

GCE 2004
June Series



Mark Scheme

History Alternative B Units 1, 4 and 6 *(Subject Code 5041/6041)*

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester, M15 6EX.

Dr. Michael Cresswell Director General

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners**

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The revised specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the new specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS**Level 1:**

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:***Either***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:*Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:*Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

June 2004

Alternative B: Europe in Transition, c1470-1610

AS Unit 1: Religious change and its consequences in sixteenth-century Europe

Question 1

(a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the importance of such images of the Catholic Church at the time of the Lutheran Reformation. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. there was a lot of criticism of the Church for practices such as the sale of indulgences. The focus could be either on the medium (woodcut) or its message (i.e. corrupt practices). **1**

L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. the Pope is clearly indicated as corrupt through the conveyor belt type production of indulgences/forgiveness of sins; the Church is seen as making money out of the poor (e.g. notes the relative appearance of the clergy and those purchasing forgiveness). It highlights the criticisms made by Luther in his 95 Theses of lack of spirituality in the Church etc. **2-3**

(b) Use **Source B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

Explain how **Source C** challenges the view put forward in **Source B** about the influence of Luther on the spread of the Reformation in Germany. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full and effective answers which do not explicitly contain 'own knowledge'. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility, will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to 'pieces' of factual content.

L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. Source C suggests that the Reformation spread as a result of the influence of secular rulers whereas Source B suggests that Luther was key through his oratory and writings in influencing a range of people. **1-2**

L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. Source C suggests that country folk were too steeped in superstition to respond to Luther's arguments, the clergy were too keen on

maintaining their positions and princes were afraid of loss of lands and privileges if they disturbed the status quo. This could be supported by reference to the Peasant's War where some were simply bent on destruction rather than establishing a 'godly community'. In contrast, Source B suggests that Luther knew how to persuade people, that his writing was 'powerful', that it was directed at specific groups – the literate, the princes and ordinary people – and appealed to their ambitions, intellect and/or greed; that he used the printing press successfully. This could be exemplified by reference to the support of theologians like Melancthon and of princes such as Frederick the Wise and Philip of Hesse. Some answers may note that the role of the secular authorities is seen as significant in both extracts but for differing reasons. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. understands the difference between Luther's personal influence (Source B) as opposed to the concept of Protestantism (Source C) and prevailing conditions; appreciates the vital role of the princes in either supporting or opposing Luther for practical or idealistic reasons (Source B) and (Source C) and shows awareness that localised factors may be more important in deciding whether or not to accept the Reformation. **6-7**

(c) Use **Source A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

Explain the importance, in relation to other factors, of the shortcomings of the Catholic clergy in explaining the success of the Reformation in Germany. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *either* on own knowledge *or* the sources. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**

- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

From the Sources: Sources A and C offer something about the shortcomings of the clergy – in Source A as personified in the Pope and his greed, his elevation above the common people and the importance of earthly things, e.g. money over the spiritual (seen in the altar in the background and the sale of indulgences in the foreground); in Source C through reference to the clergy remaining a closed caste. However, Source B and C also identify other factors such as Luther’s communication skills, the ambitions of secular rulers and the growth of nationalism which resented a supranational Church. Source C particularly reinforces the part played by secular authorities to further their own ambitions.

From own knowledge: issues of nepotism, clerical marriage, lack of education and absenteeism were common throughout Europe. It could be argued, however, that these abuses were not new and had been commonly accepted; it was only when reformers such as Luther challenged them that they became less acceptable. Luther’s challenge arose out of the influence of humanism and the concept of returning to the original texts (*ad fontes*), which generated different interpretations of the mass, indulgences, the role of priests etc. Printing speeded up the process of spreading ideas and made them available to a wider group through woodcuts as well as words. Political ambitions then became involved as rulers saw the advantages, often financial as well as spiritual, of throwing off the control of the Catholic Church. However, Germany had a devout Emperor and his absences and lack of authority could also add to the explanation of the success of the Reformation in Germany.

Level 1 responses may deal in a limited way with one factor only such as the shortcomings of the clergy. At Level 2 the range should be extended with some supporting material. Level 3 understanding may be shown through more analytical responses which show greater precision and exemplification and may offer factors which both support and oppose the proposition. Responses at Level 4 will offer some range and depth with some reference to relative contribution, thus establishing some balance in the explanation. Level 5 judgements may be demonstrated by effective prioritisation and evaluation of contributing factors.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by “the sharing of property” in the context of the radical reformation. **(3 marks)**

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the holding of property in common as practised by various radical sects such as Anabaptists at Munster. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. a practice based on the belief that property was selfish. It led to the establishment of communal farming, e.g. Moravia and to a form of communal living in Munster. It generated opposition both within the radical movement and outside it. In Munster it led to violence and intensified persecution. It was one of the factors responsible for the limited impact of the radical reformation. **2-3**

