



Pearson

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel AS Level

In History (8HI0) Paper 2B

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2017

Publications Code 8HI0_2B_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

PE Report 8H10 2B June 2017

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

In general, candidates found Section A, the compulsory two-part source question, less challenging than last year. Fewer were not clear on what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' and this enabled more to analyse and evaluate the sources (AO2). In addition, the detailed knowledge that is required to add contextual material to support and/or challenge points derived from the sources was more focused this year. There were also fewer generic comments on the provenance of the sources and more which, taking their nature, origin and purpose into consideration, were able more effectively to evaluate the use of the sources to the enquiry in each question.

Section B, the section in which candidates were given a choice of three essays in order to assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1), still tended to be done better. There remained few wholly descriptive answers with most candidates attempting to engage analytically with the demands of the questions. The majority of answers were soundly structured and clearly expressed. They also made some effort to come to a judgement. Lack of detailed knowledge of the material is still an issue for some as is a tendency not to engage fully enough with the specific focus of the question. Also, there appeared this year to be a significant number of answers which lacked balance in their response to the questions – candidates are reminded that, at this level, there is a requirement that the stated factor in essay questions is balanced by some development of a counter-case but in some answers, this was entirely absent.

Question 1 (a)

Most candidates were able to identify from the source the papal condemnation of Luther, his writings and supporters and many used their own knowledge to place this in the context of Leo X's failure to respond adequately to the Lutheran challenge since 1517. There were some very good responses which were able to infer the worry in Leo's tone, hence his need to offer rewards to capture Luther, and link this to the support Luther was getting from Frederick the Wise. Weaker responses, though aware of the historical context of the source, often paraphrased its content or were drawn into descriptions of Luther's challenge without reference to the source itself or the enquiry.

Question 1 (b)

There were some very good responses to this question which convincingly placed the source in the context of the evolution of Luther's ideas on justification by faith alone and so were able to come to a valid judgement about its weight to the enquiry. So, for example, many pointed out that, despite the dramatic tone of the source as Luther describes suddenly happening upon the true meaning of

St Paul's words, justification by faith was more likely to have been developed gradually both before and after the Tower Experience, in Luther's debates with Eck for example. Many pointed out that this source was written many years after but the best answers placed this in the context of Luther's age and infirmity or pointed out that, having perhaps lost the leadership of the Reformation, this may have been an attempt to restore his primacy. However, among weaker candidates and even among those who knew the historical context well, there was a tendency not to consider fully the content of the source – candidates are reminded of the need to make valid inferences from the source material which can be supported and developed in order to reach the higher levels.

Question 2 (a)

Most candidates were able to identify this source as hostile to Spanish rule and used their own knowledge to develop this with reference for example, to the rule of Alva and the Spanish Fury. Stronger candidates tended to have more detailed understanding of the Pacification of Ghent and were able to place the criticisms in the source in the context of Orange's revolt and his attempts to create a unified response among the Dutch provinces. Weaker answers tended to develop only lightly the content of the source without attempting to analyse its value and a significant number clearly had no knowledge of the Pacification of Ghent. Candidates are reminded that, having been named in the specification, questions may be targeted at this document.

Question 2 (b)

Good answers to this question clearly identified Titelman's role as an Inquisitor as a factor in assessing the weight of this source, many arguing that he may be exaggerating the threat of Calvinism to elicit firmer action from Margaret of Parma. They were also able to infer from the source's content the growing strength and confidence of some Calvinists in the early 1560s and develop this with their knowledge of the Huguenot influx or the growth of hedge-preaching. Weaker candidates tended to take the source at face value and/or failed to use its evidence, an armed presence in the churchyard during Mass, to draw conclusions about the growth of Calvinism. There was also a tendency to write quite a lot about the details of the Iconoclastic Fury which was not the focus of this question.

Question 3

This were a large number of answers to this question but not all were sufficiently familiar with anti-clericalism and its causes. Good answers were able to identify religious causes, such as the behaviour of the papacy, the abuses of the clergy and humanist criticism of many Church teachings. They were able to balance these with consideration of economic causes, for example the financial demands of the church at a time of rising poverty for many, and the political, perhaps the absence of strong centralised leadership in the Empire which allowed the church's demands to go unchallenged. Weaker answers however, touched lightly

on the political and the economic causes of anti-clericalism and some were unfamiliar with the meaning of anti-clericalism, equating it with Lutheranism.

Question 4

This was a very popular question which elicited some excellent responses. Candidates were generally well prepared to evidence reasons for Luther's declining influence, his condemnation of the Peasant's Revolt, confinement to Saxony by his Imperial Ban and his questionable involvement in the Philip of Hesse bigamy scandal for example. Most were also able to balance this with a consideration of the continued importance of his writings and his influence over Melancthon and others, notably over the negotiations at Augsburg and Regensburg perhaps. There were some very good answers which made nuanced judgements about the links between these factors and the pace, as well as the scale, of the decline of Luther's influence. Conversely, a number of answers were unable to balance evidence of the decline of Luther's influence with any evidence of its endurance.

