

## **Mark Scheme for June 2010**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2010

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](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

Maximum mark: 50

Each question is marked out of 25.

Allocation of marks within the Unit:

	<b>AO1 Knowledge and Understanding</b>
Level 1	41-50 marks
Level 2	31-40 marks
Level 3	21-30 marks
Level 4	11-20 marks
Level 5	1-10 marks
Level 6	0 marks

The same generic mark scheme is used for both questions:

	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1 Knowledge and Understanding</b>
Level 1	21-25	<p>Complex judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence and significance</li> <li>Explicit and effective use of two or more modes of explanation</li> <li>Developed analysis of interactions between, or prioritisation of, key features and characteristics such as ideas, beliefs, actions and events</li> <li>A wide range of relevant and accurate knowledge</li> <li>Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology</li> <li>Accurate and effective communication. Effective and coherent structure</li> </ul>
Level 2	16-20	<p>Sound judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence and significance</li> <li>Some explicit use of at least one mode of explanation</li> <li>Some analysis of interactions between, or prioritisation of, key features and characteristics such as ideas, beliefs, actions and events; or sound explanation of more than one key feature</li> <li>A range of mostly relevant and accurate knowledge</li> <li>Mostly accurate use of appropriate historical terminology</li> <li>Mostly accurate and clear communication. Generally coherent structure</li> </ul>
Level 3	11-15	<p>Partly sound judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfactory understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence and significance</li> <li>Some reasonable explanation of at least one key feature and characteristic such as ideas, beliefs, actions and events but also some assertion, description or narrative</li> <li>Mostly relevant knowledge, some accurate knowledge</li> <li>A limited range of historical terminology</li> <li>Mostly satisfactory communication. Some coherent structure</li> </ul>

