

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2012 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9769 HISTORY

9769/56

Paper 5 (Special Subject – 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 must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2012 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	56

1 (a) How far do the arguments for granting equal rights to women in Document C corroborate those in Document B? [10]

As might be expected both focus on the idea of equal rights. However the scope of the arguments in C is somewhat wider. One of the most famous of the revolutionary feminists – who was to suffer for her radical beliefs – takes the view that women's rights are so fundamental that the entire constitution is invalidated if they are not assured. The basis is that women have the same obligations as men – to pay taxes and to respect and be punished by the law that 'nature and reason' demand equality. The scope of rights is wider in C than in B, though both support women. C argues for 'liberty, property, security' and also for equal employment and access to honours and positions. B does not go so far – but does refer to male habit bringing about inertia and a failure to see the logical position. C is more extreme in seeing not an oversight but a sort of dominant tyranny. The basis of B is rather different in that the philosopher Condorcet, in the context of the enlightened rationalism, sees the key argument being moral sense – if men and women both have this then they should both have rights of citizenship and participation in making laws. However, C goes further than this. The reference to the general will is not echoed in B and similarly Rousseau vocabulary and concept is evident in the opening of C but not in B. Thus while the general thrust is similar and the views are from a similar time – before the war and terror and at a time when the Constituent Assembly was reforming many of the practices and institutions of France – the basis of argument and the scale of change demanded are different. Both the authors were liberal thinkers who took advantage of the freedom of the earlier Revolution; both were influenced by the Enlightenment; both died after arrest and imprisonment (though candidates should not be expected to know this). As a deputy Condorcet could not go as far as Olympe de Gouges, but neither represented sufficiently mainstream views to have any hope of their position on women being implemented.

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. 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.

Candidates should make use of the content of the headings and attributions as well as the text of the documents.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	56

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that the French Revolution had a major impact on the status and role of women in France? 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 should make effective use of each although, depending upon 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 with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both 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 differing historical interpretations is to be expected. The debate is whether the emergence of modern ideas on women's rights and figures like Olympe de Gouges and Therouanne de Mericourt amounted to a significant landmark in the development of women's rights or whether these ideas were seen as outlandish and impractical and, apart from extreme instances of mob violence and unrepresentative ideas and characters, the revolution had little effect on the role of women, with France being one of the last major European countries to grant them the vote and adopting, under Napoleon, reactionary social and legal policies. A shows women leading the march to Versailles in October 1789 – an extension of the capital's frequent disorders over bread in which women were prominent. However, though women did participate in the various *journées*, candidates may question their importance relative to other factors and the degree of politicisation this protest shows, given the major concern was over bread shortages and prices. B and C show the philosophical basis for reform of women's rights and should be put in the context of greater political awareness of women in participating in the political clubs. However, this did not last and as D shows there could be extreme dangers for leaders of female emancipation. Political radicalism and the onset of war did not prove favourable for women's participation in political life. Thus the typicality and acceptance of the ideas shown might be questioned from contextual knowledge, though there were greater outlets for women in Paris and the provinces to express ideas. Charlotte Corday's assassination of Marat might be cited here as an example and Madame Roland, mentioned in D. By 1793 the radical revolution had advanced but this speech indicates that traditional ideas – of the spheres of love and politics – were not extinguished by the appeals of rationalists like Condorcet. The argument in E might be supported by reference to D – or challenged by reference to A, B and C; after all women had taken a part in political actions and had produced key arguments. E takes the view that women had achieved some key reforms – but these might be put in the context of the general changes and modernisation of the 1789–91 period. They did not share in the larger political changes of the period which benefited the French bourgeoisie and may even have lost some purely political rights.

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	56

2 Assess the view that the King's financial problems were the major cause of the breakdown of royal authority by 1789. [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The financial difficulties can be seen to be at the heart of the events of 1789. The American War had increased the deficit which had become the key issue in national life. It seemed to be profoundly linked with the privileges of the clergy and nobility and beyond the ruling elites to solve as shown in the Assembly of Notables. It seemed to expose the selfishness of the royal family, the need for fundamental institutional reform and the out-datedness of the class system. Even the most assiduous financial reformers failed to deal with it and the solution of a States General preceded by a vast consultation exercise among the people stemmed directly from financial problems. When the reforming body met there was an intense disappointment. The gap between expectation and reality had become vast – but this was not all due to financial issues. The failure of the King and his government to effect solutions which met with consensus; the difficulties brought by war; the new political ideas which accompanied the calling of the States General; the economic hardships which gave rise to popular discontent in the capital and later in the countryside; the social tensions between aspirant middle classes and their social betters; the rise in publications and the thirst for discussion encouraged by the Enlightenment – all these factors might be discussed and weighed against the financial problems.