(b) Explain why the radicals were persecuted, even by other Protestant reformers. **(7 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. they were different, more extreme, they were often of a different social class. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. explaining the reasons why radicals were persecuted, as above with examples such as Grebel, a layman, Muntzer who was a parish priest; they had different beliefs, e.g. adult baptism, belief in revelation, non-payment of tithes, pacificism, polygamy etc which seemed to threaten the existing social and economic order; they were prepared to fight for their beliefs, e.g. in Munster; they organised themselves creating communities and even a 'state' in Munster thus threatening political institutions; they were more democratic and also fanatical which appealed to ordinary people; there were numerous groups springing up in the Netherlands and Germany which were seen as a threat. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. explaining why the radicals were persecuted, and prioritises, makes links and draws conclusions about their relative significance, e.g. understands that their differences, as identified in Level 2, set them part and made them a threat in society as well as to established and nascent reformed religion alike despite their small numbers; Anabaptists were generally regarded as more dangerous than e.g. Hutterites because of the Munster affair; they were generally intolerant and prepared to take up arms. **6-7**

(c) "The radical reformers made no significant impact on the progress of the Reformation."
Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

The period when radicals were high profile was short i.e. 1520s and early 1530s, there were many different groups (Melchiorites, Hutterites, Mennonites, Anabaptists, the prophets of Zwickau etc) and so did not offer a unified faith; their ideas were extreme and followers were expected to follow them in their own lives, e.g. polygamy, communism, the second coming, martyrdom – often resulting in conflict with the authorities and usually defeat or exile. The communities they established were small and short-lived. However, there are arguments to suggest the radicals did have impact, e.g. they were feared because of the threat they presented, and this may have made Luther, Calvin etc seem more acceptable; there were considerable numbers (at least 30,000 were killed in the Netherlands) becoming martyrs for their cause; they were enthusiastic and appealed to the ordinary people, although they did not become a large scale movement; they demonstrated that Catholicism was no longer a universal religion and thus helped to consolidate the reformation. Zwingli may also be seen as champion of radicalism and his success in Zurich is important, although it isolated the city from the more mainstream Lutheran reformation; he did take views on the Eucharist further in denying the real presence and he signified close co-operation between church and state which Calvin was to adopt in Geneva.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to offer some assertions about impact which may be generalised or have some limited focus for example on a particular group of radicals. At Level 2, knowledge of a number of different groups of radicals could be used to exemplify difference or links to the reformers but may do this descriptively. Level 3 answers should provide more targeted information but could still lack range and/or depth. By Level 4, a range of arguments regarding the nature of the impact of the radicals on mainstream reform will be developed to provide a balanced response. At Level 5 reasons and supported judgement about the extent of the impact of the radicals will be presented.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by “nepotism” in the context of the Papacy and the Catholic Church in the early sixteenth century. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the practice of promoting relatives, the uneducated etc to positions of importance in the Church. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. understands the consequences of this in terms of absenteeism, corruption, generation of criticism of the Church and its leaders etc. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the Popes needed to re-establish their reputation as spiritual leaders by the mid- sixteenth century. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. the Popes had been lax, irreligious etc in the early part of the period. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. gives examples of papal neglect of religious duty, involvement in wars, failure to do anything about abuses, the sale of indulgences etc. Understands that this gave rise to both criticism and resentment at all levels in society and made papacy an easy target for the criticisms of the reformers. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. explaining why the Popes needed to re-establish their reputation, links the shortcomings of the Popes with the development of Protestantism, the demand for a General Council, the growth of anti-clericalism in Europe generally etc. and prioritises and draws conclusions about their relative significance. **6-7**

- (c) “The Council of Trent brought about a dramatic change in the Catholic Church.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: **Either**
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

This is a fairly open question which should allow answers to range over doctrinal, organisational and structural issues and draw variable conclusions, e.g. the calling of a Council in itself is noteworthy as a sign that the Church had recognised the need to define itself in the face of the rise of Protestantism and the power of the HRE and other European states. The Council both defined doctrine and carried out reform. Consideration of doctrine resulted in little fundamental change but did force the Church to provide greater clarity and thus challenge Protestantism e.g. scripture and tradition were both seen as valid sources of the truth in defiance of protestant teaching; the seven sacraments were confirmed as valid; justification by faith alone was rejected and good works were seen as important. Transubstantiation was confirmed. There was little change in this respect. Reform was limited e.g. laws against absenteeism and pluralism were passed but were seldom put into effect, although seminaries to educate clergy were an improvement and there was more emphasis on the pastoral role of bishops, the potential contribution of the laity was ignored. In assessing the extent of these changes, answers might consider that the traditional structures were still in place, the pope was dependent upon the wishes of rulers for their implementation and Spain was the only country which promised support immediately. On the other hand, the church was reinvigorated and the growth of new orders is a good example of this.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be undeveloped, narrowly based and unspecific. At Level 2, the focus may be on a wider view of change but lack detailed support, e.g. consideration of doctrinal and organisational change in general terms. For Level 3, some range and detail is to be anticipated with limited links to effects. Level 4 answers will show awareness of limitations to change as well as positive outcomes and at Level 5, this judgement will be explicit.

