



Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

HISTORY (PRINCIPAL)

9769/05F

Paper 5F Special Subject: The French Revolution, 1774–1794

For Examination from 2016

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

2 hours

MAXIMUM MARK: 60

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

This document consists of **11** printed pages and **1** blank page.

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.

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

Both Documents focus on and support the idea of more equal rights for women, although for different reasons. Document C, from one of the most famous revolutionary feminists, argues that female rights are fundamental to the Constitution and offers a view based on common obligations of men and women as citizens making it logical that they should have equal rights. Document B also supports women's rights, arguing that as men and women are endowed with a moral sense, both should have rights of citizenship and participate in making laws. In terms of provenance, both come from a similar time in the history of the Revolution, before the advent of war and the extremism of the Terror, when the Constituent Assembly was reforming the institutions of France and attempting to bring about rational progress.

Both reformers were liberal thinkers influenced by Enlightenment ideas and wanted to take advantage of the freedom of thought and discussion to propose change. Some candidates may know, though this is not necessary, that they both died after arrest and imprisonment.

Neither Document represents mainstream opinion and neither author was successful in implementing change.

The scope and basis of the arguments presented in Documents B and C are different. Document C goes further than Document B in arguing for 'liberty, property, security' for women but also for equal employment and access to honours and position. The focus in B is a narrower one – it is more about purely constitutional rights. The reference in C to Rousseau's General Will is not part of the argument in B. Document B sees the failure to grant equal rights as a matter of inertia and male oversight, while for C it is a matter of the dominant tyranny of men. Document C offers a wider view than B in that the whole validity of the Constitution is undermined by the failure to grant equal rights to women, in her view. That is not the position taken by B.

In terms of provenance, the situation and purpose of the authors of these pieces of evidence is different. As a deputy involved in persuading the Assembly, Condorcet (B) does not go as far as Olympe de Gouges (C) who is not involved in practical law-making and is more concerned with making a theoretical justification.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that the French Revolution had a major impact on the status and role of women in France? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]**

Candidates should consider whether the emergence of modern ideas on women's rights and of figures like Olympe de Gouges and Therouanne de Mericourt amounted to a significant landmark in the development of women's rights or whether these ideas were seen as outlandish and impractical and, apart from extreme instances of mob violence and unrepresentative ideas and characters, the Revolution had little effect on the role of women. France was one of the last major European countries to grant them the vote, adopting under Napoleon reactionary social and legal policies. Document A shows women leading the march to Versailles in October 1789 – an extension of the capital's frequent disorders over bread in which women were prominent. However, though women did participate in the various *journées*, candidates may question their importance relative to other factors and the degree of politicisation this protest shows, given that the major concern was over bread shortages and prices. Documents B and C show the philosophical basis for reform of women's rights and should be put in the context of greater political awareness of women in participating in the political clubs. However, this did not last and as Document D shows, there could be extreme dangers for leaders of female emancipation. Political radicalism and the onset of war did not prove favourable for women's participation in political life.

Candidates could use their contextual knowledge to question the typicality and acceptance of the ideas shown, though there were greater outlets for women in Paris and the provinces to express ideas. Charlotte Corday's assassination of Marat might be cited here as an example, and also Madame Roland, mentioned in D. By 1793 the radical revolution had advanced but this speech indicates that traditional ideas of the spheres of love and politics were not extinguished by the appeals of rationalists like Condorcet. The argument in Document E might be supported by reference to D or challenged by reference to A, B and C; after all, women had taken a part in political actions and had produced key arguments. Document E takes the view that women had achieved some key reforms, but these might be put in the context of the general changes and modernisation of the 1789–91 period. Women did not share in the larger political changes of the period which benefited the French bourgeoisie and they may even have lost some purely political rights.

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

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

AO2 – The key issue for candidates is whether financial problems were so pressing and linked to so many other factors that they must be at the heart of any explanation; or whether there were deeper failings at the heart of government and in French society that prevented a solution and led to the breakdown of royal power in the series of events which followed the calling and failure of the States General.

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

[30]

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

AO2 – There are plenty of areas where the King might be criticised including his intransigence in opposing religious change without offering support for conservative reaction. The King also failed to take decisive action or join his brothers in seeing the dangers of trying to accommodate the new regime by supporting war in April 1792. On the other hand, some candidates may see the broader context as offering the best explanation. Constitutional monarchy was a very new situation and the King did seem to many to be fulfilling the expectations that he would rule wisely in the interests of all by supporting reform and taking his role in the constitution. Even after Varennes there were genuine expressions of popularity. Some candidates may focus more on the impact of war. War strained the relations between crown and people, and the ability of moderates to suppress more radical elements was reduced after the initial defeats. The war allowed radical elements free rein and some candidates may argue that the rise of extremism was key.

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

[30]

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

AO2 – Candidates should examine the debates abouts whether Robespierre was a man of genuine democratic and revolutionary principles, fighting a war where central control and visionary enthusiasm were vital, where enemies real and imaginary had to be ruthlessly destroyed to sustain that vision, or a narrow and bookish lawyer unable to empathise with real humans and eager to acquire and use power in a ruthless and tyrannical way, in the end alienating the revolutionary elite and being overthrown by those who feared him.

