

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper  
for the guidance of teachers**

**9769 HISTORY**

**9769/56**

Paper 56 (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.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 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 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

### **Special Subjects: Document Question**

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.*

#### **Introduction**

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

#### **Question (a)**

##### **Band 1: 8–10**

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

##### **Band 2: 4–7**

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

##### **Band 3: 0–3**

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

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

## Question (b)

### Band 1: 16–20

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

### Band 2: 11–15

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

### Band 3: 6–10

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

### Band 4: 0–5

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

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

### Special Subject Essays

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative 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 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

### **Band 2: 19–24**

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

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

### **Band 3: 13–18**

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

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

### **Band 4: 7–12**

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

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

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

### **Band 5: 0–6**

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

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

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	56

- 1 (a) **How far is the impression of tension and suspicion in Paris in July 1794, as communicated in Document C, corroborated by the content of Document B?** [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. Where appropriate, the answer should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of provenance by use, not only of the text, but of headings and attributions. In Document C, in spite of writing that he has nothing to fear from Robespierre, Fouche is clearly anxious. He refers to Robespierre's 'malicious rumours' and states that he did not attend the Jacobin Society as invited because of Robespierre's power there. He is certainly waiting for something to happen. In his second letter, Fouche refers to the existence of 'tyranny' and to 'rogues', 'knaves' and 'traitors' who are enemies of patriotism. From Document B, a police report, it is clear that members of the Convention are being followed and checked upon in a very detailed fashion. There is an impression that some sort of conspiracy is suspected, that the deputies are consorting with others and behaving suspiciously ('always talking with him and looking around'). Candidates may point out that it was no coincidence perhaps that Fouche and Tallien took the lead in the events leading to the coup of thermidor and that Tallien was the first to denounce Robespierre. Answers may be expected to evaluate the documents in terms of authorship, audience and chronology.

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence for the view that Robespierre was overthrown because by July 1794 the Terror had gone too far? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A-E).** [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and make effective use of each although, depending on 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 and with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong both in 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. In terms of immediate context, the coup of thermidor was preceded by the law of prairial (10 June 1794) which gave extended powers to the Revolutionary Tribunal. This unleashed the Great Terror. On 23 July an unpopular policy of wage regulation was introduced in Paris. A little earlier (7 May) Robespierre had introduced the worship of the Supreme Being. There is a good deal to support the proposition (that the Terror had gone too far) in Document E. The Great Terror of June and July 1794 resulted in an unprecedented number of executions (many of 'ordinary people'). Meanwhile, the Committee of Public Safety was seen as the dictatorship of Robespierre and his allies. There was a 'growing atmosphere of suspicion and panic' and the Terror was seen increasingly as a means of preserving the power of an oligarchy. This climate of fear and suspicion is corroborated by Documents B and C. Police agents are very active and some deputies of the Convention fear for their own safety. Document D can be linked to B in that Tallien, shown to be under suspicion, takes the lead in denouncing Robespierre. This document also helps to confirm the personal unpopularity of the principal authors of the Terror—Robespierre, Couthon and Collot d'Herbois, whilst C and E make the same kind of point. Documents B, C and D give a clear impression of the Terror having gone too far, being in the process of consuming the revolutionaries themselves. Additional explanations for the fall of Robespierre and the end of Terror might be explored as follows. Document A indicates that the revolutionary government is on the verge of losing control: factions thrive; plots against members of the Committee of Public Safety are suspected; there is unrest in Paris over food supplies; there are rumours of an aristocratic rising.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>56</b>

Document D raises the important issue that Robespierre's fall can be explained in part by his own non-attendance at the Committee of Public Safety and, from contextual knowledge, candidates may point out that Robespierre has also neglected the Convention. Document E also raises some further possibilities. The Terror, perhaps, had not so much gone too far but lost its purpose; a coercive regime had been justified by the exigencies of war but the tide had now turned (Fleurus). Document E also confirms that the revolutionary government was losing control (in the provinces as well as in Paris) and the Committee of Public Safety was dangerously isolated. From contextual knowledge candidates may be expected to assess the following: the significance in Robespierre's overthrow and of the failure of the Paris sections to support him at thermidor (here reference back might be made to Document A); Robespierre's exposed position after his destruction of opponents such as Hebert and Danton; the controversy over the cult of the Supreme Being.

