to the question and considers a number of relevant factors in framing the analysis. There is a lack of balance in places, notably in the discussion of the weak central government of the Empire, and the range of material might have been broader. Mid Level 4 overall.

Question 3

A number of candidates misunderstood the focus of the question, seeing it as a multi-factored one rather than one which targeted just the Council of Trent. This raised some issues for examiners, as sections of these answers on Trent could be quite effective but the response then wandered off in other directions. For example, many answers dealt with Trent but then argued that there were other ways in which the church responded to the Protestant challenge; and there was much discussion of the role of the Jesuits, and the part played by Catholic princes, which were not relevant to the question. Those who stayed focused on the Council often produced some excellent material on doctrines, discipline and the papacy, noting how the Council's decrees drew sharp dividing lines between Catholics and Protestants. The effect was to revive Catholic spirituality and provide the church with the weapons with which to arm 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:

- | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 first answer.)

~~How successful~~ How Successful was the Council of Trent in responding to the challenges of protestantism?

For	Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defining the Roman Catholic faith offerings were put in place to deal with abuses new teaching of the clergy clarification and the ordinary discipline of the law 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many suggestions too late Jesuits New orders Papacy injustice different councils before had protestantism

The council of Trent was somewhat successful in dealing with the challenges of protestantism. However, it wasn't entirely successful as there

(This page is for your first answer.)

was different aspects at the time that was dealing with the challenges faced by protestantism. Before the council of trent, the catholic church was under scrutiny and this was mainly due to the ~~read~~ release of the '95 theses' by Martin Luther. The theses outlined the problem of the catholic church to the laity, who at the time was not very knowledgeable because many people at the time did not have access to education.

The catholic church was a 'paper house' and was not used to having its 'stronghold' as a society opposed but due to lutheranism and other forms of protestantism across Europe, protestantism was spreading fast and so Pope Paul III called the first meeting of the council. The first session outlined the doctrine, so this infamous people of the right and wrongs of being a catholic. This allowed any differentiation between protestantism and the catholic church to be highlighted and ~~showing~~ ^{showing} the public that protestantism is not correct. Protestantism used the different abuses that take place in the church as a way of convincing the public that the catholic church was not the ~~correct~~ correct.

(This page is for your first answer.)

way. However, in the 3rd meeting of the council. These abuses that took place such as nepotism and Absentism was tackled and also the teaching of the clergy was refreshed. Through tackling the problem of abuses taking place in the Church, the council challenged one of the problems met by protestism and after the third session had finished the pope came out looking better and was given the title 'Vicar of Christ on earth'. The council of Trent was not entirely successful ~~but~~ with dealing with the threat of protestism or the challenges that it faced. Some of the things that came out of the council of Trent remained suggestions and was not dealt with until many years later. Ignatius Loyola and the Jesuits had a perception of the success in tackling the threat of protestism. Where the Capuchins and the de Vries ordinary of ~~low~~ lowe was only able to tackle reforms in Italy, an area which wasn't really affected by protestism, the Jesuits ~~st~~ travelled across lands as far as England, teaching the laity about Christ, informing people about the good

(This page is for your first answer.)

of the catholic church and also the Jesuits would build Universities, hospitals and schools across different lands which allowed people to become closer to the catholic church and it deflected the challenges of protestism. Furthermore, ~~different councils~~ some countries ~~from~~ ~~enforced~~ had inquisitions and this enforced the power of the catholic church and the pope. Spain for example had an index of books you was not allowed to have or read. They ~~Spain~~ The inquisition struck fear into the ~~pro~~ protestants in Spain who would speak out against the catholic church and many people who was against the catholic church was tortured or executed with the public being able to view these events taking place. The inquisition, could be seen as more successful in dealing with the challenges faced by protestism ~~than~~ the Council of Trent because of the power it gave to the papacy and the catholic church. The council of Trent was not entirely successful also in ~~face~~ facing the challenges of protestism because they couldn't get the points made from the council into protestism strong areas such as Germany where protestism

(This page is for your first answer.) Was strong. The Council of Trent was successful in dealing with the challenges faced by Protestants but it was not entirely successful. Even though in the Council it outlined the Doctrine and dealt with the abuses in the Church, there was other ~~successes~~ successes in combating the challenges of protestantism, like the lead work of the Jesuits on the inquisition in Spain and also the Holy Roman Empire, although that was not as successful as Spain. The Council of Trent also failed in some aspects for example, they were unable to get the message from the sessions into protestant strongholds such as Germany.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer acknowledges the importance of some of the issues raised at Trent on doctrine and discipline. However, the focus on the question is lost as the candidate turns to other features of the Catholic revival such as the Jesuits. This is a mid Level 3 explanation overall.

