



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2025

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

Paper 2: Depth study

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

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

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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 or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2025

Question Paper Log Number P76437A

Publications Code 9HI0_2B_2506_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

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
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4–7	• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	8–12	• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria but with limited justification.
4	13–16	• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.
5	17–20	• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/ or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.

Section B

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. • The overall judgement is missing or asserted. • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	4–7	• There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. • An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	8–12	• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	13–16	• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. • The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.
5	17–20	• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement. • The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

Section A: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
1	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. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the controversy caused by the sale of indulgences in Germany in the years 1515-18. Source 1 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: • Issued by Archbishop Albert of Mainz, who was responsible for the distribution of indulgences, the source will give an insight into the process of indulgence sales from a senior German cleric • The language of the source is clear and business-like, giving detailed instructions about the process of both selling indulgences and about the benefits that apparently accrue from securing them • The source was written before these indulgences had been distributed in Germany and before the outbreak of the controversy that they caused. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the controversy caused by the sale of indulgences in Germany in the years 1515-18: • The source claims that sins could be forgiven in 'full', and the punishments of purgatory 'wiped out', by an indulgence authorised by a Pope rather than by God ('gifts of grace granted...Papal Bull') • It claims that the benefits of this indulgence could be secured by the living for dead relatives and friends ('forgiveness of the sins of those suffering in purgatory...on behalf of the dead.') • It suggests that money payments were central to securing the indulgence ('ask those that wish...how much their consciences...should pay', 'kings...twenty-five guilders...others...one guilder.') • The instructions suggest that a 'hard sell' was expected of the indulgence sellers ('must concentrate on ensuring that the faithful fully understand'). 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: • The sale of indulgences was not new in the early 1500s - the practice had always raised important theological questions but successive popes had ruled the practice to be in accordance with Church law • The indulgence of 1515 was potentially controversial because Pope Leo's intent was to raise funds for the redevelopment of St Peter's in Rome, thus large sums raised in Germany would be spent in Italy • Archbishop Albert had an acute interest in maximising the revenues raised by the indulgence as he had borrowed hugely to purchase the prestigious and influential Archbishopric of Mainz • Albert engaged Johan Tetzel to lead his 'sales' campaign – Tetzel quickly became controversial for his questionable claims about the efficacy of the indulgence and his methods of persuading the poor, especially, to buy.

Question	Indicative content
	Source 2 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: • Martin Luther was a central figure in the indulgence controversy in Germany and is well placed to offer an insight into it • Written in 1545, towards the end of his life and nearly thirty years after the events he is describing, Luther may be conscious of the need to secure his legacy and could embellish or omit important details as a result • The tone and language of the source seek to portray Luther as a righteous 'David' taking on the power of a corrupt 'Goliath', and one who felt compelled to act despite the consequences. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the controversy caused by the sale of indulgences in Germany in the years 1515-18: • The source suggests that the sale of indulgences was controversial because it potentially funnelled money away from more deserving causes ('put to better use.', 'works of love.') • It suggests that the methods of the indulgence sellers were an important element in causing controversy ('urgings...greed...blasphemy of the indulgence sellers.') • It implies that the sale of indulgences caused controversy because it added to existing unease about the conduct of the Catholic Church in Germany ('weary of the deceits...the tricks...to make themselves richer.') • It suggests that indulgence sales caused controversy because Luther's response was interpreted as a direct attack on the papacy ('full power...thrown against me...summoned to Rome.'). 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: • Luther and others, like Carlstadt, had attacked the sale of indulgences before 1517 but had little impact, e.g. Luther had preached sermons in both 1515 and 1516 against the practice • Though Tetzel was not permitted to enter Electoral Saxony, Luther was angered by the numbers that were persuaded to travel some distance to hear him and buy indulgences that they could ill afford • The <i>Ninety-Five Theses</i> were intended for limited distribution and scholastic debate - however, translated into German and sold widely, their perceived attack on the papacy turned Luther into a popular hero • On the intervention of Frederick the Wise, Luther was spared an immediate summons to Rome – Luther was called instead to meet Cajetan, the papal legate, in Augsburg, who declared him a heretic. Sources 1 and 2 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • Both sources refer to the central role played by Archbishop Albert of Mainz in the development of the indulgences controversy in Germany • Both sources refer to the centrality of money payments to the securing of an indulgence and to the claims of the indulgence sellers • Whereas Source 1 details instructions for sellers before the indulgence was distributed in Germany, Source 2 describes the issues that the implementation of the instructions caused.

