

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 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 2013 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 2013</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 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.

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

## **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.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</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 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.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</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 2013</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 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

**Nominated topic: The period 1789–1792 and the descent into civil and foreign wars**

- 1 (a) How far does Document C challenge the view of the legality of putting the King on trial expressed in Document D? [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. 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. Both are public speeches in the discussions preceding the trial and execution of Louis XVI and both are against a background of rising popular unrest and the uncertainties of war and the threat from the Prussians. It is the aristocrat in D who offers a more radical view. The key issue is whether the King is inviolable under the Constitution – C proposes an argument which is in accord with D that the King’s inviolability – i.e. his special status that excludes him from trial and punishment - has ended with the constitution that guaranteed it. The thrust that the King can be tried is the thrust of D but on rather different grounds – that ‘inviolable’ has not been defined; that the constitution assumed that the King would not have committed crimes against his own people. However, C goes on to reject the argument and argues that the constitution is still binding in the same way that unrepealed laws are still binding and that the legal arguments for putting the king on trial are invalid because they threaten the whole basis of legality. D argues that the King has ceased to be king because of his actions. (C does not dispute the betrayal and makes no attempt to defend the King himself.) Thus he can be tried not as King but as a citizen (hence the insistence that he was tried as ‘Louis Capet’). D does, like C, put forward a counter argument – that Louis might have refused the constitutional throne had he realised that his inviolable status was not guaranteed – this is an argument which accords with the main thrust of C. However this is discounted as it could not have been the sense of the Constitution that any crime could be committed by the King with impunity. There is a wider argument in D that is not considered in C – that of setting an example to other nations by ending the superstition of favouring monarchy. The debate raises issues about the nature of constitutional monarchy and reflects the problems the revolutionaries faced in considering its implications. C represents a view of the centrality of legal concepts and procedures; D makes assumptions that there are higher purposes ‘outside the law’. C is not defending the King and is well aware of the counter view, but sticks to legality above anarchy; D shows some awareness of a contractual obligation but puts the ‘safety of an entire people’ above law and contract. Thus both are concerned with the wider good of society and not the good of the king, as one would expect from their presence in the debate, but reach different conclusions.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Louis himself was to blame for the failure of the Constitutional Monarchy?**

**In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]**

Candidates should make use of the content of the headings and attributions as well as the text of the documents. 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 King's flight in 1791, his refusal to compromise over the Civil Constitution, his record since 1789 of ambivalence towards the revolution and his failure to enter into a working relationship with the political leaders thrown up by the Revolution mean that he was to blame, or whether the growing radicalism of political life, the continuing economic distress and popular unrest and the sense of crises engendered by war are more to blame. E offers a clear view that the circumstances of war engendered paranoia, the Brunswick manifesto having a profound effect on the Paris crowd. Given the threat of an émigré army led by the king's own family it would have been difficult for Louis to be a flourishing constitutional monarch. The alternative is proposed in B when a radical demand for the abolition of monarchy from the volatile sections of Paris offers a condemnation which went back to 1789 and the events preceding the oath of the tennis court and then brings up the Flight to Varennes. The issue here is the lack of confidence of the nation and the need to fulfil the 'Will of the People'. The development of the whole concept of a Sovereign People was a new one and Louis perhaps should not be blamed for not coming to terms with it and the confidence of the People was very hard for any ruling group to maintain. This whole document shows the emergence of a dangerous popular radicalism and the swing to illegality is confirmed in D, which anticipated the revolutionary justice of the Terror with the view that 'the safety of an entire people must be placed outside the law'. D also contains the view that Louis has lost the confidence of the people by acting against their interests, betraying the people and committing 'crimes'. However the key sentence may be the last in which there is reference to ending respect not only in France but in all nations for 'their superstition in favouring monarchy'. With this radical attitude being exhibited by a member of the elite, then it may be that radical political ideas and not the King himself best explain the fall of constitutional monarchy. Even in C, which is defending legal procedures, there is the assumption that those who think that the King violated the Constitution had a point. There is a view that 'he sought to destroy' and 'violated' the constitution even here. However, A offers a corrective and is significantly before the outbreak of war. The King here is responding to unrest about the build-up of foreign troops and his speech which is 'well-written' is well received by the public and the Assembly. The harmful effects of the flight to Varennes here do not seem to have been so great and the fact that the author is from a group with little inherent sympathy for the King is interesting.