Question 4

Some answers were a little uncertain of just how papal power was restored during the Counter-Reformation. Only a few noted that some reformers at Trent had failed in their attempts to assert the supremacy of a general council over the papacy. There was little specific material offered on the actions of Pius V and his successors, Gregory XIII and Sixtus V: reforms of the missal and breviary might have been usefully addressed. However, there was a good range of other relevant material offered. Most were able to discuss the significance of the Jesuits in both education and spiritual development, and the role of various European rulers in carrying out the Tridentine decrees was also considered. Some high level answers placed papal power into a broader context with brief reference to the contrasting Farnese and Carafa papacies.

Question 5

The revolt of the Netherlands has in the past produced some high quality work from many candidates, and this year was no exception. In considering the nature of Spanish misgovernment of the Netherlands, candidates noted a number of errors of judgement committed by Philip II, including his drift towards centralised power and his mistaken religious policies. The rule of Margaret of Parma was described, but candidates decided quite convincingly that Alba was directly responsible for the outbreak of the 1572 revolt. They deployed plenty of detailed information in support of their claim, ranging from the Council of Troubles, the Tenth Penny, and the execution of Egmont and Horn, which led to national protests throughout the Netherlands. The role and importance of both the Sea Beggars and William of Orange were also considered. Overall, the main discriminator in answers was the depth and development given to various factors.

Question 6

The range of material and quality of argument from many candidates was impressive. The best noted the importance of Maurice of Nassau as leader of the armed forces, and provided extensive detail on his reorganisation of the military. Good answers went beyond military affairs and considered the strong political leadership of Johan van Oldenbarnevelt which, coupled with the creation of the Dutch East India Company, was instrumental in providing Maurice with the funds necessary for successful campaigns. Set against these factors was growing Spanish economic and military weaknesses, both within Spain and in the Netherlands. These, coupled with Philip II and Philip III's distractions elsewhere, all combined to make the Spanish position ultimately untenable. Once again, the development of material was the chief discriminator between different answers.

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	<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 first answer.) To what extent was effective Dutch leadership responsible for the success of the Northern provinces in the years after the assassination of William the Silent in 1584?

~~To some extent the Dutch leadership was~~

~~Plan~~

~~- Duke of Parma retook Flanders - 1594 = Spanish Armada
 = English aid.
 over.~~

To some extent the Dutch leadership was ~~not~~ effective responsible for the success of the Northern provinces after William the Silent's death in 1584. For example, Maurice of Nassau, William the Silent's son, became Stadholder of Holland, Zealand, Utrecht and so on. Therefore, Maurice of Nassau had great leadership, especially with the Waarde Gelder System ^{in 1590s}. As a result, this ensured that every man in the ~~Netherlands~~ Northern provinces was trained as a soldier in case of any

(This page is for your first answer.) attacks from the South. Therefore, this was effective leadership for the Dutch, and it did involve success for the Northern provinces as it stopped the South from being able to re-take the North.

Additionally, the Dutch leadership was responsible for success. For example, the Dutch East India trading Company was set up ^{in 1602}. As a result, this was successful for the Dutch, and effective leadership from Maurice of Nassau because the Dutch managed to become one of the ~~the~~ most successful trading companies in Europe - overtaking England and Spain. Consequently, this brought nearly ~~to~~ three million Ducats into the Northern provinces, which would have succeeded economically! Therefore, Dutch leadership was responsible for success of the Northern provinces, as the extra money could be paid towards troops, and in support of the Dutch army.