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 set of judgements. There is the opportunity for sustained discussion and not just a series of explanations. The crucial decision is whether financial problems were so pressing and linked to so many other factors that they must be at the heart of any explanation; or whether there were deeper failings at the heart of government and in French society that prevented a solution and led to the breakdown of royal power in the series of events which followed the calling and failure of the States General. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

AO3 [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

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 explicitly be 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	56

3 What best explains the failure of the Constitutional Monarchy by 1792? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The possible debate is whether radical political groups, an unstable political situation following the outbreak of war and unsettled economic conditions put a strain on an untried and unfamiliar form of government or whether the King's inability to adapt and to pursue consistent and sensible policies in cooperation with moderates made the breakdown inevitable. Candidates could look at the long-term problems – the émigrés made for suspicion and also pressured Louis not to cooperate; the whole concept of a partnership between monarchy and Assembly was very new and there were few guidelines to follow; the issue of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy made it difficult for the King and the 'refractory priests' became a major issue of division. The King was tempted by the possible support from other monarchs and their hostile stance drove a wedge between crown and people. Rising prices and continuing economic and social discontent continued to cause instability and the radical clubs seemed to present a danger to stability. On the other hand the King's ambiguity towards the new regime also contributed to the long-term failure of the experiment; the flight to Varennes proved to be a serious obstacle and was referred to a lot in the debates about ending the monarchy. However, at the time the splits were papered over and the war initially seemed to be likely to unite the King and his people. However, that was probably the major cause of the fall of the monarchy as defeats fostered radicalism and suspicion of the royal family's links with émigrés and hostile foreign regimes. The power of the Paris crowds was once more demonstrated in 1792 and once again Louis's weaknesses were apparent.

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 set of judgements. A sense of judgement will be apparent in better answers which will show more than a series of explanations of the fall of the monarchy. Some will find the best explanation in the actions of the King. There are plenty of areas where the King might be criticised – his intransigence in opposing religious change without offering support for a conservative reaction or taking decisive action in joining his brothers and seeing the dangers of trying to accommodate the new regime by a dangerous support for war in April 1792. On the other hand, some may see the broader context as offering the best explanation. Constitutional monarchy was a very new situation and the King did seem to many to be fulfilling the expectations that he would rule wisely in the interests of all by supporting reform and taking his role in the constitution. Even after Varennes there were genuine expressions of popularity. Some may focus more on the impact of war. Once again war strained the relations between crown and people and the ability of moderates to suppress more radical elements was lessened after the initial defeats. The war allowed radical elements free rein and for some the rise of extremism will be key. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

AO3 [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

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 explicitly be 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: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	56

4 'Merely a bloodthirsty tyrant.' Discuss this view of Robespierre.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Much depends on the interpretation of the situation facing Robespierre and his committee – with the British blockade; the Vendée rebels besieging Nantes; the revolutionary army demoralised by the desertion of Doumouriez on the defensive; with the Paris Commune demanding extreme measures; with Normandy, Bordeaux, Marseilles in revolt and royalists surrendering Toulon to the British. In these circumstances, was strong and decisive action with little account taken of costs the only way to save the revolution? Against this is the Terror, the violence of the Law of Suspects and the Revolutionary Tribunal. Also, the ideological flights of fancy of Robespierre in promoting Festivals of the Supreme Being and his willingness to sacrifice former associates in a seemingly ruthless and inhuman regime. Was Robespierre the necessary saviour of the Revolution or a narrow cold fanatic intent on unrealistic anti-clericalism and narrow ideological measures which divided rather than united the nation? Did he see a vision of a purer society on Rousseau-esque lines or was he just a dictator who fell back on repression, destroying enemies by raising fears of foreign conspiracies, as with Hebert in March 1794? The attacks on Danton and his supporters may seem the result of an unbridled desire for power and amorality. The Committee of Public Safety was packed with Robespierre's supporters. Against the Terror, the centralised control, the total war, the blind fanaticism is the vision which Ruth Schurr has summarised as 'a democracy for the people who are intrinsically pure and good at heart; in which poverty is honourable; power is innocuous and the vulnerable safe from oppression'.

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 set of judgements. There is a strong debate here between the man of genuine democratic and revolutionary principles, fighting a war where central control and visionary enthusiasm were vital, where enemies real and imaginary had to be ruthlessly destroyed to sustain that vision and the alternative view of a narrow and bookish lawyer unable to empathise with real humans and eager to acquire and use power in a ruthless and tyrannical way, in the end alienating the revolutionary elite and being overthrown by those who feared him. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy.

AO3 [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

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 explicitly be 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.