

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2011 question paper  
for the guidance of teachers**

**9769 HISTORY**

**9769/56**

Paper 5f (Special Subject – French Revolution, 1774–1794),  
maximum raw mark 60

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

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

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

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>5f</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: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>5f</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: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>5f</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: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>5f</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: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>5f</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: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>5f</b>

- 1 (a) How far, and why, do the opinions expressed in Documents A and B concerning the impending Estates-General differ? [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. Candidates should make use of the content of the headings and attributions as well as the text of the documents. In terms of the content of the passages, A sees the Estates-General as necessary and urgent – ‘We must think no more of delaying...’ whereas B sees not an urgent reform but a ‘revolution’ to be avoided by keeping a distinction between the orders to represent traditional hierarchy – A takes a more radical view over the key issue of voting. The major difference is the voting issue which should be explained by candidates – A, in order to recognise the greater numbers of the Third Estate and their importance, urged ‘double representation and voting by head’, while B wants to preserve ‘distinction between the orders’ and ‘separate chambers’. This would mean that the privileged orders would be able to out vote the Third Estate. This would prevent the change that de Brienne, by implication, thinks is necessary – hence the need to avoid delay – the reform of financial privilege which B sees as a threat ‘to the rights of property’. The issue of voting came to be a matter of huge importance and it should be noted that A was published after the disastrous outcome of the dispute over voting in 1789. B on the other hand does not have any benefit of hindsight and is the wish of the Princes to avoid the Estates-General having a radical effect on French society. In their view, ‘Constitutional’ is preserving the ancient rights of the Estates – something that Louis XVI’s own Controller General has no stated interest in – though it could be argued that reform might well be a means of preventing the Revolution which the Princes fear. B is intended to influence the King to restrict the power of the Third Estate in anticipation of change – evident in the troubled months before May 1789 when unrest and bad economic conditions might have fuelled fears. A is written after the events of 1789 and might be seen as more suspect, with the minister being wise after the event. However, the Controller was faced with mounting debt and credit problems which, after the failure of his predecessors and the Assembly of Notables in 1787, did need urgent attention – hence his recollections of urgency and genuine consultation with the Third Estate, offering the chance to effect significant changes. B, on the other hand, seems less concerned with the financial problems – as perhaps one might have expected from these men – and more with the dangers of change and innovation – hence explaining their different positions.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>5f</b>

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the Revolution of July 1789 was chiefly the outcome of irreconcilable disagreements between the Three Estates? [20]**

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently, with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. The debate here should be about the relative importance of disagreements between the estates. This certainly caused the Estates-General to go beyond what was expected and for the Third Estate to make its famous protest in the Oath of the Tennis Court. The creation of a National Assembly was a revolutionary turning point. However, the issue of a clash between the estates needs to be put into a wider perspective of strains and problems before 1789. From contextual knowledge candidates should be aware of context and broader issues, some of which are reflected in the documents. A and C seem to agree that a reforming royal government was set against the selfish opposition of the privileged estates. Brienne is anxious for double representative of the Third Estate as a means of effecting change. Necker and Montmorin also point out the opposition of the privileged estates to reforming measures as opposed to the obedience of the people. This is in contrast to the conservatism of the Princes in B and suggests a tension between the reforming middle class represented by Necker and the conservative aristocracy. However, it should be noted that the Princes of the Blood did not represent all the nobility – there were reforming impulses in the privileged orders as well. Brienne was a high-ranking Churchman and the role of the lower clergy in 1789 indicates that it is not possible to over-generalize about the 'estates'. The prevalent support among the upper classes for enlightenment ideas and anti-clericalism indicates that the conservatism of B was not necessarily typical and some may pick up the alacrity with which feudal dues were abolished and the willingness of some nobles and clergy to join with the Third Estate in June 1789. The Revolution though was not merely a result of class conflict and E offers an overview of financial bankruptcy – the effects of bad harvests and the 'political and intellectual' failings of the monarchy – though this can be challenged by reference to the praise offered in D by Necker (how sincere?) and Barentin's belief in the King's dislike of the privileges of the first two estates.