However, it can be argued that it was not down to effective Dutch leadership. For example, in 1588, the Spanish Armada between England and Spain occurred, resulting in a cost of over 60 million Ducats by 1590! Therefore, it can be argued that Philip II sending his troops and money elsewhere provided an advantage for the Northern provinces.

(This page is for your first answer.) In addition, the Duke of Parma was ordered to hold back his offensives, in order for troops to be sent to fight the Spanish Armada. As a result, this would be successful for the Northern provinces because ~~it~~ it were less likely that the Duke of Parma would be able to re-take the Northern Provinces. Moreover, this shows how it was not just down to ~~the~~ effective leadership from the Dutch, but also down to ~~Spain's~~ Spain's finances and Philip choosing to concentrate on other warfairs. A historian argued that if Parma had control over the Spanish troops and finances, he might have been able to re-take the Northern Provinces.

Additionally, it was not just down to Dutch leadership as the Northern provinces had English and French aid. For example, in 1589, Elizabeth I provided a mercenary army ^{of 12,000} under the command of John Casimir. Therefore, this meant the Dutch increased their army, but also had support from the English. Furthermore, this shows how English aid helped bring about success for the Northern provinces. However, a historian has argued that if the ~~English~~ provided Elizabeth I provided an army earlier on, the Northern Provinces may have been able to re-take the whole of the Netherlands.

(This page is for your first answer.) Geographical explanations ~~was~~ contributed to the success for the Dutch/Northern Provinces, and not just the Dutch Leadership. For example, the river obstacles of Holland and Zealand meant that it was difficult for the Spanish to be able to attack the North. Moreover, fortifications were built along the river, therefore ~~being~~ being prepared ~~for~~ for defence if the ~~Spain~~ Spanish attack. Moreover, the Northern Provinces used the river to their advantage, by attacking the Spanish from the rivers. For example, in Brill, 1579, the Dutch army used weapons to fire from the rivers to the Spanish/Southern Provinces. Therefore, ~~this shows how~~ it as a result it was not just Dutch leadership that resulted ~~to~~ to success for the Northern Provinces, but geographical reasons ~~also~~ contributed as well.

In conclusion, to some extent Dutch leadership, after William the Silent's death in 1584, was effective as; Maurice of Nassau ~~was~~ exceeded ~~for~~ brilliant military skills - was one of the first ~~people~~ people to develop a structured military. Moreover, he was able to unite the Provinces - which William failed to achieve. However, the Spanish Armada resulting to Spanish bankruptcy in 1596, contributed to the Northern Provinces success. Moreover, geographical ~~to~~ factors were taken advantage of by the Northern Provinces such as; attacks from the rivers to the Spanish. Therefore,

(This page is for your first answer.) This shows how Dutch leadership was not the only factor which contributed to the success of the Northern Provinces.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

In this response there is a good amount of relevant discussion on the stated factor, and on the significance of the Dutch East India Company. The distraction of the Armada and its effect on Parma's attempts at reconquest are discussed, along with foreign intervention and the geography of the Netherlands. There is strong range and depth here: mid Level 5 overall.

Question 7

There was some confusion among candidates as to what constituted social conditions. Some built their answers purely on misogyny, while others referred to the 'age of anxiety' and crop conditions. On misogyny, a frequently made claim was that men believed that, since women could bring life into the world they could also destroy it. Others made the curious claim that men were amazed that women could turn raw food into cooked meals. It would be helpful if these assertions were supported by specific evidence which refers to time and place. More successful answers were able to link factors together to show how these impacted on social conditions. Social conditions which were created by famine, village rivalries and the population increase of the time were effectively pressed into use. A few answers were very generalised and without specific examples; these tended to refer to village gossip and the traditional stereotype of the witch, but to little effect. Some answers tried to argue from the specific to the general, but without success: it was not enough to assert that because one midwife was accused of killing children it therefore followed that the witchcraze was built on hatred of women. Some went out of the time frame in the question, sometimes effectively linking earlier developments with those in the period under discussion. The growing number of unmarried or widowed women was commented on, but only a few noted that the closure of nunneries removed a traditional haven for single women. In considering other factors, many mentioned the *Malleus Maleficarum*, but ascribed to it an importance that it perhaps does not deserve. The Wikipedia article on Kramer's work is a helpful investigation.

