



**General Certificate of Education
June 2011**

AS History 1041

HIS1F

Unit 1F

France in Revolution, 1774–1815

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

June 2011

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1F: France in Revolution, 1774–1815

Question 1

01 Why did Enlightenment *philosophes* want to reform the Ancien Regime? (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why *philosophes* wanted to reform the Ancien Regime.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the *philosophes* emphasised the importance of reason and believed the AR failed to promote the wealth and happiness of all
- they believed the Church exerted undue power and they encouraged acceptance of man's place on earth

- the King claimed to rule by divine right which prevented his words and actions being questioned
- the AR paid insufficient heed to individual rights and liberties – some believed government should be based on a contract between rulers and the ruled
- they believed in the rule of law – framed in the best interests of the ‘people’ and in conjunction with those people.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might stress that the *philosophes* were not practical men and mostly had no desire to destroy kingship – nor even (with the exception of Voltaire) the Catholic Church – their criticisms interlink in that they all support a system in which individuals had greater control over their own futures.

Question 1

- 02** How important was the discontent of the Third Estate in bringing about a crisis in French government before the first meeting of the Estates-General in May 1789? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Factors suggesting the discontent of the Third Estate helped bring about a crisis before May 1789 might include:

- the ambitions of those at the top of the Third Estate – particularly lawyers and wealthy bourgeoisie who were finding their opportunities for advancement squeezed and had become influential in local politics, often under the influence of Enlightenment philosophy. (Such people led local protest, were instrumental in the drawing up of the cahiers and put themselves forward as Third Estate deputies.)
- the miseries of those at the bottom of the Third Estate who suffered from tax burdens, unpaid labour and feudal dues and whose lives were dependent on the weather and the harvest and who were encouraged to reflect on their grievances as the cahiers began to be drawn up after the announcement of the Estates-General in August 1789
- poor harvests, as in 1788, coupled with the growing 3rd estate population led to pressure on food supplies, high prices, rural unrest and urban riots. Grain convoys were attacked, homes of suspected ‘hoarders’ raided. Authorities found it difficult to maintain order
- 1788–1789 saw industrial lay-offs especially in the textile industry which caused disturbances in the towns. The Day of Tiles in Grenoble in 1788 saw workers striking in sympathy with magistrates and a riot in which crowds hurled roof tiles at soldiers. In April 1789 workers took to the streets of Paris in protest against feared wage cuts by Réveillon
- the promise of an Estates-General stirred Third Estate leaders, and pamphlets such as ‘What is the Third Estate?’ by Abbe Sieyès’ encouraged politicisation.

Factors suggesting the discontent of the Third Estate was not responsible, or was less responsible than other factors, might include:

- food riots and urban discontent brought about by poor harvests or industrial lay-offs were not a new phenomenon and the government had means of dealing with such and was effective in crushing troubles
- many of the rural and provincial Third Estate were too concerned with daily living to involve themselves in political affairs and peasants played little part in the troubles of the government before 1789. Food riots of early 1789 would probably have passed, but for the developments in Paris after May
- the main challenge to the government before May 1789 had come from the nobles – who had undermined the attempts of Louis’s finance Ministers to reform the French taxation system, refused to co-operate in the Assembly of Notables and led revolt in the ‘Revolt of the Nobles’ in 1788
- Venal Nobles in the Parlements had also forced the crisis by taking a stance against the King’s ministers
- the real cause of the government crisis was the country’s bankruptcy and the ineptitude of the country’s leaders in addressing this.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that the Third Estate was very divided and, as a whole, played only a peripheral part in the events leading up to the Estates-General in May 1789. However, they may point out that the growing politicisation of the Third Estate – certainly among Parisians and town workers, but even stretching to the peasantry, provided a force which would play a major part in the following months.

Question 2

- 03** Explain why the *sans-culottes* were able to increase their influence over French government in 1792. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the *sans-culottes* were able to increase their influence over French government in 1792.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- France's declaration of war on Austria and Prussia in April/May 1792 – and its initial failures encouraged a radical reaction (threat of invasion enabled the *sans-culottes* to exert dominance in the September massacres and the establishment of the Convention)
- the King's ambivalence in the face of war, dismissal of Girondin ministers and veto of the Legislative Assembly's measures encouraged radical demonstrations (storming of the Tuileries, June and August 1792)
- hostility to conscription (la Patrie en danger decree July 1792) raised opposition to passive citizenship and Brunswick manifesto (August 1792) threatening Paris with vengeance should harm come to the King, united *sans-culottes* in adversity

- arrival of fédérés in Paris strengthened the *sans-culottes* – in numbers and attitude; encouraged seizure of the Paris Commune which provided a power-base
- weakness of the Legislative Assembly (e.g. ignored petitions calling for the removal of the king, hence the *sans-culottes* were able to invade the Assembly and seize the king in August).