June 2004

Alternative B: Europe in Transition, c1470-1610

A2 Unit 4: The State, Authority and Conflict

Question 1

(a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Explain what is meant by “control of the appointments of bishops” in the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella. (5 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. the right to choose those appointed to the highest offices in the Spanish Church, usually bishops and archbishops. **1**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or from own knowledge, e.g. from the source – that the Pope traditionally had this right but that Ferdinand and Isabella were anxious to change this. From own knowledge may e.g. set this against the background of Ferdinand and Isabella’s accession and their determination to ensure firm control, link to the piety of the monarchs etc. **2-3**

L3: As Level 2, with developed reference to the sources and own knowledge, e.g. relates more precisely to the issue of civil war, concern for the power of the crown, the opportunity given by the vacancy at Cuenca to assert a matter of principle, the need for reform in the church which might be better overseen by a political rather than a papal appointment, resentment at foreign appointments and absenteeism etc. **4-5**

(b) Use **Sources B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

How fully does Source C support the views in Source B of royal control over the Church in Spain? (10 marks)

L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. **3-5**

L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. **6-8**

L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. **9-10**

Indicative content

Awards at Level 1 may identify agreement i.e. both sources agree that the monarch was influential in the church; may give brief example, e.g. B quotes Charles I and nomination to sees; C quotes Philip II overseeing reform. At Level 2 answers will be more developed and also draw upon own knowledge, e.g. Charles took part of the Church's income, Philip created a new archdiocese in Burgos and a number of new dioceses in Aragon. At this level may also be aware of differences, e.g. sources suggest that Charles's focus is on administration, whereas Philip's control extends to matters of faith; that B points out that although some rights are abandoned by the papacy, the legal and overarching powers are retained by the Pope. Responses at L3 should show comparison and contrast of issues from both sources and from own knowledge and should begin to evaluate C against B, e.g. in addition to comparisons already made will note that C is asserting greater powers for the monarch e.g. that Philip's powers in C appear to extend over both religious change and administrative matters, that the Pope is not mentioned, excommunications are authorised in Spain. Own knowledge may refer to the banning of books, disputes over control of the Jesuits etc. By Level 4, there should be clear focus on sufficiency considering e.g. the relative importance of the issues over which the Spanish Church had control and those which were externally supervised in each reign.

- (c) Use **Sources A, B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

“Political rather than religious factors influenced the crown in its relations with the Church in Spain in the years 1469 to 1598.”

How far do you agree with this view?

(15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **5-8**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the

question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **14-15**

Indicative content

This is a synoptic question and candidates' responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this particular Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content for each particular question.

From the sources: A states quite clearly that the monarchs aimed to limit the political power of the Church and did this through the handing over of fortresses and the nomination of a bishop. B suggests that the monarchy encroached upon the political power of the Church even more through appointments but was also motivated towards religious control through the Inquisition, although this control was not complete. C suggests the religious influence was stronger but D shows a monarch who is concerned to brook no intervention from any other authority.

Against this answers might draw upon their knowledge of the piety of all the monarchs expressed in their determination to reform the clergy (Ferdinand and Isabella), the desire to maintain the purity of Catholicism through the campaign against Erasmianism and Lutheranism under Charles I and Philip II and the re-catholicising of the church under Philip II.

Level 1 responses might provide limited information about either political or religious factors at some points during the period; full coverage at this level would not be expected. Level 2 answers should give more thorough accounts and cover more of the period; a limited attempt to compare religious and political influences could be expected. By Level 3 some balance will be achieved and a limited conclusion drawn about the relative influence of the factors identified. Coverage of the period should show range and understanding of the major differences in royal policy. Level 4 responses will be more selective in their approach, wide ranging and provide supported conclusions about the comparative influence of political and religious factors. Level 5 answers will consolidate this approach with securely based judgement on relative influence. Detailed knowledge on Charles V is not to be expected.

Section B

Question 2 onward

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates' responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 levels of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: *Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-6**

L2: *Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Option A: The Netherlands, 1565-1609**Question 2**

“The desire for independence from Spain was more significant than religious issues in generating revolt in the Netherlands by 1572.”

