



Pearson

## **Mark scheme**

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

Paper 2: Depth study

Option 2B.1: Luther and the  
German Reformation, c1515–55

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

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2018

Publications Code 9HI0\_2B\_1806\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

## 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.

## 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
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question.</li> <li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>13–16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<b>17–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

## 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.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>13–16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<b>17–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: Indicative content

### Option 2B.1: Luther and the German Reformation, c1515–55

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<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 causes of the German Reformation.</p> <p><b>Source 1</b></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"><li>• Based upon folk stories of older origin, it suggests discontent with aspects of the Catholic Church was of long-standing in early sixteenth century Germany</li><li>• Adapted into local dialects and carried from village to village by performers, it was likely aimed at the poor and illiterate and addressed their concerns most directly</li><li>• Originally meant to be read out loud or performed, the source may exaggerate for artistic purposes and there is a hint of hyperbole in several of the claims made.</li></ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the causes of the German Reformation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It depicts the Catholic Church as being in a very poor state ('few good priests...listens to them', 'Church is in decline...little life left in it.')</li><li>• It describes clerical abuses including materialism ('local taxes', 'worldly things.') and sexual indulgence ('a mistress...sin and shame', 'pretty women'), all suggesting deep dissatisfaction with the clergy</li><li>• It indicates that the Church is most interested in money ('give up our money to...Church', 'indulgences') and implies its hypocrisy in demanding moral lives from the ordinary people while the clergy acts as it pleases.</li></ul> <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"><li>• The corruptions of the Catholic Church in Germany were attacked regularly in the decades before 1517 both by learned humanists and ordinary people</li><li>• Discontent was caused by both the failure of the Church to provide the spiritual guidance the people expected and by its financial exactions which bore hard on the poor especially</li><li>• The extent of discontent should not be over-stated – many happily tolerated a priest's mistress and there is ample evidence of well-qualified and conscientious clergy dedicated to the spiritual lives of their people</li><li>• Anti-clericalism proved vital in encouraging and sustaining Luther's protest in its early years – as seen in the number of woodcuts produced, he became a folk hero attacking the wrongs many had experienced directly.</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p><b>Source 2</b></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"> <li>• It was written in the year following the events it describes by someone who was local but we have no way of knowing how he acquired the information in this account – this may compromise it as evidence</li> <li>• The writer is clearly hostile to the rebels, as his final comments suggest, which may mean that he has added or omitted detail to their detriment</li> <li>• Apart from the final comments indicating strong disapproval of the rebels, the account is otherwise written in a matter-of-fact style suggesting accuracy.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the causes of the Reformation in Germany:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The source indicates concern among the peasantry with their economic condition ('forests, rivers...all', 'interest payments...abolished' 'monasteries...surplus income...themselves')</li> <li>• It provides evidence of opposition to some forms of authority though clearly not to the Pope and Emperor, suggesting it is local rulers and landowners, clerical and secular, to whom they object</li> <li>• It provides examples of discontent with the Church e.g. pluralism ('no priest...one parish') and materialism ('monasteries...surplus income')</li> <li>• The extent of organisation among the rebels ('elected a captain', 'purchase of a flag') plus the fact that this is the latest of a number of well-supported risings, suggests deep discontent.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• Peasant uprisings were not new in Germany in the early sixteenth century but their number and size was increasing</li> <li>• Population growth, inflation and changing patterns of trade and agriculture contributed to economic discontent throughout Germany</li> <li>• The corruptions and financial demands of an Italian-dominated Catholic Church proved intolerable to many in times of hardship – the business class also resented the Church's call on their hard-earned income</li> <li>• Luther's attack on the sale of indulgences, which then broadened out into a more general critique of the failings of the Church, proved highly popular amongst the better off and poor alike.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources 1 and 2</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They come from the period immediately before the start of the Reformation and give insight into attitudes at this important time</li> <li>• They both deal most directly with the concerns of the poorer classes, many of whom flocked to Luther after 1517</li> <li>• They both indicate discontent with the financial exactions of the Catholic Church</li> <li>• They suggest together that support for the Reformation was prompted by a combination of religious and economic factors.</li> </ul>

