



HISTORY

9769/56

Paper 5F French Revolution, 1774–1794

May/June 2017

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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

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

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

This syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document consists of **13** printed pages.

Special Subject: Source-based Question

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

Introduction

- (a) This question is designed to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.
- (b) Examiners will be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.
- (c) The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (d) In marking an answer examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Question (a)**Band 3: 8–10 marks**

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

Band 2: 4–7 marks

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

Band 1: 1–3 marks

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

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Question (b)**Band 4: 16–20 marks**

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

Band 3: 11–15 marks

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

Band 2: 6–10 marks

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

Band 1: 1–5 marks

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

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Special Subject: Essay Question

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

Introduction

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

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

- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 4 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Band 5: 25–30 marks

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

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

Band 4: 19–24 marks

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

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

Band 3: 13–18 marks

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

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

Band 2: 7–12 marks

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

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

Band 1: 1–6 marks

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Section A

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>How far does Document B challenge the view about war in Document A?</p> <p>Similarities:</p> <p>Both support the Revolution and accept resistance to tyranny. Both accept the dangers of foreign war in strengthening the possible power of the King (Document A - 'War in the hands of the King's government is only a means to subvert the constitution'; Document B – 'The French court wants war and it is necessary to be wary of its secret intentions') Document B is only advocating aggressive war as a means of defence, not advocating it as a means of spreading revolution.</p> <p>Differences:</p> <p>Document B does not oppose aggressive war in the same way as Document A. Brissot sees it as vital to crush the resistance in the Rhineland and to confront 'impudent neighbours' even if there are risks. However, Document A sees foreign war as 'a nonsensical movement' leading 'the state towards death' and sees the dangers as outweighing the advantages. Robespierre also sees the war as more intent on spreading revolution – 'armed missionaries' – than Brissot.</p> <p>Provenance:</p> <p>Both documents are speeches to a radical club and both have the underlying assumption that the Revolution needs to be defended. Brissot is less concerned about domestic dangers than Robespierre because of his different political positions. The concern for domestic enemies was to characterise Robespierre's regime. Brissot saw war as key to political power. Both men had a domestic agenda.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that that the decision to go to war in 1792 was misguided? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).</p> <p>Documents A and C are written from different political viewpoints and see the war as misguided. Document B has reservations but sees it essential for defence. Document D might be evidence for the war being misguided in that it led to the massacres of September, but approves of killing the enemies of the people. Document E sees good prospects for the war with strong leaders, popular enthusiasm and a unifying crusade.</p> <p>Document A has some justification for the view that if war spread the revolution would not be popular and would have adverse consequences (as seen, for example, in Document D) and was justified in seeing the danger that either defeat or victory would strengthen counter revolution. The initial failures of the war strengthens Document A's view, though the sense of paranoia about 'profound conspiracy' weakens the case.</p> <p>Document B may be justified in that there was foreign opposition and there were gatherings of hostile émigré forces on the border. However, the war did not have the political consequences for Brissot and his allies that they had hoped for and for them the decision was misguided. Early defeats seemed to contradict the view, but the remarkable feats of organisation contradicted Document A's view of the death of the state and did justify Document B.</p> <p>Document C is written before the revival of fortunes by the large revolutionary armies. The picture may be overdrawn, but there was inflation, the threat of invasion and England did enter the war in 1793. Some of the predictions were alarmist and Fougere, not unnaturally from his royalist perspective, did not foresee the strength of Carnot's massive forces or the power of the 'nation in arms'.</p> <p>Document D shows the unintended consequences of war with the massacres and the febrile and violent situation in Paris which accompanied the end of the monarchy and prefigured the Terror of 1793–1794. Such resulting chaos and bloodshed may support the view that the war was misguided, or it may support the radical view that it brought beneficial change.</p> <p>Document E looks at the war in terms of radical hopes more than reality. There were early reverses and Dumouriez with his defection proved less than 'excellent'. Lafayette, too, was unreliable. The volunteers were a remarkable feature, but their use was limited to attacks in battering ram columns and 'the rabble' of the royal armies of the eighteenth century is a questionable assertion. However, the revolutionary war did result in considerable successes and threw up able leaders like Augereau and Bonaparte.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
	<p>No set answer is expected, but many may see the emergence of a wartime terror, the death of the King and the Girondins and internal civil war as evidence for a misguided policy on the part of some of its supporters. Ironically the greatest beneficiary was Robespierre, its most vocal opponent.</p> <p>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.</p>	