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	56

## 2 How well did the King and his advisers handle the events of 1789? [30]

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Answers which give an entirely descriptive account of events will not score highly. However, a framework of events accompanied by argument, analysis and assessment should work very well, as should a strongly thematic approach with reference to specific events to support the analysis. Candidates should focus largely on the period 5 May 1789 (the first meeting of the Estates-General) to 5–6 October (the King's return to Paris with the National Assembly). Nevertheless, some consideration of the period immediately preceding would be helpful: the calling of the Estates-General, August 1788; preparations by the King and his advisers for the meeting of the Estates, including the decision to double the representation of the Third Estate. At the meeting of the Estates-General the King was courteous but the opening ceremonies were overly elaborate, there was no royal reform programme, the crucial issue of voting procedures was avoided. On 17 June the Estates-General assumed the title of 'National Assembly'. The crown had failed to give a lead resulting in deadlock leaving the Third Estate to take the initiative. The King failed to arbitrate between the Orders. The Tennis Court Oath (20 June) confirmed that the initiative lay with the Third Estate. The Royal Session (Seance Royale) of 23 June was badly handled. The King's attempt to defend his prerogative clashed with the Third Estate's demand for constitutional reform. In the end the King left the supporters of the National Assembly in occupation of the meeting, thus failing to control the direction of the revolution. It might be argued that this represented the triumph of parliamentary over royal authority and the end of the ancien regime. On 27 June the King ordered the clergy and nobility to join the Third Estate. The dismissal of Necker on 11 July may be seen as a serious error which helped to precipitate the events of 14 July. The July Days should also be seen against the background of the King's failure to deal with social distress and disorder in Paris and the deployment of large numbers of troops in Versailles and Paris. This proved to be provocative. The creation of a new constitution and the Declaration of Rights proceeded, over which the King and his advisers had a diminishing influence. The continuing failure to deal with social and economic distress and unrest in Paris led to the March on Versailles and the return of the King and Court to the historic capital. Candidates may be expected to apply some over-arching comment and analysis to the events reviewed which might include: the personality and abilities of Louis XVI, the aims and influence of those surrounding him (the Queen, ministers, courtiers, princes of the blood) and their general unpopularity. The fact that the King seemed to be forced into concessions, he seemed to be always a step behind and had no grand strategy. Louis was equivocal, ranging from a defence of absolutism to making important concessions.

**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 importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography with and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Candidates may well be inclined to turn the question round and to judge how badly Louis and his advisers handled events. Nevertheless, there is a good deal in the argument that, given the state of France, once the Estates-General was called then absolutism was doomed. The princes of the blood had warned Louis before the end of 1788 that revolution was imminent. Did the King fully realise his predicament? Was his main fault his indecisiveness? Could he have salvaged his position had he acted more strongly?

