



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel in
GCE History (9HI0/2B)
Advanced

Paper 2: Depth study

Option 2B.1: Luther and the German
Reformation, c1515-1555

Option 2B.2: The Dutch Revolt, c1563-1609

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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 2024

Question Paper P75760A

Publications Code 9HI0_2B_2406_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

How to award marks when level descriptions are used

1. Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use the guidance below and their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

For example, one stronger passage at L4 would not by itself merit a L4 mark, but it might be evidence to support a high L3 mark, unless there are substantial weaknesses in other areas. Similarly, an answer that fits best in L3 but which has some characteristics of L2 might be placed at the bottom of L3. An answer displaying some characteristics of L3 and some of L1 might be placed in L2.

2. Finding a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

Levels containing two marks only

Start with the presumption that the work will be at the top of the level. Move down to the lower mark if the work only just meets the requirements of the level.

Levels containing three or more marks

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements *fully*, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- If it only *barely* meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a *reasonable* match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

Indicative content

Examiners are reminded that indicative content is provided as an illustration to markers of some of the material that may be offered by students. It does not show required content and alternatives should be credited where valid.

Generic Level Descriptors: Section A

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria but with limited justification.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/ or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.

Section B

Target: AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. • The overall judgement is missing or asserted. • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. • An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. • The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement. • The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

Section A: indicative content

Option 2A.1: Luther and the German Reformation, c1515-55

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the development of Lutheranism in the aftermath of the Diet of Worms.</p> <p>Source 1</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The source was written by Luther himself, who had been present at important sessions of the Diet of Worms and was in a very good position to judge its impact on the Lutheran movement• The source is a private letter, written in a trusting and intimate tone to someone who is a friend, therefore it is likely to reveal Luther's true thoughts on Lutheranism following the Diet• The letter was written while the Diet was still in session and before the Edict of Worms had been formally issued, therefore may not be able to judge the full effects of the Diet on Lutheranism. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the development of Lutheranism in the aftermath of the Diet of Worms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The source indicates that Luther, the inspiration of the Lutheran movement, has been forced into hiding in consequence of the Diet ('captured', 'protected by friends', 'safe...Emperor's laws')• It implies that the impact of the Diet on Lutheranism will be difficult for supporters and that it will cause significant religious conflict in Germany ('incite hatred and violence.')• It suggests that the results of the Diet may be mitigated by the tacit support for Luther by Duke Frederick – the letter was written to his adviser on religious matters and Luther is clearly being treated well• It suggests that, by necessitating Luther's withdrawal from public life, the Diet has freed up his time to develop his ideas still further ('write a sermon...sins.', 'continue my work...the Old Testament'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Charles V was forced to grant Luther safe passage to and from the Diet of Worms from Wittenberg by the influence of Duke Frederick the Wise, who was sympathetic to Luther and aspects of Lutheranism• Following Luther's refusal to retract his opinions during two days of examination before the Diet, Charles issued a damning condemnation of Luther and his 'false doctrine' on 19 April, declaring him an 'outlaw'• Luther left the Diet on 26 April after the failure of negotiations to avoid schism – on his journey home, on 4 May, he was 'kidnapped' by agents of Frederick the Wise and held secretly in the Duke's Wartburg Castle• The Edict of Worms, which ordered all Electors and Princes to capture the 'heretic' Luther, 'attack' his supporters and destroy all his works, was formally issued by Charles on 25 May.

Question	Indicative content
	<p>Source 2</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The author of the source, Philip Melanchthon, was a leading supporter of Luther and can be expected to comment authoritatively on the movement in the wake of the Diet of Worms • As a report written for the Duke of Electoral Saxony, under whose authority Melanchthon lived and worked, it can be expected to give a full and accurate assessment of such important religious developments • Written only months after the Edict of Worms was issued, and while Luther was still in hiding for his own protection at Wartburg Castle, the tone of the report reflects the hopes and uncertainties of the time. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the development of Lutheranism in the aftermath of the Diet of Worms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It suggests that Duke Frederick was directly responsible for Luther's 'kidnapping', in spite of the Edict of Worms, as his permission was needed for Luther to meet the radicals ('requires a prompt answer.') • It suggests that without Luther's presence as a result of the Edict of Worms, radical ideas were spreading amongst Lutherans ('dangerous arguments', 'able to converse...with God...can foretell the future') • It implies that Luther's return to public life in defiance of the Edict was vital as only he had the status and authority to lead Lutheranism ('only Martin can judge this', 'it is vital...meet soon with Martin.'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Luther remained in the Wartburg for ten months before increasing radicalism among his followers (e.g. Carlstadt, Müntzer) persuaded him to defy the Edict of Worms and return to Wittenberg in March 1522 • In Luther's absence, increasing popular support for Lutheranism, also Charles' absence from Germany and the reluctance of Germany's leading princes to enforce the Edict, significantly lessened its immediate impact • Frederick was deeply alarmed by the growth of religious radicalism in his lands, fearing the intervention of neighbouring princes, and agreed Luther's return to Wittenberg to condemn it • Luther restored religious order in Wittenberg within days through the Invocavit Sermons, confirming both his central role in the development of Lutheranism and the primacy of a 'princely-led' Reformation. <p>Sources 1 and 2</p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both sources refer to the absence of Luther from Wittenberg as a direct consequence of the decisions made at the Diet of Worms • Both sources refer to the crucial role played by Duke Frederick the Wise of Electoral Saxony in shielding Luther from the impact of Charles V's condemnation at the Diet of Worms • Both sources indicate that Luther was the central figure in the development of Lutheranism in the early 1520s, e.g. translating the Bible while in the Wartburg and as the only person able to lead the movement.

