



**Cambridge Assessment International Education**  
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/56**

Paper 5f French Revolution, 1774–1794

**May/June 2018**

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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2018 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.

**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

**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><b>To what extent are the reasons for the changes made on 4 August given in Document B corroborated by Document C?</b></p> <p>Similarities – Both documents agree that there is popular unrest. By implication, Document B refers to ‘horrible scenes’ and ‘popular risings’ and links the changes to that background; they have become an obstacle to liberty which must be removed. Document C agrees that ‘by the light of the ... burning chateaux’ changes have been made, therefore linking unrest to changes. Both documents concur about enthusiasm for change in the Assembly as a reason for the decrees; Document B speaks enthusiastically for change and Document C says the motion ‘excited enthusiasm’.</p> <p>Differences – However, when looking at differences, the message is very different. Though Document B mentions unrest, the impression is that the measures are guided by Reason, in that selfless representatives are passing measures for public welfare and the good of the state, and with the motive of establishing equal rights. Document C says that this is a façade and we must not be fooled. It is not disinterested and enlightened kindness, but concessions forced by discontent; if it were so disinterested, the reform took a long time to come about.</p> <p>Provenance – Document B shows a liberal aristocrat influenced by the enlightenment and its vocabulary (‘Reason’) in the grip of the collective enthusiasm for reform that was evident in the Assembly on 4 August, but which evaporated afterwards. Document C is the radical commoner writing after the excitement and questioning – rightly – the actual results while championing the more immediate needs of the people at a time of high prices. One aims to show that the privileged classes can be enlightened; the other to highlight hypocrisy and press for greater revolutionary change.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the people dictated the pace of revolutionary change during 1789? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).</b></p> <p>Document A gives a graphic account of the unrest in Paris in July, prior to the Declaration of the Rights of Man in August. It suggests a people out of control and not fearing authority, and with a desire for social change. The hostility to popular unrest is evident, but the failure to condemn or control the violence of July 1789 offers some justification for fears that popular unrest may be a driving force. In many ways prophetic, as the impact of popular unrest was to be seen in October.</p> <p>Document C offers a strong view that the people dictated change – it was ‘by the light of the flames of the burning chateaux that these privileged men renounced their right ...’. They only acted ‘at the sight of punishment’ of the exploiters. The ending of feudal rights came about as a result of the Great Fear, the considerable wave of peasant unrest in the Summer of 1789. However, this Parisian radical is not an objective source and wishes to stress the power of the ‘sovereign people’ and attack the privileged classes for hypocrisy. By September 1789, there was a groundswell of radicalism and unrest in Paris soon to be expressed in the October Days. There is some confirmation in Document B about horrible scenes and popular risings, but the thrust is towards the enlightened desire for rational reform by the Assembly, not the people dictating. However, this was in the heat of the moment in an excitable debate and the author may not wish to dwell too much on the pressure of popular action.</p> <p>By the time Document D was written, by a major figure in the early revolution, the King had been forced to live in Paris where he was subject to mob pressure. More importantly, the Assembly too was now in the city centre. With rising prices, a huge explosion of political awareness and the sort of agitation seen in Document C, this was to put pressure on the new regime for changes and the unravelling of the ancient regime proceeded quite quickly. However, whether popular pressure was leading to the collapse of the body politic is more questionable. The changes were in keeping with widely discussed reforms, there was a National Guard, and there was little enthusiasm for ending the monarchy. It proved possible to control the masses when the need arose. (Note: There is no requirement for candidates to show knowledge of Mirabeau.)</p> <p>Document E offers a more balanced view showing the Assembly taking measures to curb disturbances and authorities taking measures to deal with food shortages. There are some questionable assertions; for example, that the peasants had overthrown feudalism, when many payments still existed. Also, that the <i>Sans Culottes</i> could now be excluded from political influence, but this would have been with the greatest difficulty. The assertions may not entirely be true given the limited franchise and the increased control of the ruling middle classes and may be a deterministic interpretation based on the knowledge of subsequent developments which owed much to war.</p>	20

## Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>How much justification is there for the view that the fall of the Constitutional Monarchy in 1792 was the fault of the King?</b></p> <p>AO1/2 – The discussions might focus on: the role of the King; the rise in extremism; the quality and experience of the new Assembly; the attitudes of émigrés and foreign powers; and, the impact of war. The King never saw himself as a sort of chief servant of the state. He had shown his unease by the flight to Varennes. He never gave up hope of counter-revolution and unwisely hoped that this might result from the war he supported in 1792. He never accepted the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and refused to give up the veto, which he used as measures against refractory priests. However, some may argue that the whole concept of a constitutional monarchy was too difficult, given the existence of opposition from radical groups in the Assembly, and the existence of pressure from the Paris crowds whom they used. The alliance between the Brissotins and the Crown in support of war was fraught with dangers, though not entirely the work of the King. The early defeats cannot be laid at his door, but they had a profound effect. Also the misjudgement of the Brunswick manifesto enflamed the situation. The Assembly and the political leaders were faced with a very difficult situation given the massive disruptions of the past years; though, a period of peace and economic stability might have led to a constitutional monarchy working, the strains of war were too much. No set answer is expected, but many may see the flight to Varennes as the turning point from which Louis could not really escape.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>How is the fall of the Girondins best explained?</b></p> <p>AO1 – The Girondins had emerged in 1791 as a group within the Jacobin club. Intellectual, cautious, well-educated and faithful to the principles of the Revolution, their leading figures were Brissot, the Rolands and Verginaud. It was they who led the campaign for war in 1792. They attracted support from provincial representatives and were a group of about 200 out of 749 in the Convention of 1792. Against them were the Mountain, the <i>Sans Culottes</i>, the Paris Commune. Splits emerged over whether to put the execution of the King to a popular vote. The defeats of the war and the treachery of generals associated with the Girondins made for unpopularity. The Jacobins were bitter and especially Marat, who was put on trial but acquitted, though later killed by a Girondin supporter. An attempt to purge their radical opponents by a special Commission led to increasing opposition in Paris, from the sections and elements of the National Guard under Hanriot. On 2 June 1792, 20000 Parisians surrounded the Convention and the National Guard threatened bombardment. This pressure led to the expulsion of the Girondins. Some fled, others were arrested and in October, Brissot and 21 others were condemned and executed.</p> <p>AO2 – Discussion might focus on the role of the Paris sections: the impact of war; the nature and popularity of the Girondin leaders; their miscalculation in attempting to strike at Marat and the radicals without having the power to act decisively; the impact of the desertion of Doumouriez; and, their failure to meet the demands of a hungry Paris for price controls. Most accounts play down the role of their Jacobin enemies in the Convention, but this was a factor. No set answer is required.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p><b>How is the coup of Thermidor best explained?</b></p> <p>AO1 – On 27 July 1794, there was a coup against Robespierre and his allies, which resulted in their execution and paved the way for the Thermidorian reaction. There had been an increasing gulf between Robespierre and the radical left over his espousal of the Cult of the Supreme Being. More moderate members of the Convention and the Committee were concerned about the continuation of Terror when the emergencies of war had lessened. The immediate trigger was Robespierre's speeches on 26 July making accusations about traitors without being more specific and actually mentioning Collot and Billard in a speech to the Jacobins. Fear of condemnation united a lot of those who feared or resented Robespierre and his allies, from former Dantonists to those like Fouché, who had been terrorists but feared another round of political condemnations and executions. What was notable about the events of 27 July was that the Paris mobs and the National Guard radicals did not or could not save Robespierre.</p> <p>AO2 – Explanations may focus on the eccentricities of Robespierre: the Cult of the Supreme Being and his withdrawal from participation in the Convention and Committee, and his increasing preoccupation with doctrinal matters by the Jacobins, as well as the fear that he created. The radical ideas of St. Just may have alienated the right – the Dantonists were bitter; and, the left disliked his religious aims. A broad coalition of opposition ensured that Robespierre would not be saved either by support in the Convention or by popular agitation. Broader explanations may look at the changes in the state of the war and the reduced pressure for Terror, and balance the changing context by July 1794, with Robespierre's own responsibility for this downfall.</p>	30