Question 5

Many answers to this question were unable to evidence the significance of Charles's victory in the Schmalkaldic War beyond asserting the importance of the victory at Muhlberg. Even though many of these responses went on to analyse effectively the reasons for Charles' failure to defeat Lutheranism, a failure to consider sufficiently the stated factor in the question is unlikely to allow answers to reach the higher marks. The best answers knew the significance of Charles' victory in destroying the Schmalkaldic League, capturing the likes of Philip of Hesse and being able to impose the Augsburg Interim. They were also able to analyse the reasons why this victory fell apart so quickly due to his demands over the Imperial League perhaps, or the imperial succession, and were able to place these in the context of more general reasons for Charles' failure, his absences abroad during crucial periods for example.

Question 6

The better answers to this question were able to discuss in some detail the ways in which the activities of the nobility destabilised the government of Margaret of Parma during the 1560s. They were able to evidence the aims and tactics of the grandees like Orange, Egmont and Hoorn and the role of the nobility generally in rallying support in defence of the traditional liberties of Dutch government as part of this analysis. They then went on to look at alternatives, the inexperience of Margaret, the intransigence of Philip II and/or the growth and aggression of Calvinism in the period for example. Weaker answers lacked the knowledge, particularly of the stated factor, to come to a convincing conclusion and there was some lack of precision with regard to the dates in the question, several answers referencing Alva or the Sea Beggars.

Question 7

There were several very good responses to this question which confidently analysed the contribution of the Sea Beggars to Dutch opposition in this period, referencing their disruption of Spanish trade and communications for example or the way in which their capture of Brill and Flushing contributed to the success of Orange's second invasion. Some also discussed the demerits of the Beggars' contribution, their reputation for piracy for example, before looking at how Alva's rule also contributed to Dutch resistance. Weaker answers knew relatively little of the Sea Beggars and were more comfortable detailing the Council of Troubles and Tenth Penny - this lack of balance cost them marks.

Question 8

Though the least popular essay question, answers to this question tended to be well done. Good responses were confident in their knowledge of Oldenbarnevelt's contribution to Dutch independence in 1609, and balanced this with a range of alternative factors, for example scale of the Spanish decline or the growing economic strength of the United Provinces, before coming to a judgement. Weaker candidates tended to have little detailed knowledge of Oldenbarnevelt and hurried off to discuss other factors, especially the military contribution of Maurice of Nassau. While still relevant, they did not, as a result, meet fully the conceptual focus of the question.

Exemplars

Exemplar 1

This top L3 answer demonstrates understanding of the source material and adds some contextual knowledge in support of the inferences it draws. It provides reasoning for its assertion of value to the enquiry.

(This is for part (a)) The source is a directly issued document from Leo X, the Pope himself, and so for a historian's enquiry into the reaction of the Papacy, it provides a direct link to the highest authority of the Church. This suggests that Luther's challenge by 1520 was sufficient to be directly addressed by the Papacy, therefore giving value through the source's origin.

The severity of the nature of the Papal Bull also ~~shows~~ provides a historian with evidence surrounding the scale of the Papacy's response. The source highlights Luther as a "wild animal" and actively seeks to "condemn" Luther alongside his followers. This shows a historian that Luther's actions by this point had been identified as heresy, which ~~was~~ in 1519, Eck had previously claimed they were during the Leipzig debates. This is valuable to a historian in terms of

(This is for part (a))

analysing the stance of the Papacy, which by this point was clearly more combative than reformative.

The source also demonstrates that the Papacy recognised the ~~threat~~ threat of Lutheranism lay heavily in his writings. By this point, around ~~9000~~ 300 000 Lutheran documents were in circulation. The source's intention as a document to be ~~read~~ 'circulated' and read throughout Germany' shows the Papacy's clear attempt to tackle Lutheran domination of popular writings. ~~It~~ It actively "forbids" Christian population from being able to "read, praise or print the writings" of Luther, and so has value in terms of analysing the threat felt by the Papacy and the attempt to respond through popular methodology.

Exemplar 2

This answer shows some analysis of the source material by making valid inferences and supporting these with relevant and accurate knowledge. It is strong in its consideration of the limitations of the source to the enquiry, again using knowledge of the context to weigh the evidence and suggesting why it may and may not be useful to the enquiry. It was given a L4 mark though it would have benefitted from closer attention to the detail of the source content.

(This is for part (b)) Source 2 describes Luther's supposed revelation towards his then core belief in 'sola fide', or faith alone. It describes happening on this belief through the writings of St Paul, who Luther frequently looked to as justification and describes Luther's personal struggle with God. However, the source also ignores the development of this idea through the Leipzig debates and makes no reference to the indulgence scandal ~~which~~ ^{which} originally triggered Luther's 95 theses.

