



# **General Certificate of Education**

## **A2 History 2041**

### **Unit 3: HIS3H**

### **Monarchies and Republics in France, 1815–1875**

## **Mark Scheme**

**Specimen mark scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards**  
**This mark scheme uses the [new numbering system](#)**

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the operational exams.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2010 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 A2

The A2 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 a good historian must be able to combine a range of skills and knowledge. 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 low Level 2 if some comment is included. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at Level 2 or low Level 3 depending on their synoptic understanding and linkage of ideas. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(b)) and will have access to the higher mark ranges.

To obtain an award of Level 3 or higher, candidates will need to address the synoptic requirements of A Level. The open-ended essay questions set are, by nature, synoptic and encourage a range of argument. Differentiation between performance at Levels 3, 4, and 5 therefore depends on how a candidate's knowledge and understanding are combined and used to support an argument and the how that argument is communicated.

The mark scheme emphasises features which measure the extent to which a candidate has begun to *'think like a historian'* and show higher order skills. As indicated in the level criteria, candidates will show their historical understanding by:

- The way the requirements of the question are interpreted
- The quality of the arguments and the range/depth/type of material used in support
- The presentation of the answer (including the level of communication skills)
- The awareness and use of differing historical interpretations
- The degree of independent judgement and conceptual understanding shown

It is expected that A2 candidates will perform to the highest level possible for them and the requirements for Level 5, which demands the highest level of expertise have therefore been made deliberately challenging in order to identify the most able candidates.

## **CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**

### ***A2 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:

- Depth and precision in the use of factual information
- Depth and originality in the development of an argument
- The extent of the synoptic links
- 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)
- The way the answer is brought together in the conclusion

---

**Specimen Mark Scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards****A2 Unit 3: The State and the People: Change and Continuity****HIS3H: Monarchies and Republics in France, 1815–1875****Question 1**

- 01** How far was the failure to establish a successful republican regime in France between 1815 and creation of the Third Republic in 1870 due to the strength of conservatism in France? (45 marks)

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

**Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2**

- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They 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, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. 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. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**

**L5:** Answers will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be very well-structured and fluently written.

**38-45**

### 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 aware of Louis XVIII's attempts to steer a middle course between the Ultras and Republicans during his reign. They should be aware of how this was affected by the assassination of the Duc de Berry and the accession of Charles X in 1824. Charles's early actions, such as his coronation, his support of the Church, as evidenced by the sacrilege law and the land settlement, can be argued to show a lack of political acumen. These factors led to an increase in opposition to the restored Bourbon monarchy by liberals, republicans and the Ultras. The defenders of constitutionalism who held the middle ground in French politics also mistrusted Charles. Again Charles showed a lack of political acumen when he disbanded the National Guard in 1827. This was compounded by his actions when he tried to reassert royal authority with Polignac in 1830 with the Four Ordinances of St Cloud, when Charles went on a hunting trip rather than being in Paris or Versailles. Also, the absence of the best troops in the army, who were in Algeria, was also a decision lacking in acumen.

Other factors which caused the failure of the Bourbon Restoration were the presence of an unstable right-wing party, the articulate and well-developed urban liberal movement, and economic change which can be said to have fuelled the political and social unrest in France at this time. There was an economic recession going on since 1826 and Charles did very little to deal with this. It can be argued that economic development boosted the strength of the bourgeoisie, multiplied the numbers of cafés where politics were discussed and generated a demand for education among the petty bourgeoisie and popular classes. Some historians argue that the Revolution of 1830 was really against the reappearance of a noble class in France, linked closely to the clergy, who all looked back to the 18<sup>th</sup> century, led by the bourgeoisie who opposed the increased influence of the Church.

