

History A

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

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

Mark Scheme for January 2013

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, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2013

Subject-specific Marking Instructions that apply across the whole question paper to be included here.

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

	AO1a 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)

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
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>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
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>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
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

	AO1a 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	AO1a 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Grouped analysis and use of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation. · 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	AO1a 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>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
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>
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 agree that Alexius was prepared to go to Jerusalem with the Crusaders under conditions in Source C while in Source E, after being willing to go he reluctantly decided against. In both accounts Alexius was very wary of the large crusader army, directly in Source E and by implication in Source C. Both suggest that Alexius was behaving prudently, fearing invasions from his enemies if he left Constantinople in C, or repercussions from the large crusader army if he did not help them in E.</p> <p>The Sources also differ in that in C, the Frankish version, Alexius was eager to get Raymond of Toulouse to swear an oath to him, while in E, Anna indicates that he thought the Crusaders were unreliable, so their oath was likely to be worthless. The motivation behind Alexius' actions is different. In Source C he was hoping to make Raymond subservient to him, but in E he is worried about the numbers of the Crusaders and their lack of principles.</p> <p>The provenance and context of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. Both writers make it clear that they are informed about events. Raymond of Aguilers would be in the Count's confidence and know how he felt and Anna was certainly aware of her father's attitude. But candidates are likely to argue that both versions favour their particular viewpoint. They could suggest that Source C is less partial as the excuse for the attitude of Alexius could be seen as quite reasonable. Source E has nothing good to say about the crusaders and so justifies the attitude of Alexius. But as it comes from the pen of Anna, it could be concluded that she is a more credible witness for her father's beliefs, despite her obvious partiality.</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.....' 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. 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 are all capable of being interpreted as supporting both sides of the argument. Source A, Robert the Monk's account, clearly asserts a united response. Source B, Fulcher, shows qualified support from the Emperor. Source C, Raymond of Aguilers, indicates Alexius was prepared to join the Crusade. Even Source D suggests the attack on Antioch was a concerted effort. Source E, Anna Comnena, backs up Source C. The alternative view, a lack of unity, can be seen in the need for the appeal in A which shows the response was not necessarily united. B, C and E show the problematic relationship with Alexius, while D suggests some disunity among the leaders besieging Antioch.</p> <p>The supporting view comes most strongly in Source A from the reaction to the Pope's appeal to all Christians to act together against the foe. This appears to be universally favourable and the unity is extended beyond Clermont. Knowledge of the variety of people who answered the call could help in the evaluation. Candidates might however question a religious source keen to promote unity ('gloried in the knowledge'). In Sources B and E, the Emperor provided supplies and an alliance and even Source C shows commitment from Alexius. Knowledge might confirm Alexius' assistance to the Crusade despite his own absence. Sources C and D are less positive but show that despite tensions, the Christians were together in the main issues. Antioch was taken and most Crusaders then set out for Jerusalem.</p> <p>The opposing argument is found especially in Sources B, C, D and E. These all indicate distrust between the Byzantine Emperor, a Christian ruler, and the crusaders, and amongst the Crusade leaders. In Source B the Emperor refuses to let large numbers of crusaders into his capital at any one time. This could be seen as a wise move, and Source E considers Alexius to be a sagacious ruler. Moreover Source E explains how the Frankish army outnumbered the Emperor's troops, while Source B describes the wealth of Constantinople available to be plundered so that Alexius' motives could be assessed as prudence rather than dissension from the cause. In Source C Alexius is depicted as putting his own interests first again and exposed as self-serving in comparison with the constant devotion of Raymond, although such a view might be expected from his chaplain. Source E takes the opposite view where the Franks are unreliable and Alexius is consistent. Candidates could assess how far these divisions were real. Anna sees the Franks as self-serving and untrustworthy, knowledge about Bohemond's previous record re the Byzantines could be used to verify her concerns. In Sources C and E Alexius is not wholly unwilling to join the crusade but has good reasons for declining. He possibly took exception to being</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>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>made to look unsupportive by Raymond of Toulouse, but he may also have sought to use the Crusaders as a means of restoring Byzantine authority lost to the Seljuks earlier in the century. Source D has specific references to divisions among the crusaders and distrust of Bohemond.