Option 2B.2: The Dutch Revolt, c1563-1609

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to investigate the religious situation in the Netherlands in the years c1563-67.</p> <p>Source 3</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• As an Edict issued by the monarch, the source gives a clear and unambiguous picture of royal policy towards religion in the Netherlands in the 1560s• Issued shortly after he came to the throne and in force throughout following decade, the Edict was very likely to reflect Philip II's personal attitude towards heresy• The tone and language of the Edict are harsh and uncompromising, giving no room for doubt or debate. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the religious situation in the Netherlands in the years c1563-67:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It indicates that heresy, defined as any deviance from the official position of the Catholic Church, is not to be tolerated in the Netherlands ('No one shall...condemned by the Church.', 'Nobody shall explain...heretics.')• The source indicates anyone found guilty of heresy in the Netherlands will face death, regardless of any recantation they may make ('Those found guilty...executed. If they confess...buried alive.')• It provides evidence that punishment awaited even those who may succour heretics ('give food or clothing to...') and that failing to report a suspected heretic would also result in execution• It suggests, by the comprehensiveness of the Edict and the inducements offered to informers ('Any informer...full pardon. '), that heresy is already a problem in the Netherlands. <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Philip was born and raised in Spain and was a devout Catholic, extremely hostile to heresy – after leaving the Netherlands for Spain, he demanded that his regent, Margaret of Parma, enforce his religious wishes in full• Philip had little real understanding of the complexities of the Netherlands and was impatient of those who counselled caution in execution of his policies, e.g. over the work of the Inquisition or the reform of bishoprics• Calvinism spread quickly in the southern Netherlands in the early-mid 1560s, spurred on by the influx of French Huguenots, and the civil and religious authorities faced significant problems enforcing Philip's laws• Many town and provincial governments continued to turn a blind eye to the heresy laws, concerned for the preservation of traditional customs and privileges in the Netherlands, and worried about their economic effects.

Question	Indicative content
	<p>Source 4</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a letter written by a long-serving member of the Inquisition, who was involved in many heresy trials, the source will reflect the official, Catholic position towards religious deviance in the Netherlands • Written to persuade the Regent to take action, there may be an element of exaggeration in the claims that Titelmans makes • The letter was written when Calvinism was growing quickly in the southern provinces of the Netherlands due its proximity to France where religious war had just broken out, hence its worried tone. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the religious situation in the Netherlands in the years c1563-67:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides evidence that heresy is already present in the Netherlands ('a sermon attacking...faith.') and has significant support ('a crowd present of about 150 to 200 people, all from the local area.') • It suggests that the heretics are confident, displaying little need for discretion despite the heresy laws ('during High Mass...a prominent place in the churchyard...He then gave a sermon...') • It suggests that the heretics have organisation and are persistent in their cause ('To protect the preacher...and pistols.', 'This same preacher was arrested some years ago...') • It claims that the existing laws do not deter the heretics ('normal methods...inadequate') and that they are making numbers of converts ('in the countryside...poor simple folk...misled'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sure in their faith, which included the expectation of struggle and suffering, Calvinists were increasingly open in their challenge to the religious authorities in the Netherlands in the early-mid 1560s • Having few buildings available to use for worship, the Calvinists often held their meetings in the open air – such 'hedge services' grew massively in number and attendance by 1567 • The growth of Calvinism on the one hand, and Philip's insistence on Catholic uniformity on the other, put Margaret of Parma's government in an increasingly difficult position • In 1566, encouraged by leading grandees like Orange, a confederacy of minor noblemen forced Margaret to agree to moderate the heresy laws and the severity of the Inquisition ('The Compromise'). <p>Sources 3 and 4</p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both sources reflect the expectation of a fully Catholic Netherlands – Source 3 states the wishes of the King, while Source 4 is written by a member of the Inquisition whose job it was to enforce them • Both sources acknowledge that there was a challenge to Catholic hegemony in the Netherlands – Source 3 tacitly recognises the existence of heresy and Source 4 openly describes its presence • Both suggest that the resolution of the religious situation may involve struggle and violence – Source 3 is uncompromising in its punishments for heresy, while Source 4 indicates the determination of heretics to resist.