Level 4	6-10	<p>Weak judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some general, but mostly weak, understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence and significance</li> <li>Some limited explanation of at least one key feature and characteristic; mostly assertion, description or narrative</li> <li>Limited relevant knowledge, some inaccurate and irrelevant knowledge</li> <li>Little use of historical terminology</li> <li>Some satisfactory communication, some weak communication. Limited and unclear structure</li> </ul>
Level 5	1-5	<p>Irrelevant or no judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weak understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence, and significance</li> <li>Assertion, description or narrative of at least one key feature and characteristic</li> <li>Mostly inaccurate and irrelevant knowledge</li> <li>No, or inaccurate, use of historical terminology</li> <li>Poor communication, poor or non-existent structure</li> </ul>
Level 6	0	<p>No judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence, and significance</li> <li>Inaccurate or assertion, description or narrative</li> <li>Inaccurate and irrelevant knowledge</li> <li>No use of historical terminology</li> <li>Very poor communication/ Incoherent structure.</li> </ul>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1 (a)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Charlemagne</b></p> <p><b>Why was the death of Carloman in 771 important?</b></p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 Sharing power is never easy, and the two sons of Pepin the Short found it as difficult as most. Carloman seems to have lived in Charlemagne's shadow as an outstanding military leader from the early years of their rule, and the sources hint at deep tensions between them. Carloman's death gave Charlemagne a free hand to campaign where he wanted to and when he wanted to. More importantly, the removal of a dynastic rival cleared the way for the creation of the great Carolingian Empire by removing the threat of inter-family war, the very issue which was to dog Charlemagne's successors and helped to lead to the break-up of the Empire.</p> <p>L3 It was the custom then to divide your kingdom between your sons. When Pepin did this he sparked rivalries between Charlemagne and Carloman. It took Carloman's death in 771 to remove this problem. Now the family was united because Carloman's widow and their children fled to Italy.</p> <p>L5 Carloman was Charlemagne's brother and his death caused great sadness.</p>	<b>[25]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1 (b)	<p><b>How would you best explain the role of the court in Charlemagne's government?</b></p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 It would be wrong to think that the court was the only way in which Charlemagne ruled, but it can be argued that it was at the heart of all that he did. The court was peripatetic, and given that Charlemagne campaigned almost every year this meant that his leading officials were well-travelled and knew the problems of governing such diverse kingdoms at first hand. More importantly, Charlemagne's actions as recorded by a man at the heart of his court, Einhard, tell us that Charlemagne valued learning and culture in a way that was unusual at the time. His court would be a Christian court, based at Aachen when not travelling, acting as a hub for the exchange of books, correspondence and ideas, and the best minds from across Christendom would be invited to attend.</p> <p>L3 The court gave Charlemagne a means of meeting learned men like Alcuin of York. They taught Charlemagne to read and write, and it was said that he slept with writing materials under his pillow. Aachen was to be the centre of the world, a place to rival Constantinople. Court government was civilised and civilising and earned the respect of many at the time.</p> <p>L5 Important people lived at Charlemagne's court and helped him to rule. He couldn't do it all by himself.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2 (a)	<p><b>How would you best explain Charlemagne's relationship with the Byzantine Empire?</b></p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 At one level the relationship can be explained in terms of simple dynastic rivalry. A revival of the Roman Empire in the West, if that was indeed Charlemagne's purpose, could only be a challenge to the Byzantines in Constantinople. This was made manifest in Italy where the opposing empires came to blows. But there was more to the relationship than one of conventional opposition. At various moments the Byzantines wooed the Franks, and the formidable Irene arranged the betrothal of her son to Charlemagne's daughter in 781. In the end the marriage did not happen, but it reminds us of the close links between diplomacy and family ties which existed at the time.</p> <p>L3 Charlemagne wanted to be like the rulers of Constantinople, with great palaces and schools and libraries and magnificent buildings, just as there had once been in Rome. The Byzantines were understandably unwilling to see this upstart in the West do well so spent most of their time fighting him or largely just ignoring him.</p> <p>L5 Charlemagne got on well with the Byzantine Empire and sent them many gifts.</p>	<p>[25]</p>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2 (b)	<p><b>Why was Charlemagne influential outside his Frankish lands?</b></p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 The idea of a Roman Empire in the West had never really gone away, and had been cultivated by successive popes among others. When a ruler arose in France capable of translating some of the glory of Rome but with a Christian ethos into reality, Leo III was happy to support it. Similarly other rulers were keen to pay their respects to the Frankish ruler by means of gift, letter or trade, or all three. The revival of culture and learning which Charlemagne was overseeing became throughout the Christian west and much further afield; ideas could travel as widely as goods, and when Charlemagne became Holy Roman emperor in AD 800 his power and influence became the stuff of legend.</p> <p>L3 This all depends on what we mean by ‘outside his Frankish lands.’ Usually, his influence was a very simple military one, and can be explained by the fact that he took over vast areas of land to the south and east of his Frankish heartlands. His influence was that of a mighty military ruler and conqueror.</p> <p>L5 Charlemagne conquered a lot of land and became very strong outside France. He was a great soldier who also liked to read.</p>	<p>[25]</p>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3 (a)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Luther and the German Reformation 1517-47</b></p> <p><b>The Response of the Church to Luther</b></p> <p><b>How would you best explain Pope Leo X's reaction to Luther in the period up to 1520?</b></p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p><b>L1</b> Papal intentions were at first modest and in proportion. If Luther was an Augustinian monk, he should be disciplined by that order. When that failed to happen the pope took the matter into his own hands because that is what was expected of him, as the supreme authority on church doctrine. Events at Augsburg in 1518 rapidly took on a momentum of their own, however, because the papacy found it hard to distinguish matters of theological debate from the business of obedience to the pope and respect for the position of the Holy Father. Luther had no intention of recognising the latter, and would not concede over the former, so a bitter stalemate ensued.