

Examiners' Report

June 2025

GCE History 9HI0 2B

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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 <https://www.edexcel.com> or <https://www.btec.co.uk>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit <https://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus>. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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: <https://www.pearson.com/uk>.

June 2025

Publications Code 9HI0_2B_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

Once again, candidates from across the ability range were able to engage effectively with the A Level paper 2B which deals with Luther and the German Reformation, c1515-55 (2B.1) and the Dutch Revolt, c1563-1609 (2B.2).

The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two linked sources. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second-order concepts: cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated.

Significantly, examiners continue to note that a number of scripts posed problems with the legibility of handwriting. This appears to have become even more marked this year. Candidates are reminded that examiners can only give credit for what they can read. Similarly, examiners have remarked on the increasing use of shorthand and abbreviations in candidates' answers, which often hinder meaning and spoil the flow of an argument, though this was slightly less noticeable this year.

In Section A, the strongest answers were able to develop reasoned and supported inferences based on the sources. Such responses evaluated the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the enquiry on the basis of both the contextual knowledge that was on offer and through an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It continues to be disappointing to have to note that a number of candidates do not explicitly address the focus of the enquiry, but rather discuss issues arising from the sources in general terms. This question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and most candidates are now able to deal with this reasonably well. Approaches to how it is approached do vary, but that is perfectly acceptable, as long as it is present. Some candidates still continue to use their contextual knowledge to describe events in great detail, rather than using it to illuminate and to discuss the sources. This sometimes resulted in candidates not dealing with the sources adequately. In other cases, candidates might offer up little or, on occasion, no contextual knowledge to support their arguments and analysis. These were not always weaker candidates; some answers were seen that were strong in bullet points 1 and 3 of the mark scheme, but had very little that could be credited for bullet point 2. The impact of this was to hold down the marks that were achievable in this question.

In section B, it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second-order concept that was being targeted by the question. Weaker candidates either engaged in a narrative approach that made links to the question in the conclusion or alternatively shaped their responses analytically but lacked sufficient substance and accurate contextual knowledge to support the arguments that they were making. It continues to be the case that there are a number of responses that have a tendency to only deal with one side of an argument; some of these were a sophisticated analysis of that one side, showing the links between the issues that were raised, but it is essential that candidates acknowledge the existence of a counter argument, where appropriate. Candidates are encouraged to ensure that they take the most appropriate approach to answering

a question. Candidates should always aim to show the links between the issues raised, not merely to present a list of factors. Candidates continue to need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology. Equally, the evidence that is presented should come from within the timeframe of the chronology of the question.

Question 1

Responses to this question came from across the ability range. Most candidates were able to identify, from Source One, ways in which the instructions issued by Albrecht of Mainz might have led to controversy, the sale of indulgences granting full remission of sins, for example, for the living and the dead. Similarly, from Source Two, many were able to link these sales to the questionable use of the funds generated by both Albrecht and Leo X. Stronger candidates particularly used their knowledge of the context of the sources, to make incisive points about the role of the papacy in the scandal, which became the focus of Luther's condemnation in the Ninety-Five Theses. With regard to the provenance of the sources, many commented on the tone of Albrecht's instructions in Source One, and how they were interpreted by the likes of Tetzel, while others commented on Luther's ability, in Source 2, to look back on the whole controversy with some degree of hindsight towards the end of his life.

Weaker answers tended not to engage fully with the content of the sources. Such responses often commented extensively about the nature, origin and purpose of the sources, often along stereotypical lines without attempting to apply this to the content of the sources in coming to a judgement. It was clear that some candidates lacked a sound knowledge and precise understanding of this part of the specification – such responses tended to lack depth, accuracy and precision.

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

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

Source 1	Source 2	Together
→ ideology	→ people tried to make	→ financial problem

Sources one and two are extremely useful in answering for a historian investigating the indulgence controversy 1515-18. Source one sheds light on the ~~best~~ way in which indulgences were sold, while source two details how people reacted to indulgences, while together they expose the financial aspect of indulgences central to the controversy. Therefore both sources are extremely useful for an investigation into the indulgence controversy 1515-18.

Source one is extremely useful for an investigation into the indulgence controversy as it sheds light on the process of the actual sale. ^{As it was} ~~It was written by~~ Written by Archbishop Albert of Mainz directly instructing those who would sell indulgences, the source is extremely useful. Mainz was central to the indulgence controversy of 1515-18 as it was he who licensed the indulgence seller Tetzel ~~to collect indulgences~~ who would arrive on the banks of Saxony in 1517 inspiring the theses. These instructions would likely have been read by Tetzel himself and informed his controversial saying "When a coin is in the

coffer rings - soul from purgatory springs". Source one reveals the ideological component of indulgence sale that would prove so controversial, sagge making the bold claims that indulgence would lead to "full forgiveness of their sins" and that punishment in purgatory would be 'totally wiped out.' This is incredibly useful as it demonstrates how serious the claims being made by sellers were. A large concern of those opposing indulgence was that people were being led into false sense of security, ^{and that} with one person claiming that ^{people would be led to believe that something as ridiculous as} even rape of the Virgin Mary would be forgiven. The instructions ~~displays~~ ^{show} also argue that 'the forgiveness of sins of those already suffering in purgatory' would be granted. This is useful as it too is highly controversial as only God should theoretically hold that power. Therefore source one is very useful for an enquiry into the indulgence controversy as it ~~demonstrates~~ ^{provides} light on the claims being made by indulgence sellers.