How far do you agree with this judgement? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Particularism was not a new issue in the Netherlands but early signs of what might be interpreted as political opposition to Spain emerged in 1565, e.g. in the compromise drawn up by the lesser nobility objecting to the work of the Inquisition and the more direct interference by Philip II in the affairs of the Netherlands following the iconoclastic riots. This led to the arrival of Alva and the use of force. Alva's subsequent actions e.g. in setting up the Council of Troubles encouraged stronger action aimed at ousting the Spaniards. By 1568 William of Orange had been condemned by the Council of Troubles and was actively resisting Spanish rule. Unwillingness or lack of political skill on Alva's part meant that he refused to change his policies and thus strengthened the resistance further. By 1571 there was further revolt and by 1572 the States of Holland recognised William as Stadholder. Resistance might now be interpreted as rebellion and as Stadholder William could be seen as the champion of political independence recovering lost rights and liberties. However, no coherent political programme had emerged which was adopted by all the states. Religion had also played a part with respect to both the Catholic church and Protestantism e.g. the dispute over the creation of new bishoprics, the role of the Inquisition and the Spanish campaign against heresy, the iconoclastic riots of 1566 and the decision by Philip II that Protestantism must be eradicated. In terms of immediate causes, religious issues might be seen as the catalyst particularly when the States of Holland declared themselves Calvinist; however, it could also be argued that timing suggested a political response particularly as Alva and the Spanish army arrived after the suppression of the iconoclasts. Information post 1572 should not be rewarded.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be superficial and focus on one or other aspect. Level 2 responses should begin to consider both political and religious factors but in an unbalanced and descriptive manner. At Level 3 depth of knowledge should be sufficient to show some appreciation of the tensions and links between issues of religion and independence from Spain leading to tentative or weakly supported judgements. Level 4 answers will be more secure, deploying knowledge effectively to support the discussion and conclusion. The debate will be well directed, sustained and supported throughout to achieve Level 5.

Question 3

“Economic strength rather than military skill dictated the course of the conflict in the Netherlands in the years 1565 to 1609.”

To what extent do you agree with this view? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Economic strength was a significant factor for both sides because it generated the finance to support conflict, i.e. the payment of armies, the building of fortifications etc; lack of it could lead to defeat. However, even significant expenditure cannot compensate for lack of military expertise and a degree of flair. Candidates should be aware that throughout the period Spain's economy was in varying degrees of difficulty which generated problems of paying their armies, building fortifications etc. and led to disasters such as mutinies of Spanish troops e.g. in 1573 and again in 1576. The first mutiny led Requesens to attempt unsuccessful peace talks with the rebels and the second led to the 'fury of Antwerp' which simply strengthened the resistance of the rebels leading to the Pacification of Ghent and temporary unity of the Netherlands.

In contrast the Dutch did not experience such severe economic difficulties; taxes were high but trade continued. The migration of Protestants northwards strengthened the Dutch economic base and contributed to trade. The revival of Spanish fortunes in 1578 at Gembloux when further bullion reached Spain shows the effects of a good supply of cash to pay troops. Although levels of supply dropped under Parma, they were regular and Spain doubled the area it controlled in the Netherlands. After 1589, the situation worsened again; lack of cash consistently undermined Spanish efforts and e.g. led to the loss of Groningen. Again, in contrast, the Dutch received aid from their Protestant allies e.g. Elizabeth I. This directly led to the Spanish Armada, diversion of troops from the Netherlands, loss of successful commander (Parma) and eventually to the truce of 1609. Both sides at this point were anxious for peace having felt the continuous economic strain of 30 years of war.

For the Dutch, both William the Silent and his son Maurice of Nassau were able generals; they did not generate new methods of warfare but took advantage of e.g. the terrain as at Leiden when the dykes were flooded. Maurice was responsible for reforming the army (better training, developing improved tactics etc) generating a more professional approach. Both sides avoided open battle. In contrast, Alva successfully restored order in the Netherlands but proved to be politically inept, generating a repressive regime which sustained the revolt and led to his dismissal in 1573. Requesens died before he could restore the situation. Parma was the most successful of all Spanish generals, retaking most of the southern and central parts of the Netherlands by 1585; however, he was diverted to deal with the Armada in 1588. Spinola did begin to recover territory after 1605 but the truce of 1609 halted progress. Some answers could, however, argue that the support of England and the

diversion generated by France had enabled the Dutch to bring the Spaniards to a standstill rather than their military achievements or economic strength.

Answers at Level 1 are unlikely to make comparisons, will have only a sketchy notion of events and individuals and be limited in focus. For Level 2 award, there should be some outline of factors and/or understanding of major events which link to the issues; the emphasis might be either on economic or military aspects. At Level 3, the expectation is of greater balance on the issues and events and effective links between them. This is the maximum for responses which do not cover the 1580s. The precise mark will be dependent on the quality of the response and its approach adapted to that point. Level 4 responses should make direct contrasts and comparisons of economic strength and military successes and draw conclusive judgements on their influence on events. Level 5 answers may in addition be distinguished by their consistent and sustained ability to debate the issue of 'extent'.

Question 4

The emergent Dutch state in 1609 was no more united than the Netherlands had been in 1565.”

Assess the validity of this view with reference to political and religious matters.