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	<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 first answer.)

To a certain extent social conditions were responsible for the persecution of witches in the years 1580-1650. For example the case of Ursula Götze in 1627, the Pendle witch trials in 1612 and the case of Ursula Kempe in 1682 all showing social conditions being responsible for witchcraft. However other factors also include the ^{Church} religious upheavals such as the reformation, the spread of literature like the Malleus and political motivation like the Bamberg trials 1628-1633. Arguably however religious upheavals had the most effect on the witchcraft.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Social conditions were a very important factor in being responsible for the persecution of witches. The case of Ursula Götze is a prime example. In 1627 she was accused of murdering 88 cattle in her community at a time of fear and tension due to the 30 Years War. Because society had become so overwhelmed with the witchcraze she was persecuted for the death of the cattle even though it was a time of frequent disease. As well as this was the pendle witch trials in 1612 which also show social conditions causing witch trials. A family feud between two stereotypical witches Doudike and Chatterox caused them to be accused of witchcraft as again communities really did believe in the witchcraze, just like with the case of Ursula Kense in 1682, accused of murdering a friends child again after falling

(This page is for your first answer.) ... out with a friend.
She was also a stereotypical witch as she was a wife woman but she was also persecuted. Even though these witches were executed due to social problems in these communities. The Götze and Penck trials especially show that burdens were on the community, for Götze's community the expenses and burdens of the 30 years war 1618-1648 and Penck under pressure to pay increased rent and stretch local resources under strain due to large population increase. This shows how social conditions during the time caused people to find scapegoats as a mean to persecute them for witchcraft to be able to cope with the social conditions and burdens of the time.

However although social conditions were a very important factor in the witchcraft

(This page is for your first answer.)

Also a predominant factor was the spread of literature. By 1620 the *Malleus Maleficarum* had been printed in 16 editions. It defined the stereotype in Europe. "She who thinks above thinks evil", defining witches as liars and reason why Gilly Duncan in 1690 was persecuted for defying male authority which would also suggest social problems. The *Malleus* was endorsed by the Papal Bull. If the Pope believed in witches so would everyone else just like with James' ~~the~~ 1597 "Demonologie" for every male witch these 20 female" again showing pressure from above and how mainly women were persecuted at a social level. This evidence shows the spread of literature played an important role in the persecution of witches.

(This page is for your first answer.)

but also harm
it was affected by the
Church and pressure from above.

Lastly, political motivations
were also an important
factor. The Bamberg trials
show how between 1623-1633
Prince Grotfried persecuted 500
witches to gain Carol and
power. The same happened in
1628 to Johannes Junius who
most probably persecuted due
to someone wanting his position
as Mayor or not to have him
as Mayor. Both of these trials
were during the 30 years
war. A war between Protestants
and Catholics. In Bamberg
the rulers of the Holy Roman
Empire were preoccupied with
war to deal with Grotfried
and Junius' community would
also have been affected
by war. ~~The Junius case~~
~~shows~~ This evidence shows

(This page is for your first answer.)

how political motivations also caused persecutions and not only social conditions but arguably these communities would also have been under strain.

It also shows how the Churches creation of conflict however ~~also caused~~ persecution had an effect on political motivations, showing how wide its impact was.

In Conclusion quite clearly social problems like the Persecution 1512 with trials were caused by social conditions. However the evidence would also suggest the spread of literature and its impact due to pressure from above ^{creating the stereotype} as well as political motivations like Bamberger did cause witch trials. However if it had

(This page is for your first answer.)

not been for the split in the Church and its role in literature like Eusebius Canon too clearly shown by its impact on other factors was the greatest reason for witchcraft persecution.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A secure range of factors is offered here, on social and religious problems, the importance of literature and of prevailing political conditions. Support is accurate though uneven in places, but good range allows for a mid Level 4 award.