Furthermore, source two is very useful for an enquiry into the indulgence controversy ^{it sheds light on the issue held against} ~~as it was~~ ^{indulgences} written by Luther himself, another person central to the controversy, but on the opposing side to Mainz. Written in 1545, ~~and later~~ ^{he} ~~recalls~~ ^{recalls} a year before his death, Luther reveals the events of 1517-18 which is useful as it shows what issues ^{held} with indulgences were so deeply

held they were ~~remembered~~ memorable a 30 years later. However, Luther may be trying to justify his actions following the 95 theses when introducing his book, therefore he may ~~exaggerate~~ make himself appear more innocent. Source two is extremely useful as it ~~shows~~ shows the reaction that indulgences were receiving in Germany 1515-18. Luther states that "German people knew very few details of the rogues from Rome" suggesting that indulgences were looked upon with some caution. The use of the strong language to describe sellers as 'rogues' who were derisive and is useful as it shows the depth of hatred felt towards indulgence sales by the educated people, as well as Luther who was professor of Theology at Wittenberg, who were not biased by their promises. The fact that Luther 'published his theses for debate' is useful as it demonstrates the the indulgence controversy was particularly an academic issue in academic circles. It is very likely that ~~that~~ this was Luther's original intention as the 95 theses of October 31st 1517 were posted on the door of the church in ~~the~~ Latin, the language of academia. ~~This is very useful as it shows that~~ ^{the controversy} the indulgence campaign was looked at with distaste and within Germany, particularly by the educated elite.

Two years earlier fellow professor at Wittenberg, Carlstadt, had published his own theses addressing indulgence for debate, this was not uncommon practice.

Finally, together sources one and two are very useful for an enquiry into the indulgence controversy, as the both ~~sources~~ depict the financial motivations of both sides. Source one, written by Mainz suggests that 'no amount can be great enough' and that payment should be proportional to the wealth of those seeking indulgence, suggesting a ~~proportion~~ ^{proportion} that as much money should be extracted as possible. As Lutter points out in source two, Mainz was benefiting financially from indulgences both 'splitting the proceeds with Rome'. Half of the indulgence sale proceeds would pay for the rebuilding of St Peter's Basilica in Rome while the other half would repay Mainz's 20 000 gulden loan to the Pope, used to bribe the Pope into granting his role as Archbishop-elect of Mainz while keeping his other ~~past~~ ^{past} titles. This is useful as it reveals the financial motivation behind indulgence. Moreover, ~~both sources~~ source two ~~shows~~ ^{demonstrates} the ~~financial motivation~~ ^{objection} to the financial burden of indulgences with Lutter claiming that the money 'could be put to better use' instead of making the Pope richer. This is useful as it demonstrates the financial ^{motivation behind the} opposition to indulgences. The church owned 1/6 of German land and cost of living had risen 200% by 1500 in Germany, therefore people were horrified to find that money was being extracted from Germany and

funnelled back to Rome when the ordinary people were struggling. This is very useful as together the two sources reveal the financial motivations of the opposing sides of the indulgence controversy, with source one written by a wealthy Archbishop due to benefit and source two written by ~~an~~^a poor German academic. Therefore sources one and two are incredibly useful for revealing the financial motivations of both sides of the controversy.

In conclusion sources one and two together are very useful for ~~undertaking~~ an investigation into the indulgence controversy. Source one sheds light on the bold claims and counterclaims made by sellers, source two demonstrates the reaction of Germans, particularly those who were educated and together they reveal the financial motivations on both sides of the debate. Therefore both sources are extremely useful for an enquiry into the indulgence controversy of 1515-18.



This answer interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination making reasoned inferences. For example, with regard to Source One, it makes reference to the 'ideological component of indulgence sales' demonstrating 'how serious the claims being made were' and later on in the answer, with regard to Source Two, with reference to 'the depth of hatred' revealed in Luther's attitude to indulgence sellers and the opposition of the 'educated elite' to indulgences. Alongside this analysis, the candidate introduces contextual knowledge that both illuminates what has been drawn from the source material and demonstrates understanding of the values and concerns of the society from which the sources have come, e.g. with regard to Luther's intentions in posting the Ninety-Five Theses. Finally, the candidate refers to Albrecht of Mainz's role in selling the indulgences and makes perceptive comments about the possibility of Luther wanting to 'justify his actions', therefore taking into account the weight the evidence will bear, though this is weakly substantiated overall. It was given a mid L5 mark.

