
A-level HISTORY 7042/2H

Component 2H France in Revolution, 1774-1815

Mark scheme

June 2020

Version: 1.0 Final



Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2020 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the situation in France leading up to the Estates-General.

[30 marks]*Target: AO2*

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is valuable as it comes from the Princes of the Blood, those members of the Second Estate who came from the King's own family and who therefore had great authority and relatively easy access to him. However, its value will be limited to that particular, privileged perspective
- it is also valuable because it reveals the way they clearly used their position to seek to influence the King and put pressure on him during the debate on voting procedures
- it is also valuable as it is from the period in which discussion over the voting procedures was particularly intense and the parlements were revealed to be self-interested, rather than genuinely caring for the interests of the Third Estate, as they had previously suggested when obstructing the King and his minister on matters of taxation
- the tone is highly persuasive and uses language designed to convince the King that they are acting in the best interests of the whole of France, something which is valuable in terms of reflecting the way they chose to frame their arguments, and the views which many (though not all) of the privileged believed. However, its value is perhaps limited as their motivation was not chiefly altruistic.

Content and argument

- this source is valuable in highlighting the debate which took place over voting procedures, referring both to the issue of double representation and voting by head rather than by order, both of which many in the Second Estate were opposed to
- it is also valuable in outlining the argument made by the privileged Estates that the traditional form was part of the 'unalterable foundations of the French monarchy'. This was a powerful argument as part of the responsibility of the King was to uphold those traditions and forms
- it is also valuable in highlighting the paternalistic, perhaps patronising view of the Third Estate, that it was in their interest to preserve the traditional forms, even though it clearly meant that their needs would not be taken into account. Increasingly this was not the view of the Third Estate themselves, and therefore limited in representing the reality of their position
- where perhaps the value is also limited, is the absence of any suggestion that their motivation is to protect their privileges. Instead their argument is apparently one of protecting the interests of the Third Estate from 'irresponsible members'.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- it is valuable in that it is written by a member of the Second Estate, an order which was powerful and often well-educated and therefore he is likely to be well informed on the subject. However, the value could be limited by his lack of understanding of what was really motivating the people of the Third Estate
- it is valuable in that it is written in a private letter to his wife and is therefore likely to display his true feelings about the problems facing France at this time, even if those feelings are not how everyone might have felt
- it is also valuable in its timing as it was in the period just before the Estates-General met, where grievances were theoretically to be dealt with, but also bread prices were very high and the economy was struggling
- the tone is one of concern and pessimism which is valuable in emphasising the sense of uncertainty that many people, especially the propertied bourgeoisie and nobility, felt at this tumultuous time. His use of the word 'mob' indicates his negative feelings about those involved in the riots.

Content and argument

- it is valuable in highlighting the huge contrast in lifestyles between the people of Paris, with the Marquis attending the opera, something which was expensive, while others were rioting in the streets and breaking into the house of their employer, and reminds us that the violence did not start in July 1789 but was already a factor before the meeting of the Estates-General
- it is valuable in suggesting the disconnect which existed between the wealthy and the poor. The Marquis says that the pretext is the high price of bread, suggesting that this wasn't a real issue. However, bread prices were very high indeed at this point and were a genuine reason why many might have resorted to desperate measures. However, there were also rumours that Réveillon planned to cut wages, which might suggest that they were also being manipulated by more extreme members of the Third Estate and that bread prices were not the only factor
- it is also valuable in that it laments the 'ill feeling between the orders', something which had developed over the previous few months owing to increasing politicisation of the Third Estate and the desire of the other two Estates to protect their voting privileges
- however, at the same time, the description of the bourgeois and young men of Orléans protecting the town against the mob is a reminder that divisions also existed within the Estates as much as between them.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- although anonymous, this would appear to be valuable as it comes from a group of people who would have largely been without a voice in society, particularly as the cahiers were often drawn up by the bourgeoisie. On the other hand, it could limit its value as it could have been written by a political activist trying to make it look as though these people were more politically aware than they really were
- the fact that it is clearly written could be valuable in highlighting the high degree of literacy at this point in Paris and the political awareness of the lower classes, although note point above
- it is valuable as it is written just as the Estates-General were gathering, suggesting that the writing of cahiers had not satisfied everyone at this point
- the tone is largely without emotion which adds value. It is a simple statement of their situation

- the purpose is unclear, although it clearly states their dissatisfaction with the process of the Estates-General and could perhaps be an attempt to stir up similar dissatisfaction with other similarly poor people. This is valuable as it suggests the level of politicisation amongst the poor.

