

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series**

### **9769 HISTORY**

**9769/56**

Paper 5f (Special Subject: 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 May/June 2014 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

### **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 met.

#### **Question 1(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.

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

### **Question 1(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 a 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.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

### 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 met.

#### 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.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

## **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.

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

### **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.

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

**1 (a) To what extent are the fears expressed for the King in Document C challenged by the evidence in Document E? [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 –** The King is in danger in **C** which is greater than he imagines. The fact that in **E** he takes the tricoloured cockade amid a mob might confirm that, despite the apparent enthusiasm. Bailly says that he would not have been surprised if the King had been alarmed – which might confirm that the King did not see the danger he was in as stated in **C**. **C** suggests he should go to Versailles and the mob around him in Paris in **E** might well confirm that. Paris is said to be in commotion in **C** and so it is in **E**, even if the commotion does not immediately threaten the King.

**Differences –** The popularity of the King in **E**. The applause and approving shouts do seem to contradict the feeling in **C** that he is danger – though not that the sword has slipped from his hand. The tears of the people seem to contradict the inevitability of conflict in **C** as does the proposal to erect a statue and to see the king as a restorer of liberty and Father of the Nation. Knowledge of context, however, would see this as a fragile approval and a symptom more of danger than security.

**Provenance –** Both are close in date, though one is before the fall of the Bastille and one after. **C** is in that heated time after Necker's dismissal and may be a product of an outsider being worried by Castries. Bailly is looking back but was deeply involved in the situation and then may have hoped for reconciliation between King and people. Morris is perceptive in seeing noble concern and the likelihood of conflict.

**(b) How convincing is the evidence provided in this set of documents that it was the King's indecision that caused royal authority to crumble between May and July 1789? [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.

**A** shows indecision and inconsistency. At first the King seems sympathetic to the desire for voting by head and influenced by the progressive Necker. Then he seems more influenced by reactionary arguments, ignoring Necker and keeping the estates separate for voting. This could be seen as a major failing in taking a decisive lead resulting in disappointed hopes and resentment that the States general was not the way forward to change that many believed. **B** sees the King in decisive mood but within a few weeks he has reverted to the position in the first extract in **A**. He is claiming authority over troops but in **C**, only days afterwards, the

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

view is that the army will not obey – he has made idle claims in **B** which **D** shows. The forces of law and order have not prevented the barbarous massacre of the officials at the Bastille, confirming the King's lack of authority. **D** shows the failure of the King to come to Paris and act decisively. Perhaps **E** shows him good humouredly and even bravely dealing with this situation, but it is a situation that he has allowed to get out of hand. The bathos of 'They love me well' is sad.

**A** is by a court insider but is a recollection from after the revolution and the destruction of the court life and her class. Her own view is clear that the King was deceived by Necker. The address in **B** gives the impression of a firmer stand than was made. Morris may be too pessimistic and influenced by the frustrations and fears of those he talks to. **D** is an outsider but has acquired a low opinion of the King and has seen the results of indecision. The enthusiasm for the King and the hope for the future in **E** have to be put into context. The fall of royal authority was not simply the result of royal indecision. **D** and **C** show the power of the 'nation' and particularly the Paris populace. The acceptance by the States general of the violence of **D** is a major element independent of the King.

## 2 'An experiment with little chance of success.' Assess this view of the Constitution of 1791 [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. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. The Constitution was accepted by the King in September 1791. The powers of the unicameral Assembly were balanced by a separate executive and independent judiciary. And there was a balance between the new departments and central government. The King had a suspensive veto. The Constitution lasted until August 1792 and a new Convention declared a Republic on 22 September 1792.

**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 was an experiment in the sense that there was little experience of constitutional monarchy in France and the legislators were having to grapple with a new political discourse. The issue of success might focus around whether there was a willingness to make the constitution work. The King's reluctance to accept the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, his use of the veto, the flight to Varennes, the existence of émigré opposition, the hostility of the European rulers to the revolution, the influence of the people of Paris, the revolutionary republican ideas in circulation, and the political divisions in France might show that there was limited chance of success. However, it could be argued that the King was not yet unpopular, that the crisis arising from Varennes had been overcome, that the constitution had strong features and had it not been for the reverses in war in 1792, then there might have been more success. The answer does expect more than reasons for failure, but many will see that the chances of success given the situation by the autumn of 1791 were slim.

**AO3** – [not applicable to Special Subjects]



<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

**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.

### **3 How important was the role of Danton in the French Revolution?**

**[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. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. A provincial lawyer who moved to Paris, Danton became president of the Cordeliers Club. A supporter of Popular Sovereignty, he participated in various revolutionary actions and fled to England in 1791 after the Massacre of the Champs de Mars. He rose from a modest position in the Paris Commune after his return to being Minister of Justice, allying with the Girondins in the new Republic in 1792. He supported the execution of the King, sat with the Montagnards in the Convention and headed the Committee of Public Safety. He had turned against the Girondins but was unhappy with the shift to a more extreme Republicanism. He was arrested by the Jacobins accused of financial corruption and executed in 1794.

**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.

A powerful orator, Danton became a favourite of the Paris Sans Culottes; he urged the vigorous prosecution of war and was a major force in bringing about terror. His demagogic oratory had led him to being described as ‘the revolution’s unrivalled mouthpiece’. His stirring speech ‘*Toujours l’audace*’ was an inspiration for the September Massacres as well as a defence of the Revolution. The war offered opportunities for the more extreme elements and Danton lost control and became disillusioned. Attempting to retire into private life, he was summoned back to Paris and faced trial, without evidence or witnesses, and was executed on 5 April 1794, a victim of the forces he had unleashed. Importance may focus on the power of oratory, the role in creating the Committee of Public Safety, the incitement to full revolutionary war and the inability to control revolutionary violence and extremism.

**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.

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

**4 To what extent was Robespierre responsible for his own downfall? [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. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. The deaths of Danton and Desmoulins – previous friends and orators popular in Paris – shook Robespierre’s support in the Convention. There were internal divisions within the two ruling committees – public safety and general security. Robespierre’s enemies – Valdier, Lacoste, Billaud-Varenne, Barras and Collot d’Herbois – feared that they would be denounced and rallied support against Robespierre. His speech of July 26 (8 Thermidor) alarmed the Convention, which thought that a purge would take place and there would be further executions. Robespierre was not the victim of moderates but of terrorists who had come to see the need for change. Robespierre, with his increasing eccentricity and his partial withdrawal from day-to-day politics, was a scapegoat.

**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’s support for revolutionary eccentricities – the Cult of the Supreme Being; his remote and priggish personality; his role in providing material for the prosecution of popular former friends; his mishandling of the Convention and seeming threat of purges and his inability to deal with growing opposition or to see the need for more moderation – could be argued to have brought about his downfall. However, the changing situation of the war, the weariness with terror and violence, the lack of deep-rooted support for his ideology, the factional struggles among his terrorist supporters could be argued to have been beyond his control. The increasing political violence (of which he himself was a victim) was partly, but by no means wholly, his own creation.

Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2.

**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.