Question 2

There were very few responses to this subject. Candidates attempting this question mostly identified from Source One the aspiration of those close to Philip II to impose a more authoritarian and centralised rule on the Netherlands in the wake of the events of 1566, and were able to cross-reference this with Orange's claims in Source Two that this is exactly what came to pass. Contextual knowledge concerning, for example, the traditional rights and privileges of the Dutch provinces and/or the actions of the Duke of Alva was often used effectively to expand upon the inferences drawn from the content of the two sources. When considering the weight of their evidence to the enquiry, some noted the nature of Source One as advice, not necessarily acted upon, while others commented on the purpose of Source Two as a rallying cry to the Dutch preceding an invasion.

Weaker answers tended not to engage fully with the content of the sources with regard to the question. Many wrote extensively about the nature, origin and purpose of the sources often along stereotypical lines without attempting to apply this to the content of the sources in coming to a judgement. Such answers often lacked precise knowledge and understanding of this part of the specification, consequently lacking depth and discrimination in assessing the value of the sources.

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

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

Sources 3 and 4 are useful to a historian investigating Philip II's policy in the Netherlands in the years 1567-68. Source 3 which was most likely written by a close advisor to Philip states that the King needs to strengthen his control over the within the Netherlands, such as ensuring Catholicism is the only religion in the country. It also argues on how the Dutch councils had acted arrogantly against Philip by challenging his authority, for example the earlier Iconoclastic Fury in 1566 had been a threat to Spanish control. Source 4 is also useful as it mentions the other viewpoint of Philip's policy as it is a letter by William of Orange who states that Philip's policy is leading the country to Tyranny. Overall both sources are useful to a historian studying Philip's policy as they ~~are~~ focus on both viewpoints of his policy, one from a Dutch perspective and the other from the Spanish.

One way in which source 3 is useful to a historian investigating Philip II's policy in the Netherlands was that it argues he needs to strengthen his control within the country by becoming the absolute king. By being the absolute king it would lead to Philip being able to properly enforce Spanish customs within the country to ensure control. 'He should then

decree that there is only one law, one religion and one custom'. Therefore this is useful to a historian in showing Philip's policy as the writer of the letter who was most likely an advisor to Philip, is unhappy with the way things are in the Netherlands and would prefer Philip to be an absolute king. As Philip had left the Netherlands in 1559 not to ever return, it meant that his policy in the Netherlands would not be fully enforced as he was an ~~absolute~~ absentee monarch. Examples of Philip's religious policy were the bishopric schemes as well as the heresy laws, however the lack of Philip's presence in the Netherlands caused anger and refusal to agree to his policy's. Therefore, this ~~is~~ emphasises the fact that ~~Philip~~ without Philip being within the Netherlands, his policy is weakened, hence why the government advisor to Philip who wrote the letter believes he should strengthen his control.

Another way in which source 3 is useful to a historian studying Philip's policy ~~during~~ within the Netherlands is that it states how the Dutch Councils of Antwerp and Amsterdam have acted ~~so~~ arrogantly against Philip. ~~Philip's policy~~ These Councils have behaved so arrogantly that they dared to challenge and disobey the king. Therefore this is useful to a historian as it shows that Philip's policy had been widely unpopular that the Dutch councils had been actively resisting it. As Antwerp had been located in the Southern part which was more in favour of Spain, it shows that Philip's policy had been ineffective

as a large city located within the Southern region had been against Philip's Policy. However the Introduction of Alva in 1567 had been a success of Philip's policy as it had ensured Spanish control and that Philip's policy would be properly enforced. This then useful to a historian as the presence of a Spanish leader who was competent in military had meant that Philip's policy could be enforced effectively.

One way in which source 4 is useful to a historian studying Philip's policy is that it argues that the Spanish want to rule the country through tyranny. This is supported by the arrival of Alva in 1567 to restore Spanish control within the Netherlands as well as putting down any Dutch rebels from the iconoclastic fury. 'With the arrival of Duke Alva and his Spanish soldiers, acting in the name of the King, such persecutions and executions have increased and multiplied'. Therefore this is useful to a historian studying Philip's policy as Alva's use of violence and terror meant that it would be properly enforced, as well as showing how Philip's policy had led to the Dutch people feeling enslaved. Alva had managed to enforce the heresy laws as well as executing Egmont and Horn. This then strengthens the claim of them being ruled by tyranny as the Council of Troubles had not only killed roughly 2,000 people, but also 2 big Dutch nobles. Therefore this ~~shows that this~~ is useful to a historian studying Philip's policy as the source is coming

from the Dutch perspective, by William of Orange who is well known in the country, it increases its validity as it highlights how unhappy the Dutch were with Philip's policy and how they were being oppressed by Spanish control.

In conclusion, both sources are useful to a historian studying Philip's policy in the Netherlands during the years 1567-68. Both sources show ^{a different} ~~each~~ perspective of Philip's policy with source 3 being from a Spanish perspective and source 4 being from a Dutch perspective. Source 3 can be limited to some regard as the author who had direct ties with the king, is less likely to state the problems of Philip's policy, whereas source 4 being from William of Orange strengthens its significance as it is coming from the Dutch leader who explains the struggles faced as a result of Philip's policy. Overall both sources are useful as they both explain how Philip's policy needs to be improved to strengthen control within the country.