Content and argument

- it is valuable in pointing out the ways in which the cahiers were collected, where poorer members of the Third Estate often had to express their grievances to their bourgeois representatives and as a result their concerns were not always fully reflected in the cahiers
- it is also valuable in that despite the fact that the voting procedures had not been fully agreed upon at this point, there is no mention made of that ongoing issue here. They do not feel that they are truly represented whatever the procedure
- this also highlights the fact that not only were there divisions between orders on the eve of the Estates-General, but there were also significant divisions within orders, and whilst the bourgeoisie could be wealthy, the majority of the Third Estate were poor and lacking opportunity
- therefore, on the eve of the Estates-General, there was clearly real division within the Third Estates, to the extent that they are described in this source as being from a different 'class', and in reality, this was also the case within the First and Second Estates where there were big variations in power and wealth
- it is also valuable in that these grievances, already seen in violent incidents across France in the Spring of 1789, soon become much more severe in July 1789 where the differences between the 'classes' of the Third Estate become much more evident.

Section B

- 0 2** 'The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was the most significant reason for the collapse of constitutional monarchy in France in the years 1791/92.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that the Civil Constitution of the Clergy was the most significant reason for the collapse of constitutional monarchy in France in the years 1791/92 might include:

- right from the start it divided France between those who supported refractory and non-refractory priests, and the latter and their supporters were soon labelled counter-revolutionaries, although they were otherwise largely in support of the changes
- the King was conservative in his religious beliefs and it was in part disquiet over taking communion from a non-refractory priest which motivated him to flee France in 1791, something which was a major factor in undermining the constitutional monarchy
- the fact that the King was unhappy with the CCC caused him to veto a law of November 1791 which demanded that refractory priests take the oath or be treated as traitors. To many supporters of the revolution this action made Louis himself a traitor. This was even more the case when he vetoed similar laws in 1792 when France was at war
- the sans-culottes were atheistic and particularly unforgiving of those who were sympathetic to refractory priests so this increased their dislike of Louis.

Arguments challenging the view that the Civil Constitution of the Clergy was the most significant reason for the collapse of constitutional monarchy in France in the years 1791/92 might include:

- although the King was very unhappy with the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, he was also not reconciled to his reduced power and hoped to see it restored. This meant that he was never fully prepared to make the constitutional monarchy work and this inevitably weakened it
- the letter he left behind after the Flight to Varennes also outlined his opposition to many aspects of constitutional monarchy, and this, along with the fact that he had fled, fuelled discontent, and led some to call for his overthrow
- the growth and influence of the more extreme political societies increased radicalism and led to more demands for a republic, especially after the Flight to Varennes. This manifested itself in the Champ de Mars meeting, and their violent reaction to the troops sent to maintain order. The decision to fire on the crowd strengthened the resolve of radicals to bring about a republic even if it brought order in the short term
- the war was very significant in undermining constitutional monarchy as it strengthened the need to root out internal enemies, yet the King vetoed attempts by his ministers to take action to do this. Many rightly suspected that the King hoped the French revolutionaries would be defeated by their enemies and his power restored.

The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was highly significant as it divided France, creating perceived enemies of the religion among people who would otherwise have supported it. Given that the King was sympathetic to these 'enemies' and shared their outlook, revolutionaries were very suspicious of him, and it made it harder for Louis to adapt to his changed situation. However, he also faced a lot of pressure from his family not to give in to the demands of revolutionaries, and it could be argued that his aim was in fact to see his power restored through French defeat in war, in which case the Civil Constitution of the Clergy was only one factor.

