

# AS HISTORY 7041/2H

France in Revolution, 1774–1815

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

---

**Mark scheme**

June 2019

Version: 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](http://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, 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.

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. <b>Always</b> provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

## 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 attitudes to Louis XVI at the end of 1792? **[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 for attitudes to Louis XVI, students may refer to the following:**

### **Provenance and tone**

- this was written by Jacques Hébert, the editor of *Le Père Duchesne*, a radical, satirical paper which was popular among the sans-culottes and is valuable for reflecting their views regarding the King in the period between his arrest and execution
- the tone is mocking, scornful and vitriolic, mirroring the style of the newspaper and also the hatred which Hébert felt for Louis XVI, and his Prussian and Austrian equivalents
- the value of the source is limited in terms of explaining attitudes to Louis from other groups in society, but is very valuable in terms of the attitudes of the sans-culottes, a group which were growing in influence in this period.

### **Content and argument**

- according to the source, Louis XVI was a 'scoundrel' who deserved to be punished. In part this was because he was blamed for conspiring with the enemies of Austria and Prussia
- however, it also seems that he believes that kings in general deserve punishment, given his reference to the sovereignty of the people and that it is good for the people 'to become used to judging kings'. This view was common among the sans-culottes who were republican in nature and convinced, in particular, of the betrayal of Louis XVI
- he refers to the 'victorious armies' led by Dumouriez, referring to his victories against the Prussians at Valmy and against the Austrians at Jemappes which has boosted the confidence of the sans-culottes and their belief that they can destroy the monarchy
- he also appears to take pleasure in the idea of the execution of the King, given what he says about how splendid it would be to see all three killed at the same time. This suggests that he feels no sense of uncertainty or gravity over the idea of executing a monarch and feels only contempt for them.

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

**Provenance and tone**

- Morris was the US ambassador in Paris who would have been a keen observer of political events and therefore his views are valuable as coming from an outsider less immediately caught up in the events and yet fully aware of them
- he was writing in late December 1792 when the trial of the King was ongoing and therefore it is valuable in that he did not know the outcome when writing but was able to comment on the situation as it appeared at the time
- his tone is one of sorrow and sympathy for the King, reflecting his dislike of the radicalism of the revolutionaries, despite being a Republican himself.

**Content and argument**

- Morris argues that Louis XVI was the ‘mildest monarch’ ever to sit on the French throne and therefore that it seems bizarre that he should be facing this trial. Certainly, Louis was not a tyrant and in fact tended to be weak and indecisive rather than despotic, so this view is valuable when considering why Louis XVI was executed
- furthermore, he argues that Louis is being ‘persecuted as one of the worst tyrants to have lived’. The King was widely attacked in the popular press and by the Jacobins, with many calling for his death and yet, compared to many rulers he was far from being tyrannical
- his view is that the Assembly is purposely inciting hatred against Louis because he is in the way of them achieving their end, which is to create a Republic. One of the arguments for executing Louis was that while he remained, there was always the possibility that he could be reinstated as monarch, whereas if he was dead, there was no such possibility. Therefore this observation is very valuable in highlighting attitudes towards Louis by the end of 1792 and one of the reasons why he was executed in January 1793.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might argue that Source A is more valuable as it shows the hatred and lack of respect for the King which was shared by many ordinary people in late 1792 following the journée of 10 August. On the other hand, they might equally argue that Source B is more valuable as it highlights the reality that the Assembly wanted a Republic and this would be much more secure if the King were out of the way, which is the real reason so much hatred was poured out on him in the press.

## Section B

- 02** 'The errors made by Necker and Calonne, in the years 1778 to 1787, brought about the collapse of the royal finances.'

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 the errors made by Necker and Calonne, in the years 1778 to 1787, brought about the collapse of the royal finances might include:**

- one of the major reasons for the deterioration in the royal finances in this period was Necker's decision to fund the American War of Independence through loans rather than raising new taxes. The loan interest greatly increased the debt
- Necker's Comptes Rendus also made the situation worse as it wrongly suggested that there was a surplus in royal finances which made it much harder for Calonne to persuade the Assembly of Notables that reform was necessary
- furthermore, Calonne's own decision to try to increase confidence by lavish spending also added to the massive problem of debt and undermined his argument for reform when he realised that more fundamental change was necessary
- they all succeeded in offending influential people, partly because their policies were arguably too ambitious, or because they irritated those they were trying to persuade, such as when Calonne accused the Notables of being blinded by self-interest.

**Arguments challenging the view that the errors made by Necker and Calonne, in the years 1778 to 1787, brought about the collapse of the royal finances might include:**

- Louis XVI made the decision to enter the American War of Independence against Britain, even if Necker did support that decision, and therefore he is most responsible for the deterioration it brought to royal finances
- Louis failed to give his finance ministers the support they needed to carry through reform. For example, Necker resigned because of the hostility he faced from Marie-Antoinette, and Calonne was removed from his post for the same reason. This prevented measures which might have improved royal finances
- the finance ministers did make some improvements. For example, Necker reduced costs by reducing household expenses and pensions. Furthermore, many of their ideas were fundamentally the right ones and the tax on property was finally implemented by the Constituent Assembly
- the fundamental problem that income was insufficient to meet expenditure could only be overcome by major change and this was always going to be extremely difficult to achieve because of the many vested interests that existed against such change.

Students may argue that in reality the finance ministers were fairly limited in the options open to them, particularly given the vested interests against change and the relative weakness of the King who failed to stand by them when pressure mounted.

- 03** 'The flight to Varennes was the most significant reason for the failure of constitutional monarchy.'

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 the flight to Varennes was the most significant reason for the failure of constitutional monarchy might include:**

- the King literally ran away from his people. Whatever his ultimate intentions were there could be no clearer indication of his feelings about the new constitution and his place within it
- furthermore, rumours abounded that he planned to meet with the Austrians and seek their military help to overturn the recent changes and reinstate him with his former powers. These rumours damaged his reputation permanently among some people
- the letter he left behind justifying his actions seemed to suggest that he did not accept the reality of the changes to his position and his basic opposition to them
- the flight led to demands in the popular clubs and radical press for the abdication of the King and for a republic. It was as a result of this that the demonstration at the Champ de Mars took place, which was to have a long-term impact on those who were attacked, many of whom, such as Danton, Desmoulins and Marat, were to be important figures in bringing about the Republic.

**Arguments challenging the view that the flight to Varennes was the most significant reason for the failure of constitutional monarchy might include:**

- the Flight to Varennes took place in June 1791. The King remained in power for more than a year after that. Cries for a republic were suppressed and many of the deputies of the National Assembly were even reluctant to agree to a temporary suspension of the King. This suggests that even after this event, he still enjoyed some support and therefore was not 'fatally' undermined
- it could be argued that the National Assembly had themselves made constitutional monarchy unworkable when they insisted on the oath to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. This divided the nation and placed the King in a very difficult position. It was this which had primarily led him to flee Paris
- the declaration of war, in April 1792, brought many of the strains of constitutional monarchy to the fore, given that it increased suspicions of Louis XVI who was indeed in secret correspondence with his brothers and hoped for the restoration of his full powers. When the King appeared to be frustrating attempts of the Assembly to take action to deal with their enemies, for example by using his suspensory veto, he laid himself open to the claims of radicals that he was disloyal
- the growth of political clubs, in 1791–92, provided a place where more radical, republican ideas could be discussed and from where subversive ideas could be spread in the forms of revolutionary pamphlets and newspapers. They were instrumental in undermining constitutional monarchy.

Students might argue that the flight to Varennes did indeed fatally undermine constitutional monarchy as it revealed the King's fundamental opposition to it and his apparent willingness to appeal to another country for military help to reinstate his full powers. However, it might equally be argued that the growth in popular clubs, divisions caused by the Civil Constitution of the Clergy or the outbreak of war might all have led to the end of constitutional monarchy, even without the flight to Varennes, as the flight merely made clear what many already suspected.