Within the source, Luther describes coming to the belief of sola fide through the words of St Paul: 'the just shall live by faith'. Later, when translating the Bible into German, there is controversy surrounding the passage where Luther adds the German equivalent of the word 'sola' to provide justification for his belief. He defends this action by stating that he felt within him 'the presence

(This is for part (b)) of St Paul' to develop this belief. This provides the source with weight in terms of analysing Luther's strong connection to the writings of St Paul, and how this might have influenced sola fide.

However, the source makes no reference to either the Leipzig debates of 1519 or the indulgence scandal prior to that. Both of these factors can be suggested to be the real cause of Luther's development of sola fide. Eck in 1519 pushed Luther into minimising the authority of the Papacy and its stance on 'good works.' Luther's responses to Eck in this debate are often viewed as the beginnings of sola fide and sola scriptura. Additionally, it can be suggested that Luther's development into the justification for sola fide began before or surrounding the sale of indulgences which sparked the 95 theses.

Indulgences actively contradict sola fide by suggesting the afterlife can be changed through wealth

(This is for part (b)) and not faith, a fact which Luther criticized. The absence of either factor within the source therefore minimises its weight.

The source can also be seen as flawed in nature as it is a retrospective account from Luther. Luther's ~~own~~ autobiographical work has been proven to be romanticised and ~~not~~ heavily rhetorical in nature. For example, his emphasis on his upbringing as one of poverty and low status can be disproved as his family in actual fact, were fairly wealthy, particularly through his mother's side. This also reduces the weight of the source, as Luther's personal writings aim more to be persuasive than truthful.

Because of this, the source lacks weight for a historian looking into the development of sola fide, as Luther's writings are largely rhetorical and do not emphasize real events such as Leipzig or the

(This is for part (b)) *sale of indulgences.*

Exemplar 3

This L2 answer makes some inferences from the source material and supports them by considering why they add value to the enquiry. However, there is some inaccuracy also and contextual knowledge is slight and could have been used more effectively to support the inferences made.

(This is for part (a)) The source clearly shows a sense of hostility felt by the Nethalanders towards the Spanish reign within the Netherlands and the Spanish soldiers tyrannical behaviour throughout. The source shows the clear resentment towards Spanish rule through "in order to take measures against these evils." This is further enhanced by "to prevent further troubles" and "disturbances committed by the Spainiards". This allows us to see that the Spanish governoiship and the troops themselves have plagued the ~~Neth~~ Dutch people by oppression and aggression. This makes the source valuable because it allows the historian to see that the Pacification of Ghent created no permanent resolution.

The nature of the source shows the clear vehemence between the Dutch and Spanish, and helps to illustrate the anger felt. The source originates from the Pacification of Ghent in 1576, and clearly describes that "the proposals came to nothing. Furthermore, the source shows that the Dutch people wish for their "old priviliges, custans

(This is for part (a)) and freedoms." This shows that the local laws (privileges) of the Grandees have been undermined by the Spanish governorship. The purpose of the source shows a clear need to try and make a compromise between the Dutch in order to get the Spanish troops out of the Netherlands. Therefore, the source can be valuable to a historian because it shows the unity of the Dutch in order to get rid of the Spanish.

Finally, from the source we are able to learn that the Netherlanders wanted to negotiate peace with the Spanish. It describes "the States of Holland and Zeeland met at Breda and put forward measures by which peace could be furthered. Furthermore, the source describes the Spaniards as "continuing every day to oppress and ruin the subjects." This allows us to understand the severity of the situation as the 'Spanish Fury' which took place in 1576, led to many key provinces such as Antwerp being looted and sacked. The source is therefore valuable because it highlights the problems caused by the Spanish troops in the Netherlands.

Exemplar 4

This answer demonstrates some understanding of the source material by making undeveloped inferences but focus on the enquiry is sometimes lacking and knowledge of the historical context is weak. There is some consideration of the authorship of the source but this is not effectively applied in considering the weight of the source to the enquiry. It is an example of a L2 answer.

(This is for part (b)) It can be argued that source 4 is rather reliable in presenting the growth of Calvinism in the Netherlands, as it offers the view point of the spread of Calvinism in the Southern Provinces. The source shows the clear worry as it describes Calvinism as "scandalous behaviour." Furthermore the source describes Calvinism as "attacking the Church, the Pope's authority." This helps to show that Calvinism which is extreme Protestantism is "attacking" the Catholic way of life. Therefore, the source can be valued because it shows the growing conflict between both the Calvinists and the Catholics.

