



AS History

7041/2H- France in Revolution, 1774–1815

Component 2H The end of Absolutism and the French Revolution, 1774–1795

Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 1.0 Final

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

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

Level of response marking instructions

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

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

Step 1 Determine a level

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

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

Step 2 Determine a mark

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

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

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

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

France in Revolution, 1774–1815**Component 2H The end of Absolutism and the French Revolution, 1774–1795****Section A**

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the reasons for the Federalist Revolt in 1793?

[25 marks]

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **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.

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.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

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

Provenance and tone

- Le Père Duchesne was a newspaper written by Hébert, a radical journalist who encouraged sans-culottes insurrections and was an enemy of the Girondins
- the tone of the source is urgent and provocative as it is a call to action and a clear attempt to incite insurrection against the Girondins with their moderation described as ‘poison’
- it is written in response to increasing tension between the Girondins and the Montagnards in May 1793 following the defection of Dumouriez and attempts by the Girondins to indict Marat and anticipates civil war.

Content and argument

- his argument is that the Girondins are counter-revolutionary, the ‘accomplices of Capet and Dumouriez’, attempting to tarnish them because of their more moderate stand on what should happen to the King and the defection of Dumouriez, and that they present a real danger to the republic
- he argues that the Girondins in the provinces are arming themselves against Paris, which has some truth; although in reality they didn’t have sufficient power, resources or organisation to create real opposition to Paris. Even so, they were preparing to take action to defend the Girondins, should that be necessary, although Hebert’s suggestion is that it is the Girondins who are ‘moving heaven and earth to stir up civil war’ when arguably it is the Girondins who face the real risk
- this suggests that the Federalist Revolt which follows is orchestrated by the Girondins because they are counter-revolutionary and desire civil war. However, the federal revolts were not – with the exception of Toulon – counter-revolutionary but a reaction to the Jacobins and their attempt to force Parisian policies on the rest of France, then exacerbated by the sans-culottes insurrection of June 2nd which ultimately is what Hébert is encouraging here.

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

Provenance and tone

- this is an address from Marseilles, one of the main centres of revolt, following the expulsion of the Girondins from the National Convention on June 2nd
- it is a call to arms to other parts of France and uses rousing language to try to stir them to take action against the ‘infamous den of Jacobins’.

Content and argument

- Marseilles was one of the cities which reacted strongly to the expulsion of the Girondins on June 2nd along with a number of others including Bordeaux, Caen and Toulon. Its description of ‘your deputies’ being ‘in irons’ is the reason given for taking action against the Jacobins
- one of the reasons for the revolts, and indeed for the division between the Girondins and Montagnards, was resentment at the attempt of the latter to force their policies on France as a whole as highlighted in the source
- the source also suggests that the Marseillais feel that they are capable of threatening the Jacobins and marching to Paris, partly based on the role they played on August 10. This is emphasised by their description of themselves as ‘thunderbolts’. This suggests that their plans were ambitious even though they were not, in the end, able to follow this through
- the division between the Girondins and the Jacobins grew increasingly bitter over the course of 1793 and this is reflected here with the mendacious qualities of intrigue and crime juxtaposed with virtue, justice and liberty, something which is quite ironic given Robespierre’s obsession with virtue.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might argue that Source B is more valuable in explaining why the Federalist Revolt started as it is written by one of the areas which decided to engage in that revolt whereas Source A is written before the revolt actually starts. On the other hand, Source A does highlight the division between the Girondins and Montagnards and is valuable in highlighting the view of the sans-culottes, that the Girondins were the cause of the civil war rather than being the injured party.