(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

In political terms - In 1565 the whole area of the Netherlands was under Spanish control whereas in 1609, it was divided between the Spanish Netherlands and the United Provinces. There was little unity of government; in 1565, the 17 provinces had been under the control of three Stadholders responsible to the Spanish appointed Governor-General; in 1609, the Dutch state was still governed by three Stadholders but there was no monarch/ruler with supreme powers. The nearest to this was Maurice of Nassau who was Stadholder of five provinces, thus generating some level of unity. Hence it was a republic rather than a sovereign state. Holland played the biggest role in 1609 in establishing the new framework fulfilling its belief in 1565 that it was the most important state largely as a result of its economic strengths. At both points in time the States-General was the most important decision making body for the area. In 1565, it only had to meet every 3 years and its decisions had to be unanimous. However, by 1609, although 18 states had voting rights, Oldebaarneveldt was the Advocate for Holland and thus ensured that Holland took most of the important decisions – particularly military and strategic. At both points in time the towns played important roles but by 1609, the States-General could only discuss matters which had been raised before with the ruling authorities in towns which had the rights to vote in the estates, suggesting a wider diffusion of authority than in 1565.

In religious terms - in 1565, the accepted Church was Catholic but Calvinism was the main alternative and threat. Freedom of conscience had been guaranteed in the Union of Utrecht of 1579. By 1609, the UP were still divided religiously although reflected more in divisions between Protestant groupings rather than between catholic and Protestant. Therefore there was unity at one level, but differences at another. Not only were there Calvinists and Lutherans but also Mennonites. Organisation was focused on a national synod, provincial synods and regional classes (of clergy). Consistories governed the churches and contained both clergy and lay people. Already, however, the Arminian debate was dividing the Calvinists and threatened to weaken the new state.

Answers might conclude that possibly the only national institution was the House of Orange; overall the state was more tolerant than in the past but the level of unity was little different and threatened to become worse in religious matters.

Answers at Level 1 will be superficial and assertive, possibly descriptive rather than attempting comparison. Level 2 responses may have a greater focus on either the religious or political aspect but will be able to make limited comparisons/contrasts in either or each of these aspects. For Level 3, there should be some direct comparison and understanding of change. At Level 4, balance between the two aspects should be achieved, comparisons will be sustained and well supported conclusions drawn leading to judgement on the issue of unity. Level 5 responses should show understanding of the conceptual demands and the ability to offer differentiated judgement in a sustained manner.

Option B: Charles V and the Holy Roman Empire, 1519-1556

Question 5

“The structure of the Empire rather than the opposition of the princes led to Charles V’s failure as Holy Roman Emperor”

How valid is this judgement? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Initially the structure of the empire might be said to be in Charles’s favour, although the throne was elective the vote for Charles V suggested initial confidence in his abilities (although bribery and fear of the French were also factors), his title – Emperor – suggested he was more powerful than rulers of individual states, ‘Holy’ suggests he could claim additional authority and loyalty was traditionally expected from his subjects once elected e.g. imperial knights. But there were some problems; the electors were able to make him sign the Capitulation which limited his authority e.g. he had to respect the rights and privileges of the princes and not bring foreign troops into the empire; he had to consult the Electors and the Reichstag on imperial matters. Additionally, each of his territories had differing rules of

government and therefore order and stability were not likely to occur in a uniform manner. The princes had powers within their own states e.g. to administer justice, to raise taxes limited this; their authority within leagues and the effects of the Imperial reform movement, especially the Regency Council, all hampered him. There is evidence that peasants were suffering economically and they were to cause problems in the 1520s. The Imperial Knights were also a restive force. Overall, Charles's abdication was partly motivated by the fact that he recognised that he had not resolved most of these matters effectively.

The princes were significant in the role they played. They often preferred independence to any kind of imperial institution. Initially Charles attempted to retain their favour and the peace was largely kept until the early 1530s and the formation of the League of Schmalkalden. This was partly stimulated by the issue of Lutheranism and the defiance of some princes in espousing the cause, although Charles was able briefly to deal with this e.g. by taking advantage of Philip of Hesse's bigamy to neutralise his opposition. Charles had a temporary victory at Muhlberg but the League then re-asserted itself destroying order, allying with the French and leading to the abdication and the Peace of Augsburg. At this point the structural problems merged with the issues of princely opposition forcing Charles to change his plans to put Philip in his place and acknowledging his brother Ferdinand as his successor as HRE.

Answers at Level 1 will be superficial and may deal with one aspect only. At Level 2, there will be some understanding of the range of Charles's difficulties and assumptions of failure. At Level 3, there should be some detailed analysis, distinguishing between structure of the empire and the opposition of the princes and identifying outcomes. Level 4 responses may make comparisons between differing periods of the reign and differing issues to strengthen the analysis. Level 5 answers should offer well supported evaluation and understanding of the interaction of issues to decide upon validity. Some candidates discuss 'empire' rather than 'Empire' (i.e. HRE); these responses should be accepted.