The nature of the source shows the clear worry for the spread of Calvinism in the "southern provinces" which had previously been allied with the Catholic Spain. The source originates from a letter written to Margaret of Parma who was Regent (ruler) of the Netherlands at the time, the source describes "to advise your majesty to act" and further states that "normal methods for maintaining law and order are inadequate. Therefore, we can argue that the source shows a clear indication of the ever growing conflict between

(This is for part (b)) It can be argued that source 4 is rather reliable in presenting the growth of Calvinism in the Netherlands, as it offers the view point of the spread of Calvinism in the Southern Provinces. The source shows the clear worry as it describes Calvinism as "scandalous behaviour." Furthermore the source describes Calvinism as "attacking the Church, the Pope's authority." This helps to show that Calvinism which is extreme Protestantism is "attacking" the Catholic way of life. Therefore, the source can be valued because it shows the growing conflict between both the Calvinists and the Catholics.

The nature of the source shows the clear worry for the spread of Calvinism in the "southern provinces" which had previously been allied with the Catholic Spain. The source originates from a letter written to Margaret of Parma who was Regent (ruler) of the Netherlands at the time, the source describes "to advise your majesty to act" and further states that "normal methods for maintaining law and order are inadequate. Therefore, we can argue that the source shows a clear indication of the ever growing conflict between

(This is for part (b)) the Calvinists and the Catholics. The purpose of the source being written shows a clear warning to Margaret of Parma that the spread of Calvinism poses a serious threat to the Catholic doctrine. This shows the reliability of the source because it warns of the consequences.

Finally, from the source we are able to learn that Pieter ~~Tibbe~~ Titelmans, the inquisitor believes that the Calvinists are unruly and troublesome people. He describes "to protect the preacher some of the crowd carried rusty swords, clubs." He further describes that the "poor, simple folk have been misled." This shows that the source tries to paint a picture of the Calvinists being wicked heretics. In 1566, Calvinists partook in the "iconoclastic fury" which involved the destruction of Catholic relics. However, we can argue that the source may not be so reliable, as it was written by a Catholic who did not want Calvinism to grow.

Overall, the source has value because it allows us to see the growing conflict between the Catholics over the spread of Calvinism. Although, it could be biased as it was written by an inquisitor

(This is for part (b)) who believed that anyone who did not follow the Catholic faith was a heretic.

Exemplar 5

This essay provides some evidence of religious, economic and political causes of anti-clericalism during the early sixteenth century but focus on the question is often implicit and it does not clearly establish criteria in coming to a judgement. It was given a low L3 mark.

The issue of whether the spread of anti-clericalism in the early sixteenth century in Germany owed as much to political and economic factors is widely debated by historians but ultimately it's clear that the main cause of ~~the~~ the spread of anti-clericalism was economic factors, and it was not only religious factors which played a part in it.

There were several religious factors present on the eve of the reformation which helped to spread anti-clericalism.

One of these was papal corruption, several popes were highly corrupt, for example Pope Leo X used indulgences to manipulate the laity into funding the rebuilding of St Peter's Basilica from 1517 with the promise of redemption and salvation no matter the sum, through the use of indulgence seller Johann Tetzel whom he hired in 1516. Another example of papal corruption was Alexander VI, he broke his vow of celibacy and fathered 7 children, two of which became famous as ruthless murderers, and Alexander himself was also accused of murder. Other religious factors

For anticlericalism involved the bishops. The bishops frequently practised pluralism which meant they held more than one clerical position, as a result they were frequently away from their local parishes leaving the local laity with no access to them and through them God. A majority of bishops were also prince bishops who prioritised their wealth over their religious duties. Along with pluralism, simony, which is the buying of clerical positions and nepotism ~~this frequent~~ were frequent occurrences with nepotism resulting in a young boy becoming a bishop at only 7 years old in order to ensure that clerical positions could remain within the family, despite their putting the religious satisfaction of the laity at ~~peace~~ risk. However, churches still received mass attendance which suggests that religious factors ~~could not be the~~ could not have been the only reason for the spread of anticlericalism.

The most significant factors were economic. In the early sixteenth century towns began to grow with people moving from the countryside with some of the largest towns being Danzig and Hamburg. Some of these towns were also more

out of the control of the sovereign Charles V than
others. Each town also had its own market
for trade and this was a very easy way for news
of anto clericalism to spread. There were also
many economic problems. The growth of
towns had led to the increase in the price
of commodities such as food and shelter
however the wages remained the same, there
was also the vast amount of unemployment
as there were too many people, and too few
jobs. Not only were the laity already in poverty,
the church demanded money from them in the
name of good works and salvation. This angered
the laity and caused the spread of anto clericalism.
A final economic factor was the invention
of the portable printing press in the 15th century,
this meant that printing books was cheaper
and meant more were available allowing the
spread of anto clericalism.

Finally, political factors were also present. The
Holy Roman empire was made up of over
380 semi-autonomous states which meant that
Charles V was unable to control the spread of anto clericalism
in every state. He was also distracted by other
things in particular his war with the Ottomans and

France and his crowns as the king of Spain. This meant that he was unable to recognise the spread of anto clericalism until it was already too late to stop it. Upon being elected as Holy Roman emperor Charles had also signed the electoral capitulation of 1519, in doing this he had given up much of his power, this gave the princes more power and allowed those who supported Luther and the spread of anto clerical ideas such as Frederick the Wise, and John the Steadfast and Philip of Hesse to use their power to help spread anto clerical ideas.*

In conclusion, although religious factors such as papal corruption did help to spread anto clericalism, economic factors were far more significant and political factors were also present.

