

History A

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F964/01**: European and World History Enquiries
Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1073-1555

Mark Scheme for June 2012

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates 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 2012

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

Subject-specific Marking Instructions**Question (a) Maximum mark 30**

	A01a and b	AO2a
1	13-14	15-16
2	11-12	13-14
3	9-10	10-12
4	7-8	8-9
5	5-6	6-7
6	3-4	3-5
7	0-2	0-2

Notes related to Part A:

- (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 be at the same level for each AO

Marking Grid for Question (a)

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Total for each question =30	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <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. 	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness. • Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue. • The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately. • Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these. <p style="text-align: center;">15-16</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts. • Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue. • The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly. <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control. • Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made. • Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue. • The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent. <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both. • Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely. <p style="text-align: center;">10-12</p>
Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted. • A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence. • Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">7-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it. • Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach. <p style="text-align: center;">8-9</p>
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and /or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion. • Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding. • Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication. <p style="text-align: center;">5-6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit • Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation. <p style="text-align: center;">6-7</p>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement. • Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context. • Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic. • Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused. <p style="text-align: center;">3-5</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance. • Weak or non-existent context with no conceptual understanding. • No structure with extremely weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment. • Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

	A01a and b	AO2a and b
1	20-22	42-48
2	17-19	35-41
3	13-16	28-34
4	9-12	21-27
5	6-8	14-20
6	3-5	7-13
7	0-2	0-6

Notes related to Part B:

- (iv) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (v) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (vi) Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

AOs	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
Total mark for the question = 70	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <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. 	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level. • Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources. • Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication. <p style="text-align: center;">20-22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of all the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation. • Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer. <p style="text-align: center;">42-48</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance. • A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context. • Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication. <p style="text-align: center;">17-19</p>	<p>Grouped analysis and use of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent. • Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">35-41</p>

AOs	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainly sound analysis, argument and explanation, but there may be some description and unevenness. Judgement may be incomplete or inconsistent with the analysis of content and provenance. • Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive. • Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication. <p style="text-align: center;">13-16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some grouping although not sustained or developed. Sources are mainly approached discretely with limited cross reference. Their use is less developed and may, in parts, lose focus on the interpretation. There may be some description of content and provenance. • Is aware of some of the limitations of the sources, individually or as a group, but mostly uses them for reference and to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating them as evidence. There is little cross referencing. • There may be unevenness in using knowledge in relation to the sources. Synthesis may be patchy or bolted on. Analysis and evaluation are only partially convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">28-34</p>
Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts some analysis, argument and explanation but underdeveloped and not always linked to the question. There will be more assertion, description and narrative. Judgements are less substantiated and much less convincing. • Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential. • Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">9-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described. • May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely. • An imbalance and lack of integration between sources and knowledge often with discrete sections. There is little synthesis. Analysis and explanation may be muddled and unconvincing in part. <p style="text-align: center;">21-27</p>
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement. • Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant. • Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear. <p style="text-align: center;">5-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped. • There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general. • There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">14-20</p>