Here, the candidate interrogates the evidence of both sources with regard to the question and adds valid contextual knowledge that helps illuminate what can be gained from the source material. In evaluation of the utility of the sources to the enquiry, the candidate notes aspects of source provenance and establishes valid criteria in coming to a judgement though this is the weaker element of the answer overall. This received a high L4 mark.

Question 3

This was a popular essay question and was often answered very well indeed. The better performing candidates directed themselves precisely to the extent of Luther's influence over the German Reformation within the dates specified, often referring to the increasing roles taken by Luther's acolytes, like Melanchthon, or by princes such as Philip of Hesse. Those answers that accessed top L4 and L5 marks usually made the argument that, despite his lower profile, especially by the 1540s, Luther was still the guiding light of the Reformation to whom many deferred, for example at the Regensburg Colloquy, but there was a variety of valid approaches. Less strong answers tended to limit their attention to the 1520s, sometimes outside the range of years specified. Many such answers lacked depth and range of knowledge and were imprecise in their use of the material available.

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

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

Luther influence
GR declined
1525-46
died

declined

- prince's initiative after PR 1525, lost support ✓
- no new works, bible 1520s - 1534
- edict of Worms 1521 - outlaw, new face 1530 ✓
- involvement in P of 11 bigamy scandal 1540 ✓

didn't decline 300,000 works "holy man"

- stopped radicals / revolts 1525 - princely support
- 1540s, 50/65 imperial cities
- 1544, 4 electors, including Saxony Lutheran, bold

There are valid arguments to both sides of the question as to whether Luther's influence over the German Reformation declined from 1525-46, when Luther died. Whilst there's some credibility owed to the fact none of this would have been possible without Luther, especially not the extent to which the GR spread; there's more convincing evidence to suggest that Luther's influence did in fact decline, not only due to Luther himself but also external factors that undermined him, resulting in him losing support and influence.

Clearly, as the "holy man" from the prophecies, Luther,

had an extraordinary amount of influence over the G.R. Not least in his bold and convincing challenges to corrupt practices, nor his appeal to both princes, and peasants alike as "the priesthood of all believers" demonstrates. The extent of the G.R. is clearly heavily influenced by Luther, and ~~partly~~ largely in the 300,000 copies of his humanist work in circulation, and his humanist teaching style in Wittenberg.

The fact that by the 1520s, 20/65 imperial cities were Lutheran (or accepted it alongside Catholicism) indicates Luther's success. Luther's continued influence can be seen in that a further 30 cities converted by the 1540s, totalling ~~65~~ 50/65. Clearly, Luther's influence wasn't declining as he had continual success, such as reaching the milestone of having 417 electors be Lutheran by 1544. This included the elector of Saxony, the "holy man"'s hometown. Clearly, Luther exercised control and influence not only in creating the basis for the G.R., but also in implementing it and inflicting real change, so much so he earned a visit from Charles V himself (to his tomb in 1546).

He managed to maintain his influence, not only in stopping radicals like Karlstadt and preventing future ones, for example by his 1528-29 Catechisms, but also in gaining princely support, especially after displaying his conservatism in reaction to the Peasants' Revolt of 1525, calling on princes to "stab, smite, ~~and~~ slay" peasants.

With Luther's clever tactics in appealing to many people in Germany, and growing bolder in the face of challenge, such as Cajetan 1530, he clearly demonstrated a continued influence over the CR, that reached the peak it did due to the "holy man himself".

Whilst credibility is owed to that & view, it can be easily undermined and disproven. Luther's ^{influence} significantly declined ~~in~~ from 1525-46, in favour of the princes who increasingly took initiative, as seen in Brandenburg in 1525 with the Edict to "remove all unlearned preachers", and in John the Steadfast's decision to host inspection into churches in Saxony from 1528-29.

Since the Peasants' Revolt of 1525, princes increasingly took it upon themselves to restore order and continue the conversion to Lutheranism, without Luther's interference at all. Not only did the princes take over and replace Luther's role, he also lost mass support from the peasants, who blamed him for the 100,000 executions they endured.

Making the situation even worse for Luther, he also ~~lost~~ support amongst radicals, much like Karlstadt and Zwingli who denounced him for being too cautious. Luther was on his own, especially as he refused to compromise, as displayed in the Colloquy of Marburg 1529. His influence clearly deteriorated, and he was rendered a forgotten face in the CR.

This is especially seen since the Edict of Worms 1521 declared Luther an outlaw. Not only did this render him untrustworthy amongst princes who viewed him as a heretic (alongside the pope), it also meant he couldn't represent his own views and attend important meetings, where further conversions could have been generated. Whilst in hiding at Wartburg, radicals became the new face of the Lutheran movement, but with them soon defeated, Luther still didn't manage to retain his influence. Melancthon and Bugenhagen seemed to quickly become the new public face of Lutheranism displaying how Luther's influence significantly declined. This was especially true from 1537 when Bugenhagen was crowned in Denmark after they converted, through no encouragement from Luther.

Because of this new dominance displayed by Luther's former ~~see~~ deputy, Melancthon, advancements were made that Luther never would have enforced himself. One example is the Augsburg Confession of 1530, presented at the Diet that Luther couldn't attend, that was so moderate even Eck approved it. Luther's declining influence is not only displayed in the fact that others replaced him as the face of the movement, but also in the fact that things were being passed and promoted that he never would've authorised, but now lacked the means to challenge.

whilst Luther may not have been the face of the movement anymore, he could've continued the influence he once exercised behind the scenes in writing books and pamphlets that encouraged popular demand for change.