It can be argued that the first clear failure of republicanism in this period was the creation of the Orleanist Monarchy in 1830 as a compromise between all groups. Even so, selecting to continue with the monarchy shows the strength of conservatism even though reform was expected. As this reform did not materialise, the King's (Louis Philippe's) association with the so-called conservative 'party of resistance' became evident in the 1830s. The strength of the opposition press, reform banquets and the development of socialism could be said to indicate the likelihood of another revolution that would lead this time to a republic. However, radicals opposed conservative liberals and constitutional monarchists feared the republicans. For example, Red Republicans, led by Ledru-Rollin, frightened moderate republicans who feared attacks on property, increased taxation and the admission of the potentially violent masses to the political arena. The National Workshops became a focus of middle class resentment and the Government's attempts to expel unmarried men from the workshops and to close them down caused a violent clash between the radicals and conservatives in the June Days of 1848. Even though the monarchy was overthrown in this year the forces of conservatism survived in the forms of the Church, army and aristocracy. The Constituent Assembly elections of March 1848 produced an assembly with a monarchist majority, which was evidence for the conservatism of the French peasants outside of Paris. In the Presidential elections of

---

December 1848, Ledru-Rollin received only 370,000 votes compared to the 1,448,107 votes of General Cavaignac and the 5,434,226 votes of Louis Napoleon, this representing a triumph for the forces of conservatism. Louis Napoleon's election manifesto had pledged the reduction of taxation and unemployment, the expansion of private enterprise, freedom of the press, and the protection of the educational rights of the Catholic Church (*Loi Falloux*, March 1850), all of which appealed to the conservative element in French society. This was compounded by Louis Napoleon in 1851 and the creation of the Second Empire in 1852.

When the Second Empire fell in 1870, a republic was created but again even though the Communards had sought to create a radical republic, Thiers ensured that the Republic was conservative in nature. In fact, in putting down the Paris Commune he ensured that the radicals were in no position to launch an active bid for power for some time.

Candidates could argue that personalities were another important factor as to why republicanism took such a long time to be successful. For example, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte seemed to appeal to republicanism initially due to his escapades before 1848. His attempted uprising in Strasbourg (1836) and attack on Boulogne (1840) were an attempt to replace the Orléanist monarchy and led to his imprisonment. Once in power as President of the Second Republic, he allowed himself to be influenced by the conservative Right who supported his *coup d'état* of 1851. In power he showed himself to have autocratic tendencies until the creation of the liberal empire in the late 1850s. The plebiscite that showed support for the new constitution of 1851 and the extension of his period of office as President, which amounted to the introduction of a benevolent dictatorship and his triumphant tour of the provinces in 1852 showed popular support for his actions. In this year another plebiscite ratified his return to Empire and these points are examples of the conservative nature of France outside Paris. This is another factor why republicanism took so long to be successful. With Louis Napoleon it can be argued that after the experiences of 1848 to 1849 people had wearied of parliamentary struggles and the disorders caused by radicalism which could influence republican regimes. The demand for a 'strong man' to govern France grew and this was more likely to encourage conservatism rather than republicanism.

Higher level candidates should make a balanced judgement based on widely selected contextual support, which is precise. They should also show an understanding of the whole period covered in the question and refer to major turning points at least.

---

**Question 2**

- 02** To what extent were the governments of France successful in their foreign policy aims in the years 1814 to 1831? (45 marks)

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

**Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2**

- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They 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, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. 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. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be very well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**



---

**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.**

Foreign policy during the Bourbon Restoration was very guarded as it could not afford to offend the foreign powers that had made it happen at the Congress of Vienna. They had been apprehensive about the restoration of Louis XVIII in case the French people insisted on the national glory they had become used to. They might have reacted against Louis' dull monarchy. Even so, Louis XVIII had one successful foreign venture but failed to gain much popularity from it. French armies invaded Spain in 1823 in order to free the King, Ferdinand VIII, from the control of liberal politicians who had forced him to restore a constitution that greatly reduced his power. The French armies were quickly victorious. Little enthusiasm was shown in France, however – perhaps because the campaign restored a despotic ruler to power.

Charles X aimed to achieve great public acclaim with his major foreign adventure. For centuries North African pirates, known as the Barbary Pirates, had taken their toll of shipping near the entrance to the Mediterranean. They had committed barbaric murders and carried off Christians to slavery. Charles X sent a large expeditionary force against them in 1830. The venture was successful and the pirates' main base, Algiers, was captured. However, hardly had news of the seizure of Algiers arrived in Paris when Charles was forced into exile.