**Option 2B.2: The Dutch Revolt, c1563–1609**

Question	Indicative content
<b>2</b>	<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 extent of Philip II's responsibility for the outbreak of the Dutch Revolt in 1566.</p> <p><b>Source 3</b></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"><li>• It was written in 1559, shortly after Philip's accession to his various thrones but after sufficient time to be able to judge how his reign is developing</li><li>• That it is a report from an ambassador strengthens its utility – Suriano was present at Philip's court and it was his job to be both well informed and to make accurate and insightful reports back to his government</li><li>• The tone of the report is neutral and matter-of-fact but contains serious criticisms of Philip – this suggests that Suriano was presenting as frank but as accurate a picture as he could.</li></ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the extent of Philip's responsibility for the outbreak of the Dutch Revolt in 1566:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It provides evidence of Philip's preference for Spain among the nations of his Empire ('born in Spain', 'no nation is superior')</li><li>• It indicates that Philip's dealings with the people of his Empire had started badly due to his personality and attitude ('harsh and unbending') and that this was raised by those closest to him ('the Queen...father')</li><li>• It states that Philip had already, by 1559, a poor relationship with his Dutch subjects ('thoroughly disliked...Dutch') and suggests that this is largely down to his attitude ('thinks little...Dutch')</li><li>• It indicates that Philip does not rate his native advisers such as the Dutch Grandees ('none...closest advisors...his enemies.').</li></ul> <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"><li>• Unlike his father, Philip II had little affection for the non-Spanish parts of his Empire and was intolerant of the different traditions of government in the Netherlands</li><li>• Philip's determination to be obeyed led to his appointment of an inner council led by Granvelle in 1559 – this denied the Grandees the prominence they had enjoyed and created many difficulties</li><li>• Philip's contempt for the traditions of the Netherlands is demonstrated by his attempts to reform the bishoprics and his determination to impose religious uniformity despite the demand for toleration</li><li>• Margaret's inability to balance Philip's intransigence with the demands made by the Dutch for a greater say on religious and political matters eventually led to his decision to use military means to impose his will.</li></ul> <p><b>Source 4</b></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"><li>• The petition was presented to Margaret as Regent after years of political instability in the Netherlands and shortly before the outbreak of open hostilities in 1567</li></ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a petition demanding change, it may be considered that some of the claims made are exaggerated in an attempt to press their case</li> <li>• As an alliance of noblemen, the <i>Compromise</i> has significant support but clearly does not reflect the attitude of everyone in the Netherlands.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the extent of Philip's responsibility for the outbreak of the Dutch Revolt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It states that royal religious policy is tyrannical and designed to oppress the Dutch ('no concern...Netherlands.', 'barbarity exceeding...tyrants.', 'destroy our ancient...customs...slaves of the Inquisitors.', 'religion...excuse')</li> <li>• It blames Philip's advisers for the failure to compromise on religious uniformity ('foreigners', 'false arguments', 'persuaded the King... strength.') – this is possibly a device however, to avoid accusing the monarch directly</li> <li>• It indicates that a significant section of Philip's subjects were threatening revolt against their divinely-appointed ruler and, suggests that violence is possible should they be ignored ('all our efforts', 'destroy it completely').</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• The <i>Compromise</i> was an alliance of over 300 noblemen formed after Philip refused to modify his religious edicts in October 1565 despite representations from the Grandees and, to some extent, Margaret</li> <li>• That the confederacy was made up of noblemen, usually supportive of monarchy, and included both Catholics and Protestants, indicates the depth of resentment to Philip's exercise of power in the Netherlands</li> <li>• Philip, rattled by the Beggars and the increasingly-open challenge of Calvinism, was implacably opposed to Margaret's attempts to compromise on matters of such personal importance to him</li> <li>• Philip's responsibility for the revolt can be shared with other factors in a highly-complex situation e.g. the political divisions of the Netherlands, the ambition of the Grandees or the aggression of the Calvinists.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources 3 and 4</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sources reference Philip's difficulties in ruling a diverse empire, both indicating his disregard for Dutch customs and its leading citizens</li> <li>• Both state clearly that Philip took advice only from his close, usually Spanish advisers, Source 3 suggesting that this was by his choice though Source 4 suggesting he was, in some way, dominated by them</li> <li>• The sources are dated towards the start and at the end of a tumultuous period during which Philip's will was increasingly challenged – together they may indicate how Philip's personality and attitude (Source 3) translated into practice and led ultimately to revolt (Source 4).</li> </ul>

## Section B: Indicative content

### Option 2B.1: Luther and the German Reformation, c1515–55

Question	Indicative content
<b>3</b>	<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 significance of Luther's denunciation of radicalism in the development of Lutheranism in Germany in the years 1521–30.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Luther's denunciation of radicalism was significant in the development of Lutheranism in the years 1521–30 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Luther's condemnation of Carlstadt and the Zwickau Prophets upon his return from the Wartburg in 1522 re-established his leadership of the Reformation following his disappearance</li><li>• His appreciation that his absence had created a vacuum allowing the spread of radicalism helped hasten the production of texts giving form to his vision of the Reformation, e.g. the German Mass and Catechisms</li><li>• His rejection of the religious radicals ensured that there remained differences between protestants over key issues, especially the Eucharist – this led to permanent division following the Marburg Colloquy</li><li>• Luther's decision to oppose the social and political demands of the peasants in 1525 confirmed the support and protection of the princes which became essential to the future development of Lutheranism</li><li>• His condemnation of radicalism ensured that Germany would experience largely a conservative and magisterial reformation rather than one which was radical and popularly-driven.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that Luther's denunciation of radicalism was not significant and/or that there were other significant factors in the development of Lutheranism in the years 1521–30 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Without the intervention of Frederick the Wise following the Diet of Worms Luther may not have survived and the German Reformation would likely have developed in a much different way</li><li>• The refusal of German princes to enforce the Edict of Worms pre-existed the condemnation of radicalism mostly as a means of countering Imperial power, as can be evidenced by the Diets of Nuremburg and Speyer</li><li>• Lutheranism gained a distinct and separate form from the basics of the Lutheran faith produced during this period both by Luther and others like Melancthon, e.g. the Loci Communes and Augsburg Confession</li><li>• The root causes of the Reformation whether social, economic or religious, continued to encourage separate Lutheran congregations regardless of Luther's condemnation of radicalism.</li></ul> <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 on the statement that the failure of the papacy to respond effectively was the most important factor for the survival of Lutheranism in Germany in the years 1521–55.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the failure of the papacy to respond effectively was important for the survival of Lutheranism in Germany in the years 1521–55 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The papacy vacillated in its response to Lutheranism during this period between the threat of force to eradicate it completely and hints at reform intended to avoid a schism – neither was effectively pursued</li> <li>• Despite pressure from the Emperor and princes to call a Church Council to coordinate action, Clement VII and Paul III resisted until 1545 largely in the interests of safeguarding papal supremacy</li> <li>• Clement's role in the Habsburg-Valois wars in opposition to Charles V seriously compromised the Church's response during the 1520s when Lutheranism was weakest and hopes for reconciliation were strongest</li> <li>• Though Paul III appreciated the need for reform, he sacrificed the report of the <i>Consilium</i> and the negotiations at Regensburg in favour of maintaining papal interests, notably financial</li> <li>• By the time the Council of Trent convened in 1545, the Church was dependent on a military solution which, despite Charles' victory at Muhlberg, was increasingly unlikely</li> <li>• The hard line of the Tridentine Decrees and the implacability of Paul IV brought permanent schism in Germany even closer – this was conceded in 1555 when Charles agreed the Treaty of Augsburg.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that other factors were important in the survival of Lutheranism in the years 1521–55 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the influence and leadership of the papacy was central to the Catholic response, practically it was dependent on the Emperor and the princes either to enforce the Edict of Worms or facilitate compromise</li> <li>• Charles was distracted throughout this period by largely dynastic wars outside Germany and was only intermittently able to concentrate his attention on Lutheranism – his triumph of 1547 quickly dissipated</li> <li>• Though the princes cited religious grievances as the immediate reason for their unwillingness to effect the Edict of Worms, political self-interest led many first to protect Lutheranism and then fight on its behalf</li> <li>• The growth of reformed congregations in Germany, aided by increasing doctrinal cohesion, e.g. the Augsburg Confession, made Lutherans less likely to accept compromise even if it had seriously been on offer in Rome.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