AOs	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question. • Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant. • Little organisation or structure with poor communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation. • A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content. • No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">7-13</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question. • No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context. • Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive. • No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately. • No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince. <p style="text-align: center;">0-6</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)	<p>The Sources are similar in content in that both accounts indicate that the Christians were determined foes and that the Muslim resistance was not as great as it could have been. Source B, al Sulami, makes much of the disunity of the Muslims and their reluctance to fight the Christians, while C, Ibn al Qalsini, shows that the Muslims were unprepared, but in this case ready to resist, and unlucky. The Christians in Source B saw their chance and in Source C they seized their opportunities.</p> <p>The Sources differ in content in that Source B emphasises much more the faults on the Muslim side which allowed the crusaders to expand their territories, seeing no obstacles in their path, while Source C sees the main reason lying with the crusader equipment and tactics. Their siege engines were well deployed, while the Saracens were awaiting reinforcements. Tactically their approach is to inspire terror. The example of the treatment of Tripoli was not likely to encourage further resistance from the Turks. Even if the Governor was treated with respect, the Turkish troops and the inhabitants of towns that resisted could not expect such clemency.</p> <p>The provenance and context of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. Both the writers are Muslims, writing relatively soon after the events and trying to explain why their forces had been overcome. Hence any credit they attribute to the Christian armies can be viewed as reliable. They were aware that the capture of Tripoli by the Crusaders meant that supplies could be brought in to help the Crusaders through the port, so it was a serious loss. Al Sulami saw the crusades very much in terms of a Holy War, but felt the Muslims were being punished for their lack of resolute resistance. His aim in writing is to revive a spirit of resistance among the Muslims and to end their damaging internal disunity. He clearly believes that the Crusaders should not have been victorious in an unfamiliar and inhospitable setting, but the lack of resistance made them far more confident. His frustration at the turn of events is evident. The author of Source C was perhaps more realistic in his evaluation of the reasons for defeat and recorded the increasingly brutal attitude of the crusaders, which, in turn, did help to bring about the unity on the part of their enemies which Al Sulami urged. Although the Sources are written at much the same period, their perspectives do reflect changing circumstances so either can be justified as the better evidence.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....'</p> <p>The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence, taking into consideration purpose and audience. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The Sources contain references to different interpretations so they may be grouped according to their view. The supporting view, that relationships were hostile is shown predominantly in Sources B, al Sulami, C, Ibn al Qalsini, and D, William of Tyre.</p> <p>The opposing view, that relationships were not so bad is found in Sources A, Fulcher of Chartres, and E, the modern historian. The latter, as the view of a modern historian, offers a longer term perspective. There is some support for Source E in Source B and elements of Source D could be interpreted in a similar way.</p> <p>The supporting argument in Sources B, C and D is that there was much hostility. In Source B there is clearly ambition for conquest from the Christians, who are determined to take over all the land they can and do not expect much resistance. In Source C the savage attack on Tripoli shows mutual hostility. Both sides fought strongly. The more humane treatment of the Governor and his entourage could show that hostility was not totally pervasive, but could also be justified as a sound practice in this kind of warfare. Source D indicates that it was the Muslims who were most hostile, expressing their dislike in passive resistance or guerrilla like attacks, rather than in all-out war, but so terrifying the Christians that some returned home in the face of this hostility. William of Tyre is writing later and so has a longer term perspective on the likelihood of a peaceful outcome.</p> <p>The opposing argument is mainly in Sources A and E, but there are some references in the other Sources. In Source A, much at odds with Source D, the Christians have been assimilated into the life of the kingdoms, have intermarried with the locals and have their own stake in the countryside. They even speak the language. Far from returning home, as in Source D, their improved economic status means they see no reason at all to go back to poverty in France. Fulcher was writing in the hope that more Franks would go to join the Christians in the kingdoms so he is likely to be encouraging. The modern historian makes it clear that in practical terms, the Christians and the Muslims were having to share the Holy Land and so could not survive in a permanent state of war. Source B suggests that the Muslims were content to live peaceably with the Christians and the author of B castigates them for doing so, hoping the situation would be reversed. Source D does show the two groups living at apparently close quarters, but clearly not amicably. Sources A and D indicate that the Christians are in a minority.</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual evidence and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>A supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>There is a measure of agreement between the Christian and Muslim sources, but each, as might be expected, blames the other for the relationships being hostile. Candidates might well argue that this is hardly surprising. In the end the Christian presence inspired a movement for unity among the Muslims, as the author of Source B had hoped it might. On the other hand, Source A suggests that many Christians were settlers rather than crusaders and accommodated the habits of their neighbours. Some had come on the crusades to escape conditions at home and, having done so, would put up with the some local difficulty given the better general experience. Baldwin as ruler had too few troops to dominate, and concentrated on building castles which protected trade routes and the settlements around them. But the security of these did depend on some co-operation with the Muslims, which Baldwin encouraged. There were also settlers who went native, married local women, ate the local diet and embraced comfortable Arab fashions. They were despised by true crusaders and many of the chroniclers, but they show that the assessment in Source E has some justification. Theory and practice diverged.