* Pope Leo X also helped the spread of anto clericalism as he did not consider Lutheranism to be a serious threat. This was due to the existing political rivalry between the Dominican and Augustinian monks. This led to the pope not sufficiently dealing with Luther until he issued the Bull of excommunication in June 1520 and by that point Luther's anto clerical ideas had

already spread and had gained widespread support.

Exemplar 6

This answer identifies a range of relevant issues relevant to the question and a particular strength is its ability to make links between these in constructing its analysis. It clearly establishes criteria for judgement and throughout, its argument is clear, coherent and consistent. It was awarded a top L4 mark.

PLAN: ✓ - Restricted movement: Melancthon

✓ - Decrease in popularity: Peasants' War, Philip of Hesse, Zwingli

x - Peasants war also gained ideas → Albert, Philip

x - Further clarification of Luther's ideas

From 1525, Luther was established as an iconic figure, known across Western Europe and had amassed thousands of followers from his very first move against the Catholic Church in 1517. The Peasants' War of 1525 helped Luther gain more followers in his reaction to it, particularly among the higher orders, and further clarified his ideas as Luther released and published more pamphlets, publicising Lutheranism. However, by 1546, whilst Lutheranism had grown steadily over the years, the influence of Luther himself became much more redundant as his supporters and followers began to take on bigger roles, notably Melancthon.

The 1521 Edict of Worms had vastly restricted Luther's movement across the country, thus leading to a decline in his influence. Luther began to increasingly rely on others to spread his message, and one representative for that was Melancthon who soon became recognised as the systematic

mouthpiece for Luther. Drawing up a compilation of all Luther's ideas and doctrine in 1521 - named *Loci Communes* - Melancthon soon went on to write several more those of Lutheranism. One particular example would be the Augsburg Confession of 1530, where a collection of articles were drawn up to establish the basis of Lutheranism, without Luther himself writing it as he was under imperial ban. However, Melancthon excluded discussion of predestination - which had been a prominent idea of Luther's - indicating a divergence from Luther's ideas, and so demonstrating the ^{increased redundancy} decline of Luther's influence.

Furthermore, the reputation of Luther himself had been in a steady decline from this point onwards. Whilst previously seen as a figure of liberation and social equality, particularly among the lower orders, Luther's controversial reaction against the Peasants' War caused much upset over the German people as their view of him as a hero was dashed. Publishing a pamphlet in April 1525 entitled 'An Admonition to Peace', this was soon followed by 'Against the Thieving, Robbing, Hordes of Peasants' a month later, where Luther told the secular rulers to put down the peasants by any means necessary. This contrast to his previous stance and harsh condemnation was particularly shocking to the people and many lost faith in him, indicating a decline in his influence. ~~Luther~~ The establishment of separate fiefs had also

began by the point: whilst the common differences were Lutheranism and the Catholic Church beforehand, there were now new faiths such as Zwinglianism who had broken away from Lutheranism. The Marburg Colloquy of 1529 demonstrates the decline of Luther's influence as he and Zwingli could not come to a compromise on the Real Presence in the Eucharist, signifying that Lutheranism had also broken up into different fragments and that the influence of Luther was not as strong as it was before.

Another prominent factor in the tarnishment of Luther's reputation was the bigamous marriage of Philip of Hesse in 1540. Luther had given permission to Philip, allowing him to have a second marriage and when news of this leaked out, Luther, who had traditionally been seen as a defender of family values and protection, was ruined. Catholic opponents pounced on this opportunity to denounce Luther, and again, the people lost faith in Luther as they could no longer trust him, leading to a decline in his influence. However, this is not to say Luther's influence had been diminishing since 1525, but only in his latter years. Luther's reaction against the Peasants' War also polarised him from social radicalism and as he was seen as a social-hierarchy supporter, this gained him lots of important followers in secular leaders. The first to be converted was Albert of Hohenzollern, who acted as

a catalyst for other princes and imperial knights. Formally a grand master of the Teutonic knights and the Duke of Prussia, Albert helped Luther regain popularity & many other princes followed suit, notably Philip of Hesse. Although Philip was to court Luther later on, he was also a great asset as he would essentially act as the political leader of the Lutheran princes for the rest of his life, & well as establishing the first ever Lutheran university in 1527. However, it is difficult to tell whether this shows a growth of influence in Luther, & of Lutheranism, as his ideas were increasingly adopted all over Germany and protected by the princes.