Section B

- 02** 'Before the first meeting of the Estates-General in May 1789, the Third Estate was a strongly divided group.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that before the first meeting of the Estates-General in May 1789, the Third Estate was a strongly divided group might include:

- the estate ranged from rich merchants, industrialists and farmers owning large amounts of land to unskilled workers and poverty-stricken peasants. Extremes of wealth produced very different interests and outlooks
- the unskilled poor were very vulnerable to fluctuations in bread prices, sometimes facing starvation, and resented/hated their bourgeois employers and wealthier members of the Third Estate who lived in relative luxury
- the rural Third Estate had little in common with their urban counterparts; townfolk often blamed peasant hoarding for high bread prices; rural peasants were generally more strongly religious than workers in the towns
- the bourgeoisie was well-educated, affected by enlightenment ideas (encouraging them to seek reform and political participation) and shared the outlook of the more enlightened nobility. Lower members of the Third Estate were illiterate, particularly in the countryside. While the peasants wanted freedom from their seigneurs, the bourgeoisie wanted access to positions closed to them because of their non-noble status.

Arguments challenging the view that before the first meeting of the Estates-General in May 1789, the Third Estate was a strongly divided group might include:

- the Third Estate was universally excluded from high office in Church, State and army and were united in their lack of political influence
- all members were subject to the full range of state and Church taxes and duties (such as the corvée), uniting them in their resentment of their unfair treatment
- the Estate was a single group in legal terms and subject to a process of law that was different from that of the upper two Estates; for example, if a member of the Third Estate committed a capital offence he would be hanged rather than beheaded by a sword
- the Third Estate depended on secular work (whether by hand or brain) for its income and, with some limited exceptions among the haute bourgeoisie, ambitions were limited and their opportunities for advancement restricted.

Overall, it is reasonable to say that the Third Estate was indeed a strongly divided group, given that the main unifying factor was that they were neither members of the clergy nor the nobility. The 'commoners' varied greatly and there was often conflict between them, for example between employer and employee. Despite this they were a single group in legal terms and the preparations for the Estates-General served to increase their consciousness of the common burdens they shared by dint of their being in the Third Estate.

- 03** 'Crowd action was the most significant factor in bringing about a political revolution in France between May and October 1789.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that crowd action was the most significant factor in bringing about a political revolution in France between May and October 1789 might include:

- the King was reluctant to accept the National Assembly and was building up troops around Paris in late June and early July. Without the action of the Parisian Crowds, before and including 14 July, it is very possible that the political revolution would not have survived
- the Commune and the National Guard were set up in response to the threat of violence – to a breakdown of order by the people as well as to potential action by the King. As violence spread across the towns of France, National Guard units were set up there as well. These provided the bourgeoisie with the ability to defend themselves and happened partly in response to crowd action
- the August Decrees were passed in response to the violence in the countryside during the Great Fear, which included attacking landlords' chateaux and burning terriers. The National Assembly was forced to respond to this widespread violence and feudal rights were abolished, something that signified real change and which was arguably revolutionary
- the King only agreed to accept the August Decrees and the Declaration of Rights following the march of 6000-7000 people (mostly women) in October 1789 when some of his bodyguards were killed and the King and the Assembly were forced to go to Paris.

Arguments challenging the view that crowd action was the most significant factor in bringing about a political revolution in France between May and October 1789 might include:

- the Third Estate deputies were a more significant factor in bringing about a political revolution. They began the process of change when they broke away from the Estates General, declared themselves the National Assembly and swore the Tennis Court Oath. Without their initiative the violence would have been pointless
- it is possible that the National Assembly would have acted to end feudal rights even without the violence, given the impact of the enlightenment and the cahiers, which had been drawn up, particularly as the August decrees went further than the peasants had envisaged
- the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen was the result of enlightened thinking by the deputies and a desire to set out the grounds on which the new constitution would be based, not a response to action by the crowds
- the enlightenment had led to demands for changes in the way France was governed and leaflets such as 'What is the Third Estate?' had created an impetus for change which encouraged the deputies to act despite the opposition they faced. This suggests that the main factor in bringing about a political revolution was intellectual.

Students might question to what extent a political revolution took place in this period although this is not necessary in order to do well. They might argue that crowd action was essential both in order to preserve change, for example after the establishment of the National Assembly, and to provoke change, for example with the Great Fear. However, a political revolution could not have come about without the deputies who took the initiative in June 1789 and, under the influence of enlightenment thinking, started the process of political change. Without their actions, violence would have achieved nothing. On the other hand, it is equally true that without the actions of the crowd, the National Assembly might not have survived and that no political revolution would have taken place.