Question 6

"Political rather than religious issues generated conflict."

To what extent do you agree with this explanation of the struggle between Charles V and the Ottoman Empire? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Political matters could encompass e.g. the Turks needed to expand their territory to support the timars and expand empire threatening the eastern border of HRE; probably also responding to the challenge of HRE and its links with Spain through Charles V – both Suleiman and Charles claimed to have universal empires and were seeking to either expand or to defend their territories; Charles needed to defend himself against the growing Ottoman

links with France and the threat to the Italian peninsula. Both were men with a particular vision of their authority and role which needed to be sustained. If either of the two dominated then communications and trade east and west could be disrupted as well as leading to political change. In religious terms, Charles V saw himself as the champion of Catholicism (concept of permanent crusade), inherent in his title and vital if he was to maintain his authority *vis a vis* the princes in the HRE ; Suleiman was the embodiment of the Turkish Muslim state and had a duty of holy war; Charles possibly championed his religion more overtly because of the fear of internal division between Protestants and Catholics. These two elements came together in the Habsburg–Valois rivalry and Charles’s work to maintain dominance over the Pope.

At Level 1, general accounts of the struggle or limited focus on political or religious causes are likely. Level 2 responses could show understanding of a range of political and religious factors causing conflict but with limited development. At Level 3, explanation of the issues in both respects should be developed and some comparison attempted. For Level 4, a thorough analysis demonstrating the breadth and depth of the conflict and assessing the depth of commitment from each ruler in respect to the synoptic issues could be presented. Level 5 answers will generate sustained discussion and draw well supported and differentiated conclusions.

Question 7

“The Peace of Augsburg was a confirmation of Charles V’s failure in both political and religious terms.”

Assess the validity of this view.

(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6

L2: 7-11

L3: 12-15

L4: 16-18

L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Politically, the Peace reinforced the authority of the princes as it subordinated religion to politics (*cuius regio eius religio*). The concept of political and religious unity as established from medieval times was destroyed. However, it restored order in the Empire and saved it from further incursions from the French. Charles abdicated, agreeing to continue in name only until the electors could choose his successor (his brother). In religious terms, the lengthy conflict was also resolved with the formula of *cuius regio* etc. However, it did not settle the issue of Calvinists or other protestant groups and was effectively an admission that religious unity was not possible except in imperial cities where toleration of both Catholics and Protestants was possible. The situation had become an impasse; the Catholics could not subdue the Protestants forcibly and the Lutherans wanted religion to be a choice. In both political and religious matters the individual principalities within the empire could differ and were able, in religious issues, to change as the rulers changed, unlike the Emperor. It was the nature of his variable powers in the empire which made it impossible for Charles either to suppress Protestantism or to agree to the compromise at an earlier stage. However, the peace

enabled the HRE to enjoy a period of peace and stability under Charles's successor, Ferdinand.

Answers at Level 1 may outline some of the decisions at Augsburg with generalised comments. Level 2 response will differentiate between political and religious decisions and show some awareness of the consequences thus implying success and/or failure. Those answers which make direct links between the terms and success and failure for Charles V, the princes and the HRE should be considered for Level 3. Responses at Level 4 are more likely to differentiate between success and failure and offer some debate regarding extent. At Level 5, sustained judgement will emerge from a sound understanding of the issues not just in 1555 but also through the earlier conflict. Extensive discussion of Charles in Spain should not be rewarded; the focus of the question is HRE.

Option C: Suleiman the Magnificent, 1520-1566

Question 8

To what extent was Suleiman's "magnificence" the result of the image he presented of monarchy rather than of his achievements in domestic policy? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers should consider the 'image of monarchy' in terms of the ritual, splendour, cultural and symbolic aspects of the Sultanate under Suleiman. Reference therefore might be made to his personal magnificence in terms of dress, elaborate ceremony, strict protocol observed at court, the processions and displays of his wealth and authority. His patronage of architecture and buildings produced many great palaces, mosques, bridges, hospitals etc. He gathered around him an entourage of poets and learned men. Certainly these gave his people and visitors an impression of authority, culture, power and authority.

In domestic matters, Suleiman can be credited with the establishment of Constantinople as a great commercial centre which attracted trade from the west as well as from the east. Administration appeared effective; stability was provided by a well trained staff of Moslem born men who were experts in their fields; the raising of taxes was efficient and enabled the administration to function effectively as well as paying for the 'magnificence'. The use of slaves as his ministers ensured loyalty on the whole and the Grand Vizier and Divan implemented the Sultan's policies. The Ulema provided the administrators and advised the Sultan. Local government operated through the timar system ensuring stability and public order and Suleiman as the 'Lawgiver' listened to complaints and ensured there was an effective legal system.

