

# A-LEVEL HISTORY

Unit HIS3H: Monarchies and Republics in France, 1815–1875  
Mark scheme

---

2041  
June 2014

---

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)

---

## 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 students. 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 students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or low Level 2 if some comment is included. Students 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. Students 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, students 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, students 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 students 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 students.

---

**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 students 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 students' 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*. Students 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 2014

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

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

**Question 1**

- 01** 'Although Charles X inherited a throne that was strong and successful in 1824, within six years he had personally destroyed it.'  
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 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 engage with the debate about the extent to which the monarchy was strong and successful by 1824, and in addition the debate over the extent to which Charles X was personally responsible for its collapse. In addition, students may consider the long-term and short-term factors involved.

In support of the argument that Charles X destroyed a strong and successful monarchy students might deploy some of the following material:

- the monarchy was popular in 1824 and Louis XVIII had done much to secure the position of monarchy within government. Charles X was thus well received by the majority in 1824
- Charles X's previous attempts to move the monarchy had created a fear however that was reinforced by the nature of his atavistic coronation
- the law to compensate émigrés 1825 created further distrust, especially amongst the pays legal. This only served to further undermine the position of Charles X who was seen as the motive force
- Charles and the Ultras' religious views caused further concern amongst the pays legal – the image that the anti-sacrilege war gave was one that Charles X proved unable and perhaps unwilling to shift
- an inconsistent attitude to the press and to censorship further added to the impression of a lack of direction
- Charles X's treatment of the Chamber and the deputies did little to endear him, especially considering that the parliamentary system had been working quite well. The creation of a new ministry with Polignac at its head was a considerable mistake
- the July Ordinances prove that by July 1830 Charles had lost the support that the monarchy had had in 1824.

To refute the argument students might include some of the following material:

- whilst the majority of Louis XVIII's reign may be considered successful, it was clear that sections of French society never engaged with prospect of a constitutional monarchy and that there remained a fundamental weakness to the 1814 Charter which Louis XVIII failed to address
- the last years of Louis XVIII's reign were not ones that secured the position of the throne. The increase in the number of Deputies and the emergence in 1822 of the Comte de Villele as the parliamentary leader of the Ultras smacked of a fundamental instability at the core of government
- the slide away from a moderate approach and stability had therefore begun sometime before Charles became king
- the compensation of the émigrés became a cause celebre amongst the Pays legal but was in fact a reasonably moderate measure considering the demands placed upon the monarch

- the vast majority of the population, especially in rural areas, supported the sacrilege law which became a means of opposing Charles for an already hostile group, rather than the motivating force behind opposition
- Villele's attitude to government did not allow compromise – a position that had not been eased by Louis XVIII's dismissal of Chateaubriand. Charles was in many respects facing an impossible task of appealing to both the emerging left and the growing right
- the suggestion that Charles X was poorly advised certainly carries some weight in 1830.

**Question 2**

- 02** 'Despite a strong sense of purpose, the foreign policy of the Second Empire completely failed to achieve its objectives.'  
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 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 engage well with this central question. The better response will probably address the nature of the double focus and will assess the degree to which there was a strong sense of purpose combined with the extent to which the objectives were achieved.

Students may use some of the following material in support of the quotation:

- Napoleon III clearly had high expectations for foreign policy and believed that the period of France's foreign subservience should come to an end
- this aim was balanced by the need for moderation 'l'Empire, c'est la paix'
- hence Napoleon set out to destroy the territorial settlement of Vienna but to do so peacefully
- the decision to fight in the Crimea might indicate a strong sense of purpose: the desire to protect the Holy Places simply an excuse for an entirely reasonable policy aimed at keeping Britain and Russia at loggerheads and to give Napoleon an early foreign policy success. The failure was that he could not foresee or control subsequent events, and especially the actions of the Turks
- Italy had proven how little Napoleon was able to advance his clear objectives. Rather than French aid for reunification, Napoleon had created a resentful, partial state that was secular and had done little to appease the Pope
- involvement in Mexico was a clear failure. The execution of Maximilian in 1867 became symbolic of the abject defeat of French foreign policy
- increasingly ignored, for example in his Polish policy, Napoleon's foreign policy increasingly angered a population eager for glory
- the Franco-Prussian war caused the collapse of Napoleon's rule. The war itself was prompted by Napoleon's extravagant claims and sense of importance and he was quickly bettered by the politics of Bismarck. The siege of Paris a visual testament to the utter failure of policy.