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

Question	Indicative content
2	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. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to investigate Philip II's policy in the Netherlands in the years 1567-68. Source 3 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: • As 'advice' written for King Philip II, there is no certainty that he would agree with it or act upon it • Probably written in 1567, the 'advice' followed a period of considerable resistance to Philip II's policies in the Netherlands and can be seen as a response to this • The tone and language of the advice are mostly stern and uncompromising, suggesting a loss of patience with the Dutch people in light of the recent upheavals. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about Philip II's policy in the Netherlands in the years 1567-68: • The source indicates that Philip II's policy should be to impose royal authority more stringently in the Netherlands ('combine all the provinces...absolute king.') • The source suggests that the current government of the Netherlands lacked uniformity ('one law...one custom...throughout the kingdom.') and that it lacked religious conformity ('one religion') • It provides evidence that the king was advised to crack down on dissent ('reform the town councils', 'appoint a new official...') with the backing of an increased military presence ('castles', 'well-armed troops.') • The source indicates that, to restore order, it was better for Philip II to treat even the ringleaders of the recent unrest with leniency ('treat them more with mercy than with severity.'). 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: • Philip had little patience or understanding for the complexities of government the Netherlands, and would have much preferred to rule the Dutch in the same way that he was able to rule the Castilians • Philip was strongly opposed to granting concessions to the Dutch, particularly in matters of religion, and was supported in this view by close advisors like Granvelle • The determination of the Dutch people to preserve their traditional rights contributed greatly to a breakdown in obedience to Spanish rule during the mid-1560s, which came to a head in 1566 • Philip's response to the challenges posed by the leading grandees and the 'Beggars', and to the Iconoclastic Fury, was to authorise Alva to re-impose Spanish authority using force if necessary.

Question	Indicative content
	Source 4 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: • As a leading figure in the Netherlands, who was closely involved in its political affairs in the 1560s, Orange would be well placed to comment on Philip II's policy • Written while he was in exile, and shortly before he launched an invasion to challenge Spanish rule, Orange was unlikely to give an impartial view of Philip II's policy and was seeking to rally support for his invasion • The tone and language of the source are extremely negative about Spanish rule in the Netherlands, and about Spanish royal advisors, though less so about the King himself. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about Philip II's policy in the Netherlands in the years 1567-68: • It claims that royal advisers have persuaded Philip to seek to rule absolutely and that the consequences of such a policy have been disastrous for the Dutch people ('robbed, killed or forced abroad.') • It suggests that a key element of Spanish policy has been the destruction of the long-standing customs of government in the Netherlands ('privileges and rights...totally oppressed and destroyed.') • It claims that with the 'arrival of...Alva and his Spanish soldiers', the policy of Philip II has become harsher still ('persecutions and executions have increased and multiplied.') • It claims that royal policy in the Netherlands has reduced the country to 'misery' and 'enslaved' the people. 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: • During the 1560s, Orange was one of the leading grandees who sought to moderate Philip II's policies in the Netherlands, especially with regards to religious toleration and traditional Dutch governmental privileges • The grandees acted both out of self-interest and a genuine fear of Philip's intentions towards the Netherlands and, in 1566, encouraged the 'Beggars' to challenge openly Philip's regent, Margaret of Parma • Upon Philip II's appointment of Alva as governor-general, Orange fled the Netherlands while opponents that remained, like Egmont and Hoorn, were executed for having voiced a challenge to Philip's policies • In response to Alva's crackdown (e.g. the Tenth Penny and the Council of Troubles), and in an attempt to restore his own personal position, Orange co-ordinated a number of unsuccessful invasions in 1568. Sources 3 and 4 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • Both sources refer to the traditional privileges, customs and rights of the Netherlands that were considered, in Spain, an encumbrance to Philip II's rule • Both sources acknowledge that force was a potential solution to end recent resistance to Philip II's policies in the Netherlands • Both sources indicate that Philip's policy was shaped by 'hard-line' advisors at the Spanish court • Source 3 advises stern measures to end disobedience to Philip II's policies in the Netherlands - Source 4 claims that such measures were used and that their use intensified with Alva's arrival.