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>What best explains the failure to achieve a lasting solution to the financial problems of the French crown in the period 1774–1788?</p> <p>AO2 – The explanations might include the deep-seated vested interests to reforming tax privilege that made the efforts of reformers like Turgot, Necker and Calonne so relatively unsuccessful. Reforms produced hostility at court and, even when faced by the reality of the deficit, the Parlements and the Assembly of Notables could not agree on a reform package. A stronger monarch might have won the day and the support given to reforming ministers was inconsistent. However, the scale of the problem was considerable and made worse by the wars of the eighteenth century. The American War added to the problem considerably. Some may see the limited powers of the administration as the key with tax farming and the problems of assessing taxation liability. The extravagance of the court may be noted, but this should be put into perspective as the structural limitations of the taxation and public finance system compared to say that of Britain or the Netherlands may be the root cause.</p> <p>AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2.</p> <p>AO4 – Candidates should 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, punctuations 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.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>How important was popular discontent in weakening the French monarchy in 1789?</p> <p>AO2 –The excitement in Paris at the calling of the Estates General following the public consultations about grievances provided a somewhat feverish background to the discussions. The emergence of radical groups and public meetings undermined traditional public order in a city with a swollen population and large working class areas susceptible to unrest. The famous revolutionary days had been anticipated by outbreaks of unrest before 1789, but were made more dangerous for the King by the spread of revolutionary ideas and the alliance of bourgeois malcontents. The key event may well be seen as 14 July and its significance could be analysed. The popular discontent spread to the provinces in the Summer of 1789. Mob activity accompanied political changes and the key event of the Autumn was the October Days where the King was forced to live in the centre of the city and was vulnerable to mob activity and pressure. This element could be set against the mismanagement of the situation in 1789 by the King, his failure to be decisive about the voting issue and his raising concerns about the use of force without being decisive enough to employ it. The failure of the King’s traditional supporters to offer support, with the divisions among both nobility and clergy, and the divisions among the royal family, might be considered. However, the emergence of radical groups and the willingness of the Third Estate to accept the mob violence could also be seen as significant. Mob activity and popular unrest were features of the ancien régime before 1789, but the links between urban discontent and political agitation, and the weakness of authority in maintaining order may have been more significant. No set answer is expected but the question ‘How important’ as opposed to ‘in what ways was...important’ must be addressed for higher bands.</p> <p>AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2.</p> <p>AO4 – Candidates should 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.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>How well did Robespierre serve the Revolution 1793–1794?</p> <p>AO2 – Much will depend here on interpretations of ‘serve the Revolution’. Responses should consider, in the context of 1793–1794 what threatened the Revolution and how well those threats were met, and in ideological terms how the underlying revolutionary aims were developed (or betrayed). Responses which explain Robespierre’s actions, but do not focus on how they did or did not serve the Revolution and what that might have entailed will not score as highly.</p> <p>The supporters of Robespierre will look at his concept of revolutionary virtue, the development of a new type of revolutionary France based on concepts of changing human nature linked to a new spirituality (the Cult of the Supreme Being), and a new Fraternity. They might argue that uncompromising opposition to counter revolutionary elements was essential to the survival of a Republic faced with formidable internal opposition and external invasion threats. They might argue that Revolutionary survival was linked to the law of suspects, the revolutionary tribunal and the revolutionary terror both in Paris and the provinces. However, this and the visionary social agenda depended on a particular view of the Revolution. If the Revolution were seen more in terms of the hopes of 1789 for a constitutional monarchy, a fairer taxation system, equality before the law, more effective central administration, the protection of property and economic freedom and greater equality of opportunity, then Robespierre’s actions seem less likely to have served ‘the Revolution’. Repression brought greater divisions; the problems of inflation increased the gap between Frenchmen; revolutionary justice did not offer equality before the law or even protection of the innocent and the restrictions on prices reduced economic freedom. The eccentricities of Robespierre and his more radical supporters like St Just devalued the gains of 1789, led to more political convulsions in 1794 and a less effective and representative system which was eventually toppled by a military dictator. No set answer is expected.</p> <p>AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2.</p> <p>AO4 – Candidates should 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.</p>	30