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>The provenance and context should be integrated into the source comparison and linked to content. The sources share a common author and nature, each is a pamphlet or tract written by Luther, but the context, purpose, audience and tone are different. In content, the Sources have fewer similarities than differences because Luther's general attitude towards peasants and princes seems contradictory. However, they do have some similarities. Both Sources suggest that Luther sees himself in a central role, able to advise and direct events. Knowledge of his views on obedience might be used. Both Sources suggest that peasants are wrong to kill others. His angry tone in Source D is in contrast to his calm reaction to their moderate proposals in B. In B he is willing to overlook 'false prophets' leading them astray from Christian laws as long as they remain peaceful. Their violence at the time of D explains his change of heart.</p> <p>His tone is different in the two sources. Luther's response to the Twelve Articles, Source B, is conciliatory in order to calm the situation and maintain peace. In contrast, after a tour of Thuringia which revealed his lack of influence with the rebels, Source D incites the princes to violence against the peasants, contradicting his view in Source B that you should 'love your enemies and not avenge yourself against injustice'. In Source B Luther gives full blame to the princes and lords, while in Source D he supports the princes against the peasants, ignoring his view in B that they had provoked the peasants by their heavy taxes and injustice. In Source D, Luther admits that he did not judge the peasants in 'his earlier pamphlet', i.e. Source B, whereas in D he does judge them as carrying out 'the devil's work', in context of their violent attacks. In Source B, Luther criticises spiritual lords for ranting against the Bible but accepts the validity of the peasants' first Article and of others based on scripture. In contrast, he states in Source D that the peasants' claim to be inspired by the Bible was 'nothing but lies', having lost influence over them.</p> <p>The tone of Source B is mostly placatory, rational and instructive but mildly condemnatory of the princes ('they shame you') with the purpose of conciliating the two sides for a peace based upon Christian values. The tone of Source D is emotive, judgemental and aggressive ('mad dogs', 'stab, slay') because of the peasants' violent rejection of Luther's advice. Ironically, he incites the princes to use violence against them in retaliation rather than conciliation. Some might argue that this changed attitude towards the princes suggests that his purpose in Source D was to keep princely support and not be tarred with the activities of some sections of the radical peasantry, who by now were losing. The Twelve Articles, to which Luther was replying in B, were written by moderate peasants, whereas in D Luther is generalising from the actions of extremists.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>The sources can be read/analysed in different ways and as part of their judgement candidates will need to appreciate this.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Knowledge of context should help explain and extend the content and tone of the Sources. Source D was written at a time of peasant violence against monasteries but before the Battle of Frankenhausen. Its publication came after tens of thousands of peasants had died in the battle. Luther's angry tone may reflect being heckled by peasants who listened instead to 'false prophets' such as Müntzer. A supported judgement should be reached on the relative value of the sources as evidence, taking into consideration tone, typicality and purpose.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The Sources contain references to both sides of the argument and may be grouped according to their view. Firstly, concerning the outbreak of the War, Sources A, B and C suggest that Luther did not bear the main responsibility. Sources A and B lay the blame on the princes for their heavy burdens on the poor in tax, rents and unpaid labour and their injustices. Context might be used to develop these issues. Thus the outbreak of War may be seen primarily as social and economic in its causes. Alternative views might be argued using Source C to blame Thomas Müntzer and other extremist preachers for its outbreak or Source B to blame churchmen, in context of the power of Archbishop-Electors and Catholic clergy.</p> <p>However, aspects of Sources A and B support Luther's religious responsibility for the outbreak of the War. Knowledge might be used to extend Source A, especially the first and last Articles, including Luther's emphasis on sola scriptura, along with his widely circulated German translation of the New Testament and his 1520 pamphlets stating the liberty of a Christian and the priesthood of all believers. However, in evaluation, these ideas were widely misinterpreted as social and political rather than spiritual as he intended. In Source B, he adopts a conciliatory tone and reminds them to follow Christian laws such as 'love thy neighbour'. In this Source, Luther certainly sees himself at the heart of events and with the power to alter their course. Thus as far as responsibility for the violent outbreak of the Peasants War, Source B suggests that Luther's purpose was to prevent a violent war breaking out and that he preached political obedience.</p> <p>Secondly, as regards the bloodshed meted out by the peasants, Source C might be used to argue the alternative view that Thomas Müntzer and other extremist preachers were primarily to blame. Luther admits in Source B that 'false prophets' have led the peasants astray. The steer of Source C suggests that Müntzer is an untypically extremist but influential preacher. Knowledge of his beliefs and actions might be used to develop these points and for comparative evaluation.</p> <p>As regards the bloodshed meted out by the princes in crushing the peasants, Sources D and to some extent E also suggest the supporting view that Luther was to blame. His angry, violent tone in Source D differs from the calm, rational approach of Source B. Cross-reference with Source E, written with balance by a prominent reformer critical of princes, confirms that Luther's views were seen as rash and fickle by many reformers. Knowledge might be used to argue, perhaps using the steer to D, that Luther had been</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>insulted and his advice rejected by some peasants. The tone might be seen as typical of Luther's rashness and extreme language when criticised by opponents. Though he and Müntzer despised each other, the tone and ideas of Source B might be seen as more typical of Luther's attitude of obedience. In the case of Source E, the author is a shocked supporter rather than a critic of Luther and though he reports criticism, he tends to exonerate him by suggesting that the princes were already massacring the peasants, both rebels and the innocent, when pamphlet D was published. He feels their violence would have continued even without further encouragement from Luther. The provenance of Source E might be explored a little for reliability and use - the author is very critical of the princes generally ('tyrants'), and is the mayor of a town where extremism had been rife (the Zwickau prophets). He is more concerned with the social consequences of Luther's rash pamphlet than with blaming Luther. An even balance between the two issues in the question is not required. Argument on the 'outbreak' may entail use of only Sources A, B and C and on the 'bloodshed' use of Sources C, D and E – this is an acceptable approach as long as there is synthesis in each section.</p> <p>Supported overall judgement should be reached on how far the Sources accept the interpretation that Martin Luther was responsible for the outbreak and bloodshed of the Peasants' War. No specific judgement is expected.</p>		

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

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

© OCR 2012