Students may offer some of the following material to argue against the statement:

- Napoleon III had aspirations but even here there was inconsistency. There was never any convincing explanation if the Empire was about peace or war. Napoleon seemed to want glory but lacked the desire to take convincing action. Napoleon's policy flattered according to circumstance
- L'Empire, c'est la paix had a hollow ring to it when Napoleon so willingly went to war in the Crimea within 18 months of having said it. This might be combined with the fact that he became increasingly subject to events here rather than the master of them
- the Treaty of Paris did however, despite this inconsistency of objective, see success. Napoleon had effectively split the unity of powers established post Vienna and had ended the diplomatic isolation of France
- the Italian crisis showed a clear change in Napoleon's objectives mid-way through and indeed it is difficult to argue that Napoleon was ever really in control of events. Whilst events did run away from Napoleon, it might be argued that this was not entirely of Napoleon's doing – he reacted as best as he might to an evolving crisis which only seems poor with hindsight

- the Crimea was hardly a success for any power, yet France emerged reasonably successful. In addition, it is unclear if the French actually desired an extensive foreign policy of aggression
- some students may cast Napoleon as a victim of Prussian aggression and of Bismarck's wider policies. The EMS telegram might be used as evidence of this.

**Question 3**

- 03** How far was the instability within France in the years 1831 to 1875 due to Republican opposition? **[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 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 access this question well. At the higher end one might expect a clear identification of the opponents faced by the regimes, and indeed as a breadth question, some awareness of change and continuity over time. This might take the form of recognising that the nature of opposition changed as did the groups. At the highest levels there should be a clear focus on the issue of actions of opponents rather than simply their existence.

Students might offer some of the following material in support of the premise:

- Louis-Philippe was unlucky in that there were so many alternative forms of government available to opponents. Sympathetic histories of ‘the Republic’ encouraged opposition to the Bourgeois monarch, as did romantic notions of life under Napoleon – all of this fed into a certain romanticism about life under a republic
- the myth of republicanism and the sense of a golden age at the fall of the Ancien Regime increased. The reign of Charles X and of Louis-Philippe did not really advance the image of crowned heads
- 1848 might simply be the continuation of the work begun in 1789
- Thiers and others in the Legislative Assembly advocated dramatic change to the franchise
- the banquets subsequently held from 1847, although ostensibly directed against Thiers, was clearly focused on opposing apparent government inertia and became increasingly radicalised
- the National Guard itself became a focus of opposition to Louis-Philippe and became increasingly republican in nature
- the number of arrests and indeed those exiled to Algeria under Napoleon, indicates the scale of potential opposition that he faced
- the events of 1870 brought the opposition to the fore but this republicanism and desire to return to a representative liberalisation, had been a feature of the Empire throughout.

Students may refer to some of the following material to challenge the premise of Republican opposition:

- whilst opposition under Louis-Philippe and Guizot focused on the apparent inertia over social reform, it was the prevailing economic condition that brought this to the fore. This may have manifested itself as republicanism but at heart was little more than social and economic discontent
- Louis-Philippe can be personally blamed for much. He failed to live up to the popular image of a monarch and seemed immune to popular movements. This was however, personal opposition to the character of Louis-Philippe rather than to a system of government
- the collapse of the regime came with the flight of Louis-Philippe, not the violence of the political opponents
- Napoleon struggled to develop a political system that was in line with the expectations of the population. Over-reliance on some ministers further weakened his position
- aptitude for dramatic change waned during the period rather than escalated
- domestic achievement under Napoleon was stilted and seemed not to address the fundamental economic and financial crisis of the period
- the government fell because of foreign policy failure, not the strength of opponents

- instability in the years after 1870 were necessarily a consequence of defeat in war and the flight of the Emperor. The period of republican success was tempered by the consequences of foreign occupation.

### **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)