Candidates should be aware of Louis Philippe's position as a ruler who owed his position to being selected in 1830 as a result, in part, of a successful publicity campaign. The other rulers of the major states of Russia, Prussia and Austria owed their position to the principle of hereditary monarchy. Louis Philippe realised that an aggressive foreign policy could unite these powers against him. Accordingly, his conduct in foreign affairs could be considered restrained and unambiguous. He wished to be accepted by the other rulers and saw foreign policy as an area where he could achieve this acceptance. He tried to reassure the European powers that after the disorder of 1830, France posed no threat to international peace and stability. He wished to promote an atmosphere in which middle-class commercial interests were able to flourish, and hoped to establish improved relations with Britain as a means of restraining the legitimate monarchies in the east. Even so, whilst not seeking to reassert French domination in Europe, he did seek opportunities to gain any advantage and prestige which shrewd manoeuvring might secure for France. These points should be counterbalanced by a discussion of popular expectations. The French were accustomed to the glories of military conquest and regarded their ruler as the natural provider of prestige and influence in Europe. Since the defeat of Napoleon in 1815, the French had an overwhelming wish to reverse the humiliation of military defeat and a desire to re-establish France as the dominant Continental power.

The significant episode, within the time frame of the question, in French foreign policy against which Louis Philippe's success can be judged is Belgium (1830). When the Belgians rose up against their Dutch masters many Frenchmen saw this as an opportunity to reassert French authority in a French-speaking area that had been conquered by Napoleon. Louis Philippe resisted the temptation to annex Belgium and worked with Britain to establish its independence. He also refused to allow his son to accept an invitation to become King of the new state. This won the approval of Britain.

Stronger answers will clearly judge how far the regimes were successful in achieving their aims balanced against popular expectations and the context of their rule including the effect of foreign influence.

---

**Question 3**

- 03** 'Napoleon III's attempts to reform the Second Empire (1852–1870) were a genuine attempt to liberalise the government of France.'  
To what extent do you agree with this view? (45 marks)

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

**Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2**

- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They 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, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. 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. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be very well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**
-

---

**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 may well begin their answer with some discussion of the conservative nature of the Second Empire and Napoleon III's Authoritarian Empire (1852 to 1859). This is a good context on which to base discussion of the liberalisation of the Empire. This could involve discussion of the constitution, the repression of opposition, the winning of loyalty and the gagging of the press.

One of the first reforms of the Liberal Empire had been the granting of a general amnesty to all political opponents still under sentence following the *coup* of 1851 but candidates might be aware that the main domestic stimulus to reform had been the formation, in 1863, of the 'Third Party'. The origins of this group lay in a group of 40 members of the government majority in the legislative body who broke away, not to oppose the government outright, but to press for further reform within a constitutional framework. They were joined by others from different political backgrounds such as Orleanists and former republicans such as Émile Ollivier. Other pressures for reform that deserve consideration are the failure of the Mexican expedition and the virtual collapse of the Pereire banking empire. Higher level candidates will probably engage with the debate as to whether the liberalisation of the Empire was always Napoleon III's intention as he claimed or whether it happened because he felt his regime and its hereditary succession would be threatened if such a liberalisation did not happen. Some historians have argued it was only a temporary expedient to be reversed at the first opportunity. Candidates could discuss the mandate for reform provided by the 1869 elections. Some discussion of reforms from 1865 to 1870 is appropriate to analyse their nature in terms of liberalisation, for example, under the new laws of September 1869 the legislative body could propose legislation, elect its own officers, and debate and vote on the budget. Trade Unions were legalised by 1868. Initially it could be argued that the main threat to the Emperor had not come from republicans or radicals, but from the Orleanist and other conservatives who saw little need for a Napoleonic figure now that stabilisation and the preservation of property had been completed. Some historians argue that liberalisation was a form of inspired *realpolitik* to form new alliances to thwart conservative designs.

Candidates can see the ambiguity of the Emperor's attitude to suggest that liberalisation was not genuine and therefore only a political expedient to appease his opponents. Reforms failed in education, where the Church was not yet ready to yield control of primary education, and in the army, where a set of proposals to reform the army and make it stronger led to much opposition from republicans, bourgeoisie and peasants. Candidates may also be aware of the ill health of the Emperor from 1865 and how this might have affected his ability to fight opposition and risk the succession.