</p> <p><b>L3</b> Both Cajetan and Eck tried to argue with Luther on behalf of the pope. Leo did this because he wanted to prove logically that Luther must be wrong. If he could do this, surely everyone would accept that the pope's authority at the head of the church was undiminished? If Luther could not or would not accept that he was wrong, then he would have to be excommunicated from the church, a very serious step.</p> <p><b>L5</b> There could only be one head of the church, and the pope wanted it to be him and not Martin Luther.</p>	<b>[25]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3 (b)	<p><b>Why was Luther excommunicated in 1521?</b></p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 It is interesting that the same man who had disputed matters of theology with Luther at Leipzig, Johannes Eck, was then directly and immediately involved in the issuing of the papal bull <i>Exsurge Domine</i>. The bull itself did not excommunicate Luther but it condemned some of his propositions and gave him 60 days to recant. Clearly the papal intention here was to demonstrate the enduring power of the Holy Office to judge in matters theological of this kind. But there was more to it than this. Luther's very public airing of his views demanded an equally public response. Moreover, excommunication would mean that no obedient Christian could have dealings with him, making it in very practical terms harder for Luther to spread his teachings in the future.</p> <p>L3 Papal authority was absolute, and Leo had to take this step or suffer a catastrophic blow to that authority. His own power and that of the popes who came after him would suffer if he allowed Luther to get away with his opposition to the doctrines of the church. This is why Leo X acted as quickly as he did and in such an uncompromising way.</p> <p>L5 The Pope wanted Luther to say sorry, but Luther wouldn't and so the pope had no choice but to excommunicate him.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4 (a)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Luther and the German Reformation 1517-47</b></p> <p><b>Why did some Protestant reformers and their supporters attempt to achieve greater unity?</b></p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 It was understandable in practical terms for Philip of Hesse to bring together rival Protestant groups. Their very survival was under threat from the aggression of the Habsburgs. In several cases the relationship between Luther and other reformers was that they were no more than disciples of his, spreading the word as he taught and wrote it and ensuring that Protestantism had as wide a transmission as possible, especially when Luther was confined to Wittenberg. Protestantism appeared at times to be its own worst enemy, to the frustration of many of its exponents and lay defenders.</p> <p>L3 Luther was such a powerful writer and debater that men such as Melancthon fell under his influence. Clever as they were in their own right, it was Luther's teachings that people wanted to hear about so their job was to act as messengers and interpreters, translating some of Luther's more difficult works into writings which ordinary people could understand.</p> <p>L5 There could only be one ruler of the Protestant Church and that was going to be Luther. He didn't want anyone else to tell him he was wrong about God.</p>	<b>[25]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4 (b)	<p><b>How would you best explain the failure of Protestant reformers to reach agreement at the Colloquy of Marburg in 1529?</b></p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 As I have explained, the most important stumbling-blocks were theological issues surrounding the nature of the Eucharist. 'Eat, this is my body' was to be taken literally, argued Luther. For Zwingli, there was no bodily transformation because the words of Jesus were intended to be used figuratively. This meant more than a simple matter of doctrine. Luther could not accept the Zwinglians as proper Christians. There could be no compromise. The Swiss reformer claimed rather unconvincingly that his own thinking owed little to that of Luther, and certainly their two churches remained well apart. Whatever the practical sense of greater unity, the two men found it impossible to reconcile their intellectual and theological differences.</p> <p>L3 The views of the rival groups were just too diverse for agreement to be reached. They could not agree about the words Jesus used at the Last Supper. This had caused disagreement with the Pope and the Catholic Church, too, and had been the main reason that the Protestants had broken away in the first place. Now they couldn't agree among themselves either.</p> <p>L5 If the Protestants had been able to agree with each other it would have been much better, but they couldn't and so it wasn't.</p>	[25]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
5 (a)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Robespierre and the French Revolution 1774-95</b></p> <p><b>Why was the ‘Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen’ of 1789 important?</b></p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 We can identify a mixture of negative and positive intentions behind the Declaration. Sweeping away absolute monarchy and privilege were at the heart of the document, and as such the influence of the <i>philosophes</i> was tangible. The document would not have achieved its fame and influence in such a form, however. It set out ‘natural, inalienable and sacred’ rights of man, such as equality and popular sovereignty which served as a benchmark for the French Revolution and other revolutions around the world. Although it spoke of taxation being borne equally and agreed by an elected government, in practice there was no way of achieving economic equality in particular.</p> <p>L3 Such a declaration had never been issued before. As an event it was unprecedented. After it had been published in August 1789 there was no going back for the French Revolution. It was truly a historic event and one which marked the real start of the revolution as far as most ordinary people were concerned.</p> <p>L5 The Declaration said that all men were equal. I agree with this and think everyone else should, too.</p>	<b>[25]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
5 (b)	<p><b>How would you best explain the increasing hostility towards the Church in the period up to 1791?</b></p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 However much it might protest to the contrary, the Catholic Church was seen as very much part of the Ancien Regime. It stood for obedience, authority and tradition. Whatever the popularity of some devout priests, others were thought to be lazy and corrupt. The church was wealthy, and owned lands on a vast scale. Hostility was demonstrated from an early point in the revolution by the vote in the Assembly in November 1789 to place church property at the nation's disposal. Clergy were now to be paid by the state, with the hope that they would now pledge loyalty to or at least avoid disloyalty to their new paymaster.</p> <p>L3 In 1790 there was the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. This set out pay scales for churchmen and required them to live in their parishes. They would be elected by the people instead of by the church itself. We can tell from all this how unpopular the church was.</p> <p>L5 The Church was too rich and wealthy. Nobody believed in religion anymore and the French Revolution got rid of it all.</p>	<b>[25]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
