

History

Answers and commentaries

A-level (7042)

2H France in Revolution, 1774 — 1815

Marked answers from students for questions from the June 2022 exams. Supporting commentary is provided to help you understand how marks are awarded and how students can improve performance.

Contents

The below content table is interactive. You can click on the title of the question to go directly to that page.

Question 1	3
Question 2	17

Answers and commentaries

Please note that these responses have been reproduced exactly as they were written by the student.

This resource is to be used alongside the A-level History Component 2H France in Revolution, 1774-1815 June 2022 Question paper and inserts.

Question 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 reaction of the French people to life under Napoleon in the years 1801 to 1808. **[30 marks]**

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

A-LEVEL HISTORY – 7042/2H FRANCE IN REVOLUTION – ANSWERS AND COMMENTARIES

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**

Student responses

The provenance of Source A is valuable to a historian studying the reaction of French people in 1801-1808 as it is from 7th November 1801, very early in Napoleon's reign, and therefore portrays the initial enthusiasm for Napoleon's rule. As a private letter to a friend, the source most likely portrays Blagdon's genuine perception of events - furthermore as a journalist he would be accustomed to reporting on such events and gauging recognising the attitude of a crowd, adding value as this increases the likely accuracy of his account. As an Englishman, Blagdon's judgement would not be influenced by any patriotic love for Napoleon, which might add ~~wattle~~ no value - however this also limits the value of the source, as, as an outsider, he may not have full context nor understand the day-to-day attitudes of the French to life under Napoleon. Furthermore the fact that Source B is from 1801, only 2 years after the Coup of Brumaire and before Napoleon became Emperor in 1804, limits the value as it does not offer insight into reactions to

Napoleon's increasing accumulation of power. Nevertheless Source A is fairly valuable to studying initial reactions to Napoleon, as it offers an authentic depiction of celebration of him.

The tone of Source A is ~~highly~~^{fairly} valuable as it imparts a strong sense of Napoleon's grandeur and the extent of positive attitudes towards him in 1801 with the emphasis of his officers' 'gold and silver lace', sabres 'gleaming' brilliantly and the overall event being 'in full splendour'. The content of Source A valuably supports this tone - particularly of note is the assertion that '15000' people, 'multitudes', come to see the 'Grand Parade' ~~despite~~^{despite} it happening 'every month', as this implies that enthusiasm for Napoleon was consistent, ~~however~~ and that any chance to witness him was ~~to~~ taken.

However, the setting of the Source being at a Grand Parade somewhat limits its value in terms of understanding general attitudes to Napoleon - by its very nature it would primarily be Napoleon's supporters who attended such an event, therefore the content of the Source does not display the variation of reactions to life under

Napoleon. Nevertheless Source A's emphasis of the crowd's 'awe' of Napoleon and 'sighing' at his departure does give a valuable sense of his reputation and respected status among many Parisians.

~~The so~~ The provenance of Source B is highly valuable to a historian studying the reaction to life under Napoleon as its date, 21 July 1805, is after Napoleon had become Emperor and set out many changes in the Civil Code in 1804, and therefore is fairly representative of life under Napoleon once his power had been firmly established. The location of the *bedaine* being South western France is particularly valuable as the source therefore gives insight into the attitudes of common French people out in the provinces, not just the politically active in Paris, thereby offering a more comprehensive understanding of reactions to Napoleon (although this does, of course, limit the value for understanding urban / supportive attitudes to life under Napoleon). The fact that Source B is an official report could also be a limiting factor, as the reporters may ~~be~~ have reason

to exaggerate the negativity of the people's reaction in order to justify the gendarmerie's ruthless arresting of evaders - on the other hand it is valuable to see that ~~ever~~ official reports contradict the ~~official~~, ~~prop~~ propagandistic narrative of total support for Napoleon. Source B's provenance is therefore ~~valuable~~ valuable for demonstrating the commonly unrepresented reaction of rural communities to life under Napoleon as Emperor.

The tone of Source B is valuable as it highlights the severity of opposition to Napoleon's rule in Pamiers - the violent language of 'attacked' 'assailed' and 'disorder' emphasises a sense that Napoleon's forces are not truly in control, whilst the report of gendarmes being labelled 'wolves' strongly and valuably demonstrates the divide between Napoleon's desire for national unity and the reality of resentment and of life under him. The source's content valuable points out 'imperial conscription' as the source of this resentment in; the rallying together of locals to 'impede our action' - 'he would not show us' demonstrating that even supposedly loyal officials such as the mayor and priest were 'totally opposed to us' - disapproving

Napoleon's hoped-for reaction to life under him as 'calme et ordre' around him from all parts of society. The content of Source B is somewhat limited, however, by the portrayal of the gendarmes as 'firm' but ~~but~~ peaceful ('without striking anyone') - the provenance makes it difficult to tell just how accurate a portrayal this is to the reaction of Napoleon's police to dissent-suppression such as the execution of royalists in 1804 would imply that their reaction was generally harsh. ~~Nevertheless it~~ Still, Source B's tone ~~is~~ and content is valuable as it portrays the divided reaction to life under Napoleon by 1805.

The provenance of Source C is extremely valuable ~~for~~ as it is a bulletin from one highly influential figure, Fouché, to another, Napoleon, and therefore offers insight into the primary concerns of the leaders of the day. This value is added to by the date of the Bulletin being 14 March 1808, around the establishment of the Imperial Nobility, as this demonstrates that by this time Napoleon and Fouché were most interested in the reaction of the middle and upper classes to life under Napoleon - specifically, that they intended to ensure middle and

upper class support. Whilst the provenance of the source somewhat limits its scope - official bulletins were often propagandistic and may have overemphasised support of Napoleon - in this case the nature is valuable as Fouché has reason to lay out exactly what problems Napoleon's policy of Imperial Nobility may face, thus offering valuable insight into the wants and fears of both the bourgeoisie and the old Nobility with regard to Napoleon's rule by 1808.

The tone of Source C contributes greatly to its value - Fouché states in clear terms and honest terms the hesitations of the old nobility, who fear the imperial nobility being 'their own tomb', new nobility fearing they'll be 'extinguished', and shopkeepers fearing they'll be 'scorned' + ~~this presentation~~. This presentation of various groups' reaction to Napoleon's policy of 'amalgamation' is valuable enough on its own, and made even more so by Fouché's emphasis of the 'need to... enlighten' both the old and new elites of Napoleon's intention to bring them both together - the 'intention' indeed was not to

ostracize any group (23) of the imperial nobility²² were old aristocracy), but to 'link' elites to 'new titles' and thus to Napoleon himself, ensuring their loyalty whilst emphasising service. (as ~~57% of titles were earned~~ + Fouchi's comparison of the reactions to the Imperial nobility to the reaction of 'chees' to the 'Legion d'honneur' in 1804 is particularly valuable, as this demonstrates the perceived importance of potentially hereditary titles provided in 1808, versus the more limited importance placed on personal praise and the small annual salary of the Legion of Honour.

Overall Source C valuably demonstrates the conflict between Napoleon's wish to introduce an 'amalgam' of old and new elites through the imperial nobility and the reaction of said elites to this, somewhat fearful

This is a Level 5 response

Across all three sources, the analysis of provenance is focused and effective. Evaluation of the date of each source is supported by means of good, specific subject knowledge that places each source within a specific timeframe and explains how this affects value. The evaluation of content is also supported by short, pithy quotation that reinforces a substantiated judgement about value. Each source has a clear and balanced evaluation of both provenance and content, using specific subject knowledge and quotation in support. At no stage does this become purely descriptive of the source. The provenance is addressed in an especially impressive manner.

Response B

Taking into consideration the arguments of sources A, B and C, it is clear that Source C is the most valuable in studying the reaction of the French people to life under Napoleon due to sharing ~~the~~^{of the people} discontent but also how they benefited from the regime. Sources A and B are somewhat valuable, but rather biased and ~~as~~ insofar in their opinions.

Source A is somewhat convincing in sharing the grandeur of Napoleon in the Tuilleries Palace. It is clear that Napoleon's regime was regimented for example when the source mentions the "Grand Parade", which reflects a rather monarchical ceremony. This is valuable because Napoleon did indeed see himself as ~~almost~~^{almost} royalty, through branding himself as Emperor and founding the House of Bonaparte. For the French people, the reaction may have been that of relief due to having a stable leader. The context of the source ~~being~~ describing the "full splendour" of life under Napoleon connotes a positive tone to the source, as people may have felt fulfilled, showing how ~~that~~ the source is valuable in that sense.

However, Source A is ultimately not valuable, mostly because the

argument of the source being the
splendid nature of Napoleonic life
is rather shallow. The imposition
of a tyrannical figure like Napoleon
~~did n~~ was not revolutionary and
the fact that "no one is allowed
inside" the Palace makes Napoleon's
regime intangible and unrelated.
The reaction of the French people
is more valuable in Source B, for
example, which argues that
the people are discontented with
government. The provenance of the
source is less valuable, despite being
a private letter, due to being
documented by an Englishman in
an ~~area~~ Paris, concentrated with
unrepresentative Napoleonic support.
Ultimately, it is less valuable due
to presenting ~~to~~ Napoleon as glorious,
rather than showing his true harsh
policies, such as conscription and
an undemocratic form of government.

Source B is somewhat ~~convincing~~^{valuable},
more so than Source A, as it
demonstrates how Napoleon faced
support in some areas of France.
The provenance of the source is
quite valuable as it is from a
government official of the police
force. The fact that it is from a
department in the south of France,
away from Parisian ~~support~~ ideas,

is valuable as the discontent is reflected in the source. The reaction of the French people is shown as action such as conscription is represented well in the source, as it had always been an unpopular policy. The source reflects a negative view as the French people seem angry with most form of control or need to go to war, similar to that of the rising in the Vendée for example. The fact that "the mayor and parish priest seemed totally opposed" to the gendarmes is a ~~contradict~~ valuable argument, as it contrasts source A in showing that Napoleon's regime was far more draconian than full of splendour.

However, the source is also less valuable in that it may have been exaggerated; as it was a report to the Minister of War, the gendarmes may have wanted to show "firmness", "despite the disorder" to make themselves look more impressive. Moreover, the "200 people" that "assailed" them and "attacked" them with stones are unconvincingly suppressed by only 5 gendarmes, which is rather invaluable ~~and~~ and unbelievable. But overall, however, the source

and opposition experienced by the gendarmes shows the people's ~~real~~ reaction to life under Napoleon as negative. This can also be seen through the various plots such as the Jacobin's 'Jagger Conspiracy' and the Royalists' 'Infernal Machine' at the beginning of his rule.

Source C is the most ~~con~~ valuable of the three. It argues that the class system under Napoleon shifted rather dramatically, out of the favour of "old noble families" and towards the "bourgeoisie". This is valuable as the monarchy would have been well received by the French people, their reaction being a positive one. For example, the Legion of Honour was awarded to 32,000 people in total, and Napoleonic patronage became an important part of gaining status.

However, at the same time there is an invaluable interpretation as the Legion of Honour awarded 32,000 people, but only 1,500 of those were not nobility, perhaps showing that life under Napoleon was not completely meritocratic. Furthermore, the creation of hereditary titles hindered this

gap in social inequality. This did ~~not~~ "show more and more the power of the Emperor" as he based his security ~~on~~ perhaps on bribing the upper class. The reaction of the French people to this may have been positive, but Napoleon's intention of bribing support was ~~an~~ almost certainly not evident to them at the time. Moreover, the provenance ~~was~~ is not valuable as it came from Napoleon's secret police, a corrupt institution within itself.

In conclusion, source C is the most valuable as it shows both sides of life under Napoleon, whereas sources A and B are perhaps more biased and invaluable in their content.

This is a Level 3 response

The general introduction is not needed, neither is the comparison of the sources which appears throughout the response. Provenance is mentioned for each of the sources, but the evaluation is limited. This is also true for the content, which loses focus on the 'impact on the French people' as demanded by the question. There is an attempt at balance and some analysis as demanded at Level 3, but this is not fully supported and is consequently not entirely convincing. The analysis of B is the most effective, but that of C veers into description. There is however some attempt to address value for each of the sources as demanded at this level.

Question 2

'In the months of May to September 1792, it was the sans-culottes, rather than the deputies in the Assembly and Convention, that brought an end to monarchy in France.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

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**

Student responses

Response A

From May to September 1792, the sans-culottes were primarily responsible for ending the monarchy in France: they enabled the Assembly to officially end Louis' reign by overcoming political deadlocks through violent journées. However the will of both the sans-culottes and Assembly/Convention was itself caused by Louis' own actions, and the atmosphere of fear created by war.