<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>5f</b>

**2 To what extent was Louis XVI personally responsible for the fall of the monarchy in August 1792? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The focus of the question is the fall of the monarchy rather than just the causes of the French Revolution, but candidates could deploy material on the monarchy's failure to address long-term problems and to offer enough support to reforming ministers who tried to engage with financial problems and reform economic and social abuses. Candidates could consider how well Louis coped with the challenges brought about by the huge rise in public expectations in 1789 and how well he adjusted to the rapid developments of 1789 which limited his power. His relations with the Assembly and his ambivalent attitude to the development of Constitutional Monarchy might be analysed and the breakdown of that compromise can be attributed both to a growing radicalism, the strains of war, social and economic tensions on one hand, and the mistakes made by the King, on the other. Many will focus on the flight to Varennes, the unrest caused by his support for émigrés and non-juror priests, his misjudgements and his ambiguous support for war.

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here, candidates should demonstrate an especially sharp evaluation of the relative importance of the difficulty of the circumstances the King found himself in after 1789, facing challenges that no other monarchs in Europe experienced, with unprecedented popular radicalism, poor economic conditions, an inflated capital city out of control and new political ideas. Set against that are the limitations of the king's understanding of the situation, his failure to take decisive action to stay in control of events, his misjudged flight and the fatal links maintained with national enemies once war had begun. By 1792, with whatever justification, he had failed to maintain enough trust among his subjects on one hand, and had lost the option of decisive counter-revolution, on the other.

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 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: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>5f</b>

**3 Why did the revolutionary governments in Paris face such serious opposition in the provinces? [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. Candidates should be able to focus on identifying reasons and offer some discrimination as to their importance. The major factor will probably be religion, with the increasing anti-clericalism of the capital having little appeal for many provincial areas inspired by refractory priests. The growing political sophistication and extremism of the radicalised middle class of the capital offered little to more rural areas who resented the demands of an increasingly centralised state in time of war. Traditions of separatism, for example in the prolonged resistance in Brittany were opposed to the modernising bourgeois centralised state. Some may be aware of the relatively limited integration of outlying areas that the so-called absolutist rulers of France had achieved. Provincial traditions and languages offered a strong basis for the groups who opposed the Revolution, such as the Chouans. A distinction might be drawn between the opposition to the modernising reforms before April 1792 and then opposition to the demands of war. The repression of the Jacobin representatives intensified resentments and the development of more extreme ceremonies, rhetoric and pseudo-religious practices widened the gulf between traditional, Catholic and local France, and the France of Paris-based revolutionary idealism.

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here, candidates could demonstrate an especially sharp evaluation of the relative importance of religious causation in particular areas, or whether developments in Paris intensified opposition; whether provincial resistance was deep-seated, or a response to the ideas of the Revolution, and whether war, with its greater demands for taxation, conscription and requisitioning, was the most important factor.

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 be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5f

**4 How are the extreme policies of the Terror best explained?**

**[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. Candidates should be able to focus on examining the relative importance of the various explanations. These may focus on the impact of war and the threat of invasion and revenge by émigrés and foreign troops. Inflammatory threats like the Brunswick Manifesto or revolutionary defeats triggered violent events and the needs of war offered the justification for greater discipline and punishment of enemies, and those who seemed to threaten the war effort. Some see the Terror as an extension of the tendency to political violence begun with the storming of the Bastille and insufficiently condemned by a radicalized middle class in awe of 'the people'. The ongoing influence of the Paris mobs, the problems of enforcing discipline in the Faubourgs and the impact of economic distress, may offer some explanation of the forces that could be harnessed by extremist political leaders. There might be an exploration of the power of the appeal of the Revolutionary extremists – Robespierre, St. Just, Marat. The death of Marat, the émigré threats, the fleeing of the King all made for the development of paranoia in the capital. The war allowed for the export of terror to the provinces in the suppression of provincial counter-revolution and the shootings and drownings led by such activists at Carrier, often with the collaboration of local activists eager to revenge themselves on old enemies. The ideas and ideals of republican purification and sacrifice provided a justification and possibly motivation.

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. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here, candidates should demonstrate an especially sharp evaluation of the relative importance of the different factors, rather than just listing and explaining them. Better answers will see the different phases of terror and try to account for its most developed form by seeing the connection between changing external circumstances and the revolutionary creeds and aspiration of the Sans Culottes and their political leaders. Such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses.

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 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.