Question 8

The two most prominent individuals mentioned were James VI/I and Matthew Hopkins. Most understood the intensity of persecution in Scotland, and ascribed the outbreak of the Scottish witchcraze to James' belief that witches tried to drown him at sea along with his new wife. Few noted the political dimension at work, especially attempts to incriminate Bothwell and remove his influence. Hopkins' campaign was well known, and most mentioned that he was able to operate only because of the breakdown in order caused by the civil war. The persecutions launched by Balthasar Nuss, Ferdinand of Bavaria and Christian IV were also well known. Many used the example of Queen Christina of Sweden as evidence of the power of individuals to prevent witch persecution. Other relevant factors were developed quite effectively, notably the changes to legal systems with the replacement of the accusatorial system with an inquisitorial one, and how the use of torture could lead to an individual to accuse others, and thus instigate a small witch hunt in one area.

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.)

The role of the individual undoubtedly played a key role in the witch trials across Europe. People such as Matthew Hopkins in the Essex trials and Nicholas Remy in France all show that individuals were extremely influential in witch accusations across this period. However they were not the only reason, and ~~Leacock's idea of weak government~~ ~~Leacock's~~ ~~idea of~~ ~~weak government~~ ~~being~~ the main protagonist in this, and Trevor Roper's idea of religion all show more convincing reasons to the witch craze across Europe.

There is without question that the ^{role of an} individual in regions of Europe most certainly had an effect. For example Matthew Hopkins was responsible for the Essex ^{trials} and saw the accusation of near hundreds of witches, ~~over~~ ^{over} 90%.

(This page is for your first answer.) of which were found to be women. In addition ~~the~~ Hopkins position at the time left him powerful, with the English Civil War in 1642 - 1647 giving him a chance to exploit this power vacuum, and do as he pleased. This ~~shows~~ also backs up Leach's theory of weak government and shows the actions could be down to the lack of authority. ~~However~~ in comparison ~~the~~ King Christian IV of Denmark ~~shows~~ ~~weak~~ ~~government~~ ~~wasn't~~ ~~the~~ ~~reason~~, was responsible for many deaths. His role as a King allowed him to burn people alive and with the Maurean speed case shows this key individual certainly contributed to the witch trials.

However from ~~then~~ the Denmark trials we can see a clear link ~~etc~~ of government and 'power from above' being the reason to allow such actions. For example the Essen trials taking place during the English Civil War shows a more convincing reason and without this Hopkins wouldn't be able to use his 'interrogation' methods and exploit the courts in the way he did. More so in Denmark with the prominent leader of the trials being the King at the time shows that his authority ~~is~~ may be

(This page is for your first answer.) the only reason he was able to make such actions. Also the 30 years just ending at the time Christian was in power could show that the government was stronger than ever and had a firm grasp on the events which took place, once again showing Lewacks ~~argument~~ theory to be ~~impo~~ important in helping key individuals in their actions during this time.

However Trevor Ropers theory that religion played the more important role ^{and} is undoubtedly the more convincing one. For example in Trier Schoenbourg, a key individual in the witch trials, was a Jesuit. This shows that religion certainly influenced him and what he did. It could be said his strong catholic ~~&~~ views ~~was~~ ~~the~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~reason~~ so intensified his actions showing religion was more influential. Also Hopkins, a ~~peniter~~ puritan, again highlights the ~~st~~ fact that religion is responsible for the actions of key individuals. ~~La~~ ~~conatus~~

In conclusion I feel B individuals did play a part in the witch trials across Europe. B People such as James IV VI introducing his

(This page is for your first answer.) book 'demonology' had an impact on individuals' actions.* However it is more convincing that religion played the more important role. Even though the civil war in 1642 opened up a power vacuum for Hopkins, religion still plays the core role as the war was ignited from a religious dispute between Catholics and Protestants. This is seen with the 30 years war showing that without religion being the driving force behind such events, individuals wouldn't have been able to take the actions - they did, and still have the same impact.

* such as Remy in France.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The prominent individuals discussed are Matthew Hopkins and Christian IV; and one other factor, the role of religion, is addressed. While there is some understanding of key issues here, the answer is narrow in its range of factors, though material support is accurate and relevant. Mid Level 4.