Answers might argue that the ‘image’ could not have existed without the reality of a sound form of government, but that external appearances were important to generate confidence. The ephemeral nature of the ‘image’ might however suggest that his ‘Magnificence’ was less important than the solid achievements in administration, legal affairs, law-making, dispensing justice and raising taxes. The nature of his government ensured loyalty throughout the empire whereas ceremonial in Istanbul impressed a more limited audience. However, the ‘image’ symbolised Suleiman’s power just as much as his ability to collect taxes.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to offer simple comment on or limited information about the way in which Suleiman governed or attempted to impress his people. For Level 2, there should be a limited attempt to consider how each/either factor might have contributed towards ‘magnificence’. Level 3 answers will make some connections and comparisons between policies and external appearance and Level 4 response should provide reasonably comprehensive analysis of the links. A Level 5 response should give sustained analysis of the issues arriving at a balanced and well argued evaluation.

Question 9

“Suleiman the Magnificent achieved more through his campaigns against the West at sea than he did on land.”

To what extent do you agree with this view? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

On land, Suleiman’s main aim was to strengthen his borders and acquire territory, the latter sometimes reinforcing the former. He captured Belgrade in 1521 drawing closer to Hungary and the HRE. By 1526 he gained Hungary although he established overlordship and not sovereignty. In 1529 he besieged Vienna; this was the furthest west he advanced, retreating because of the weather (end of the campaigning season). By 1533 most of Hungary was occupied and he advanced into Transylvania by 1547. After this Suleiman was less successful but he had established a base and diverted the attention of Charles V, weakening his resistance. At sea, he was aided by the alliance with the corsair Barbarossa, siezing Algiers in 1529. Following this he won the battle of Prevesa in 1538 and forced Venice to surrender land in the Morea by 1540. The alliance with Francis I was significant and the emergence of a second ‘champion’ in Dragut secured Tripoli but not Malta. Ultimately, however, the Turks lost at Lepanto although his fleet was rebuilt with amazing speed. However, Constantinople had been defended and the Turks were free to focus on eastward expansion.

In terms of acquisition of territory, Suleiman gained more through land campaigns than by sea, although this might have been because of the divisions within the HRE rather than specific strengths of the Turks. He diverted the attention of Charles V and weakened his resistance to Ottoman advances; the weather rather than failure made Suleiman retreat. In

terms of his reputation and that of the OE, Suleiman emerged more triumphant at sea. The coalition which defeated the Turks at Lepanto was short lived and did not follow up its victory thus saving Constantinople.

Answers at L1 may focus on one aspect only or be brief and assertive. Level 2 answers will consider both land and sea campaigns but the emphasis may be on one or the other. L3 responses will link method and achievement to draw conclusions. For L4, clear analysis and direct comparison will inform the debate. Level 5 responses will evaluate the outcomes of each method of attack to arrive at a reasoned judgement on relative success.

Question 10

“The success of the Ottoman empire under Suleiman was built upon the obedience and loyalty of his subjects rather than a real sense of unity.”

How far do you agree with this judgement? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

The question suggests a view of the Ottoman state as an ordered society of slave-like subjects giving personal obedience to the Sultan rather than acting out of a sense of nationhood. This might be borne out by reference to the Devshirme as a form of tax on the outlying provinces, although increasingly they did become more willing to serve because of the opportunities, especially for the brightest who became servants. Some trained as sipahis or janissaries, the latter forming the core of the army. The sipahis were given land and were responsible for collecting taxes and were responsible for law and order. Obedience and loyalty might have been engendered by the prospect of reward, responsibility etc. Unity would be more difficult because of the disparate nature of the backgrounds of these people who were often actually tribute from conquered lands, especially in the early period of Suleiman’s reign. They were not always obedient and loyal; in 1529, the Janissaries made the decision to abandon the siege of Vienna; they also wanted to turn back from campaigns in Egypt and Persia. Suleiman was always anxious to keep their support and by the end of the reign he allowed offices to be bought; this became a source of weakness as incompetents could buy offices

Level 1 responses will offer generalised statements about the people of the OE. Level 2 responses should show knowledge of the Devshirme system and its operation. At Level 3 some analysis of the ways in which subjects’ obedience and loyalty contributed to the success of the OE is expected with awareness of the limitations. Level 4 responses will provide a balanced discussion and Level 5 will offer some evaluation and judgement on the issue.

June 2004

Alternative B: Europe in Transition, c1470-1610

A2 Unit 6: Henry IV of France: A Modern King?