<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

**2 What best explains the failure of Louis XVI’s ministers to deal successfully with the financial problems facing the crown before 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. Louis XVI inherited a debt derived from the wars of Louis XV and underlying weaknesses in the system of assessment, collection and exemption from taxation. The American War added another 2 billion livres and increasing amounts were spent on servicing debts. The brief ascendancy of Turgot (1774-76) saw the emphasis put on economic growth, developing communications and trying to free trade in grain and reduce guild restrictions. Necker focused on the credit worthiness of the Crown and offered a degree of transparency about the royal finances in the *Compte Rendu* of 1781. Calonne from 1783, a successful intendant, extended the efforts of Necker to expand the economy so that the crown could benefit, but encountered similar problems of a spiralling national debt. The Assembly of Notables of 1787 failed to persuade the privileged elites of the need for a radical reform of the tax system and resistance to additional taxation was considerable, both in the parlements and in the Assembly. The negotiations between his successor Brienne and the privileged orders failed and there were clashes with the parlements. The issue of taxation had become enmeshed with concerns about respect for traditional rights. The solution suggested was for an Estates General to consider a thorough financial reform.

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 should, in better answers, be a sense of discussion of the factors and an understanding of the links between them. The issues for discussion are the inherited problems of venality and privilege and the rising costs of war and government, together with the difficulties of reducing court expenditure. The gap between tax yields and the rising wealth was considerable and Louis’ ministers failed to establish either firm enough royal support or a political consensus to solve the financial problems. This was partly a matter of personality and partly that reforms fell foul of entrenched expectations. The attempts to create wealth through free trade caused social unrest and upset vested interests. Unrest gave the enemies of the financial ministers ample chance to turn the King against them. The King was certainly not capable of rigorous enlightened despotism, and he offered variable support to his reformers. However, some of the solutions proved rather over optimistic, as was shown in both the publication of figures which could be challenged (Necker) or another assembly which offered vested interests a platform to block reforms (Assembly of Notables). So long-term problems, the inadequacy of the King, the opposition of the privileges, the association of financial reform with fears of royal power; the on-going effects of war and a heavy military expenditure and the individual failings of the finance ministers need to be balanced.

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.

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

**3 Assess the importance of popular unrest in the development of the French Revolution during 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 decision to call an Estates General and the extraordinary consultation exercise of the drawing up of the Cahiers in 1789 produced an unparalleled public interest in political change at a time of poor harvests, higher prices and urban unemployment. Paris had become densely populated and control depended on a heavy military presence. The public debate extended to the streets and stirred up agitation. The splits in the ruling elite that were revealed by the dramatic events of the Oath of the tennis court and fears of a military coup led to the greatest popular explosion of 1789 in the storming of the Bastille. The violence of the crowds went unpunished and a precedent was created for subsequent revolutionary ‘days’. The spread of unrest to the countryside in the summer of 1789 was probably a result of a feeling of decline in traditional authority and poor economic conditions. Popular unrest had been a major feature of the progress of the revolution and had contributed to the abolition of feudal rights and the Declaration of the Rights of Man. In the October days it had a profound effect on the monarchy when the Paris mob forced the Royal Family from Versailles to the centre of the City, where they could be subjected to popular pressures.

