



HISTORY

9769/56

Paper 5f Special Subject: The French Revolution, 1774–1794

May/June 2016

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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 May/June 2016 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	56

Special Subject: Source-based Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

- (a) This question is designed 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.
- (b) Examiners will 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.
- (c) 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 will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (d) In marking an answer examiners will 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 3: 8–10 marks

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 marks

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the focus 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.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	56

Band 1: 1–3 marks

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.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	56

Question (b)

Band 4: 16–20 marks

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.

Band 3: 11–15 marks

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 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.

Band 2: 6–10 marks

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 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.

Band 1: 1–5 marks

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 be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	56

Special Subject: Essay Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

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

Examiners will 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 will be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit will be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind 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 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 4 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 will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will 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 5: 25–30 marks

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.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to 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 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	56

Band 4: 19–24 marks

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.

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 marks

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

Band 2: 7–12 marks

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 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.

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

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	56

Band 1: 1–6 marks

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; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. 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 are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	56

Section A

- 1 (a) **To what extent does Document C corroborate the view of privilege expressed in Document A?** [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 are in defence of privilege. Both see a world where the classes have distinct functions (C – nobles fight; magistrates judge; priests hold services. A – clergy deal with education, religion and charity; nobles defend the state and advise the king). Both see essential stability as being related to the maintenance of privilege: A – privilege is inherent in the constitution, and C – any change might lead to a republic.

Differences Document A admits the possibility that a general land tax replacing the Corvee which ignored privilege might be seen as 'kind'. Also C is much more intent on defending the privileges of the great families than of the social order as a whole. The maintaining of the gap between the people and the aristocracy is much more of a concern in C than in A. The comparison in A is more between the distinguished services of the privileged order and the limited contribution which is made by the lower order. C sees republican tendencies in any proposal to reduce privilege while A does not go so far but insists that reform of privilege would mean changing 'the Constitution'.

Provenance The Parlement de Paris is speaking for a rather wider view of privilege being associated with justice because of its wider composition than just the noblesse d'épée represented by the noble in C who makes a more direct defence of the nobility. Both are in the context of moves towards reforms dictated by the financial problems facing the Crown. The gap in dates between the two documents indicates the ongoing resistance to change and the failure of the nobility to be moved by Calonne's arguments in the Assembly of Notables.

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that, by 1789, a weak king's inability to deal with a selfish nobility was mainly responsible for creating the conditions which led to revolution? In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge, as well as to 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.

Document A shows that the royal government had some aspirations to reform as does C, but the ongoing problem, shown by the fact that over ten years later there was little progress in changing attitudes, shows royal weakness. C is evidence of the limited ability of Calonne to

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	56

persuade the nobility of the need for reform. Ongoing financial problems were a sign of royal weaknesses and led to the calling of the Estates General, which itself led to Revolution. B challenges the view of royal weakness. The King disregarded the votes and dealt firmly with Orleans and imprisoned two members of the Parlement. The King's determination to give more rights to Protestants seems to argue for a ruler with a clear idea of reform. However, the intention to call the Estates General in five years was amended to its summoning in 1789 under pressure.

The King's firmness needs to be set in the context of other less decisive actions and the ongoing failure to end privilege and give adequate support to reforming ministers. D casts some doubt about the typicality of the view held in C. The higher nobility were not all opposed to change as the reference to Orleans shows, but many provincial nobles had closer relations with their communities and had less to lose from reform. However, the atmosphere of excitement about change that had even spread to America and the unprecedented local consultation meetings leading to the drawing up of cahiers might have affected the nobles here.

The enthusiasm for reform was not really understood or capitalised upon by the King. E notes the liberalism of the King shown in B and refers to his enlightened ministers who were making the proposals referred to in A and C. The argument is, however, that the sort of ruthless absolutism which might have carried reform was not undertaken. This might seem to be challenged by B. The view that he lacked the will to defend his authority and power might be supported by knowledge of the weak responses to opposition before 1789 and the failure to utilise the enthusiasm for reform in maintaining the traditional voting by orders when the Estates General met and to use force to maintain order.

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both 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 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	56

Section B

2 Was the Constitution of 1791 ‘doomed to fail’?

[30]

Candidates should:

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.

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 Constitution of September 1791 incorporated the Declaration of the Rights of Man and was the result of a long process of drafting. It had a National Assembly as the legislative body with the King and his ministers as a separate executive. The feudal provinces were replaced by new departments. The King had a suspensive veto to balance out the power of the people exercised through the elected representatives. Voting was on the basis of a distinction between active and passive male citizens. Tax qualifications resulted in about 2/3 of the male population selecting electors who then voted for the Assembly. It ended the old division between the three estates.