Question 1

(a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

How valid is the interpretation in this source of the reasons for Henry IV's success in foreign affairs? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract and the interpretation it contains. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the interpretation and relates to own knowledge. **3-5**
- L3: As L2, and evaluation of the interpretation is partial. **6-8**
- L4: Understands and evaluates the interpretation and relates to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well supported judgement on its validity. **9-10**

Indicative content

At Level 1, the view expressed is that Henry IV was successful in foreign affairs because the Habsburgs were weak and therefore his policies could be limited and cheap to put into effect. To achieve Level 2, answers could verify this through focus on events after 1598, when through marriage and alliances e.g. with the Swiss and Savoy and the friendship of Venice he was able to contain the Spanish forces in Italy blocking the "Spanish Road" to the Netherlands, whilst acknowledging that Henry first had to achieve superiority militarily in his 1595-8 campaign against Spain which was expensive. At Level 3, answers will be more critical perhaps focusing on the financial element e.g. as well as the expense of the initial campaign itself after 1595, Henry spent large sums of money subsidising the Dutch rebels and lost revenues through a temporary ban on trade with Spain and her colonies in 1604. Some answers might also refer to the internal costs of the construction of defensive fortifications. Level 4 answers will show understanding that the reasons for Henry IV's success were variable and dependent upon circumstances; there were occasions when he was cautious and worked largely through alliances e.g. alliance with the Ottomans in 1597 and 1604 and Sweden; there were occasions when diplomacy was paramount and others when action was necessary, e.g. helping the Pope to annex Ferrara, war with Savoy which earned France some control over the Spanish road. His policies were expensive but cheaper than outright war with Spain. These answers may also challenge the notion that the Habsburgs were relatively weak; their lands and allies encircled France and although Henry picked at this, it was always a threat and this is demonstrated in the prompt reaction of the Spanish to the situation in Cleves Julich in 1609 which led Henry to prepare for war.

(b) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

How useful is **Source B** as evidence that Henry IV was more concerned to establish the internal stability of France than to achieve success in foreign policy? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. **6-8**
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well supported judgement. **9-10**

Indicative content

A Level 1 answer will make simple statements e.g. this is a personal statement from Henry in which says quite categorically that he wants to establish his authority in France and to stabilise the country after the Wars of Religion. Comment may also be made on the use of 'above all'. Level 2 responses may highlight the limitations of the source by e.g. noting the circumstances in which this statement is made and Henry's desire not to draw down fire upon France; this may be simply a propaganda statement intended to distract the Spanish. Level 3 answers will use the context more fully to explore both utility and limitations of the source and provide a balanced discussion e.g. the source reflects the impact of recent events in that Henry had already spent a great deal of time and money on a successful if limited foreign policy fighting Spain and ensuring the expulsion of Spanish influence from France by 1598; there was some opposition to spending more money e.g. on war from the parliament of Paris; France had already gained territory in the recent war with Spain. However, Henry was still paying subsidies to the Dutch to aid them in their struggle with Spain, although this was not well known, and he needed to retain credibility as a good Catholic, therefore this statement may have been one of propaganda rather than of true intent. Judgement at Level 4 may be demonstrated by the longer term view/overview of the reign e.g. awareness of the speed with which this statement was overridden when the Spaniards withdrew and Henry immediately offered help; this process was repeated in 1609 demonstrating that Henry's policies were consistent over time.

(c) Use **Sources A, B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

"Henry IV's foreign policy was driven by the desire to prevent Spanish domination in Europe rather than to promote the Protestant cause."

Assess the validity of this interpretation.

(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative. **1-6**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

Source A implies that the strength/weakness of Spain was an important consideration in foreign policy; Source B implies fear of attack and Source C refers to Henry's response to the Spanish invasion of Cleves-Julich in 1609 and the differing motives which might have influenced him, e.g. concern that the invasion tipped the balance in favour of Spain as a European power. This source also indicates disagreement amongst historians as to the real cause of Henry's threatened action in 1610. Some answers might also be aware of other issues, e.g. Buisseret's belief that he may have been driven more by personal motives (e.g. his affairs with Conde's wife) than by political ones. Answers should also be debating religious/political motives e.g. Henry's willingness to ally with German Protestant princes to keep Spain out of the duchies; alternatively he may simply have seen this as expedient. Greengrass maintains that politicians of the time were wary of large federations being convinced that they were unlikely to succeed. Instead he argues for France's desire for peace whilst maintaining a strong France. Alternatively Rady suggests that it was a contemporary belief that Henry wanted to promote Protestantism and that therefore he had to confront Spain, but prefers the view that he may rather have seen conflict with Spain as a way of containing rather than promoting the protestants.

Answers at Level 1 may rely heavily on information from the sources. At Level 2 there will be either agreement or disagreement with the view expressed in the question but with limited supporting material from either the sources or from own knowledge of the listed sources and/or other historians. By Level 3, evidence both for and against the proposition with some reference to the differing views of historians could be presented. Level 4 answers will demonstrate depth of knowledge and some integration of sources and own knowledge; judgement may be confined to the conclusion but clearly develop from the evidence provided. To achieve Level 5, the argument should be sustained and based on a wide range of evidence, effectively analysed and evaluated to present more independent and sustained judgement.