Section B: indicative content

Option 2A.1: Luther and the German Reformation, c1515-55

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the accuracy of the statement that the printing press was of only minor importance in the development of Luther's challenge to the Catholic Church in the years 1517-20.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the printing press was of only minor importance in the development of Luther's challenge to the Catholic Church in the years 1517-20 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Over ninety percent of the German population in these years was illiterate, suggesting that the output of the printing presses, often concerning abstruse theology and written in Latin, was less important• Much of the material printed in this period lacked importance in the development of Luther's challenge, e.g. it often merely contained crude attacks on the Catholic Church• Prevailing popular hostility towards the abuses of the Catholic Church and the inconsistencies in the Church's teachings, as highlighted by the humanists, created a receptive audience for Luther's challenge• The mistakes of Luther's academic opponents during these years were important in the development of his challenge, e.g. the abrasive over-confidence of Cajetan and Eck in debates with Luther badly backfired• The complacency of senior churchmen like Archbishop Albrecht of Mainz and Pope Leo X, who both missed opportunities to act against Luther in this period, was crucial in the development of his challenge• Luther's character, and his abilities as a scholar and polemicist, were crucial in his developing challenge, e.g. his courage in maintaining and developing his ideas in spite of the threats made against him. <p>Arguments and evidence that opposes the view that the printing press was of only minor importance in the development of Luther's challenge to the Catholic Church in the years 1517-20 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The rapid growth of the printing press helped prepare the ground for Luther's challenge by encouraging the market for cheaply-produced devotional works, e.g. primers and Books of Hours• The press enabled Luther to access humanist texts when developing his own ideas, e.g. Erasmus' Greek Testament was crucial in his understanding of penance• The presses in the larger urban centres churned out Luther's writings in such numbers between 1517 and 1520 that he became a figure of both national and international importance who could not be ignored• The easy availability of Luther's works produced by the printing press was crucial in enabling the growth of support for Luther's challenge among the more educated and most influential, e.g. in university theology faculties• Cheap, mass-produced images of Luther were widely produced by presses for the illiterate majority, e.g. by Cranach, vastly exceeding the number of Luther's books in circulation and turning him into a popular German hero• The importance of the presses is supported by the scale of production of Luther's works, e.g. the first edition of the 1520 pamphlet 'To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation', sold 4000 copies in three weeks. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the statement that the failure of Lutheran-Catholic negotiations, in the years 1526-46, was due largely to the attitude of Martin Luther.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the failure of Lutheran-Catholic negotiations, in the years 1526-46, was due largely to the attitude of Martin Luther should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Luther was stubborn and abrasive in defence of his theology, and prone to vituperative outbursts against his opponents – these were not qualities likely to encourage compromise or agreement • During the debates over the Augsburg Confession at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, Luther wrote continually to Melanchthon urging him to avoid compromise on issues such as purgatory and the role of the papacy • While the Diet of Augsburg was still sitting, Luther published a pamphlet, 'An Admonition to All Clergy Assembled at Augsburg', which was sceptical of agreement and mocked key teachings of the Catholic Church • Despite some progress being made in initial negotiations between the two sides at the Regensburg Colloquy in 1541, Luther refused to agree to important articles regarding justification and the sacraments • During the Regensburg Diet, Luther told supporters that he had doubts about the sincerity of the Catholic negotiators and made any agreement dependent on conditions that he would have known could not be accepted. <p>Arguments and evidence that counter the view that the failure of Lutheran-Catholic negotiations, in the years 1526-46, was due largely to the attitude of Martin Luther should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charles V bears responsibility for the failure of negotiations – a devout Catholic, he privately indicated his unwillingness to accept any compromise with the Lutherans, preferring a military solution • Though Charles did convene negotiations at Augsburg and Regensburg, he broached talks only when it was expedient for him, e.g. when he was unable to use military means or needed the support of the German princes • The papacy was responsible for the failure, e.g. in 1536, Paul III rejected reforms that may have convinced Lutherans that compromise was possible and he vetoed Contarini's attempts to reach agreement at Regensburg • German princes prevented agreement at the Diets of Speyer in 1526 and 1529 – having refused to enforce the Edict of Worms at the former, they insisted on it in the latter, prompting the 'protestation' of the Lutherans • The aggressive stance of Lutheran princes like Philip of Hesse, who formed the Schmalkaldic League in 1531 and allied with both the French and the Ottomans against the Emperor, made negotiations less likely to succeed • By the early 1530s, Lutheranism had acquired theological clarity, a powerful protective alliance and thousands of sincere and determined followers – all this made it unlikely that compromise could be reached. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Option 2B.2: The Dutch Revolt, c1563-1609