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might suggest that the growth in power of the *sans-culottes* was entirely linked to the coming of war and France's failures in that war. Without this there would have been less reason for a clash with the King and the Legislative Assembly might have appeared less weak. Alternatively, the seizure of the Paris Commune as a power-base might be seen as the most important factor in strengthening the *sans-culottes'* position and allowing for the organisation of events such as the September Massacres.

Question 2

04 How far was the development of the Terror in France due to counter-revolution?
(24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Factors suggesting that the development of the Terror in France was due to counter-revolution might include:

- fear that nobles and refractory priests (preying on the fears of Conservative peasants) were plotting to overthrow the regime had become more intense with the coming of war (April 1792) and the execution of the King (January 1793)
- wartime failures in the first half of 1793 – with the defection of Dumouriez, increasing economic difficulties and levées, breeding unrest – spread fear of counter-revolution further
- the counter-revolutionary rising in the Vendée (from February 1793) alarmed the Convention (which had to send regular troops from the front to deal with it)
- the Convention was obliged to establish a number of ‘extraordinary’ bodies through emergency measures March-May 1793 in order to combat this counter-revolution which threatened to undermine the French war effort and the political/social gains of revolution
- the Federalist revolt (which contained elements of counter-revolution) which the emergency measures provoked merely drove the government (and representatives on mission and local revolutionary leaders) further down the path of Terror.

Factors suggesting that counter-revolution was not responsible and other factors were more important might include:

- terror was the product of war – and in particular war-time failure and its economic/military demands
- terror was a reflection of the influence of the *sans-culottes* who pressed for radical measures
- the federal revolt which the terror sought to address was more a revolt against centralisation than true counter-revolution
- counter-revolution posed no greater threat in 1793 than it had 1789–1792 and that period had not produced a time of ‘Terror’
- the Terror was the work of Robespierre and his followers among the Jacobin Montagnards who had supported the King’s execution and dominated politics in France. From July 1793 Robespierre wielded immense power as a prominent member of the Committee of Public Safety
- the Terror was self-perpetuating – beginning with the Law of Suspects of September 1793 and the show trials of October–November 1793 – the definition of ‘enemy of the people’ grew (most particularly in June 1794) so that it became impossible to stop.

Good answers are likely to/may show awareness that whilst counter-revolution played an important role in the development of the Terror, it cannot be held solely responsible. The Terror was the product of a variety of circumstances – including the war and the leadership and a case could be made that any one of these was more important and that ‘counter-revolutionary activity was at best, an excuse for Terror and at worst, a myth, fabricated to justify it.

Question 3

05 Explain why there was little growth in the French economy under Napoleon. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why there was little growth in the French economy under Napoleon

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- Napoleon inherited a country weakened by political turmoil and in which under-investment had left the economy under-developed
- Napoleon's financial policies were more concerned with taxation to enable him to fight his wars and maintain his Empire than economic growth within France. (While plunder kept France buoyant, he showed limited interest in economic affairs)
- the Continental System was more a means of warfare against Britain than an economic measure and was undermined by smuggling
- the restrictions imposed by the Continental system and warfare with Britain hit French trade badly. British retaliation and lack of British imports harmed some manufacturing (although parts of France benefited – developing trade elsewhere)
- war brought the loss of colonial markets, removing a stimulus to economic development

- too much money was diverted to warfare so that communications remained poor, and technology backward
- the loss of men to the army limited workforce and demand.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they are likely to stress the demands of continual war as the key factor which prevented the growth of the French economy. Napoleon's own lack of interest might also be seen as a major linking factor here.

Question 3

- 06** How far had Napoleonic rule brought about equality within French society by 1815?
(24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by considering the ways in which Napoleonic rule had brought about equality and weighting these against the ways in which it failed to do so.

Factors suggesting that Napoleonic rule had brought about equality might include:

- no re-establishment of a hierarchy based on birth

- increased educational provision
- fairer taxation
- careers open to talent and promotion by merit (e.g. within the army)
- religious toleration (although Catholicism was recognised as the religion of the majority in the Concordat.)
- political involvement – e.g. use of plebiscites.

Factors suggesting Napoleonic rule had not brought about equality might include:

- the reintroduction of a system of honours and titles (and Napoleon's own hereditary position)
- the limitations on education – lycées for the sons of army officers and little interest in girls' education
- legal changes which emphasised the rights of fathers and males over women
- the livret and curbs on unions and workers
- the lack of influence for non-property owners.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that despite talk of upholding equality, Napoleonic France fell far short of that goal. However, the observant might also suggest that it would be wrong to judge equality (e.g. attitudes to women) in the Napoleonic era by present-day standards and that in comparison with the Ancien Regime there was a far greater degree of social 'equality'.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion