

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2013 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/56

Paper 5f (The French Revolution, 1774–1794),
maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	56

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Question (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	56

Question (b)

Band 1: 16–20

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	56

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	56

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	56

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	56

1 (a) To what extent does Document B challenge the view of Document A about the necessity for war in 1792? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. Where appropriate, the answer should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of provenance by use, not only of the text but of headings and attributions.

Similarities – Both see the presence of enemies – A sees ‘powerful enemies abroad’ and B sees the émigrés threatening with future invasion. B sees security threatened and confirms the threat referred to in A. Both see the dangers of war – A says it is a means of undermining the constitution; B is cautious about war putting armed forces in the king’s hands.

Differences – Despite this, the conclusions drawn about war are different. The famous caveat in A that invasion is unlikely to spread the ideas of the revolution – ‘no one loves armed missionaries’ – is not reflected in B which sees the necessity of war to crush impudent neighbours, regardless of consequences. B sees war as inevitable – ‘we are not free to want or not want war’ – but A sees that it should be avoided in order to consolidate the effects of Revolution within France. War in A will serve Liberty badly; in B it is a necessity to preserve Liberty from its external enemies.

Provenance – both are radicals, and both are writing at a time when war was being discussed as imminent given the émigré activity. Brissot however allied himself with the Girondists and was a major influence for war. Later in April he was instrumental in starting the wars. Robespierre was more inclined to extending the revolution at home and feared war would be either a distraction or a threat to internal radical change. Both are engaged in a debate which is about more than war.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	56

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the war of 1792 arose out of misjudgement and lack of understanding on the part of those in France who advocated it?
 In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and make effective use of each although, depending on the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently and with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong both in range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well-constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of different historical interpretations is to be expected. The expectations of war could be seen as showing a misunderstanding of its consequences.

There was a threat from the émigrés, but whether the monarchs of Europe represented the threat that A, B and D expressed is doubted in E and by the subsequent events of the war. The hopes for Liberty in B and D were based on a misunderstanding of the consequences of war for the growth of radicalism and terror. The fact that there were so many contradictory expectations, as C shows, is indicative of a lack of consensus and clear thinking about the likely consequences.

The outsider's view is expressed in C. Morris points to the financial weaknesses and the dangers that war would lead to greater political upheaval. He points to the view that the war will bring an end to the monarchy. He identifies some consequences which did happen. The view of the nobles, of course, is over optimistic. The existence of these contrary expectations suggests that there was a considerable amount of misjudgement on the part of the supporters of war that it might either bring an end to revolution or support moderates. The historian in E stresses the miscalculations – foreign help was unlikely with foreign powers being distracted by other concerns. The mistaken beliefs that the war would lead to the recovery of royal power is referred to. With the benefit of hindsight, Boshier is aware of the limited success of foreign powers in 1792; the rallying of revolutionary forces to defend the frontiers and the onset of radicalism. Ironically the war created the conditions for Robespierre to establish his authority, so even he in A has some misunderstanding that war might inhibit rather than encourage revolution; but he was correct in the lack of enthusiasm for 'armed missionaries'. Both A and B were not misguided about the unreliability of the King and some of the elite like Lafayette and Doumouriez. The sentiments of D might seem to show some misunderstanding. The actual threats from foreign monarchs and their troops were exaggerated, but the threats made by the Duke of Brunswick were real. The aim of war to spread Liberty, to destroy 'conspiratorial kings' created a reign of Terror and a much stronger central authority in France, and the rhetoric could be seen as unrealistic.