</p> <p>Regarding the provenance and context, Source B is written by a Frank, who gives a degree of credit to the Emperor and hence seems reliable. Source C takes the opportunity to show its hero in a good light and to indicate that Raymond's mind was on higher things while Alexius was focused on the mundane. Arguably Raymond was safe enough in offering pledges to Alexius as long as Alexius joined the crusade, since he could be sure Alexius would be too concerned for the security of his empire to take him up. Source E is by a very partial author, writing a while after the events and keen to justify her father's actions. But she suggests he thought seriously about going with the crusaders and so disunity was perhaps more apparent than real. Source A is obviously going to emphasise the united front and enthusiasm contrasted with the opposition. Candidates could argue that it was when the crusade entered a more challenging phase that the disunity among its leaders and participants became more glaring, with the pursuit of worldly ends by some and use Source D to support this view. They could also suggest that the initial aim, to remove the Moslem threat, did unify the armies and point out that even at Antioch, after the siege reached a crisis, they agreed to Bohemond's proposal. Source D, written by one of Bohemond's admirers, is perhaps kinder to him than some versions.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>In content, the Sources have similarities and differences and there is contextual evidence in Source D which will require explanation in evaluating any change of view. The Sources disagree. In Source A, Charles is begging the Pope to decide which course of action to take, and promises to obey his orders, whereas in Source D he sees it as his duty to take action himself. Here he seems to be fulfilling the responsibility of his imperial title, whereas in A he might be seen as ‘passing the buck’ to Rome. However, at face value, the Sources agree that the Emperor would like to take severe action against the German heretics, but whereas this is said to be impossible in Source A it seems a possibility in Source D. Contextual knowledge might explain Charles’s huge inheritance, the failure of the Diet of Speyer at the time of Source A in 1524 and the Habsburg–Valois Wars distracting Charles by diverting his forces to Italy. The context has changed by the time of Source D, in which Charles mentions a treaty with the papacy and truce with the Turks. Contextual knowledge might add the Peace of Crépy with the French in 1544. He mentions war between Francis I and Henry VIII, each in the last year of his life. These factors had given Charles a breathing space to tackle the German heretics himself. So his views on action had remained similar in a changing context. In Source A, Charles suggests a General Council of the Church deal with the unrest, and the Germans hope to persuade the Pope, through Campeggio, to open one at Trent. Source D is written in the month after the first session of the Council of Trent had finally taken place, so this action continued, but Charles preferred war. In D, Charles mentions Protestant obstinacy and fears that heresy would spread to the Netherlands. Germany was always at the bottom of Charles’s priority list (he is famously quoted as saying ‘I speak Spanish to God, Italian to women, French to men, and German to my horse’).</p> <p>The provenance and context of the Sources should be integrated into the comparison. Source A is a report in the form of a letter written from Rome by the Venetian ambassador to the Catholic Venetian republic, geographically between Rome and Germany, thus very interested in events. It contains hearsay news about the Emperor’s views, to keep his government up to date, so it should be useful inside information, if not first-hand. In contrast, Source D is a private letter giving first-hand information from Charles himself, confiding in his son Philip, at that time regent of Spain in his father’s absence, so it should be more reliable in giving the Emperor’s own views. Contextual knowledge might be used to explain that Charles was preparing for battle against the Protestant princes in Germany in 1546. The distractions to which he refers in his letter might be the failure of the Colloquy of Regensburg, the opening session of the Council of Trent and the imminent death of Luther, which occurred 2 days after it was written. He is seizing the opportunity denied him in A.</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>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	A supported judgement should be reached on the relative value of the sources as evidence, taking into consideration provenance and content in context. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.		
(b)	<p>The Sources contain references to both sides of the argument, so they may be grouped according to their view. Sources C, E and to an extent A are useful for the supporting view that problems with foreign rulers prevented the Emperor from defeating Lutheranism. The Pope may be considered a foreign ruler who delayed calling a General Council of the Church in support of the Emperor in Sources A and B.</p> <p>Sources B, D and much of A are useful for the opposing view, that the Emperor followed his own policy without hindrance, but that it was a weak policy (eg financial limitations in Source C) and that Lutheranism was getting stronger. The set of Sources also provides an alternative view, that internal German factors prevented the Emperor from defeating Lutheranism. Sources B, D and E suggest that the obstinacy and strength of Lutheranism prevented the Emperor defeating them. Alternatively, Sources C and B suggest that in 1530 the German Catholic princes also failed to support the Emperor's firm stand against Lutheranism.</p> <p>Sources C, E and to an extent A are useful for the supporting view, that problems with foreign rulers prevented the Emperor from defeating Lutheranism. Sources C and E strongly support the interpretation in the question. In Source C, French and Ottoman threats to the Holy Roman Empire are sharply defined by the Catholic princes at Augsburg if the Emperor should try to use force against Lutheranism. They advise the Emperor against fighting an internal religious war within the Empire because of his own weakness and his enemies' strengths. Knowledge of context might be used to evaluate this point. 