Question 9

Many answers focused exclusively on Mountjoy's leadership, but were often unable to develop their answer beyond brief references to Essex and the siege of Kinsale. Better answers noted that Mountjoy carried out a successful scorched earth policy in Ulster which provoked a famine and the consequent weakening of Tyrone's forces. Some strong answers referred to the Spanish invasion, noting that Tyrone's forces were forced to leave their familiar territory in the north, only to be overwhelmed by Mountjoy's fierce and successful campaign. Other relevant factors which were frequently mentioned include the division of the Irish nobility, with the native lords in the countryside favouring Tyrone against the old nobility in the towns and cities. In the end, as many answers noted, Elizabeth's determination to crush the Irish rebellion was successful simply because the English had the men and the money to determine a favourable outcome.

Question 10

Some answers described the outbreak of the Confederate War, but then omitted the intervening years to describe the intervention of Cromwell after the end of the English Civil War. Such answers were only modestly successful. Better answers were able to range over the whole chronology, noting that Charles I's difficulties in England prevented a rapid defeat of the Irish rebellions: the role of Ormond was generally well understood here. Some of the best answers displayed impressive range and depth of material. These candidates noted that it was the deep bitterness felt towards English rule which fuelled the rapid spread of rebellion throughout Ireland, and that both the plantations policy and the religious divide played a prominent role throughout the course of the rebellions. Most noted the significance of the formation of the Confederation of Kilkenny, and of papal intervention through the person of Rinuccini, who supplied the Confederates with money and arms. While many answers accessed Level 4, only a few went beyond this: most provided a number of relevant factors, but did not make effective links between them, which is a feature of many Level 5 answers.

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	<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 first answer.) There are many reasons why it took England so long to defeat the Irish rebellions of 1641 - 1653.

During 1641, there was a major rebellion which led to many protestants being killed. This was due to the fact that the Catholics in Ireland were angry at the fact of the plantations policy in 1608. This meant that the amount of Protestants were significantly reduced. 4000 Protestants were killed by the Catholics and 8000 died of famine, disease and exposure.*

During the course of the rebellions there was a Civil War going on in England against the king and Parliament. This meant that it was very hard for England to devote all their troops to Ireland as they needed their troops

(This page is for your first answer.) to be fighting for England.

This caused strain on England as they didn't have enough money to be able to train up new soldiers to help defeat the rebellions in Ireland. Also with the Civil War in England and the Irish rebellions in Ireland it was a drain on English resources.

~~As there was a civil war in England, Wentworth had to return to England.~~

During the rebellions, Charles I sent out a representative to Dublin, Ormond, to help keep an eye and take control in Ireland.

Ormond had a hard challenge as many groups like the Irish Confederates and the Scottish covenentors were against Ormond at some points. In 1648 Ormond created his Second Ormond Peace Treaty, which was to try and get as much support for Charles and defeat the rebellion. However the Peace Treaty was made too late and Charles was executed on Tower Hill in the later part of 1648.

In 1641/42 the Irish set up its own Government. This meant it was hard for the English to

(This page is for your first answer.) to take full control as the Irish had much more support and the Irish had enforced Laws.

Rinuccini was sent on behalf of the Pope to help the Catholics ~~get~~ defeat the English. He had always opposed the Protestants in England and tried to take over Dublin from Ormond. However Ormond gave Dublin to the Parliament in England, so it wouldn't be handed on a plate to Rinuccini.

* However, in 1650 Cromwell got revenge on the Catholics and killed many Catholics and Protestants at Wexford and Drogheda in the September and October. This may have been seen as a way to suppress the rebellions, but Cromwell killed hundreds of Protestants as well.*

The reasons why it took the English so long to defeat the rebellions in Ireland from 1641-53 was because everytime the English tried to suppress the rebellions the Irish came back with another tactic. The fact that England had a poor leader in Ormond and not getting enough support in time ^{for Charles} can be seen as the main

(This page is for your first answer.) factor, for which it took England a long time to defeat the rebellions. However the other factors like the civil war in England and Rinuccini being sent held the English back by not having enough troops and Rinuccini being sent by the Pope to help the Catholics in Ireland.

Overall the major factor why it took the English so long to defeat the Irish rebellions of 1641-53 was because Ormond did not get enough support in time and Charles was then executed.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer includes material on a number of relevant points, and does range over the whole chronology. However, the shape of the answer is essentially narrative rather than explanatory, and there is a lack of depth in several places. Descriptive with some implied relevance: mid Level 3.

