



A-level HISTORY 7042/2H

Component 2H France in Revolution, 1774-1815

Mark scheme

June 2023

Version: 1.0 Final



2 3 6 A 7 0 4 2 / 2 H / M S

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 © 2023 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, ie 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 execution of Louis XVI in January 1793.

[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

- it is valuable as it is written by Robespierre, a leading Jacobin Club member, and therefore privy to more information about attitudes to Louis XVI within the National Convention as he was elected in August 1792
- the fact that he was a leading figure within the Jacobins and had a reputation as an incorruptible politician, having risen to prominence during the Estates-General, shows he has a good understanding of Louis XVI's 'crimes'. He was a lawyer who had a belief in democracy and was opposed to capital punishment
- it is also valuable in that the address was before the trial of Louis in December, before the verdict of the trial was announced mid-January in 1793. It is trying to persuade the National Convention to vote in favour of the death penalty
- the tone is of concern of what to do if the Convention doesn't execute him. It is an emotive speech trying to ask the members to consider their fates if the King is found to be not guilty.

Content and argument

- this is valuable in highlighting the crimes which the King has committed. Although there were 33 charges, the content of the address suggests that the fate of the Republic and the achievements so far will be ruined if they fail to execute him
- it is also valuable as it shows that 'A king, whose very name draws foreign war on the nation', which refers to the Battle of Jemappes from November 1792 against the Austrians, who were connected to the Queen
- it has limited value as it demonstrates his selfish wishes for France and his reference to 'draws foreign war on the nation' which is referring to the progress of the war, albeit limited about the impact of the monarchy
- finally, he states 'Louis must perish because our country must live' which refers to the Jacobins' priority for victory in France. France was undergoing hardship through growing inflation and peasant rioting. The Jacobins wanted to exert centralised control.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is valuable as it explains the views of an American who was educated in Paris and Geneva and therefore may have been exposed to some of the debates about the monarchy or perhaps the ideas of the Philosophes whilst he was in Paris
- the timing of this article is significant as it is written at the time that Louis' trial had just commenced (although perhaps too early to report on the indictment). The author has awareness of the actions of the King in previous years so has formed an opinion represented in the article
- it is clear from the language of this source that the author feels strongly that the King and nobles were to blame for the disastrous consequences of the revolution so far and there is little objectivity in the account of the situation in France
- the tone of the source shows a strong belief that the King has made huge mistakes and the language is rousing support for the revolutionaries.

Content and argument

- the content supports the charges which Louis faced at his trial. The reference to 'deluging their native soil with blood' links with the charge of Louis using the troops in Paris to march against the French citizens during the capture of the Bastille
- the article also mentions 'King and Queen build up armies to attack France' which may refer to the charges of inciting the Declaration of Pillnitz and other subsequent actions which caused the French Revolutionary Wars
- the article also mentions that the King 'exercised a despotic power without restraint' which may refer to the charge of Louis keeping the Swiss Guards amongst his bodyguards which went against the constitution and the part they played in the violence of the journée of 10 August
- the source has limitations as it is threatening.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is valuable as it is from a British newspaper who may be less emotive when describing the execution, however, as Britain had a monarch and the London Times being a respected newspaper, they would feel great sympathy for the demise of Louis and the manner in which he was treated
- at the time of Louis' execution, Britain was preparing for entry into the French Revolutionary Wars which seemed inevitable as the French were unwilling to give up their conquests. This position would mean that there was animosity towards the revolutionaries
- the purpose could be partly to convince the British people that Louis was an honourable king and it could be used as propaganda to rouse support for the Revolutionary War. In addition, it could be as a means of promoting support for the British monarchy
- the tone reflects sadness and sympathy for Louis XVI. It depicts Louis as an innocent king who was caught up in the revolutionary fervour of the French people.

Content and argument

- the article highlights that 'the sans-culottes are the only persons that rejoice'. This resonates with some belief that they were instrumental in putting pressure, from 1792, on the radical members of the National Convention as they supported the abolition of the monarchy, although it could be argued that they had not reached the peak of their influence at the time of Louis' execution
- it goes on to express 'heartfelt grief' for the death of Louis XVI, which suggests reprisals for his execution, in the wake of preparing for war against the revolutionaries

- this article highlights frequently terms such as ‘wisdom’ and ‘mind enlightened’ to suggest that Louis was prepared to accept new ideas. The ideas which the author may have been referring to could be the calling of the Estates-General in 1789 or more recently the journée of 20 June and the acceptance of the bonnet rouge
- the content is limited as it says that Louis XVI ‘spoke with firmness and resignation’, however, Louis’ last words were drowned out by drums.

Section B

0 2 'In the years 1777 to 1787, neither Necker nor Calonne put forward any significant proposals for the reform of French finances.'

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 in the years 1777 to 1787, neither Necker nor Calonne put forward any significant proposals for the reform of French finances might include:

- Necker made fundamental errors when advising the King, such as suggesting that France was able to afford to join the American Wars of Independence, without additional taxation. This increased royal debt as the war cost 1.3 billion livres
- Calonne's attempts to reform in 1786, including a land tax payable by all including the Church, led to widespread unpopularity amongst the First and Second Estates and led to the Assembly of Notables
- Calonne's attempts to secure confidence in the economy were short term and he failed to secure loans in 1785 and 1786. At this point he had to admit to Louis that France was near to bankruptcy
- Necker made inaccurate statements. In order to disguise France's high interest payments, he hid the debt to suggest that they were part of France's normal expenditure to suggest that France's financial position was stronger than it seemed.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1777 to 1787, neither Necker nor Calonne put forward any significant proposals for the reform of French finances might include:

- Necker had differences with the King and his courtiers for the introduction of the Compte Rendu au Roi which was a break in Royal protocol. The report alienated support and therefore support for any change, although it was needed publicity for the extent of the debt
- Necker attempted to reform royal expenditure and he increased the royal share of farmed taxes alongside cutting venal offices, despite hostility from the nobles
- Necker did have some achievements, such as reducing royal spending and pensions. He removed taxes such as the vingtième on industry and reduced the number of tax farmers from 60 to 40. He also introduced a 'budget statement' of royal finances in 1781
- Calonne's reform package did have some significant suggestions such as to end the corvée royale to be replaced by a tax on landowners.

Both Necker and Calonne recognised the need for reform of royal finances, however, they were unable to implement any reforms due to the reluctance of the King. Both did manage to propose significant reforms such as reorganisation of the King's spending and taxation, but due to the lack of an accurate picture of the financial situation, there was reticence to change. Necker arguably did propose more significant reforms as Calonne was less successful in his proposals as he was a traditionalist and continued the extravagant public spending to restore confidence.

0 3 'The 1801 Concordat was the most important reason for the consolidation of Napoleon's rule in France.'

Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1799 to 1804.

[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 1801 Concordat was the most important reason for the consolidation of Napoleon's rule in France might include:

- the Concordat (1801) declared that the Pope was head of the Catholic Church and Catholicism was the religion of the majority, whilst Napoleon still retained control through government approval, such as government permission was needed when the Papal legate entered France. This ensured that Napoleon consolidated his power over the Church
- the Concordat helped win over royalists and reassured nobles. It promised that the biens nationaux were safe and new wealth would not be lost. In addition, refractory priests came out of hiding and the revolutionary calendar was abandoned. Consolidation was supported as the Church would not try and regain its lands. It also drew Catholics away from allegiances with the Bourbons
- Napoleon won the support of the property owners who were reassured that the Church had no intention of taking back their lands
- the Concordat meant that now the Church was to be state owned and therefore paid by the government, the clergy had to declare its loyalty to Napoleon. This meant that bishops were now appointed by him and his agents could find out about subversive behaviour.