The Sans-Culottes were instrumental in ending the monarchy in France in September 1792 as they were willing to use violence and crowd action to achieve their political aims. The first example of this was on 20 June 1792, when thousands of sans-culottes marched on the Tuilleries to demand Louis overturn his suspensory vetoes - although this alone did not ensure the end of the French monarchy, as Louis was able to appease the crowd by toasting to the nation, nevertheless this undermined his role as executive power of the Constitutional Monarchy, as the sans-culottes ignored the fact that such vetoes were Louis' constitutional right.

However, the clearest example of the sans-culottes influence on the end of the French monarchy was the journée of 10 August 1792: the magnitude of the anti-Louis crowd (20 000 sans-culottes and several thousand fedues), the defection of many National Guardsmen to the sans-culottes, and the total massacre of Louis' Swiss Guard all demonstrate the height of ^{the} sans-culottes' power by September 1792, as well as being the direct physical cause for Louis' removal from the Tuilleries and subsequent imprisonment and suspension. Therefore the sans-culottes were largely responsible for bringing an end to the monarchy in France, as their violent journées overcame political deadlocks and undermined the king's power.

However, the Assembly and Convention were also essential in ending the French monarchy in September 1792: as the sans-culottes themselves lacked direct political power, they were forced to act through the Assembly from May to September. Indeed, in this period the sans-culottes and Assembly, especially the Jacobins, ~~were~~ mutually incited.

each other towards ending the monarchy: whilst the Jacobins were keen to maintain the support of the sans-culottes and so responded to their protests, radical leaders ~~themselves~~ such as Saint-Just, Danton and Robespierre also encouraged increasing Republicanism, such as Robespierre's Republican speech in July 1792. Furthermore, it was the Assembly and Convention who put in place the decrees, arrests and official political actions that ended Louis' rule: the Assembly ~~actually arrested Louis after the 10 August Journée~~ ~~after the 10 August Journée~~ ~~inaction after the~~ which had encouraged the sans-culottes by not punishing them after the June 20 Journée, the Assembly arrested and imprisoned Louis in the Temple prison after the August 10 Journée, and the Convention unanimously voted to end the monarchy and begin the French Republic on 22 September 1792. Therefore the Assembly and Convention were essential to ending the Monarchy in France: radical Jacobins encouraged the sans-culottes' actions from May to August, and in September the Assembly/Convention translated the sans-culottes' wishes into official law.

Finally, although it was the sans-culottes and Assembly who forcefully brought about the end of the Monarchy in 1792, both groups were turned against the King in the first place by the actions of Louis and his foreign supporters. In May and June 1792 Louis earned ^{the} 'sans-culottes' resentment by vetoing the Assembly's decrees against refractory priests and the King's guard, who were seen as counter-revolutionary, and in favour of expanding the National Guard with 2000 federal soldiers. It was therefore Louis' own actions that triggered the Juillet 20 Journée - the more he seemed to align himself against the Assembly and try to maintain his own power, the more the sans-culottes and Assembly alike regretted his constitutional rights. This growing suspicion was ~~increased~~ hastened by the actions of Louis' foreign supporters, as well as the general atmosphere brought on by the war: the inflation and supply shortages in Paris, caused in large part by blockades of trench ports, caused great agitation among the sans-culottes, whilst the 25 July Brunswick Manifesto, which arrived in Paris on August 1, ~~was~~

brought about an acute fear which was arguably the primary ground for the August 10 journée; similarly, news of ~~the besiege~~ Verdun's fall on September 1st May have catalised the Assembly into swiftly declaring a republic, in order to stand firmly against Louis and the enemy. Therefore Louis himself was largely responsible for his own downfall as by seemingly aligning himself with the enemy & he made Republicanism an essential aspect of patriotism.

From May to September 1792 it was the sans-culottes who primarily brought about an end to monarchy in France: although incited by Jacobin leaders and Louis' counter-revolutionary supporters, it was their direct, violent actions that progressed the ^{revolution} ~~constitutional~~ from constitutional monarchy to Republic.

This is a Level 5 response

The introduction is focused on providing a clear judgement and identifying reasons for this view. This sets up a fully analytical response which uses good, specific evidence in support of argument. The first paragraph, in addressing the most substantial factor not only gives a clear point of view which frames the overall essay, but ensures that this is substantiated by means of carefully selected information. At no time does this become a simple description of events. The final paragraph, which details the role of the king, is not strictly relevant to the demands of this question, although the student successfully links this to the role of the Sans Culottes or to the Assembly. Overall, a balanced, substantiated judgement with many features of Level 5.