- 0 3** To what extent did the actions of Napoleon strengthen France in the years 1795 to 1799?
[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that the actions of Napoleon strengthened France in the years 1795 to 1799 might include:

- his role in the Vendémiaire rising helped to secure the Directory
- although given fairly limited objectives in the campaign against Austria, Napoleon enjoyed a run of spectacular successes and by May 1797 his forces were occupying Venice, thus extending the power of the French Republic
- Napoleon created new states for the French Republic in Italy with the Cispadane Republic and the Transpadane Republic, and then the Cisalpine Republic in June 1797. He set up a Directory with a two chamber legislature both there and in the Ligurian Republic
- Napoleon succeeded in forcing the defeat of the Austrians and negotiated the Treaty of Campo Formio on 17 October without the involvement of the Directory. This strengthened France considerably, recognising French control over the former Austrian Netherlands and Austrian acceptance of the French Cisalpine and Ligurian Republics
- by the end of 1799 he was the leading Consul in the new Consulate, having overthrown the Directory. Many people were concerned that the Directory was too weak and that a stronger government was needed in order to preserve the Republic. Napoleon succeeded in providing this stronger government.

Arguments challenging the view that the actions of Napoleon strengthened France in the years 1795 to 1799 might include:

- Napoleon was very alert to the importance of hiding negative stories and promoting good ones. His use of propaganda successfully exaggerated some of his achievements and covered up his weaknesses, such as his apparent near fainting fit during the Coup of Brumaire. Without help at that point he might not have succeeded at all, and therefore the successful outcome of the coup was certainly not the result of his actions alone
- his judgement in Egypt was not always good. Nelson destroyed the French fleet in Aboukir Bay, cutting off Napoleon and his troops from France, and he underestimated the enemy and had to abandon a siege of Acre
- Napoleon's decision to expel the Knights of St John from Malta in 1798 angered Tsar Paul of Russia and led to the formation of a new coalition against France. This proved a real challenge and although France succeeded in the end, they were put under great pressure by the coalition
- Napoleon arguably put his own ambitions before the good of France when he abandoned his troops in Egypt in order not to miss out on what seemed to him the ripe moment for the overthrow of the Directory. However, it could be argued that his success in the coup did strengthen France and that ultimately this action did therefore strengthen France
- the Directory were suspicious of Napoleon's motives, for example in his signing of the Treaty of Campo Formio without their authority, and given that they were the government of France at the time, his actions could be said to have undermined them, and therefore to have potentially weakened France.

Overall, although Napoleon did make mistakes, his actions in this period did indeed strengthen France, although sometimes his use of propaganda suggests that his greatest concern was his own image. Justifiable conclusions could be drawn based on an assessment of Napoleon's impact on the government of France and/or its military strength.

0 4 'French rule did not benefit those living in the Grand Empire.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that French rule did not benefit those living in the Grand Empire might include:

- on the whole, Europe suffered from the policies of 'France First'. The primary requirement of the economies of Europe was to provide France with whatever goods or raw materials she needed, even if it was to the detriment of their own economies. For example, Piedmont and Lombardy's silk industry declined because all raw silk had to be exported to France
- the Continental Blockade also brought some economic hardship as it reduced the potential markets in which European goods could be sold, and its impact was particularly felt from 1810 onwards
- there was considerable unhappiness about some aspects of the Concordat, and in particular, Napoleon's seizure of the Pope which led to uprisings in Spain and hostility in southern Italy
- even where there were potential benefits to be had, such as the more enlightened parts of the Civil Code, these were not always successfully implemented, particularly from 1808 when military needs became the main focus
- military conscription tended to be very unpopular and could provoke rebellion, especially after 1808.

Arguments challenging the view that French rule did not benefit those living in the Grand Empire might include:

- ordinary people benefited from the end of feudalism in most parts of the Empire and in most places, serfdom did not return after the fall of the Empire
- they also benefited from the ending of tax exemptions and greater equality, particularly before the law
- inner parts of the Empire benefited from the preferential trade zone. For example, the Belgian textile industry boomed, and mining did well in the Rhineland
- large scale commercial agriculture benefited from Napoleonic policies
- the abolition of the privileges of the Church was welcomed by more secular sections of society across Europe.

Given that the Empire was such a big place, it is difficult to be prescriptive, as experiences varied greatly, but on the whole, whilst there were some tangible benefits, such as the abolition of serfdom, the need to provide armies for France and fund its wars meant that being part of the Empire was more of a burden than a benefit. Even so, some places definitely did enjoy lasting benefit.