**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 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	56

**3 Assess the impact of foreign war upon the domestic affairs of France in the period 1792–94. [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. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative of the wars fought by revolutionary France in this period is not required, although reference to events will be necessary. Successful answers will be characterised by a thematic approach. A sensible chronological focus would be from the declaration of war against Austria (April 1792) to the Battle of Fleurus (June 1794). The scope and scale of war should be recognised: Prussia declared war on France in June 1792; France declared war on Britain in February 1793 and then on the Dutch. The combined effect of war was to create the serious danger of invasion across France's north-eastern and eastern frontiers and a damaging blockade of the French coast by enemy fleets. Even before the outbreak of war the Declaration of Pillnitz (August 1791) had made it clear that the situation of the French monarchy was a matter of interest to all European sovereigns. There was a very real chance that the gains of the Revolution would be reversed. The war raised ideological as well as nationalist issues. War had a profound effect on political developments in France including the overthrow of the Brissotins/Girondins and the triumph of the radical Jacobins (Montagnards). War by land and by blockade caused serious economic problems, raised taxation, inflation and social distress. These developments helped to encourage popular discontent in France and especially in Paris, and played into the hands of the more radical revolutionaries. There was an intensification of fears about 'the enemy within' – emigres, non-juring priests, speculators, food hoarders and spies. These fears and internal disorder help to explain the evolution of the Terror (emergency, revolutionary government, la patrie en danger) and its policies of control of prices and wages, laws against suspects, arbitrary judicial proceedings, purges and executions. Events such as Brunswick's Manifesto (July 1792) had important domestic consequences – arms were distributed to all citizens, the National Guard was opened to all, the sections petitioned for the execution of the King. The threat of invasion helped bring about the fall of the monarchy and triggered the September Massacres. The French Republic was forced to take on vast commitments – raising forces, taxation, manufacturing munitions, billeting and requisitioning. Such policies were unpopular and helped to encourage resistance and risings in the provinces (notably in La Vendee). Meanwhile, however, a more favourable turn of events in the war helps to explain the overthrow of Robespierre and the dismantling of Terror.

**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 importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Whilst recognising the impact of the war in directing the Revolution into more radical and violent paths candidates may seek to demonstrate how war combined with other developments and factors to bring about some kind of directional change – religion (especially the Civil Constitution of the Clergy), remaining royalist support, strong provincialism.

**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 2010	9769	56

**4 How is the triumph of Robespierre and his allies over their political opponents in the years 1792–4 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. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Candidates may be expected to concentrate their attention upon three groups of political opponents – Brissotins/Girondins, Hebertists and Dantonists. Explanations are both general and specific to particular groupings. Among the more over-riding explanations candidates may be expected to explore the circumstances of war, its effect on domestic conditions and politics, the sense of national emergency it created, suspicions as to where loyalty lay. Robespierre, of course, had opposed the war from the outset and gained political advantage when it went badly. Furthermore, Robespierre and the Montagnards were the party of Paris, they were supported by the sections, the Clubs and the sans culottes and pursued policies which were popular with this constituency (for example, the law of the maximum). Robespierre also occupied a powerful position in the Convention and, with his allies, in the Committee of Public Safety. The Brissotins suffered from being closely associated with the war and were blamed for defeats. Furthermore, their relationship with the King might be seen as equivocal. The Brissotins/Girondins were seen to stand for the interests of France more widely rather than Paris. They made the mistake of attacking the power of Paris in September and October 1792. Brissot himself was expelled from the Jacobin Club. In the events leading to the purge of the Convention in June 1793 the assembly was invaded by the sans culottes. Brissot and his colleagues were arrested on 2 June 1793 and executed the following October. The Hebertist rising in September 1793 forced even more radical policies upon the revolutionary government. Terror became the 'order of the day' and a general maximum of prices and wages was imposed in October 1793. The Hebertists were attacked by the Dantonist inspired Vieux Cordelier in December 1793. Robespierre and his allies were able to represent the Hebertists as too extreme, they were shown to stand for little more than unrestricted violence and fears were raised about the extent of de-christianisation. In March 1794 Hebert and his followers were arrested and executed. The fall of the Hebertists left the Dantonists dangerously exposed. They could be, and were, represented as being too moderate and planning to negotiate with the foreign enemy. In November 1793 Danton had called for 'an economy of blood' and in the following December Vieux Cordelier had attacked the Terror. Once the Hebertists had been struck down the relative strength of the Dantonists had been increased, making them even more dangerous to Robespierre and his followers. The leading Dantonists were executed in April 1794.

**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 importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography, and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here, candidates may sharpen the argument by assessing the relative importance of the factors at work. A debate might well be opened on the extent to which the political conflicts amongst the revolutionaries were matters of personality or principles. A further approach might be to suggest that the structure and nature of institutions and laws during the Terror made purges possible and, indeed, almost inevitable.

**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.