Arguments challenging the view that the 1801 Concordat was the most important reason for the consolidation of Napoleon's rule in France might include:

- Napoleon's use of censorship consolidated his control as he could regulate what information the French people received, for example, by the end of 1800 there were only 9 Parisian newspapers remaining. In addition, books, plays and lectures were observed and duly censored. There were severe punishments for those who broke the censorship guidelines
- Napoleon also changed the political system by reintroducing the hereditary principle in 1802, reducing importance of the representative bodies of the Tribunate and the Legislature while enlarging the power of the Senate and the constitution of 1804 which made him Emperor
- Napoleon consolidated his rule by ensuring that there was loyalty amongst his men. He was able to win over politicians and soldiers through the use of honours and titles. These included the Legion of Honour (1802) and for the lower social class, army officers could expect to receive financial bonuses. The loyalty ensured support for his rule
- education reforms enabled a uniform common curriculum which consolidated power. The state employed teachers who used the same resources and taught the same curriculum. This standardisation enabled Napoleon to bring the state together. He established an education system which had the emphasis on teaching the value of obedience and moral values
- Napoleon's rule was consolidated when he became a Life Consul (and later made Emperor). Alongside this, the Senate was enlarged and the Legislature contained a greater number of Napoleon's supporters. This enabled Napoleon to have greater control of both. In addition, how he dealt harshly with opponents, eg duc d'Enghien.

The Concordat which Napoleon signed was a significant consolidation of power as it introduced a tolerant approach to different religions, such as the Jews and the Protestants and loyalty of the Catholic Church, which garnered support for his consolidation of power. He ensured a tax paying, obedient Church which would reduce the royalist threat. Conversely, the administration changes which Napoleon implemented in 1800 to ensure centralised control by the First Consul were significant. These included prefects who controlled the 83 departments and reported back to him.

- | | | |
|----------|----------|---|
| 0 | 4 | To what extent was Napoleon himself responsible for the defeat of his armies in the years 1812 to 1814? |
|----------|----------|---|

[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 Napoleon himself was responsible for the defeat of his armies in the years 1812 to 1814 might include:

- Napoleon assumed he would be able to march into Russia and defeat Alexander I in just six weeks. As a result, his men were poorly dressed for the Russian winter and were lacking in adequate equipment. In addition, his army was made up of raw recruits from the Empire, in his haste to advance
- Napoleon was naïve and unprepared when faced with new tactics. An example of which was the scorched earth policy of withdrawal of the Russian army
- Napoleon fought war on several fronts at once. This proved disastrous as his men were divided fighting in Russia, enforcing the Continental Blockade and in the Peninsular War against the British
- Napoleon rejected a generous peace deal after his defeat at the Battle of Nations at Leipzig, which would have allowed France to keep the natural frontiers of the Rhineland and Belgium.

Arguments challenging the view that Napoleon himself was responsible for the defeat of his armies in the years 1812 to 1814 might include:

- tactically, the Russians ensured Napoleon's defeat. They used the scorched earth policy to draw the French further into Russia without a supply network, but also stood firm and refused to negotiate with Napoleon
- defeat of Napoleon occurred due to the co-ordination of Britain, Austria, Prussia and Russia in the mobilisation of their troops and tactics. They effectively were prepared for war against Napoleon. Their co-ordination also meant that Napoleon was outnumbered
- another reason for defeat was due to the drawn-out nature of the Peninsular War. This became known as Napoleon's 'Spanish ulcer'. The repeated English attacks and Spanish guerrilla warfare wore the French commanders and soldiers down. It meant that Wellesley was able to advance into Toulouse
- Napoleon was still winning battles up to 1813, which showed that his ambitions were worthwhile. He won three battles against the Prussians and when being chased back towards France, across Germany, he still won some battles.

Napoleon himself proved a decisive factor in his defeat. His determination to defeat Tsar Alexander with a hastily gathered force of 600 000 men in a mere six weeks showed the extent of which he egotistically believed he could win easily. However, a legacy of campaigns which were not yet concluded, including enforcing the Continental Blockade and the Peninsular War, meant that he had to split his troops around Europe which resulted finally in defeat.