Question 11

The best answers started with a sharp focus on the Bohemian revolt of 1618, and noted that it had a double significance. The offer of the Bohemian crown to the Protestant Frederick V gave a religious dimension to the war, while many states were worried that the accession in Bohemia of the Emperor Ferdinand II would lead to an unwanted expansion of Habsburg power. This linking of two discrete factors was often developed very effectively. Some candidates promoted the idea that the Thirty Years War was essentially a religious conflict, noting that the Religious Peace of Augsburg of 1555 was beginning to break down with the growth and expansion of Calvinism. Others noted the growing challenges to Habsburg power evidenced in the War of the Julich succession: the expansion of Habsburg power in north-western Germany threatened the interests of the princes, as well as France and the Netherlands. The formation of the religious leagues of princes also had a double significance for some. Set against these strong answers were others who missed the point of the question. Many decided that Habsburg power triggered the war, but then went on to describe how the nature of the war changed in the 1620s and 1630s with the intervention of Denmark, France and Sweden: the material offered, though usually correct, was not relevant to the question.

Question 12

Some answers went off focus with a lengthy discussion of the gains made by other states, notably Brandenburg and Sweden. However, many answers proved highly successful. These compared the apparently modest territorial gains made by France in Alsace and Lorraine with her success in restoring a sense of balance to the European state system, and the ending of Habsburg encirclement exemplified by the defeat of Spain in the 1650s and the Peace of the Pyrenees in 1659. There was some excellent discussion of the effects of the war on the Habsburgs. Some noted that the Spanish branch of the family suffered extensive losses and defeats which weakened Spanish power considerably. For the main branch of the family, the German Habsburgs, the picture was mixed. Candidates noted that the effective ending of Imperial power in Germany was a blessing in disguise. It meant that the Habsburgs fell back to their core territories, and this contributed to the growth of Austrian Habsburg power in the eighteenth 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:

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: Intro - France gained, but little

Habsburgs lost, but gained a bit.

Para 1 - France gained, but not enough, social issues.

Para 2 - Habsburgs lost a lot, ~~Empire~~ Emperor.

Para 3 - Habsburgs strengthened themselves, still big power

Conclusion - France gained a little land, but social problems

Habsburgs lost quite a bit, but solidified position.

→ France = in stronger position after 30 yew.

(This page is for your second answer.)

While some may argue that neither France or the Habsburgs gained from their participation in the Thirty Years war, this statement is simply incorrect. It is true that the French gained relatively little land by the Peace of Westphalia when you take into account the amount of resources they poured into the war, & that the Habsburgs lost all powers as Emperor. However, the French were in a stronger position at the end of the war than they were at the beginning, having ended the threat of Habsburg encirclement, & they were still on the ~~ascent~~ rise. The Habsburgs too, while seemingly losing everything, actually ~~strengthened~~ strengthened their position as hereditary rulers of Austria, to such an extent that they were still the dominant force in the area for the best part of a century after the end of the war. Therefore, you cannot say that neither France or the Habsburgs gained anything from the war; the both ~~lost~~ gained and lost, but France certainly ended up stronger after the war.

The ~~peo~~ Peace of Westphalia may seem like little reward for a lot of effort for France. They had poured huge amounts of resources into the war. Before getting ~~not~~ militarily involved, they had essentially funded the Swedish war effort in 1631-32, with a massive subsidy of 400,000 rixdaler, & they kept funding the Swedish-founded Protestant League of Heilbronn.

(This page is for your second answer.) France also became heavily involved after 1635, sending armies into the Holy Roman Empire and fighting extensively from right up until the end of the war. And their rewards for this considerable amount of efforts were a couple of Bishoprics and a portion of Alsace, hardly a fitting reward. Furthermore, the war caused quite considerable social & economic problems for France. The French people ~~too~~ were forced to pay quite severe tax to fund the war effort, eventually leading to great discontent, eventually culminating in 1647 with a rebellion, called 'Le Fronde'.