However, he was so consumed with his translation of the Bible that dominated his life throughout the whole 1520s and until 1534, he produced no new works so also failed to exercise influence this way. His focus on the Bible restricted his ability to partake in the continued conversion to Lutheranism, rendering it ~~so~~ inevitable others were going to take over, whether it be the princes, radicals, or those he formerly had power over. His influence was clearly deteriorating.

This was intensified in the 1540s when his reputation suffered irreversible damage due to his role in the Philip of Hesse's bigamy scandal. As Luther agreed to his disapproved solution of taking a 2nd wife, as the Old Testament displayed, he was labelled a hypocrite. This undermined his previous advocacy for traditional family values, and led his supporters to question whether anything he promoted was something he actually believed in, or just what he thought people wanted to hear. § This reduction in support, similar to that of 1525 left Luther alone and with no

influence over the CR. This was further intensified by his old age, ill-health, and ~~violence~~ violent attacks he experienced leading up to his death in 1546. Luther had gone forgotten, acting as more of a hinderance to the movement towards the end of his life, more than someone exercising influence.

Conclusively, Luther's influence



This response sustains an analysis of Luther's influence on the German Reformation across the period specified in the question. Noteworthy is the candidate's demonstration of the relationship between key features of the period, e.g. the initial paragraphs demonstrate a 'sustained analysis' of Luther's relevance to the movement throughout the period, while the latter part of the essay discusses a range of reasons to show that, despite this, his importance did decline. The knowledge displayed enables this answer to respond fully to the demands of the question and the answer is well organised, and communicated with clarity and precision. Although the answer is incomplete and lacks a conclusion, the candidate sets out their argument and their judgement in the first paragraph of the essay, sets out criteria for this judgement and these are applied as the answer progresses. The answer was awarded a top L5 mark.

Question 4

This too was a popular question and one that elicited a considerable number of very good answers. Those that accessed top L4 and L5 addressed themselves precisely to the 'office' of Holy Roman Emperor and how the relative weakness of that position impacted on Charles V's ability to combat Lutheranism. So, for example, many referred to the fragmented nature of political authority in Germany, and the necessity for the Emperor to seek the support of princes in his aspirations, which was not consistently forthcoming. Such answers were often able to come to a reasoned judgement by considering other reasons for the survival of Lutheranism, such as the growing confidence and determination of German Lutherans evidenced by the devotional clarity provided by the Augsburg Confession. A number of responses, however, did not specifically address the 'office' of Emperor or chose to interpret this as meaning the personal difficulties faced by Charles V in the light of his dynastic or other responsibilities outside Germany, for example his wars against the French. Such answers were still able to access L4 but could not be considered to have responded fully to the question, a criterion for L5. The weakest answers tended to lack detailed knowledge of the reasons for the survival of Lutheranism in the years specified. In such cases, judgements tended towards assertion and lacked conviction.

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

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

Lutheranism was able to flourish and survive the many attempts made by the Holy Roman Emperor to eradicate it throughout the years 1521-55. This could be explained by the limited powers held by Holy Roman Emperors. However, other factors such as the incooperation of the princes, the papacy, Charles V's wrong tactics, and conflicting priorities also ~~did~~ allowed Lutheranism to survive in Germany from 1521-55.

Firstly, the office of the Holy Roman Emperor meant that Charles V ~~was~~ found himself to be over-reliant on the princes in taking the measures required to eradicate Lutheranism. Charles V, despite being a member of the Habsburg family who were the largest landowners in Europe and owned vast amounts of territory, faced major setbacks in his attempts to defeat Lutheranism due to his position as the Holy Roman Emperor. He was only able to raise taxation with the permission of ~~the~~ the imperial diets,

which consisted of princes and electors. He also had no standing army, which meant he relied upon princes to provide men who would ~~defeat the Lutherans~~ deal with and defeat Lutheran advances.

On the other hand, it could be argued that conflicting priorities within the Holy Roman Empire meant that Charles V's attention was drawn away from defeating Lutheranism, allowing ideas to thrive and spread. ~~But~~ ~~Charles V's inheritance~~ Charles V inherited the several foreign threats and issues in Habsburg territories. In Spain, his subjects felt alienated by Charles not knowing their language (Castilian), ~~and~~ ~~not~~ having foreign advisors.

and sending his much more popular brother, Ferdinand, away. Discontent in Spain led to revolts. This means Charles spent ~~the last 3 years~~ the majority of the 1520s (9 years) in Spain, where he learned the language and won over his subjects. More threatening was the Ottoman advance. Charles feared the rapid expansion of the Ottoman empire and was determined to ~~for~~ launch crusades ~~to~~ against the Ottoman to defeat this threat, (partly why he was elected as Holy Roman Emperor). After the French took Metz, Charles sent 80,000 troops to retake Metz, ~~as~~ however they were defeated by ~~the~~ King Francis of France's 6,000 troops. These conflicting priorities abroad ultimately meant that Charles was absent from Germany at a crucial time (mainly the 1520s) in the development ~~and~~ spread of Lutheranism. He spent the majority of his reign as Emperor absent from the Empire. ~~loss of troops~~ Charles' diverted attention meant that ~~he~~ he was unable to ~~give his undivided~~ ~~at~~ focus on eradicating Lutheranism.