Section B: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
3	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that Luther's influence over the German Reformation declined significantly in the years 1525-46. Arguments and evidence that Luther's influence over the German Reformation declined significantly in the years 1525-46 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Luther's condemnation of the Peasants' War in 1525 was widely unpopular and lost him considerable influence among supporters, many believing that his language had encouraged the severity of its repression • From the 1520s, the spread of the German Reformation was increasingly directed by the secular authorities, e.g. princes, like Albrecht of Prussia, and city councils, like Nuremburg, without direction from Luther personally • Luther's conservatism, and his inflexibility in discussions with other reformers (notably over the Eucharist at Marburg in 1529), lost him the unquestioned theological leadership of the German Reformation • Largely confined to Saxony by the Edict of Worms, Luther was unable to attend the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, therefore ceding influence to figures like Melanchthon (who drafted the hugely important Augsburg Confession) • Luther's support for Philip of Hesse in the bigamy scandal of 1540 badly damaged his reputation among reformers, when he appeared to condone a serious moral offence by one of his leading supporters • In the 1530s and the 1540s, other figures became more influential over the course of the German Reformation than Luther, e.g. Bugenhagen's Saxon Model gave organisational clarity to Lutheranism • Luther's volatility, and the violence of some of his language, made him a marginal figure by the 1540s, and he was increasingly confined by ill health to Wittenberg. Arguments and evidence that opposes the statement that Luther's influence over the German Reformation declined significantly in the years 1525-46 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Luther remained highly influential over the German Reformation throughout these years, respected as its inspiration (e.g. author of the <i>Ninety-Five Theses</i>) and its founding theologian (e.g. the 1520 Treatises) • Though Luther's condemnation of the peasants lost him some support, it gained the Reformation the crucial backing of leading princes, like Philip of Hesse, who sought his personal guidance throughout these years • Luther continued to produce works of considerable influence over the Reformation, notably the German Mass of 1526, the Catechisms of 1529 and the completed translation of the Bible in 1534 • Though confined to Saxony, Luther was in constant correspondence with Melanchthon during the drafting of the Augsburg Confession in 1530, and his support was vital in its acceptance by reformers across Germany • Even in the 1540s, Luther's influence over the German Reformation remained central, e.g. through his writings and contacts, he ensured that the negotiations at Regensburg did not compromise over key tenets. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
4	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how far the survival of Lutheranism in Germany, in the years 1521-55, was due to the weakness of the office of Holy Roman Emperor. Arguments and evidence that the survival of Lutheranism in German, in the years 1521-55, was due to the weakness of the office of Holy Roman Emperor should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Though of great symbolic importance, the office of Emperor conferred little power on the holder but did bring with it significant responsibilities, e.g. dealing with the religious schism prompted by Luther in Germany • Nominally ruling over hundreds of independent states, some almost as powerful as the German lands he ruled, e.g. Hesse, Brandenburg, Saxony, any Emperor would have struggled to impose his wishes on them all • Governing the Empire was complex and slow – prompt and concerted action, such as that against Luther in the 1520s, depended on the Emperor being able to juggle competing interests at the occasional Diets • The Emperor had no powers of taxation in the Empire and no automatic right to intervene in the affairs of its cities or states – this gave many of the richer rulers considerable scope for defiance of the Imperial will • Having no imperial army, an Emperor was dependent on either princely cooperation or his own personal resources if he wanted to enforce his will – Charles was only able to muster both, temporarily, in 1546-47 • As the secular head of Christendom, the Emperor was expected to lead armies against its enemies, even outside the Empire, costing him valuable time and resources, e.g. his campaigns against the Ottomans in the 1530s • During the Imperial Election of 1519, Charles V was forced by the Electors to agree to the Capitulation, which further weakened the Imperial office, e.g. the promise not to bring foreign troops into the Empire. Arguments and evidence that the survival of Lutheranism in German, in the years 1521-55, was not due to the weakness of the office of Holy Roman Emperor and/or that other factors were more important should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Empire had more bureaucratic clarity by 1521 than ever before thanks to recent reforms, e.g. the ten 'circles' helped enforce decisions taken at the Diets – it was, therefore, by no means ungovernable • It was less the office and more the person that held it that allowed Lutheranism to spread - Charles had too many responsibilities outside the Empire and made serious mistakes, e.g. the Interim of Augsburg (1547) • The survival of Lutheranism was due to the behaviour of leading princes within the Empire, acting out of self-interest or religious conviction, who staunchly opposed Charles, e.g. the formation of the Schmalkaldic League • Lutheranism survived because the Catholic Church was unable to respond effectively to Luther, e.g. successive popes failed to inspire concerted action in the 1520s and ducked the challenge of real reform thereafter • Lutheranism survived because, by the 1530s, it had acquired theological clarity, a powerful protective alliance and thousands of sincere and determined followers across Germany, making it impossible to contain. Other relevant material must be credited.