However, France had achieved his primary aim for the war; to stop encirclement by the Spanish & Austrian Habsburgs and distract the Spanish from a possible invasion of France through the Spanish Netherlands. After the war ended, France's star was certainly on the rise, while the Spanish were waning a bit. The territorial gains France made coupled with confirmed independence for the United Provinces stopped the threat of encirclement, & France's victories over Spain in a few wars after the Peace of Westphalia made them the premier power in Europe.

On one level, the Habsburgs did really quite badly out of the Peace of Westphalia. The Spanish Habsburgs, certainly, made only a small territorial gain, which must be considered as a loss for them as they had poured quite possibly the most into the war, having sent thousands of

(This page is for your second answer.) men, millions of florins and being involved right from the start of the war. More importantly, the longstanding alliance between Austrian & Spanish Habsburgs came to an end when the Emperor, Ferdinand III signed a separate peace treaty, effectively in 1648, effectively leaving his Spanish cousins to fend for themselves. This weakened the Habsburg cause overall. The Emperor himself lost almost all power, as with the right to make treaties with foreign powers, the German Princes achieved independence, & the title of Emperor was pretty next to useless.

However, in the hereditary Austrian Habsburg domains like Austria & Moravia, Habsburg authority increased enormously. The Habsburgs lost almost none of their own lands during the war, & Ferdinand III now really stamped his authority over these areas after the Peace of Westphalia. The Peace of Westphalia was by no means the end of Habsburg power. As kings of Austria the Habsburgs would go on to dominate central Europe for the best part of a century until the rise of Brandenburg-Prussia.

In conclusion, while superficially it may seem like neither France nor the Habsburgs gained from the Thirty Years War, as a general statement, this is incorrect. France did gain relatively small territorial gains in regards to the amount he poured into the war, but their aim of stopping

(This page is for your second answer.) Habsburg encirclement had been achieved & France's power was on the rise. While the connection between Spanish & Austrian Habsburgs was lost, & their powers ^{as} Emperor were almost non-existent, Habsburg dominance over their own lands was reinforced. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to say in the short term, France may have been unsatisfied, but it did gain from the war, & while the Habsburgs were overall weakened by the war, they were actually strengthened in their hereditary lands, and gained in that way.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer directly addresses the question, and has a good understanding of the key issues involved. The candidate notes the intangible gains made by France which made her the leading power in Europe, and the variable outcome of the war for the two branches of the Habsburg family. A range of appropriately selected material is deployed, and the broad balance overall makes for a low Level 5 award.

Question 13

Many answers remained within Level 3. This was because candidates were either unable to support their points about power and money with clear and specific evidence, or because answers went beyond the settlement itself to describe features of the later part of Charles' reign. Better answers noted that the financial settlement was a modest one, and that the expected revenue from excise duties rarely materialised. Candidates were able to link this point to Charles' frequent demands for parliamentary subsidies, which caused conflict for much of his reign. Answers also noted that, although in theory royal power was quite broad, there was insufficient clarity about the separation of powers, and this was linked to Charles' drift towards absolutism later in the reign. Few noticed the promises made in the Declaration of Breda, or that religious differences clouded the whole of the 1660s.

Question 14

The question required a focus on the years 1678-85, and most answers were restricted to this time frame. However, the course of events in these years was sometimes confused, especially on the number of parliamentary sessions and the frequency of the exclusion bills. The harnessing of Monmouth to the Whig cause was not always accurately explained. Some candidates were content to provide a narrative of varying quality covering the given period, but others did attempt an explanation, usually focused on the weaknesses and mistakes made by Shaftesbury and the Whigs. Only a few noted that, during the years in question, Charles displayed significant political skills, which few realised he possessed, in outmanoeuvring his opponents.

Paper Summary

Centres might consider the following ways in which future performance might be improved.

- Candidates must answer the question set, not the one they were hoping for.
- The whole chronological range given in the question should be covered.
- Candidates should be familiar with, and comfortable with, historical words and phrases appropriate to the course of study.
- Candidates should study the factors relevant to an aspect of their course as a set rather than as a number of disconnected factors; and their relative importance could be weighed up accordingly.

Grade Boundaries

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

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

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US032392 June 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