Another reason for the survival of Lutheranism ~~is the~~ from 1521-55 was the inco-operation of the princes and the Pope. After the 1520 ~~at~~ Diet of Worms, Princes were meant to enforce the Edict of Worms (which stated Luther was a heretic) throughout their territories by burning all heretical texts. However, ^{many} ~~the~~ princes refused to enforce the edicts ~~because~~ unless ~~they~~ they get a

general council to address their 102 grievances about the abuses of the Church in Germany. Despite Charles V's ~~attempts~~ appeals to the pope to call a general election, the Pope refused to until the 1545 council of Trent. This, however, was too late. Lutheran ideas had already taken root in Germany with 50/65 imperial cities having converted to Lutheranism, or allowing Lutheranism to coexist with Catholicism by the 1530s. Furthermore, Frederick the Wise was a prince and was vital in Luther's survival and protection. He allowed Luther to hide in his castle in Wartburg after the edict of Worms was enforced. This is where ~~many~~ Luther expanded on his ideas through pamphlets and the German translation of ~~the~~ Erasmus' New Testament, which sold hundreds of thousands of copies in Germany.

Another reason for the survival of Lutheranism in Germany from 1521 - 1555 is ~~the failure of Charles V's tactics~~ the failure of Charles V's tactics. It has been argued by many historians that Charles undermined the ~~ext~~ depth of the faith of the princes and the extent of the schism in ^{the} German Church. He did not immediately react to Luther's ideas because, compared to other issues, he passed

little threat. Charles made a mistake ~~by~~ by not calling a national council instead of pleading the Pope to call a general council to address the prince's 102 grievances. ~~Had~~ Had he called a national council immediately, the prince would have likely supported Charles in defeating Lutheranism. ~~Furthermore~~ Furthermore, despite his defeat of the Lutheran Schmalkaldic League, ~~Charles still~~ Charles still ~~was~~ in 1547, Charles was unable to capitalise on his victory at the Battle of Mühlberg because he wanted to pursue territory ambitions, such as retaking Metz. This was a mistake because it left him essentially bankrupt and in a weak position to ~~defeat~~ eradicate Lutheranism and the revival of the Schmalkaldic League. His weak position left him feeling overwhelmed and ill-equipped to defeat Lutheranism. This meant that, in his place, Ferdinand organised a Peace Treaty (the Peace of Augsburg). ~~This meant~~ This meant that each prince could decide the religion of his territory. This was crucial in the survival of Lutheranism as it meant that, still to this day, Lutheranism survived and ~~existed~~ existed throughout the majority (50/65) of imperial cities in Germany. Thus, Charles using the wrong tactics by promising territorial gains and not calling a national council ~~ultimately~~ ultimately led to Lutheranism's survival.

In conclusion, whilst the office of Holy Roman Empire meant a ~~large~~ slight dependency on the pope and limited powers, other factors such as the pope, Charles V's and conflicting priorities abroad facilitated the survival of Lutheranism in Germany from 1521-55



In this answer, the candidate is aware of the weakness of the office of Holy Roman Emperor and makes some attempt to address this in paragraph two, without development. The candidate is much more comfortable addressing a range of other valid reasons for Lutheranism's survival and is able to include knowledge that certainly meets most of the demands of the question. The argument is clear and communicated with clarity and throughout the answer criteria for judgement are established (e.g. in paragraph three, the candidate comments that Charles' continued absences meant 'he was unable to focus on eradicating Lutheranism' during the crucial 1520s). Therefore, it was awarded a top L4 mark.

Question 5

This was the less popular of the two essay questions on Paper 2.B2. and there were very few responses. Of these, the better answers had some precise knowledge of the positive impact of Orange's invitation to Anjou on the Dutch cause, for example, such as increased funding and provision of troops for the rebels. Most knew, also, that the invitation caused religious friction between Dutch provinces due to Anjou's Catholicism and that Anjou's ambitions resulted in the 'French Fury' and its aftermath. Weaker candidates had a relatively weak knowledge and understanding of the material, and tended towards assertion rather than a reasoned judgement based on clear criteria.

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

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒ Question 6 ☒

The period marking 1578-92 ~~clearly was~~ is identified as an era of rising division. This not only included the continuing opposition to Spanish rule but the further decline in alliance between the southern and northern provinces. Despite Orange's attempt to establish Anjou as a figure head for the Dutch revolt, its failure signifies that the Netherlands was left in an even weaker position against governor-general Duke of Parma; therefore it is ~~inaccurate~~ accurate to state that the Duke of Parma weakened opposition to Spain.