One defining factor indicating the growth of Luther was the increasing amounts of works he published. Although he was physically restricted by the Edict of Worms, the use of the printing press allowed him to spread his messages directly in an extremely short amount of time. In 1522 and 1534, he released his German translations of the New and Old Testament respectively, and further clarified Lutheran rites by publishing a *Deutsche Messe* in 1526, which was essentially a revised vernacular liturgy. In 1529, he wrote and released the Large and Small Catechisms, which explained the Lutheran faith by way of question and

answer; ~~which~~ with the 'Large Catechism' aimed for adults and the 'Small' aimed for children. The popularity of these pamphlets were great, it was in this interim of time (the late 1520s) that Luther's works exceeded the amounts sold by seventeen of the other most prolific German writers of the time altogether, and each work went on to be published in several more editions. This demonstrates the increase in Luther's influence and popularity as his works would not have been so well-read otherwise, and proves that his reputation was not in complete decline ~~in the period 1525-1546~~ from 1525.

The period 1525-1546 is a broad one in terms of Luther's life: from when he amassed national recognition after the Peasants' War to his death, it seems natural that there are both increases and decreases of his popularity in that interim. The Peasants' War of 1525 gave Luther an increase in influence, as it catalysed the support of the secular rulers of the Holy Roman Empire and allowed a further clarification of his own ideas as demonstrated by the works published in the late 1520s. However, his reaction also caused him some unpopularity with the lower orders of society and seemed to tarnish his reputation, which was only further limited in his refusal to compromise with Zwingli and the Catholic Church. His virtual incarnation also caused him to remain

in Saxony until the end of his lifetime, which prompted others such as Melancthon to take his place and establish several key doctrines of Lutheranism, showing a decline in Luther's personal influence. Although it would be unfair to say Luther's influence was negligible by the time of his death, it had certainly declined as Lutheranism had already been long established and he, remembered predominantly as the man who started it all.

Exemplar 7

Though this essay addresses itself to Charles' campaign against Lutheranism in Germany, its lack of depth in considering the stated factor, the significance of Charles' victory in the Schmalkaldic War, means it was awarded a mid L3 mark.

Answer:

Whether or not Charles V's victory in the 'Schmalkaldic War' of 1546-47 was significant in his campaign against Luther in Germany is disputable and has been widely debated by historians.

Primarily, his victory was significant ~~in~~ against Lutheranism, because he successfully managed to defeat the 'Schmalkaldic League' and dissolve it apart.

The 'Schmalkaldic League' was set up by Philip of Hesse and included ~~the~~ countries such as Germany ~~and~~ and France (although France had to withdraw later due to other problems) - its instrumental leaders included Philip of Hesse and John of Saxony (Frederick the Wise's brother) who were both instrumental in organising it and who were both early converts to Lutheranism.

~~The~~ The league was set up to resist Charles V and offer support to the other countries in the league if one of its members were attacked, including 1,000 infantry and 600 cavalry.

the German princes managed to dissolve the 'Schmalkaldic League' as it created it. ~~Approximately~~ ^{over} 1,000 men were slaughtered and over 200 were taken prisoner, and this was a disaster for the league.

Therefore, Charles V's victory in the 'Schmalkaldic War' meant that the ~~the~~ league was totally destroyed and what it stood for - Lutheranism, was completely ~~was~~ suppressed.

on the other hand, Charles V's victory in the 'Schmalkaldic War' may be argued to be not that significant in his campaign and 'fight' against Lutheranism in Germany.

After the Schmalkaldic War, Luther's allies ^{with} the German princes broke apart, ~~and~~ he had ^{with} joined them before the war and they had agreed to stand with him, however, having won, these connections fell apart so Charles V was left alone which meant he struggled to fulfil his fight against Lutheranism in Germany.

However, it could be argued that Charles'

'schmalckaldic
victory in the war' wasn't at all
significant in suppressing hutteranism
because Charles V in fact couldn't
suppress in his rule, no matter how hard
he attempted to do so.

Charles ~~was~~ became emperor at
the young age of 19 ~~and~~ years old and
so was very naive, ^{and} inexperienced, his
attention being more focused on the
threat from Francis I of France who
believed part of the empire was his and
the threat from the Ottoman Turks
rather than the threat of hutteranism
in his Empire. The powerful Turk and
Charles' enemy, sultan sulaiman,
allied with Francis against Charles.
So this was a double-threat to him
during this time so his eyes were taken off the issue
of hutteranism.

However, arguably, Charles had ~~some~~
some leverage over Philip of Hesse because
he had previously given him a 1 pardon
from his ^{earlier} mental problems so Philip was
in his debt from that point forward.

In conclusion, I don't think that Charles

His defeat ^{at} the 'Schmalkaldic League' of the 'Schmalkaldic War' of 1546-47 did do anything for his campaign against Lutheranism in Germany as he was too naïve and inexperienced to make an impact and lacked supporters as he allies and support crumbled after the Schmalkaldic War, and despite his efforts to suppress it, Lutheranism continued to grow.

Exemplar 8

This answer makes only simple and generalised statements in answer to the question and its knowledge is sometimes wrong. It is an example of a L1 answer.