The eventual failure of the Constitutional Monarchy and the ending of the monarchy in 1792 with a new National Convention elected on a wider franchise is not the issue, but rather did the 1791 Constitution have any real chance of success. Without sustained experience of a constitutional monarchy, the system depended on the rapid development of a working relationship between the King and the Assembly. The attempted flight of the King to Varennes had seriously reduced trust in him. The members of the new Assembly lacked experience as existing members of the Constitutional Assembly were barred. The existence of radical elements opposed to monarchy and seeking to radicalise the revolution together with the ongoing influence of the Paris faubourgs did not argue for much chance of success. The King was not reconciled to sharing power and was willing to use his veto in matters of religion.

However, the external disruption of war could be argued to have prevented the new system from becoming established in peacetime and being given a chance to deal with France’s problems and establish a new system. Many of the ideas which had become accepted, such as the separation of powers based on the American constitution, were in line with enlightenment ideas of good government, and revolutionary principles of the rights of man were inserted as a preamble, so the Constitution did contain many popular elements. There was a balance between the sovereign people and the concerns of the propertied classes in the way that voting was restricted but more extensive than before. The monarchy fell, it might be argued, because of the circumstances brought about by war rather than the inadequacies of the Constitution. However, even without war, there were very profound problems and divisions in France.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2.

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both 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 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	56

3 Why was there so much social upheaval both in Paris and in the provinces in the years 1789–1792? [30]

Candidates should:

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.

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.

Social upheaval, urban riots and peasant disturbances were not new in 1789, and the alliance of popular unrest with political grievance was also not new. The announcement of the suspension of the Brittany Parlement in 1788 had resulted in popular unrest in Rennes in 1788, for instance, and there were peasant disturbances as well. The rise in population in Paris and the existence of large poor areas, the impact of poor harvests and higher prices, grievances in the many rural areas about local dues had been likely to provoke unrest throughout the century, so the intensification of unrest in 1789 might be explained by the effects of hopes and grievances being brought to the surface by the meetings prior to the calling of the Estates General and the agitation in the capital that accompanied the disputes about voting and the fears of troops being deployed by the King.

The union of these political events with longer term causes of unrest may explain the growth of popular unrest in the revolutionary ‘journées’ in the capital and the widespread agitations in the countryside in 1789. The coincidence of political upheaval and high prices for bread caused hunger riots and pillages of corn in many regions in March and April 1789. Outbreaks of violence such as the attack on the Revellion works in April were forerunners to the violence of 14 July. Riots against high bread prices had been taking place since the beginning of June 1789. Before the storming of the Bastille, there had been disturbances in the Paris outskirts about high food prices. Urban disturbances spread to other cities and large towns, but the most striking expression of unrest was the countryside revolts motivated partly by high prices and partly by a desire to seize land and destroy records of dues and payments. In Alsace, three abbeys were destroyed and eleven chateaux plundered in a week in July 1789.

The spread of demands for the end of feudal dues was great enough to lead to their formal abolition on 4 August. Food scarcity together with politicisation of the masses and a failure of the authorities to contain unrest resulted in the October Days in 1789. Unrest was stirred and made possible by the organisation of peasant communes and also the Districts and Sections of Paris. Inflation brought about by the assignats and brief shortages continued to provoke unrest and resentment about profiteers. By 1792, the strains and disappointments of war were adding to the urban unrest. Enemies of the Revolution were associated with those who hoarded food and those who drove up prices.

Though unrest was often at the back of and compounded by revolutionary agitation, it would also be possible to see social unrest stirred by counter-revolution and fear that revolution was undermining living standards and traditional values and loyalties.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	56

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both 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 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	56

4 What best explains the fall of Robespierre?

[30]

Candidates should:

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.

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.

Robespierre was overthrown on 27 July 1794 (9 Thermidor). The coup marked the end of the Terror and a move away from social and economic radicalism. The greatest element in Robespierre's support, the Parisian sans culottes, did little to save him. Erstwhile allies turned against him possibly in fear that another bout of political accusations and executions was imminent.

Explanations may consider that Robespierre had pushed radicalism too far with the Terror, with radical social experiments proposed if not put into practice and with the Cult of the Supreme Being, reducing his support to small numbers of radicals rather than the revolutionary groups as a whole. The acceptability of emergency measures had been greater in wartime when France was under threat of invasion and extreme measures and a call for total commitment for the Republic of Virtue had been the alternative to foreign conquest and an end to revolution. When the threats subsided, the extreme level of repression and control did not gain enough support for it to continue, especially when even former terrorists felt that their position might be threatened. Robespierre had relied a lot on the support of the mobs, but even they let him down in 1794.

Discussions may turn on whether his personal traits and eccentricities and the memories of his treatment of former allies lay at the heart of his fall or whether it owed more to changing circumstances in which a regime built on terror and which aimed to radicalise society was no longer an acceptable alternative.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2.

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both 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.