6 (a)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Robespierre and the French Revolution 1774-95</b></p> <p><b>Why did Robespierre try to destroy his political rivals?</b></p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 It is not easy to work out what motivated Robespierre. It seems that he thought he could achieve, and that France needed, some kind of a Republic of Virtue, from which all corrupt elements should be cleansed. Worryingly, it was he who seemed to determine who those individuals and groups should be. Former friends, political allies and supporters were sent to the guillotine as well as political opponents. So, there was some kind of method in Robespierre's madness because it went far beyond conventional political infighting.</p> <p>L3 Robespierre could not allow any rival bodies to set up to rival the Committee of Public Safety. Nor could he allow any speakers or politicians to be more popular than himself. So, he got rid of Danton and he got rid of the Hebertists, which removed the sans-culottes effectively as a force in politics. Robespierre was utterly ruthless and was jealous of anybody with power and influence.</p> <p>L5 Robespierre was a monster. He destroyed everyone and then destroyed himself. That's the kind of man he was.</p>	<b>[25]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
6 (b)	<p><b>How would you best explain the ‘return to moderation’ after the overthrow of Robespierre?</b></p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p><b>L1</b> The ‘Thermidorean reaction’ was too deliberate and too prolonged to be accidental. It marked a weariness with the spiralling bloodshed of the Terror. The new Constitution avoided the mistakes of the past by not allowing the concentration of power in the hands of an executive. This desire was also propelled by the economic crisis, which had if anything worsened under Jacobin rule. Price rises, inflation and bread shortages were the real issues in 1794 and 1795, not political speechmaking.</p> <p><b>L3</b> Everyone had had enough of violence. There was a widespread desire for peace in Paris. The Terror was at an end, and people wanted that: no more guillotine, no more Jacobins, no more Robespierre.</p> <p><b>L5</b> Moderation means a return to the centre, and that’s what happened. Robespierre had been overthrown, and good riddance people said.</p>	<b>[25]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7 (a)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Russia in Turmoil 1900-1921</b></p> <p><b>Why was there a revolution in Russia in 1905?</b></p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 The trigger event was, ironically, an old-fashioned form of protest in the form of the presentation of a petition to the Tsar. By itself this dramatic event cannot however explain a revolution. In my view the longer-term economic breakdown which can be said to correspond to Nicholas II's period in power from 1894 offers a fuller explanation. Unplanned economic growth, poor harvests in 1900 and 1902 and a series of strikes together contributed to protests and riots which came close to toppling Tsarism itself</p> <p>L3 Father Gapon led the revolution. He and his followers said that they only wanted help, but others said they were hungry or were bitter about losing the war against Japan, a less powerful country, which humiliated Russia.</p> <p>L5 People were fed up with Nicholas II and wanted to get rid of him</p>	<b>[25]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7 (b)	<p><b>How is the failure of the 1905 revolution best explained?</b></p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 No single factor therefore explains why the revolt failed. What is not in doubt is the utter determination of Nicholas II to stay in power, using force against the St Petersburg and Moscow soviets and driving into exile political opponents whom his secret police did not capture. He was aware of his own family history and of Russian history across the centuries, not wishing to be recorded as the last Tsar. However, what is interesting is his readiness to allow uncensored newspapers, political parties and a Duma. Was the Tsar just playing for time, or genuinely interested in an advisory political body? Either way, many of his most vocal critics among the middle classes were prepared to stop their protests. Their optimism or naivety contributed to the collapse of an event which barely deserves the title of 'revolution', as I have stated before.</p> <p>L3 I have shown that Nicholas had no intention of bringing in a Duma and free elections and democracy, still less in letting a parliament have a say in the running of Russia. He was an autocrat like his father and grandfather and he knew what he was doing: keeping control using force. This explains why the so-called 1905 revolution did not succeed.</p> <p>L5 Nicholas just wanted to stay in power in his palace and he wasn't going to allow a revolution to disturb his lifestyle.</p>	<p>[25]</p>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
8 (a)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Russia in Turmoil 1900-1921</b></p> <p><b>How would you best explain the introduction of War Communism in 1918?</b></p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 I have therefore indicated that the main and obvious reasons for the introduction of the mis-named War Communism were pragmatic. In order to win the war, harsh economic medicine had to be swallowed in the form of a 'command economy' with production and distribution of all goods strictly controlled. Often overlooked, though, is the second word of the label. The redistribution of wealth via the methods of production, distribution and exchange was classic Communism in action, and Lenin was well aware of the theoretical underpinnings to what he was doing.</p> <p>L3 The harshness of War Communism can be explained simply by the need to win the Civil War against the Whites and their foreign supporters at any cost. Otherwise there would be no revolution to protect and Lenin and the Bolsheviks would have faced annihilation.</p> <p>L5 Lenin was a cruel man and he did not care about the ordinary Russian people so this is why he let them starve.</p>	<b>[25]</b>

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
8 (b)	<p><b>Why were the Tsar and his family executed in 1918?</b></p> <p>This is what the key part of each answer might look like:</p> <p>L1 I have therefore tried to explain that it was more logical and politically necessary to kill the Tsar than to leave him alive, and the same applies to his family. There was no room for sentiment in Marxist-Leninist theory and none in Bolshevik practice, which put the good of the many before the interests of the few. From March 1917 the locomotive of history drove all before it and political necessity meant that a former ruler in exile was a danger which could be eliminated in simple fashion.</p> <p>L3 I believe that Nicholas and his family were killed randomly and without the main Bolsheviks even knowing much about it. They were a long way from St Petersburg and no-one really knew what was happening and a local commander seems to have taken the decision without referring to Lenin. Nevertheless the Bolshevik leaders would have been glad to have this problem out of the way.</p> <p>L5 This was cruel and some people think they weren't all killed and one called Anastasia survived until really quite recently.</p>	[25]

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2010