It can be argued that the actions of the nobility were the main reason for the failure of Margaret of Parma to establish stable government during the 1560s. However, religion, the opposition of the Dutch and the strength of the rebels also influenced this.

Nobles such as William of Orange and grandees such as Hoon and Egmont were Protestants, and strongly opposed the Spanish's Catholic rule. This led to Orange constantly attempting to take over, which was a failure at first but he had succeeded by the second time. This affected Margaret's

government as the Spanish were unable to stop Orange for a number of reasons, finding being one of them.

Religion also seriously affected this. The constant battle between the Catholics and Protestants meant that Margaret could never form a ~~truly~~ truly stable government as there was always conflict which could not be resolved.

The Dutch strongly opposed the political ways of the Spanish which meant Margaret ~~was~~ struggled to have a stable government as ~~it~~ she was constantly opposed by the Dutch people.

Rebels in the Netherlands were going stronger as they had Orange as a leader and economic backing from Elizabeth I in England, which

impacted on ~~Elizabeth's~~ Margaret's ability to stabilise the government.

In conclusion, although the actions of the nobility affected Margaret's government, other factors such as Dutch opposition to Spanish rule played a more significant role.

Exemplar 9

This response does attempt to address the role of the Sea Beggars during Alva's rule though it lacks some range and could have been more effectively addressed to the sustaining of opposition. Nonetheless, it does consider alternative factors in coming to a judgement and was given a L3 mark.

Historians have long since debated how much of a role the sea beggars played in sustaining the opposition to The Duke of Alva. This essay will look at the role of the Sea Beggars, the role of local opposition, the role of reforming figures such as William of Orange, ~~and the role of Philip II king of Spain~~. This essay will argue that although the sea beggars played a vital role in opposing the Duke of Alva it was in fact the role of local opposition that proved to get Alva removed from his position.

The role of the Sea Beggars proved to be very substantial in helping to maintain opposition to the Duke of Alva. Foreign support from the Sea Beggars and those who sympathised with the Dutch rebels, led to many helping the sea beggars to fight. For example, the sea beggars helped to capture and seize the towns of Brill and Flushing which acted as a major foothold in the Northern Provinces

against the Spanish. Furthermore, the sea beggars were able to disrupt import and export of Spanish naval ships, and as a result helped to lessen trade. This proved to be influential because it helped the Dutch rebels to have time to re-organise their troops. However, they were sometimes unreliable and attacked both Spanish and Dutch ships. Although, the capture of Brill and Flushing helped to rally the opposition against Alva as it was viewed as a ~~major~~ major victory.

Another deciding factor that proved to be vital in creating opposition against Alva was the role of the local opposition. Many people disliked Alva's strict enforcement of the heresy laws, and hated that he would not moderate them. Alva's use of the Council of Troubles from 1567, relied upon public denouncements to reveal heretics. Furthermore his forcible collection of the Tenth Penny Tax led to economic downfall, as many businesses were forced to shut rather than pay tax. This angered many Dutch locals because they believed they were being unjustly persecuted by Alva. Therefore they took up

arms in order to defend themselves. This proved to be more vital, than the sea beggars because the population of the Netherlands were revolting against the injustice and persecution they were facing.

Finally, the role of reforming figures in the Netherlands such as William of Orange helped to sustain the opposition towards the Duke of Alva. Although, William of Orange's first invasion in 1568 proved to be unsuccessful because it lacked popular support as many feared they would be denounced as heretics by the Council of Troubles, his second invasion in 1572 proved to be much more organised. William of Orange used propaganda to portray himself as the natural leader of the Netherlands, and presented Alva as a "tyrannical monster leader and oppressor." Furthermore, the Prince of Orange now gained foreign support such as the support of the French Huguenots who were French Protestants. This allowed the invasion to be more successful because there was now widespread popular resistance for the Duke of Alva. Therefore, this proved to be a very influential factor as it created a sense of unity.

In Conclusion, although the sea beggars did help to create and sustain military opposition to Alva, through the use of military tactics such as the capture of Brill and Flushing, it was in fact the role of local resistance throughout the Northern Provinces that beat the tyrannical reign of Alva.

Exemplar 10

This L4 answer considers a range of key issues relevant to the question and displays sufficient knowledge to demonstrate a full understanding of its conceptual focus. It establishes criteria for judgement and reaches a reasoned conclusion. The argument is clear and coherent throughout.

Since William of Orange's first revolt in 1568, there had been an ongoing war which divided the largely ~~Protestant~~ Calvinist north and Catholic south of the Netherlands. The advantage swung between the two but just as it looked like peace would be resumed, such as at Breda in 1575, negotiations broke down and fighting resumed. By 1609 the ~~Peace~~ Truce of Antwerp was signed giving the United Provinces independence at last. There were a number of factors that contributed to this including Oldenbarnevelt, Maurice of Nassau and support from Elizabeth ~~and France~~, however I believe it was finance that was the key factor in securing independence.