1530 saw a temporary halt to the Habsburg-Valois Wars after the signing of a Peace at Cambrai in 1529. Charles wished to take advantage of this to win a speedy victory in Germany, which the princes in Source C considered unrealistic. Here the Catholic princes remind the Emperor he is poor and suggest that his forces are weak mercenaries who might defect to the Lutherans. Source E confirms their fears that problems with foreign rulers prevented the Emperor from defeating Lutheranism. Charles's temporary victory at the Battle of Mühlberg 1547 followed a further lull in the Habsburg-Valois Wars, but the French soon successfully intervened, as the princes had warned in Source C. Source E is less reliable because it is based on rumours that the French are preparing to aid the Protestants by invading</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> <p>A supported overall judgement is required on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the light of the changing religious context. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Germany. Knowledge might be used to confirm this rumour, citing the Treaty of Chambord of the previous month, where Henri II promised troops and aid to Maurice of Saxony and the Protestant princes. Unlike Source C, there is no mention of the Turks in Source E, though it might be known that the French had allied with the Turks in 1536. The Emperor’s resultant humiliation and flight from the Empire, together with the Religious Peace of Augsburg 1555, might be used to confirm the value of the Sources for the interpretation.</p> <p>Source A also contributes to the supporting view. Charles is reported as having dismissed any prospect of war as ‘impossible’. Knowledge may be used to explain the Habsburg-Valois War context. The Emperor’s policy is reported by the Venetian ambassador as dependent on the Pope calling a General Council of the Church. The reliability of his views might be evaluated. Source evaluation might involve discussion of the part played by the Papacy (a foreign ruler) in preventing Charles from defeating Lutheranism. Knowledge of the Sack of Rome in 1527 might be used relevantly to evaluate imperial relations with Rome. It is reported in Source A that the Emperor is ‘passing the buck’ to the Pope to call the General Council. He is reported as placating the Pope by conceding that the General Council might be moved to Rome after meeting in a city acceptable to the Germans. If this point is mentioned, it might open up evaluation of papal reluctance to share power with a General Council, using knowledge of earlier General Councils, delays in convening the Council of Trent until 1545 and disruptions due to war mentioned in Source E. Source B confirms the Pope’s reluctance to support the Emperor by reiterating that a General Council should be arranged, which has not happened in the intervening six years. Furthermore, it might be argued in evaluation that the Emperor was unrealistic in expecting a General Council to defeat the Lutheran threat. Thus Source A also offers an opposing view, that Charles adopted a weak policy.</p> <p>The opposing view is strongly supported by Source D, which may be linked for argument to Source B. In Source B Charles seems reluctant to fight a war against Lutheranism, as he mentions ‘armed conflict’ as a possible course of action only after other avenues have failed. Source D suggests that the Emperor faces no foreign threats in 1546, so the time is right to defeat Lutheranism by force. Knowledge might add that by then Charles V is exasperated with fruitless, long drawn-out negotiations and wishes to seize the ‘present opportunity’ of foreign peace and his enemies’ distractions. The unfavourable conditions mentioned in Source C have been remedied by money from the Pope, truces with France and the Turks and the outbreak of war between England and France. Unfortunately, war would have to be</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>won quickly before his enemies regrouped, implied in Source D by reference to funding ‘for the necessary period’. Knowledge might be used to evaluate this policy – Charles won a victory at the Battle of Mühlberg 1547, but his own misjudgement meant the victory was soon lost. Source E confirms that the French took advantage of this by allying with Maurice of Saxony and the Lutheran princes. It may be known that German princes of both religious persuasions later united against the Emperor, fearing loss of power.</p> <p>Thus alternatively, the Sources might be seen to support the view that the German princes prevented the Emperor from defeating Lutheranism. Charles seems unhindered in Source B, attempting to impose his will on the Lutherans at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530. However, he needs the backing of the Catholic German princes to persuade the Lutherans to accept his religious judgement. Source D refers to Lutheran obstinacy as a key reason for their survival, also hinted at in Sources B and E. Contextual knowledge might be used to evaluate the likelihood of the Edict of Worms being upheld. The Protest had shown princely support for Luther, and the Confession of Augsburg gave credence to the new Protestant faith. The Schmalkaldic League was forming and the later failure of talks at Augsburg and Regensburg is evidence of Lutheran (and Catholic) obstinacy. Source C reveals a lack of support from the Catholic princes for the Emperor’s war against Lutheranism. They seem to have their own interests at heart and fear loss of power should Germany descend into civil war. Source E mentions Maurice of Saxony, whose treachery in changing sides to obtain the Electorship of Saxony might be used to explain the ruthlessness of some of Charles’s German opponents.</p> <p>Overall, in evaluation of the interpretation, it might be concluded that Lutheranism survived because of an interaction of the Emperor’s weaknesses, Lutheran strengths and problems with foreign rulers in the context of the Italian wars. Supported overall judgement should be reached on how far the Sources accept the interpretation. 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 2013