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	56

2 Assess the view that Louis XVI was poorly served by his leading ministers between 1774 and 1788. [30]

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. Candidates could consider the economic policies of Turgot, influenced by Physiocratic notions of wealth creation and free trade. The financial policies of Necker were aimed at restoring confidence in government credit and meeting the deficits increased by the American War, urged by Vergennes. Calonne pursued a policy of more radical change and attempted to reduce fiscal privileges, end unpopular and divisive dues and to gain approval by a special assembly of Notables. It was Brienne who after clashing with the Parlements paved the way for the summoning of the Estates General.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. The debate is whether the ministers lacked the ability to pursue policies which would have dealt adequately with the major financial policies and modernised France; or whether they were undermined by a monarch who gave them inadequate support and vested interests who misrepresented their ideas. There were policies proposed which might have offered France the necessary reforms for stability; but these were often imposed with limited awareness of the need for political as well as financial and economic change. The ministers were not always able to deal with the opposition their enlightened and often thoughtful reforms produced. No set answer is expected and some may be thought to have served the King better than others.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	56

3 What best accounts for the loss of royal power during 1789? [30]

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. The widespread public debate which preceded the drawing up of the Cahiers might be seen as a threat to established authority. The emergence of open public discussion and the relaxation of censorship in Paris was the prelude to the disputes about the voting in the Estates General which led to the open defiance of authority in the Oath of the Tennis Court and the concession of merging the orders, creating a National Assembly. The failure to restore authority while engendering fears of a backlash led to the events of 14 July in which unpunished mob violence set a dangerous precedent. The spread of unrest in the summer eroded authority on a national scale and considerable changes were instituted by the Assembly independent of the Crown. The humiliations of the forced removal of the royal family in October showed how traditional power had been lost in the course of the year. A constituent assembly assumed that the power of the monarchy would be shared.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. The debate might be whether the King himself was responsible for his loss of power – by the failure to manage the Estates General or to offer prospects of the grievances of the cahiers being addressed; by failing either to repress or to accede to the demands of the Third Estate; by the acceptance of mob violence. The alternatives are the new political ideas and discourse which transformed the situation and brought into open discussion of popular sovereignty and constitutional monarchy. The overwhelming influence of Paris and its unruly faubourgs and the willingness of the middle class to use popular discontent could be analysed; the social and economic problems might be seen as being too great for the King and his government. No set answer is expected, but better responses will offer some judgements about the relative importance of different factors.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	56

4 Why was there so much political violence in France in the years 1793–94? [30]

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. The war had increased tensions and September 1792 saw massacres in Paris of ‘suspects’. The Paris mob showed its violent side and the political groups pursued state violence. The King was executed in January 1793. The Committee of Public Safety adopted terror against counter revolutionaries from January 1793. Political disagreements were increasingly settled by violent action. Marat was assassinated on June 13. The Girondins were purged in June after demonstrations by the Parisian sans culottes. The provinces were in violent revolt. La Vendée was especially violent and there were federalist revolts. Popular action pushed the government towards a policy of Terror and the Law of Suspects (17 September) and Revolutionary Armies accelerated the trend to violence. The enragés were executed in October, followed by the Queen and many of the Girondins. 16,000 followed. In the suppression of Civil War in the provinces there were extreme measures, for example in Lyons (December 1793). There were reprisals and executions in Toulon. Following the defeat of the rebels in la Vendée there were massacres, notably at Nantes by Carrier. Armed with the powers of the Law of 14 Frimiere, the Republic of Virtue of Robespierre embarked on cleansing of enemies and a Revolutionary Tribunal was established with speeded up justice. In June and July 1794 there were 1500 executions in Paris. Robespierre was overthrown and he and eighty others died by guillotine (July 30–31). Thermidor brought a White Terror.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. The question asks why there so much political violence and so more is required than a list of causes. These might include the effects of war and the volatility of the people of Paris; the accumulated legacy of popular violence from 14 July 1789 to the September Massacres; the intensity of political disputes and the willingness of leaders to justify violence with high revolutionary ideas and concepts of ‘purity’ and cleansing. The deep-rooted hostility between provinces and centre and the devotion of some provincial areas to the old religion and the bitterness caused over attacks on it might be explored. The intervention of foreign powers, for example of Britain at Toulon caused bitterness. Candidates might see the sheer scale of violence as a combination of the circumstances and dangers of war; the power of revolutionary ideas and vocabulary and the influence of determined leaders inured to violence in pursuit of higher goals.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.