



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2011**

**A2 History 2041**

**HIS3H**

**Unit 3H**

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

**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](http://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 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

June 2011

## A2 Unit 3: The State and the People: Change and Continuity

### HIS3H: Monarchies and Republics in France, 1815–1875

#### Question 1

- 01** 'The collapse of the July Monarchy was due to short-term political miscalculations.'  
Assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

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

#### Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- 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. **1-6**
- 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 an 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good 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 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.**

Answers should assess the significance of 'short-term miscalculations' in the fall of the July monarchy against other, long-term causal factors. It could be argued that Louis-Philippe's regime was always fragile and thus always vulnerable to any short-term economic, financial or foreign policy crisis. Against this, it could be argued that economic prosperity and the rise of the middle classes showed France advancing towards modernity and democracy in the 1840s and that everything suddenly went wrong from 1846 because of avoidable political errors.

Factors in support of the key quotation might include:

- the re-emergence of republican slogans in the popular press at least encouraged by the Campagne des Banquets
- the use of the banquets by radicals using them as a vehicle for pre existing republican demands they were unwilling to compromise
- the use of these banquets by moderates to rally support within the law; the ineffective and counter-productive reaction by the government; subsequent prohibition as a rallying cry
- the dismissal of Guizot; lack of consistent response from the government to political pressure
- the flight of Louis-Philippe confirmed the collapse of the regime, although this in itself was not the sole determinant of collapse. It was the lack of faith in the government.

Candidates are likely to balance assessment rather than narrative of short term political factors with some, although by no means all, of the following:

- fundamental weakness of the regime. The regime was itself a convenience, a compromise in a period of crisis that was unlikely to last
- Ideology: 1848 as the attempted culmination of a period of revolutionary/republican thinking established in 1789. The collapse of bourgeois political hegemony
- the existence of groups, such as the Legitimists with a vested interest in the collapse of the new order
- the failure to respond to demands for social reform, especially in the context of the political and social changes occurring in Great Britain
- the unsuccessful and uninspiring foreign policy that did little to bolster the glory of France or of the regime
- the character failings of Louis-Philippe and his own unremarkable lifestyle
- economic and financial crisis from 1846 especially that focused on Paris.

More able candidates may well conclude that no one factor determined the collapse of the July Monarchy. The July Monarchy was more obviously 'constitutional' than the rule of the Bourbon Kings, but was perhaps prone to crisis. It may be argued that Louis-Philippe was 'too republican to be acceptable to monarchists but too monarchist to be accepted by republicans' – there are clearly a range of long-term political factors that might be considered.

## Question 2

- 02** 'The foreign policy of Napoleon III was a complete failure.'  
Assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

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

### Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- 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. **1-6**
- 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 an 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good 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 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.**

This question requires an overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the foreign policy of the Second Empire under Napoleon III. There is a range of possible arguments and the opportunity for differentiated assessments: perhaps agreeing with the key quotation; perhaps disputing the fact that there was '*complete*' failure'.

Answers cannot be expected to be comprehensive or even in coverage but it is essential to address the period 1852 to 1870 as a whole, even if some aspects are covered in more depth and detail. A balanced response should consider both successes and failures of foreign policy and should perhaps also provide some criteria for determining it as such.

Evidence might include:

Arguments in support of the quotation:

- the apparent triumph of the unification of Italy in 1861 might well be considered to have actually included a series of failures. Certainly the rise of a secular Italy was uncomfortable and did little to appease the pope
- Napoleon's involvement in Mexico was a key failure. Certainly it damaged Napoleon's reputation. Given the expectations that were aroused by French intervention, the eventual collapse of French policy was all the more keenly felt. The execution of Maximilian in 1867 after the complete withdrawal of French forces became symbolic of Napoleon's foreign policy delusions
- defeat in the Franco-Prussian War caused the collapse of Napoleon's regime. The war itself might be used as further evidence of Napoleon's disastrous inability to comprehend the changing realities of international relations in this period
- the disaster of 1870 came on the back of a decade of embarrassing snubs in the European sphere that sat very uncomfortably with French public opinion. Napoleon himself had failed to appreciate the rise of Prussia.

Arguments to oppose the quotation:

- it is difficult to conclude that the whole period was one of complete failure. In Italy there were obvious successes from 1858 to 1861 – judgements of failure can only be made in hindsight
- Napoleon had good reason in 1861 to believe that his own and France's international prestige had been significantly increased and that France had again become the power of note
- the Crimean War did much, at least initially, to strengthen France's position in Europe, and might be considered to have led in turn to a series of successful foreign policy events such as the creation of Romania under French auspices. The Treaty of Paris in 1856 could be used as evidence of a successful foreign policy and the emergence of a renewed prestige for France.



---

**Question 3**

- 03** How significant was the part played by the Church in the political changes in France in the years 1815 to 1875? (45 marks)

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

**Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2**

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- 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. **1-6**
- 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 an 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good 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 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.**

This question allows candidates to consider a full range of significant influences on French politics in some breadth. Whilst a full coverage of the period might be expected from the more effective answers, it is certainly not expected that every factor is covered. However, there should be at least some consideration of the role of the Church during this period. There should also be some attempt to determine the criteria of 'significant influence' and whether this was on ministers or those that headed government.

Some evidence used might include:

Arguments in support:

- the church might be considered one of the major factors that undermined Charles X – especially the fear that his position seemed to engender
- the Catholic Church grew obviously in presence; debates over its position in French society thus came to dominance under Charles X
- Louis-Philippe and especially Napoleon III were expected to be good friends of the Catholic Church at periods of their rule. This was especially true in Napoleon III's efforts to restore the authority of the Pope.

Arguments against:

- candidates might reasonably identify a range of significant other factors
- ideology might be considered, especially in the periods of significant change, to have played a key role. 1848 is an obvious turning point in this respect
- individuals might be considered to have been more significant. The role of character in the period 1852 to 1870 was clearly highly important, especially in foreign policy
- economic and financial concerns might be taken as significant. This might be especially true from 1846 to the early 1850s.

It is probable that many candidates will argue that a range of factors had influence and that none can be taken in isolation. Considering the historiographical emphasis placed on the individuals it may well be their achievements, or lack of character, that may be determined to have had the most significant impact.

## 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](http://www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion)