

History A

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F962/01**: European and World History Period Studies
Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1095-1609

Mark Scheme for January 2011

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Distribution of marks for each level that reflects the Unit's AOs and corresponds to the UMS

2 answers: each maximum mark 50.

	A01a	A01b
IA	21-24	24-26
IB	18-20	22-23
II	16-17	19-21
III	14-15	16-18
IV	12-13	13-15
V	9-11	11-12
VI	4-8	6-10
VII	0-3	0-5

Notes:

- (i) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO.
- (ii) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found.
- (iii) Many answers will not fall at the same level for each AO.
- (iv) Analysis refers to developed explanations; evaluation refers to the argued weighing up/assessment of factors in relation to their significance in explaining an issue or in explaining linkages between different factors.

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Total mark for each question = 50	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.	Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied
Level IA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a wide range of accurate, detailed and relevant evidence • Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly <p style="text-align: center;">21-24</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and accurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear and accurate understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context • Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed and substantiated explanations, some of which may be unexpected • The argument evaluates a range of relevant factors and reaches clearly substantiated judgements about relative importance and/or links <p style="text-align: center;">24-26</p>
Level IB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence • Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; writes accurately and legibly <p style="text-align: center;">18-20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and accurate understanding of most key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Answer is mostly consistently and relevantly analytical with mostly developed and substantiated explanations • Clear understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context. • Substantiated judgements about relative importance of and/or links between factors will be made but quality of explanation in support may not be consistently high <p style="text-align: center;">22-23</p>
Level II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence which demonstrates a competent command of the topic • Generally accurate use of historical terminology • Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear <p style="text-align: center;">16-17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly clear and accurate understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context • Much of the answer is relevantly analytical and substantiated with detailed evidence but there may be some description • The analysis of factors and/or issues provides some judgements about relative importance and/or linkages <p style="text-align: center;">19-21</p>

<p>Level III</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate and relevant evidence which demonstrates some command of the topic but there may be some inaccuracy • Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used • Most of the answer is organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated <p style="text-align: center;">14-15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some/uneven understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to their historical context • Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also simple description of relevant material and narrative of relevant events OR answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin. • Answer considers a number of factors but with very little evaluation of importance or linkages between factors/issues • Points made about importance or about developments in the context of the period will often be little more than assertions and descriptions <p style="text-align: center;">16-18</p>
<p>Level IV</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant • Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication <p style="text-align: center;">12-13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and the topic is variable but in general is satisfactory • Limited and patchy understanding of a few relevant issues in their historical context • Answer may be largely descriptive/narratives of events and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained OR answers will mix passages of descriptive material with occasional explained analysis • Limited points made about importance/links or about developments in the context of the period will be little more than assertions and descriptions <p style="text-align: center;">13-15</p>

<p>Level V</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some relevant accurate historical knowledge deployed: this may be generalised and patchy. There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material also • Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate/inappropriate use • Often unclear and disorganised sections; writing will often be clear if basic but there may be some illegibility and weak prose where the sense is not clear or obvious <p style="text-align: center;">9-11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic • General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context • Attempts at analysis will be weak or generalised, based on plausible but unsubstantiated points or points with very general or inappropriate substantiation OR there may be a relevant but patchy description of events/developments coupled with judgements that are no more than assertions • There will be some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic not address the focus of the question <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>
<p>Level VI</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy • Answer may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation <p style="text-align: center;">4-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little understanding of key concepts • Very limited understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements • Limited explanation will be very brief/fragmentary • The answer will be characterised by generalised assertion and/or description/narratives, often brief <p style="text-align: center;">6-10</p>
<p>Level VII</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements; little relevant and accurate knowledge • Very fragmentary and disorganised response; very poor use of English and some incoherence <p style="text-align: center;">0-3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of key concepts or historical developments • No valid explanations • Typically very brief and very descriptive answer <p style="text-align: center;">0-5</p>

Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1095-1609

Answer any **two** questions from either **one** or **two** of the Study Topics.

The Crusades and Crusader states 1095-1192

- 1** 'Religion was the main motive of the members of the First Crusade.' How far do you agree?

This question seeks to elicit responses which assess the relative significance of the different motives that people had for joining the First Crusade. There needs to be real assessment for the top bands. Candidates should discuss religious motivation in some detail and focus in on the crusade as an 'armed pilgrimage' and the plenary indulgence that Pope Urban II promised crusaders. Candidates may consider motives such as those that can be inferred from the reports of Urban's sermon at Clermont: revenge for the atrocities committed against eastern Christians by the Turks; aid to Christians in the East; the chance of 'righteous' warfare; the recovery of the Holy Land (and the focus on Jerusalem that emerged as a key factor as the crusade recruitment campaign got underway). Candidates may also suggest more worldly motives: the prospect of a land of 'milk and honey', an escape from the hardships of life in western Christendom, the chance to carve out reputations and lands as a result of victory and conquest. Candidates may discuss motivation in relation to general groups as well as particular individuals. However candidates must focus on the motives of the members of the First Crusade and not just the motives of the Pope. Allow reference to the People's Crusade. No specific answer is being looked for.

- 2** **Assess the reasons why the People's Crusade failed.** [50]

Answers should focus strongly on reasons for failure. It was not a case of insufficient numbers or of weak motivation and examiners should be wary of answers that suggest this. Answers are likely to focus on a range of issues: charismatic but no effective military leadership, disorganisation and poor coordination, the strains and losses incurred on the journey to Constantinople, lack of trained soldiers and effective weapons, limited support from local rulers (focus likely to be on the Emperor Alexius' attitude), failure to wait for the main armed crusade, superior tactics and might of the Turks of Asia Minor and so on. The key to an effective answer will be the degree to which candidates assess the relative merits of different reasons for failure and their linkages. Answers may well stress the predominantly, but not exclusively, non-military membership of the crusade, the lack of military expertise and the limitations of Peter the Hermit as a leader (although they may balance this against the military experience of Walter the Penniless).

- 3** **Assess the impact of Muslim disunity on relations between Muslim and Crusader states.** [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may well examine the relations between the Crusader states (particularly the Kingdom of Jerusalem) and the neighbouring Muslim states of Egypt, Damascus, Aleppo and Mosul in particular. They may well discuss the impact of the religious divide between Sunni and Shiite muslims as well as the local rivalries between muslim states. They may argue that the initial establishment and survival of the Crusader states owed much to the fact that at no time before Nur ed din and arguably not until Saladin was there united action against the crusader states and that the survival of the crusader states was only seriously threatened once such unity emerged. Indeed, Candidates may point to the occasionally effective relations established at times between crusader states and individual muslim rulers, pointing, for example, to the understanding between Jerusalem and Damascus in the years before the Second Crusade. Candidates may also make the point that muslim disunity allowed the crusader states to deal with threats to their existence – the nascent Kingdom of Jerusalem, for example, was able to deal with the threats from Fatimid Egypt without the intervention of Damascus or Aleppo. Candidates may refer to the slow growth of the idea of jihad, and to the reasons why the campaigns of Ilghazi, Mawdud, and (less so) Zengi gained only limited success.

The Renaissance from c. 1400-c. 1550

- 4** 'Rivalry between city states was the main reason why the Renaissance developed in Italy in the fifteenth century.' How far do you agree?

No specific answer is looked for, but candidates do need to assess the impact of city rivalry on the development of the Renaissance. For example, candidates may argue that the relative independence and wealth of city states engendered a rivalry that found expression in art and architecture – politics by other means. Candidates may balance their discussion of city state rivalry against a range of other reasons including: the political situation of Italy c.1400, the nature of individual states with their city/urban base and controlling families, guilds etc, relative wealth, the existence of classical remains, the contacts with Constantinople and the Levant (and the exodus of Greek scholars as the Ottomans advanced), the development of humanism and the revival of classical learning.

- 5** **To what extent was Renaissance architecture a rediscovery of classical styles and methods?**

Candidates are likely to argue against the contention in the question along the lines that, although Renaissance architects did draw inspiration from the works of Rome and Greece, they developed something innovative. The Renaissance placed emphasis on symmetry, proportion and the regularity of parts. Here the main inspiration was the remains of the Roman Empire. Columns, pilasters, lintels, rounded arches and domes distinguished Renaissance architecture from medieval. They may draw on their knowledge of individual architects to illustrate their argument. They may point, for example, to Brunelleschi's marriage of classical features such as Corinthian columns and a concern with proportion with Romanesque arches and Byzantine inspired domes. They may also refer to the work of Bramante, such as his temple of St Peter in Rome. They may also refer to Michelangelo. They may argue that what was new was the application of classical designs, principles and approaches to churches and city palaces along with greater decoration. No specific answer is looked for but the quality of exemplar material is likely to be a key discriminator.