Having said this I do believe that the role of Oldenbarnevelt did contribute a great deal to the independence of the United provinces. Working closely with ~~and~~ Maurice of Nassau to deal with ~~military factors~~ political issues rather than military functioning, Oldenbarnevelt brought the provinces closer together. He did this by increasing the power of the States General (Dutch Parliament) and decreasing the power of the Council of State. This meant that the States General ruled as a sovereign institution. This meant that the

Northern provinces became more united and decreased the power of the Southern provinces. ~~That~~ Oldenbarnevelt's role in ~~also~~ reducing ~~the~~ Calvinism in the South should also not be undermined with this preventing a civil war and the possible continuation of battling between the rebels and the Spanish for another ~~se~~ ~~year~~ lengthy spell. As a result of Oldenbarnevelt's political reforms and reduction of Calvinism in the South later on, he is clearly an ~~key~~ important factor in securing independence as without his fighting may have continued even longer. Manning said this his political reforms did occur sometime before the 1609 truce meaning I see him a contributory factor rather than a key factor.

Similarly, the role of Maurice of Nassau, William of Orange's second son should not be ignored. His military reforms were key to the strengthening of the Northern provinces after their popular leader, Orange had been assassinated. ~~Maurice~~ Maurice was an expert in making the military more efficient with the standardisation of weaponry for efficient resupply and the organised siege strategy where his 10,000 strong army ~~remained~~ (inherited from his father) remained compact ^{in order to} ~~and~~ capture towns. His innovative methods of 'pike and shot' that involved

pikeman protecting musketeers as they fired at the Spanish and his Trojan horse strategy where his troops rode in on a barge to surprise the enemy in Zutphen proved successful. This can be seen from his capture of Turnhout and Nieuwpoort where he defeated Spanish opposition and regained much needed land. It is clear therefore that without his ~~essential~~ military efforts, the Dutch rebels would have been comprehensively beaten by the strong Alva and they would have never gained independence. However ~~many~~ of some of Maurice's victories were merely pyrrhic victories such as that at Nieuwpoort where he lost 2,000 men. As a result of these tremendous losses, I only cite Maurice of Nassau as a contributory factor.

Elizabeth's role should also not be undermined. Her support for the Dutch rebels ~~in 1589~~ ^{in 1589} with the Treaty of Nonsuch provided the rebels with much needed money and men. She provided the rebels with 6,000 men and 60,000 florins in the hope of defeating the Spanish and removing the threat the Armada posed to Elizabeth. This money allowed the rebels to pay their soldiers on time, something that the Spanish increasingly failed to do, as well as providing them with more numbers

in battle. If she had not sent the money ~~to~~ or the men to the Dutch rebels it may have been that they would have been beaten way before the Truce of Antwerp could be made in 1609. This would have meant that the Spanish ~~would not have recovered the same~~ United Provinces would not have secured independence. Moring said this, I only see Elizabeth I role as a contributory factor because she supplied the Dutch with the disastrous military commander, Robert Dudley (Earl of Leicester) who divided the provinces of Holland and Zealand. They only became united again with the appointment of the much more successful Sir Francis. It is for this reason that I have not placed Elizabeth's support as a more important factor in securing independence.

For me, the most important factor in securing independence for the United Provinces by 1609 comes from finance. Spain were suffering severely from financial problems throughout the war with Phillip II declaring bankruptcy. Moreover the failed Spanish Armada wiped out ~~the~~ two thirds of the Habsburg's annual revenue putting them in an increasingly worsening position. When Phillip II died in 1598 he was replaced with Phillip III

his son, who increased the financial trauma by spending four times more than his father in court and eventually declaring himself bankrupt also. With the Bubonic plague ⁽¹⁵⁹⁹⁻¹⁶⁰⁰⁾ ~~making the~~ wiping out 10% of the population, the financial situation only worsened meaning they were in no position to fight even after Spinola's appointment. With the rebels also spending over 10,000 florins a month, both sides sought after peace. This led to the ceasefire in 1607 and in 1609 the Truce of Antwerp was signed which secured independence. I therefore see finance as the key factor as it directly affected both sides and led to the eventual ceasefire in 1607 which was the closest step yet to the United Provinces securing independence.

Overall, it is clear to see that there were a number of contributory factors to the United Provinces securing independence by 1609. The work of Oldenbarnevelt's political reforms, Maurice of Nassau's military reforms, and Elizabeth I's much needed support ensured that the Dutch rebels did not wobble before independence was gained. As a result these were all key contributory factors in ~~the~~ securing independence. However, clearly

the main factor comes from the financial hardship that faced the Spanish (Southern provinces) and the Dutch rebels that eventual led to ~~the Truce of~~ a ceasefire which led to the Truce of Antwerp in 1609. It was in this truce that the United Provinces finally gained independence.

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

Section A

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

Section B

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