Upon his invitation to the Netherlands in 1578, the Duke ~~d~~ was not well-liked by the Dutch. Evidently, the Dutch remained in the strong mindset that they desired their ancient ~~at~~ rights and privileges, this included their right to rule their own provinces accordingly and not ~~to~~ obtain a leader who acted as a united figurehead for all 7 provinces. As a result of this ~~the~~ strong, unrelenting mindset the provinces did not greet Anjou in the manner he desired. They were resistant to fighting under him alongside

viewing him as a leader by any means. Therefore, his failure to unite the provinces exemplifies the Dutch opposition to a supreme leadership, even if this could help against Spain. Overall, it is clear Anjou could not unite the provinces, further weakening their position in opposing Spain. Moreover, Anjou's attempted coup in 1581 within Antwerp further weakened the Netherlands. As Antwerp was a place of high wealth and trade, its destruction greatly damaged the state. Additionally, his haste and hostile reaction to the Netherlands further divided the provinces from Orange. 1583 saw a significant decline for support in Orange as a result of an overall feeling of betrayal for appointing Anjou. Later leading to his assassination by Gerrards in 1584 which emphasises that despite Orange's extended and ~~built~~ built period of respect from 1568 onwards was made insignificant as a direct result of Anjou weakening the Netherlands position within opposition against Spain. Overall, it is ^{accurate to say} ~~clear~~ that Anjou's invitation by Orange was an incredibly dangerous political mistake leading to their subsequent decline alongside the reduction of power within opposition against Spain.

It can also be argued that opposing unions within 1579 made a significant impact upon a lack of unified opposition to Spain. The union of Arras

saw the unification of the ~~former~~ majority Catholic southern provinces with Spain in order to cease the hostilities in the opposition against Spain. However, the Union of Utrecht's unification of the Northern provinces saw, for ~~the~~ only a minimal period, provinces set aside religious and political differences leading to a unified opposition against Spain. ~~The~~ Nonetheless, failures to capture towns such as Breda signifies the ~~pro~~ lack of true and powerful opposition to Spain is a direct result of the provinces inability to unite against opposition. Therefore, it is accurate to say that the failure of Orange's invitation to Anjou was a major reason ~~for~~ opposition in the Netherlands to similarly fail. However, to say Anjou is the singular reason would be limiting as a failure for the provinces to work in coalition precedes the invitation of ~~A~~ Anjou and remains a significant problem for the Dutch revolt throughout.

Overall, it is evident that division exacerbated by the actions and symbolic ~~representat~~ significance of Anjou negatively impacted the Netherlands. As a political figurehead, Anjou created even further division from each province, ~~especially~~ significantly, the division between the provinces and ~~the~~ Orange led to a completely unified Dutch opposition to Spanish.

authority and a therefore weakened fight against
formid forces. It must be noted however that the extreme
loss as a result of this alliance with France was ~~only~~
a result of the continued underlying issues with coalition
and resistance to absolute leadership.



This response offers an analysis of some key issues related to the question though it also includes material that is of more limited linkage. There is also some accurate and relevant knowledge included to demonstrate some understanding of the conceptual focus of the question, and the answer shows some organisation. It was awarded a high L3 mark.

Question 6

There were some very good answers to this question. The stronger ones had a very good knowledge of the importance of the Treaty of Nonsuch for the Dutch cause in the years specified, with reference especially to how English support secured by the Treaty crucially bolstered it with money and soldiers at a vulnerable time following the fall of Antwerp. Against this, many often considered the role of Leicester, and the alternative contributions of Maurice and Oldenbarnevelt, as well as the financial and military overreach of the Spanish during the 1590s. The less strong answers tended lack precise knowledge of the period, and their judgements lacked conviction as a result.

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

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒ Question 6 ☒

Many historians debate whether the Treaty of Munsich in 1585 was of minor importance or not in the success of the United Provinces in the years 1565-1600. Some would argue that it was of minor importance as other factors such as Maurice of Nassau's military excellence or Johan Van Oldenbarnevelt's political transformation of the Netherlands played a more significant role. However, it is undeniable that the Treaty of Munsich was not of minor importance but instead was majorly important in the success of the United Provinces as it provided crucial resources for the rebels to keep fighting as well as diverting Spanish attention away from the Netherlands and onto England.

One reason why some would argue the Treaty of Munsich was of minor importance in the success of the United Provinces was due to Maurice of Nassau being more pivotal in securing rebel success. Nassau entirely revolutionised the rebel army; introducing regular pay for his troops; decreasing battalion size to 550 men; and creating a standing army that built up a sense of camaraderie. These transformations were crucial in comparison to the Treaty of Munsich as it allowed the rebel army to have a major advantage over the Spanish troops. The Spanish army, in comparison,

were unpaid resulting in a series of mutinies against James in 1589 and were also large making them difficult to navigate particularly with the boggy geography of the Netherlands. The contrast in armies was crucial to the rebels success as with their small, mobile battalions they were able to use the waterlogged geography to their advantage and defeat the Spanish on many occasions (such as at Liden in 1584). Some historians would argue that this revolutionary change to the army was the only significant factor in the success of the United Provinces, meaning they would consider the Treaty of Nonsuch to be of minor importance as it played no role in altering and bettering the rebel army. However, without the Treaty of Nonsuch, the rebel army would not have had the strong manpower for Nassau to revolutionise as the signing of this treaty convinced England would send 6000 men and 600,000 flans a year - both which Maurice needed to pay and improve the army. Despite this, some would still argue the treaty of Nonsuch was of minor importance as Nassau's military excellence was vital to the success of the United Provinces in the years 1585-1600.