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 should, in better answers, be a sense of discussion of the factors and an understanding of the links between them. The progress of the Revolution depended on various factors and these might include the way the royal government allowed the situation to spiral out of control during the run up to the meeting of the Estates General in May 1789 and in the meetings. The failure to agree on the voting and the emergence of the Third Estates as a dominant element was a key development. The king’s failure either to accept or to suppress change opened up a power vacuum in which popular unrest could rage unchecked and could be used to put political pressure on the government. The effects of intellectual change – enlightenment writings and of the new sensibility and political vocabulary were important and the popular violence seemed to show the power of popular sovereignty and bring ‘the people’ into the political arena – but ideas had paved the way. Without the substantial financial problems, the Crown would not have been brought to the calling of a new body which aroused such passionate hope and a sense of new beginning which eroded traditional authority and opened the way for agitation to have influence. The rise of new revolutionary orators and ambitious leaders who could use the unrest could be discussed. Urban violence was not unusual in the eighteenth century and the power of popular unrest must be seen in the light of the factors which allowed it to characterise key changes such as the joining of the estates in a new national assembly, the abolition of feudalism and the return of the King to Paris.

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.

<b>Page 11</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

**4 How far can the Terror of 1793–94 be explained by the tensions brought about by war? [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 execution of the King in January 1793 saw a shift to radicalism that coincided with the expansion of large scale war. There was a crusading spirit in the armies that extended Republican control to the Rhineland, Belgium and Northern Italy. However, the desire to spread revolution was met by a powerful European coalition which invaded France in 1793. The city of Paris became more extreme and the splits between Jacobins and Girondins intensified political feelings. The Paris mobs were used by the Jacobins to purge the Convention in May 1793. The murder of Marat confirmed the domination of Robespierre who dominated the government in 1793-94. Faced with foreign invasions and considerable internal unrest the Jacobins organized a national resistance and a new kind of ‘total war’ which was accompanied by a high level of repression and coercion. The 12-man Committee of Public Safety acted as a highly centralised government. In the middle of a radicalised Paris, the Convention passed draconian legislation on suspects and political enemies perished along with suspected counter revolutionaries in Paris and in the provinces. To produce the largest standing army in recent European history and to equip them required a considerable amount of disciplined organisation which was accompanied by repression. However, the period was characterised too by radical changes which owed much to ideology – enemies were identified as ‘aristocrats’ and the sans-culottes became an inspiration for idealizations of the people. Symbols of class were swept away; there were new titles and the sense of a new start with a true republic of virtue – with the renaming of the months and years and the idea of a ‘Year One’ which suggests a sense of rebirth. The replacement of traditional religion by the Cult of the Supreme Being suggests a sort of millenial fervour which might make suppression of all supposed opposition a duty. Conversely, those who stood against this resurgence were enemies of all that was virtuous and progressive and had to be eliminated. Against a background of a massive war effort and unparalleled social change was the on-going Terror. The war needed emergency measures – rationing, fixed prices, currency controls - and created new opportunities to transgress against the state, the revolution and the people

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 should, in better answers, be a sense of discussion of the factors and an understanding of the links between them. It is possible to see the Terror as an extension of the revolutionary violence established in 1789 or as a result of the emergence of violent personalities. It is also possible to see it as a result of fears of internal and external enemies – with whole areas of France in revolt and taking inspiration from the Catholic Church. Revolutionary survival may have depended on ruthless violence. There are also explanations which stress rivalry between revolutionary factions. Within revolutionary Paris there were conflicting power bases and groups and Terror developed as a political weapon. The arguments which put higher ideals above law itself were instrumental in the acceptance of wholesale slaughter both in Paris and the provinces. There is also the effect of the political ideas of revolutionary virtue which had their origins before the exigencies of war. Men like Saint-Just and Robespierre were obsessed with ideas and ideals of apparent political virtue, admiring self-sacrifice and accepting violence in pursuit of ideals. These same men created a massive army that achieved considerable success and was supported by a war economy unprecedented for its time. The strain of this on a divided leadership was considerable and any setback could be blamed on counter-revolutionaries. This was especially true after the desertion of Dumouriez and the widespread internal revolts. The hysteria of the Paris crowds suffering from high prices and shortages was an element in plunging France’s new rulers into irrational hatreds, evidenced too in the provincial massacres in the Auvergne and Vendee. The war and the need for survival explains a lot, but a fuller explanation may be necessary to encompass the scale and purely political aspects of the Terror.

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

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.