## Option 2B.2: The Dutch Revolt, c1563–1609

Question	Indicative content
<b>5</b>	<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 accurate it is to say that foreign intervention in support of the Dutch rebels did their cause more harm than good in the period 1578–83.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that foreign intervention did the cause of the Dutch rebels more harm than good should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The invitation to Anjou in 1578 was deeply divisive among those who had agreed the Pacification of Ghent– many thought it disloyal to Philip II while many Protestants were appalled at his religion</li><li>• The aggression of Casimir's German mercenaries, who were believed to be fighting more for Calvinism than in the Dutch cause, led many Dutch Catholics to seek rapprochement with the Spanish</li><li>• Foreign involvement encouraged the southern provinces to agree the Union of Arras in 1579 and then support renewed Spanish military intervention</li><li>• The decision to support Anjou as sovereign in 1580 alienated those who had objected to him in 1578 – in addition, his attempt to seize power in 1583 deeply discredited Orange and fuelled Parma's advance</li><li>• For all the difficulties they caused, Anjou and Casimir contributed relatively little to the cause – Casimir's forces left in 1579 and Anjou's ill-defined role led to the French Fury and his subsequent withdrawal.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the foreign intervention in support of the Dutch rebels did not harm and/or benefited their cause in the years 1578–83 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The rebel cause was vulnerable in 1578 due to Philip's truce with the Ottomans and the appointment of the able Parma as governor-general – foreign intervention was deemed crucial to stave off defeat</li><li>• Anjou's intervention brought 12,000 troops to the rebel side in 1578 and prompted Elizabeth I to fund Casimir's intervention with a further 12,000 soon after – Parma's campaign stalled, at least partly as a result</li><li>• Though Anjou was divisive, it was hoped that he could be more of a unifying figurehead than Orange himself who was suspected by many of those opposed to Spanish rule as a personally-ambitious 'politique'</li><li>• The decline of the rebel cause during this period can be blamed on the lack of effective government in the rebel provinces regardless of foreign intervention, e.g. divisions over aims and tactics, and lack of finance.</li></ul> <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 Dutch strengths were more responsible for the truce of 1609 than were Spanish weaknesses.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the truce of 1609 was due to Dutch strengths should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Dutch position was strengthened by greater unity and better government by 1609 thanks to the reforms of Oldenbarnevelt, e.g. the position of the States-General and acceptance of the House of Nassau</li> <li>• The economic position of the Dutch had grown strong with the exploitation of overseas markets enabling increasing sums to be spent on the military – this made a truce more possible</li> <li>• The military gains of the previous 20 years owed much to the effective organisation and leadership of Dutch forces by Maurice, ensuring that defeat by the Spanish was increasingly unlikely</li> <li>• The success of the Republic attracted a large inflow of people, many of whom were Calvinists – this enhanced its cohesion and identity and encouraged Spain to negotiate seriously.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the truce of 1609 was due to Spanish weaknesses should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foreign policy under both Philip II and Philip III caused Spain serious strain and compromised action against the Dutch at key times, e.g. war against France from 1589–98 and England from 1588–1604</li> <li>• The death of Parma led to a period of confusion on the Spanish side during which the Dutch made important gains – the arrival of Spinola was too late to halt the decline despite his victories in the years 1602–05</li> <li>• The financial problems of the Spanish crown worsened markedly in the early seventeenth century due to incessant war and economic decline – it was unable to pay its forces regularly and mutinies were common</li> <li>• Though increasingly unable to muster the strength to defeat the United Provinces, the Spanish monarchy refused to compromise on its aim of a united, Catholic Netherlands under Habsburg rule until it was too late.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>