- 6** **To what extent were humanist ideas totally new?** **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for, but candidates do need to assess to what extent humanist ideas represent a new beginning. Candidates who wish to argue against the idea of 'totally new' may argue that one of the key foundations of the Renaissance was the renewed and widened study of Latin and Greek texts. The study of Latin texts especially had also been a feature of Medieval scholarship and the influx of Greek scholars and texts (especially after the fall of Constantinople) clearly had great influence on both what was studied, how it was studied and the results of study. Candidates may draw the links between humanist writers and classical authors – such as the influence of Plato on writers like Ficino, Aristotle on Mirandola, Livy on Macchiavelli and so on. However, candidates may well argue that humanist thought was new, placing man and his capacities at the centre and praising the dignity of man, rather than the traditional idea of man being unworthy, fallen. Candidates may also argue that humanism was new also in its attempts to reconcile 'philosophy' to Christianity and the reality of the early modern world, and that there was a real break with the Medieval and even the Classical past.

Exploration and Discovery c.1445-c.1545**7 'Technological developments were the main reason why voyages of exploration took place in this period.' How far do you agree?**

No specific answer is looked for, but candidates must deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. Candidates are likely to argue that technological developments were crucial in enabling voyages of discovery, pointing to the development of the caravel and carrack, and the ability to calculate latitude. However they are likely to argue that although technological advances were a necessary condition they do not provide a sufficient explanation. Candidates may also discuss other reasons such as the context of Ottoman expansion, the Renaissance, and the patronage of princes and nobles. Candidates may focus on motivation and discuss some of: the desire to find an alternative route to the spice islands (candidates may address the issue of why at this time?); the desire to find gold (candidates may address the issue of why at this time?); the search for Prester John and other Christian kingdoms and the desire for fame and reputation.

8 Assess the reasons why Spain was successful in establishing an overseas empire in the Americas. [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must assess a range of reasons, evaluating their relative importance and/or links between them. Candidates may stress European technological superiority referring to the significance of steel weapons and armour, gunpowder and cannon; they may also refer to the significance of the mounted warrior and the horse. They are likely also to refer to the attitude of native tribes – and the alliances, for example, that Cortes was able to forge with those resentful of Aztec supremacy in Central America. Others may point to the significance of disease in decimating native populations. Candidates may stress importance of gold as a motivator for conquest and acquisition of territory. Cortes was motivated at least in part by the rumours of a vast wealthy empire in the heart of Mexico, and Pizarro plundered the Incan empire of Peru. The hope of (easy) riches was clearly a strong motivator for those who forged the Spanish Empire in the Americas and brought conquistadors. However, there were other factors such as land for colonization (from the start settlers set out from Spain and the granting/seizing of large *encomiendas* encouraged such settlement). There was the wealth to be made from cochineal, sugar, cocoa, cotton as well as food staples. Another reason can be found in religion. The Church came with or followed the sword. Isabella was keen that natives were converted from the start and received papal encouragement in 1493 – by 1536 there were over 5 million converts in New Spain (Mexico).

9 To what extent did Spain benefit from her overseas Empire? [50]

No specific answer is being looked for. What is important is that candidates do not simply describe the benefits, but also evaluate their significance to reach a judgement on 'To what extent?'. Among the benefits we can expect candidates to consider the import of specie (mainly silver), the prestige for Spain and the Spanish Crown, the acquisition of land and territories for the Spanish Crown, the opportunities for ambitious Spaniards for adventure and settlement in the New World and the growth of trade between Spain and the Americas. Such discussion may be balanced against the downsides of her empire: the costs and organisation of control of her farflung territories; the control of conquistadors and the colonies established; the distorting effects that the import of gold and silver began to have on the economy; the security and policing of the routes to and from the New World; the problems posed by native populations and so on.

Spain 1469-1556**10 To what extent was Isabella personally responsible for the consolidation of her rule of Castile to 1479?**

Candidates must discuss the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue other factors were more important. They may discuss both the winning of the civil war and the measures taken after its conclusion to secure Isabella's position in Castile. In relation to the Civil War candidates may refer to Isabella's securing of the Treasury at Segovia, her confirmation of privileges of loyal nobles, her attempts to buy support, her fortification of key points, her conclusion of a truce with the Moors of Granada, negotiation of peace with Louis XI, the birth of a son, the use of propaganda and so on. Here they may point to the importance of her own role and talents. However they may well balance such discussion against the role played by Ferdinand – the significance of their marriage and the marriage contract, Ferdinand's accession to the throne of Aragon and his key role in the Battle of Toro and the subsequent Treaty of Alcaçovas. In relation to the consolidation of rule more generally candidates may well discuss Isabella's peripatetic style of rule, her measures towards the nobility (threats, pressure, action against key nobles and bribery), the revival of the *Santa Hermandad*, royal control of the military orders, the use of *corregidores*, more efficient collection of taxes and the use of *letrados*. Candidates may also discuss the relative weaknesses of the opposition to her.

11 How successful were Ferdinand and Isabella in dealing with the problems they faced in Castile after 1479? [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates should discuss a range of different areas of policy but do not need to be comprehensive in their coverage. They do need to evaluate success in the policy areas they discuss and come to an overall judgement. Success may be assessed in terms of aims, outcomes and the limitations of historical context. They may discuss such areas as relations with nobility, towns, organization of government and administration, law and order, relations with the various Cortes/provinces, finance and religion. They may legitimately consider the conquest of Granada (although arguably this was an aspect of foreign policy). Candidates may well argue that there was generally mixed success (eg in relation to the nobility that the price of royal control at the centre was acceptance of aristocratic control and influence at a provincial level). They may argue also that Ferdinand and Isabella enjoyed considerable success in their policy towards the Church, effectively controlling appointments but may argue that Cisneros' attempts to reform the clergy were less successful.

12 How successful was Charles I's management of royal finances? [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Success may be assessed in relation to aims and/or outcomes of policies and/or context. In relation to the last candidates may discuss the huge demands Charles made on Spain's (and particularly Castile's) resources and may discuss the costs associated with Charles' foreign policy and war which ate a very high percentage of royal income each year. They may suggest that the fact that Spain effectively had to sustain all Charles' imperial ambitions (whether or not they were directly in Spain's interest). They will point to the accumulation of debt that led his successor to declare bankruptcy soon after his accession. Candidates may discuss the *alcabala* tax and its conversion to a local fixed sum payment whose real value was eroded through inflation. They may point to the increased reliance on *servicios* granted by the Cortes of Castile and the increase in it. They may point to the tax privileges of the nobility and the use of the Church as a source of income. They are likely to refer to the income from the Americas as well. Some positive points can be made here, but candidates may point to the increasing use of loans (*juros*), the selling of offices and certificates of nobility to cover expenditure.

They may also point to the failure to persuade the nobility to share the tax burden with the failure of his proposed *sisá* tax on food. Candidates may also point to the impact of Charles's financial exactions on the Spanish/Castilian economy and society. They are unlikely to reach a positive conclusion about Charles' financial administration.

Charles V: International Relations and the Holy Roman Empire 1519-1559

- 13 'Charles V's power in the Holy Roman Empire was limited mainly by the princes.'
How far do you agree? [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. The focus in the question is on the limitations to Charles V's power. This is not just a question about his relationship or difficulties with the princes, although candidates must deal adequately with the issue of how the princes did limit his authority/power. Candidates are likely to discuss Charles's desire to win princely support and the issues arising from their religious allegiance. Candidates are likely to discuss how the limitations imposed by princely power are closely linked to other limitations on his power, such as the circumstances of his election as Holy Roman Emperor and the nature of the Empire and his position within it, the role of Diets, the limitations placed on him by virtue of his other responsibilities (eg as King of Spain), the issues created through his wars with France and the Ottomans, and, of course, the impact of the Reformation.

- 14 Assess the reasons for the spread of Lutheranism in the Holy Roman Empire.**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may discuss the Indulgences Controversy, the 'abuses' within the Catholic Church, Church exactions and the reputation of the Papacy in Germany. They may balance such discussion against some of the following: the role of Martin Luther and his pamphlets, the power of the ideas associated with Lutheranism (*sola scriptura*, *sola fide*, priesthood of all believers, etc), the background of humanism (these at least in part can be linked closely with the given factor), the role of the printing presses, the role of princely protectors, like Frederick of Saxony, the significance of the Diet of Worms, the role of popular support in towns and cities, links with peasant unrest, lack of decisive action by Charles V in 1520s, the Schmalkaldic League. Candidates may argue that there was a combination of circumstances (Papal exactions, princely concern for their privileges, weaknesses of Charles V's actions in Germany - distractions elsewhere, lack of power-, the printing press) in the Holy Roman Empire that allowed the ideas of Luther, powerful as they were, to gain public currency and many may stress the crucial roles played by lack of effective action against Luther by Charles V combined with the protection of Frederick of Saxony.