Response B

The deputies of the new National Convention declared France a republic on the 22nd September 1792. This was a result of a multitude of factors bringing an end to the monarchy in France. It is true that the sans-culottes brought an end to the monarchy, rather than the deputies of the Convention. By 1792, their radical views were of great influence of France. The combination of this and the actions of the king hinted an end to the monarchy was nearing. However, it was ultimately the effects of the war that underpinned this, causing the monarchy in France to end when it did.

In the months of May to September 1792 the sans-culottes contributed to the end of the constitutional monarchy. During this time they carried out two journées that varied in degrees of violence. On the 20th June, 8000 National Guards marched to the Tuilleries, demanding Louis withdraw the use of his vetoes. They contributed to the end of the monarchy in France by undermining Louis' position and authority as king. They made him wear a bonnet rouge and drink a toast to the nation. However, as this journée was due to political reasons it didn't provide much of a violent outburst. The actions of the sans-culotte did have a greater influence than the deputies of the Assembly and Convention. This is shown via the fact that after the journée, on the 29th June, Robespierre called for a republic. This showed how the actions of the sans-culotte had helped to make republicanism a mainstream view, thus helping to bring about an end to the monarchy in France.

The second jàvne by the Sans-Culottes on the 10th August 1792 also demonstrated how the Sans-Culottes were more influential in fall of monarchy than deputies in the Assembly and Convention. The second jàvne was far more meticulously planned. 20000 marched to the Tuilleries. This was a force so great that the King had to take sanctuary at the Assembly. This again highlights the significance over Sans-Culottes force over deputies of the Assembly. The weakness of the King was clearly highlighted. This therefore proves that the Sans-Culottes actions significantly influenced the end to the monarchy in France. The actions of the deputies in the Assembly and Convention were subservient to anything the Sans-Culottes could achieve given their great size and violent reputation.

In the months of May to September of 1792, France was at war. This proved fatal. This factor was more influential than the actions of the Sans-Culottes and deputies in the Assembly in Convention in bringing about the end to monarchy in France. Had France not made the decision to go to war, it is likely that the Constitution of 1791 would have survived. The war highlighted the weakness of the King. Despite being constitutionally acceptable, Louis' use of his suspensive veto in wartime proved suicidal. He used the veto on matters such as disbanding of the King's guard and deportation of refractory priests. His most opposed use was against the fédere camps. The war, however, made Louis' use of his veto push him into the realms of a traitor. This pushed the government into a state of disarray, which is displayed in the resignation of Lafayette. It appeared as though Louis had cleared a path

A-LEVEL HISTORY – 7042/2H FRANCE IN REVOLUTION – ANSWERS AND COMMENTARIES

into Paris for the Prussians and Austrians. This dismal affair on top of his flight to Varennes in June 1791 meant the monarchy in France was destined to fail. This therefore clearly demonstrates the way to war makes a republic possible (significant as in June 1791 there was still too much opposition for this to be feasible). The war showed every weakness of the monarchy in France, ultimately bringing it to an end. Without the war, the actions of the sans-culottes and deputies of the Assembly and Convention weren't sufficient enough to bring the monarchy to an end in France.

In conclusion, war impacted every angle of France between May and September of 1792. This said, it influenced the actions of the sans-culottes and deputies of the Assembly and Convention. The deputies and of the Assembly, of Convention, although wanted change were not a strong enough force on their own. The sans-culottes in their numbers carried a greater influence. The monarchy in France was coming to an end. However, it was the effects of the war between the months May to September 1792 that sped this up. The war made republicanism a mainstream idea, thus enabling the monarchy to end and establishment of a republic on the 22nd September 1792.

This is a Level 3 response

The introduction attempts to establish a judgement, but this is not focused, and brings in other factors such as the role of war which is not made relevant to the set question. The first substantive paragraph has a narrative feel as expected at Level 2, although this is punctuated by elements of evaluation which is more indicative of Level 3. This paragraph is the strength of the response, for the next relies heavily on assertion with some fairly cursory evaluation added to the end. A number of statements are therefore inadequately supported and generalist as expected at Level 3.

Get help and support

Visit our website for information, guidance, support and resources at [aqa.org.uk/7042](https://www.aqa.org.uk/7042)

You can talk directly to the History subject team

E: history@aqa.org.uk

T: 0161 958 3865