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

Question	Indicative content
5	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the accuracy of the statement that Orange's invitation to the Duke of Anjou weakened opposition to Spanish rule in the Netherlands in the years 1578-83. Arguments and evidence that Orange's invitation to the Duke of Anjou weakened opposition to Spanish rule in the Netherlands in the years 1578-83 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The invitation to Anjou helped destroy the unity of the Estates-General forged through the Pacification of Ghent – it gave Parma the scope to re-set relations with some who had opposed Spanish rule hitherto • Anjou was a poor choice to choose as the 'Defender of the Liberties of the Low Countries' – he was of limited intellectual grasp, of uninspiring appearance and struggled to keep the opposition cause united • Anjou's involvement weakened opposition to Spanish rule by encouraging some southern provinces to agree the Treaty of Arras with Parma, and then to support Spanish military intervention against the rebel provinces • The invitation to Anjou was consistently opposed by Holland and Zeeland, the two key rebel provinces – Anjou was a Catholic, unacceptable to most Calvinists, also his ultimate aims were considered obscure • The decision to support Anjou as sovereign in 1580 (the Treaty of Plessis-les-Tours) caused further division among those who had opposed Spanish rule, as many moderates still recognised Philip II as King • Anjou's attempt to seize power by force, in 1583, was strongly resented and opposed, especially in Antwerp – it encouraged still more opponents to seek reconciliation with Spanish rule and helped fuel Parma's advance • For all the difficulties it caused, the invitation to Anjou contributed little to the cause of opposition to Spanish rule - it ended ignominiously with the 'French Fury' and his subsequent withdrawal. Arguments and evidence that Orange's invitation to the Duke of Anjou did not weaken opposition to Spanish rule in the Netherlands in the years 1578-83 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The opposition cause was vulnerable in 1578 due to Philip II's truce with the Ottomans, the arrival of a new bullion fleet in Seville and Parma's appointment as governor – securing French backing was therefore vital • Anjou's experience in matters of religious difference (he had negotiated peace between Catholics and Protestants during the French Wars of Religion) helped strengthen the opposition cause in its dealings with Spain • Anjou's intervention brought 12 000 troops to the opposition side in 1578 and prompted Elizabeth I to fund Casimir's army with a further 12 000, soon after – Parma's campaign stalled, at least partly, as a result • Anjou had some success in galvanising opposition to Spain, e.g. in 1582, having already secured financial backing from France and England, he persuaded the States-General to vote 2.4m florins a year to the war effort • Anjou brought some unity to the opposition, having been chosen due to persistent and widespread doubts about Orange's ability to lead those challenging Spanish rule. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
6	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that the Treaty of Nonsuch was of only minor importance in the success of the United Provinces in the years 1585-1600. Arguments and evidence that the Treaty of Nonsuch was of only minor importance in the success of the United Provinces in the years 1585-1600 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Treaty did not clearly define the responsibilities of the governor-general appointed by Elizabeth I – as a result, the Earl of Leicester struggled to have any impact upon the war effort of the United Provinces • The Treaty could not prevent the loss of important towns, such as Deventer in 1587 and, shortly after, Elizabeth recalled her forces from the Netherlands entirely • The success of the United Provinces in these years was more due to the leadership of Maurice of Nassau, e.g. his reforms to the military, his expertise in siege warfare during the 1590s • The political expertise of Oldenbarnevelt was vitally important to the success of the United Provinces before 1600, e.g. his promotion of a stronger Estates-General, his curbing of Calvinist excesses • The over-ambitious strategy and financial weakness of Spain was important in the success of the United Provinces, e.g. Philip II's expensive intervention in France in 1589 gave them vital breathing space • Their success was due to a burgeoning economy, strengthened by the influx of refugees from the south, who were attracted by its increasing stability and relatively liberal intellectual and religious climate. Arguments and evidence that the Treaty of Nonsuch was not of only minor importance in the success of the United Provinces in the years 1585-1600 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Treaty of Nonsuch gave vital moral and military support to the United Provinces at a crucial time - 6000 troops and 600 000 florins a year helped them to regroup after the disastrous fall of Antwerp • Crucially, the Treaty resulted in the declaration of war on England by Spain – it persuaded Philip II to launch an unsuccessful invasion that he could not afford, and that sapped Spanish military strength and morale • The need for his troops for the English invasion forced Parma to suspend his campaign against the United Provinces in 1588, allowing Maurice breathing space to rejuvenate the cause of the United Provinces • Under the Treaty, England continued to support the United Provinces after the Armada, e.g. Sir Francis Vere's forces played an important role in the fall of Breda (1590) and in the victory at Turnhout (1600). Other relevant material must be credited.