- 15 How successful was Charles V in his wars with France? [50]**

No specific answer is called for. The assessment of success may take into account aims, outcomes and context, for example. Candidates may discuss the strategic and political situation in 1519 and Charles' aims, referring to the extent of Charles' territories, the strategic importance of Italy to the physical linkage of these territories, the history of warfare and rivalry with France, Charles' desire to recover Burgundy and so forth. Candidates may discuss developments over time to explain relative success or failure, pointing to the ups and downs of the Habsburg-Valois rivalry in the 1520s (Pavia, Madrid, Cognac, sack of Rome, Landriano and Cambrai) and Charles's strong position at the end of the decade, the events of the 1530s and 40s to Charles' triumph' in the Peace of Crèpy (1544) and the renewal of war with Henry II and the failure of the siege of Metz. Candidates may legitimately refer to the Peace of Câteau-Cambrèsis (1559) as a way of discussing overall success or failure.

Philip II, Spain and the Netherlands, 1556-1609**16 How successful were Philip II's domestic policies?**

Candidates may address success/failure in relation to the problems Philip faced, what he was trying to achieve and what the results of his policies were. Candidates may discuss some of the following areas: government and administration; relations with the nobility; faction; relations with Castile and the other provinces; finance; religion. In relation to the first, candidates may discuss Philip's style of government and the degree of efficiency/effectiveness in the administration (use of Councils, conflicts, role of the Grand Junta, role of secretaries and key personnel, like Perez) – they may argue that his style of government inhibited good government. Candidates may discuss Philip's need to cooperate with local nobility and clergy and the role of faction at court. Candidates may also discuss the impact of Philip's centralized system and the exclusion felt by the provinces, a factor in the Aragonese revolt and may see this as a failure. They may also spend some time discussing the weaknesses of financial administration and the policies adopted to deal with growing expenditure and debt – candidates are likely to see this as an area of failure. In relation to the Church and religion, candidates may discuss Philip's counter-Reformation credentials, backing of the Inquisition and policies towards the *moriscos* and heresy – candidates may argue this as an area of relative success. Some candidates may consider Philip's relations with the Netherlands and this is acceptable provided it does not dominate the answer, however candidates who do consider the Netherlands must not be penalised. No specific answer is looked for.

17 Assess the reasons for Spain's changing relations with France during Philip II's reign. [50]

No specific answer is looked for. The focus of the argument needs to be on reasons for changing relations. There has been dispute over Philip's 'aims' although there appears to be some consensus that overall Philip's aims were largely defensive (to hold on to what he had) and candidates may assess the changes of his policies toward France largely in these terms. They may also place policy in the context of the security of Philip's possessions in the Netherlands and/or in terms of religion. Candidates may discuss some of the following: war with France and the Treaty of Câteau-Cambresis, the issues arising from the Revolt of the Netherlands and tensions over the Americas, Philip's involvement in France via the Catholic League in the 1580s, intervention in France in 1590 and 1592 and war in 1595. A key change to explain is that which led to intervention in the internal affairs of France through the Catholic League.

18 Assess the reasons why Philip II had problems in the Netherlands from 1556 to 1572.

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must assess a range of factors. In relation to Philip II, candidates may discuss Philip's absence from 1559, his lack of understanding of the depth of feeling in the Netherlands, his (insensitive) religious policies (reform of bishoprics, the Segovia letters), the impact of his decision to send a Spanish army to the Netherlands, and of his appointments such as Granvelle and Alba and their policies. They may also discuss the actions of Margaret of Parma; the longer term context of regional, States and noble privileges; the burdens of taxation; the spread of heresy, the Iconoclastic Fury, hedge preaching; the roles of Egmont, Horne, William of Orange and Brederode; the Sea Beggars and so on. Candidates may well argue that it was a combination of Philip's uncompromising rule from Spain and the actions of his lieutenants in the Netherlands in the context of a Netherlands and nobility jealous of their privileges/semi-independence, economic hardship and the spread of Protestantism that explains his failure to impose his authority.

Paper Total [100]

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553