* ~~Another reason why some would argue the Treaty of Nonsuch was of minor importance is~~

~~because it was Oldenbarnevelt's diplomacy that actually secured the United Pro~~

On the other hand, it is clear to see that the Treaty of Nonsuch was of major significance as it diverted the Spanish attention away from the Netherlands, giving the rebels time to organise themselves. Following its signing in 1585, the Treaty of Nonsuch was considered to be England formally declaring war on Spain, meaning Philip II now had to fight a war on multiple fronts. A crucial blunder made by Philip, that ensured the success of the United Provinces, was taking the Duke of Parma and sending him to England in 1588 to fight the Armada, following the Treaty of Nonsuch. With this distraction, Spain were exhausting their resources, spending 2/3rds of their annual income on the Armada which resulted in them declaring bankruptcy in 1596 and 1607. This obviously greatly benefited the rebels, who were now able to fight a weakened and distracted Spain - all of which would not have happened if it was not for the Treaty of Nonsuch taking away Spain's most successful Governor-General and destroying their economy. Therefore it is undoubtable that the Treaty of Nonsuch was of major significance in the success of the United Provinces as it forced Spain to divert their attention which gave the rebels

a chance to attack.

A final reason why the Treaty at Danube was undeniably of major importance is because it gave the Netherlands a strong ally that boosted morale and provided the necessary resources to win against Spain.

As aforementioned, a crucial part of the rebel success was having standing armies, something Nassau would have struggled with if it was not for the

Treaty at Danube - as Elizabeth had to send 600,000 florins a year to the Dutch. This, again,

was a massive contribution to Spain who had been economically struggling ever since Alva's failed 10th

punny for in 1571. Spanish economy was only

worsening following the treaty whilst the United

Provinces was flourishing. Furthermore, with Elizabeth I

having to send 6000 men a year and one of

her best advisors (the Earl of Leicester), morale was

massively boosted. The strengthening manpower also

strengthened the rebel image, making them look like

the more favourable side to support, when compared

to Spain's exhausted and constantly mutinying

army. Therefore it is obvious that the Treaty at

Danube was of major importance in the

success of the United Provinces in the years

1582-1600 as it strengthened the rebel image by

creating a strong partnership and generating resources and manpower

In light of all of this, it is undeniable that in the years 1582-1600 the Treaty of Norwich was not only a minor importance in the success of the United Provinces, but instead a major one. Whilst some would argue it was a minor success as, other factors such as Maurice of Nassau's military excellence was instead vital in the success of the United Provinces, without the Treaty of Norwich, Nassau would not have had the funds nor the manpower to revolutionise the rebel army. Not only this, the treaty ensured that Spain would be fighting a war on many fronts, leaving them over-extended and distracted, giving the rebels a chance to attack. As well, the alliance strengthened the rebels' image, taking support away from Spain and drawing it to the rebels. Therefore, it is clear that the Treaty of Norwich was of major importance in the success of the United Provinces.

* Another reason why some may argue the Treaty of Norwich is of minor importance is due to Oldenbarnevelt's diplomatic skills in politically restoring the Netherlands, being more instrumental in the success of the United Provinces. Oldenbarnevelt was crucial in removing support away from the

Spanish and to the rebels by creating a climate
of liberation with his laws banning religious
extortion. This attracted many skilled labourers and
intellectuals from the South, with 10,000 cloth
workers going to Mexico, which was significant in
cementing the success of the United Provinces. With
Spanish and the South losing such large amounts
of export, this necessarily strengthened the rebel
image whilst noting Spain's lost wealth, however
some would argue Oldenbarnault's actions were
more important than the Treaty of Nonsuch. However,
it could be said the Treaty of Nonsuch just
the rebels more support from Oldenbarnault.



Here the candidate explores the relationships between key issues relevant to the question, and deploys knowledge sufficient to meet most of its demands. Valid criteria are established in coming to a judgement, and the overall conclusion is supported. The answer is well organised and the argument communicated with clarity. Overall, this essay received a low L5 mark.

Paper Summary

Based on this year's performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A

- Candidates should read the question carefully and ensure that they explicitly address the focus of the enquiry rather than merely discussing the issues raised by the sources in general terms
- Candidates should aim to go beyond comprehension and summary of the sources by developing reasoned inferences that are fully discussed
- Candidates should read the caption and make full use of it when evaluating the sources
- Contextual knowledge should be used to illuminate and discuss what is in the source, rather than provide an answer to the enquiry. Long descriptions of linked events are unlikely to gain much, if any, credit
- Candidates should ensure that their responses address the demands of all three bullet points that are assessed in this section of the paper.

Section B

- Candidates must provide precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses generally lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues rather than merely presenting a list of factors
- Candidates should ensure that they deal with both sides of an argument where the question requires this.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