Question	Indicative content
5	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how far Parma's leadership of the Spanish cause in the Netherlands, in the years 1578-92, can be termed a success.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Parma's leadership of the Spanish cause in the Netherlands, in the years 1578-92, can be termed a success should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Parma moderated Philip's hard-line policies as a means of restoring Spanish rule from 1578, acknowledging that religious and political intransigence, combined with a lack of money, would not bring success• Parma's political skills led to the increasing use of diplomacy as a tactic to restore Spanish rule in the Netherlands, playing on the fear, among many, of Calvinist radicalism and mistrust of Orange's intentions• In 1579, Parma persuaded Philip to agree the Treaty of Arras (which included confirming Dutch customs and privileges and a promise to limit taxation), thus helping to establish key allies in the southern Netherlands• Parma had significant military success, starting with the Siege of Maastricht in 1579, which re-established Spanish control of Brabant and Flanders, and culminating in the recapture of Antwerp• Parma's abilities as a commander ensured that his armies maintained discipline and that there was no repeat of the 'Furies' which had so alienated the Dutch previously• By 1585, Parma's combination of military and diplomatic skill had restored all but the provinces of Zeeland and Holland to Spanish rule, even detaching northern provinces like Groningen from the Union of Utrecht. <p>Arguments and evidence that challenges the view that Parma's leadership of the Spanish cause in the Netherlands, in the years 1578-92, can be termed a success should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Parma's military progress began to stall from the mid-1580s, even before the launch of the Armada, e.g. his narrow escape at Empel in December 1585, and he had no further successes after 1589• Parma initially supported Philip's plan for the invasion of England despite its likely effect on his position in the Netherlands, only later indicating his opposition• Parma's failure to capture Bommel in 1589 was a major turning point that led to the re-emergence of mutiny amongst his troops and a steady collapse in morale in the Spanish cause• Parma was unable to react successfully to the reinvigoration of the rebel cause under Maurice of Nassau from 1590 – this led to a collapse in confidence in his leadership in Spain and increasing calls for his dismissal• Parma died exhausted in 1592, having failed to reunite the Netherlands under Spanish rule – the difficulties of his later years in office foreshadowed those that led to the Truce of Antwerp in 1609. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
6	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that, in the years 1584-1609, the growing power of the United Provinces was due mainly to the development of overseas trade.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1584-1609, the growing power of the United Provinces was due mainly to the development of overseas trade should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overseas trade boomed during the 1590s, buoyed by the migration of many merchants and businessmen from the south, following the fall of Antwerp, helping to widen the tax base of the United Provinces • The United Provinces continued to exploit markets in the Baltic, Africa, the Caribbean and South America, vital to its rising prosperity and power • The foundation of the Dutch East India Company in 1602 challenged Portuguese domination of the spice trade, and significantly enhanced the international reputation and 'soft' power of the United Provinces • The immediate success of the Company, seen in its rising returns to shareholders, enabled significant capital accumulation – this boosted military expenditure through the issue of government bonds • By its success, overseas trade helped further the political ends of the United Provinces – international recognition of its cause was hastened by the prominent role it played in the European economy • The prosperity of the United Provinces rapidly became a focus for national pride, enhancing political unity and cohesion in what had been previously a disunited and fractious entity. <p>Arguments and evidence that counters the view that, in the years 1584-1609, the growing power of the United Provinces was due mainly to the development of overseas trade should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maurice of Nassau was central to the growing power of the United Provinces, following the setbacks in the early 1580s, e.g. his reform and reorganisation of the army led to the vital military victories of the 1590s • The political skills of Oldenbarnevelt assisted the power of the provinces by ensuring that the army was properly paid and supplied, that trade was encouraged, and he also negotiated the Truce of Antwerp in 1609 • Oldenbarnevelt successfully curbed the religious intolerance of individual provinces, stressing allegiance to secular authority and helping to avoid the re-emergence of dangerous division in the United Provinces • The growing power of the United Provinces was attributable significantly to the inability of Spain to finance its armies in the Netherlands, following its disasters against England and in France during the late 1580s • Foreign support was vital in assisting the growth in power of the United Provinces, e.g. the Treaty of Nonsuch with England in 1585 and agreements with Henry IV of France from 1589 • The spirit of greater religious toleration in the United Provinces helped its power develop by attracting those, often among the intellectual and commercial elite, that enhanced its economy and reputation. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

