
AS HISTORY

Paper 2H France in Revolution, 1774–1795

Mark scheme

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

AS History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

2H France in Revolution, 1774–1795

Section A

0	1	With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining why the Civil Constitution of the Clergy led to divisions in France?	[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 of 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

- Source A is from a radical newspaper in Paris – therefore reflects the popular mood in Paris at the time – particularly the mood of the sans-culottes. The sans-culottes were against the Catholic Church as indicated by the dechristianisation that they carried out later on in the terror
- as a radical newspaper it could be expected to use exaggerated and inflammatory language
- the tone of the source may be commented on; phrases such as ‘The reign of the priests has passed’ and ‘tottering remains of ecclesiastical power’, indicate the language of radical newspaper in its attempt to appeal to the anti-Church sentiments of the sans-culottes.

Content and argument

- it celebrates the overthrow of what it sees as the reign of the priests
- it argues that bishops and priests were fomenting counter-revolution
- it argues that bishops were interested only in wealth and privilege, contrary to the Gospel

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- whether the Civil Constitution of the Clergy had the impact suggested, especially whether it was universally popular as the source seems to suggest
- the role played by churchmen in the beginnings of counter-revolution
- the extent to which the characterisation of churchmen is accurate

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

Provenance and tone

- this is written by an Archbishop who is against the Civil Constitution and has actually lost his seat as a result it; it could thus be expected that he would be hostile towards the Civil Constitution
- it is a public appeal or 'Warning' to his clergy and congregation and so is designed to be persuasive to win people over to his position
- the tone and emphasis may be commented on; the emphasis on 'spiritual authority' and 'immutable decrees' and 'head of the universal church' indicate the fury of the church at the interference by 'a purely civil authority'.

Content and argument

- the source argues that the Civil Constitution is bound to divide France
- it argues that the government has no legitimate authority in what us a spiritual domain
- it hopes that the laws will be revoked in what is a most Catholic kingdom

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- the degree to which the Civil Constitution lacked legitimacy or whether the Constituent Assembly had a new type of legitimacy
- the extent of division actually caused
- the characterisation of France as a most Catholic country in the era of the Enlightenment

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude that (e.g.) taken together, the two sources are valuable for showing the division of opinion over the Church in France in 1790. Both are partisan and clearly narrow in view and interpretation and any supported argument as to relative value should be fully rewarded.

Section B

- | | |
|----------|----------|
| 0 | 2 |
|----------|----------|
- 'It was the actions of the Paris Parlement that forced Louis XVI to agree to call an Estates-General.'

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.

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not.

Evidence which agrees with the statement might include:

- the part of the Paris Parlement in forcing a crisis by refusing to endorse early measures of tax reform
- its leadership in the outcry against ‘ministerial despotism’
- the impact of the Parlement's exile to Troyes (August 1787), refusing to accept Brienne's land tax proposals. This brought middle class citizens, particularly lawyers into the conflict – with protest centred on the Palais Royal – home of the duc d'Orléans. It inspired pamphlets defending individual rights
- the reaction of the Paris Parlement when surrounded by troops (November 1787) which led Parlement to publish ‘Fundamental Laws of the Kingdom’ (May 1788)
- the actions of the Paris Parlement inspired similar activity in the provinces and helped provoke the Revolt of the Nobles and riots in provincial capitals (e.g. the Day of Tiles, June 1788)
- responding to the leadership of the Paris Parlement, the clergy refused to offer more than a quarter of the King's request in its ‘don gratuit’. Such actions left the King with little option but summon an Estates-General.

Evidence which disagrees might include:

- in theory, the King could over-rule his parlements through the lit de justice – consequently the decision was essentially because of custom, the failings of his Ministers to win confidence, his involvement in further war which increased his debts and his own inability to control an escalating situation
- the calling of an Estates-General was primarily about the need to reform the taxation structure of France. It could be argued that this could not have been done any other way – whatever the attitude of the Paris Parlement
- had the King been able to continue to raise money through loans, the opposition of parlement would have made no difference to his actions
- other crucial factors include, the actions of the third estate, the revolt of the nobles, and the recall of Necker.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that the reluctance of the Paris Parlement to co-operate with the King certainly left him with fewer options, but that ultimately it was the declaration of bankruptcy which forced Louis to call the Estates-General.

0 3 'The Terror was successful in preserving the Republic.'

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.

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not.

Evidence which agrees might include:

- the various bodies established to deal with internal threats in the Vendee and other parts of France, such as representative en mission and revolutionary armies, helped restore order to France
- the Terror meant that measures could be introduced to speed up the process of dealing with other enemies of France, e.g. Marie-Antoinette and the Girondins
- the Economic Terror allowed the Republic to deal with potential economic chaos
- the measures applied during the Terror to fight the war – conscription, action against draft-dodgers and deserters, providing enough food for the army – allowed for victory and thus again helped to strengthen the Republic.

Evidence which disagrees might include:

- it actually turned many people against the Republic – it created great divisions and resentment – caused more harm than good. Led to the White Terror
- aspects of the Terror such as dechristianisation caused much bitterness
- the latter part of the Terror was not about saving the Republic but was about killing anyone whom Robespierre saw as a threat to his own quest for the ideal society, e.g. Danton and Desmoulins and many other innocent people who were killed in the Great Terror
- other factors helped save the Republic, e.g. the army was now made up of many fervent revolutionaries who had a passionate commitment to the cause and principles of 1789 and therefore made a formidable fighting force regardless of actions of CPS and the Terror.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that The Terror was successful in dealing with threats to the Republic but that this was at a huge cost to the people of France and it created a legacy of bitterness, which contributed to more violence in the White Terror.

