



A-level HISTORY 7042/2H

Component 2H France in Revolution, 1774-1815

Mark scheme

June 2022

Version: 1.0 Final



2 2 6 A 7 0 4 2 / 2 H / M S

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 Examiner.

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

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges 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 schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2022 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the reaction of the French people to life under Napoleon in the years 1801 to 1808.

[30 marks]*Target: AO2**Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.***Generic Mark Scheme**

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25–30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19–24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13–18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7–12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1–6**
- 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.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- although limited, in coming from an Englishman, this journalist's account shows his keen eye for detail and demonstrates an emotional response which was likely to have been shared by the French people present at the ceremony described. It is a first-hand account with plentiful reference to the behaviour and reaction of the French crowds in attendance
- written in November 1801, after Napoleon had entrenched his position as First Consul, (following his 1799 coup), this source provides evidence of how people were responding to the regal way in which Napoleon was behaving; in 1800, Napoleon had moved into the Tuileries Palace, created the Consular Guard and had begun instituting regal ceremonies like the levée; the source gives a valuable indication of how such grandeur impressed the Parisian crowds
- writing privately to a friend, it can be expected that this source provides an accurate representation of what the author saw. Although Blagdon's gift for words suggests some hyperbole, this nevertheless provides some trustworthy detail of crowd behaviour, with the enthusiasm described matching the 99.9% approbation given him in the plebiscite of 1800
- the source paints a vivid and dramatic picture of a clearly unforgettable scene. The author notes the detail which made the ceremony so impressive: the gold and silver embroidery and the contrast between Napoleon's white charger and the horses of the guards. Nevertheless, it is largely descriptive and he avoids passing judgement on the ceremony or the crowd's reaction, which limits its value for an historian.

Content and argument

- the source is a valuable picture of how Napoleon sought to win the loyalty of the French people by placing himself on a pedestal – and it suggests the strategy was successful; Napoleon had already gained a heroic and idealised reputation in war and, in 1800, had milked his victory at Marengo, to affirm his image of invincibility; his regal behaviour is part of an act and the source affirms that it is one that he carried out to good effect
- the source describes a ceremony that has been carefully orchestrated to give a vivid impression (numbers of soldiers, the elaborate dress, the staging of Napoleon's entrance, the contrast of his charger, Napoleon's 'agility'). The crowd reacts with awe, which is exactly what Napoleon sought; the occasion reflects his understanding of the mood of the times after the dark days of the Terror and the chaos of the Directory and perhaps indicates the malleability of the Parisian crowd
- the source suggests that Napoleon was held in high regard by the French people: the ceremony attracted thronging multitudes, Blagdon needed to arrive three hours early, there was 'awe' and, at the end, 'sighs'. However, the source only references a Parisian event and across society, Napoleon still had to win support from old nobility to Jacobins; the turnout in the 1800 plebiscite had only been c25% (although falsified to suggest higher) and the behaviour of these Parisians cannot be judged as fully representative

- the source provides fairly limited detail on the reaction of the French to Napoleon's pomp and ceremonial, but it does show that even an Englishman could be entranced by it; furthermore, it offers a valuable indication of the way Napoleon used spectacle to win support and his ability to play – with some success – on emotion, to maintain the myth that he had brought order to France out of chaos.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this source provides a valuable picture of French people's behaviour from the first-hand experience of the recently revamped gendarmerie; although founded in 1791, the service had been reconstituted in 1804 as an elite professional force of army veterans and was required to be 'honest, impartial and reliable' – making the gendarmes' evidence of greater worth; as a provincial report, this source also provides a valuable counter-balance to sources which focus on reaction in the capital
- written in July 1805, the source provides an interesting example of hostility to Imperial conscription at the very time when Napoleon was most in need of soldiers and loyalty might have been expected to produce more enthusiasm; in 1805, the third coalition was formed when Austria (March) and Russia (April) joined Britain in the war against France; Napoleon had been proclaimed King of Italy in March 1805 and the press praised the glory brought by Napoleon and the heroism of French soldiers
- the source is addressed to the Minister of War (to whom the gendarmerie reported directly) and is therefore quite factual, although somewhat provincial in tone; its apparent honesty adds to its value and although not necessarily representative of the wider picture throughout France, records of similar incidents elsewhere would confirm a widespread hostility to conscription that was never overcome
- there is a clear bias to the source as the gendarmes show their brave attempts to effect arrest in the face of local hostility; there is also an element of exaggeration and self-congratulation – 'we showed firmness' and the arrest was effected 'without striking anyone'; nevertheless, this does not detract from the facts of the incident.

Content and argument

- the source provides a valuable picture of the struggle which conscription demands provoked; it gives detail on the way the gendarmerie turned out in force to follow up potential evaders, tried to check birth certificates, bound the arrested with rope; it also shows the way men evaded conscription, using the local church as a place of refuge
- the source speaks of the hostility of the villagers, mayor and parish priest, so providing valuable evidence that it was not just the conscripts themselves, nor even just the ordinary village people who opposed this Imperial demand, but 'officials' who might have been expected to uphold the law
- the behaviour of the local crowds, who hurled both insults and stones, as well as setting two conscript-evaders free, suggests the primitive desperation of rural people to the ever-increasing demand for men to fill the Napoleonic armies
- overall, the source is valuable in showing an underlying source of discontent in France and the way in which this was dealt with in Napoleon's quest to fill his armies and yet uphold law and order within France; it certainly negates the official Napoleonic line of the people's overwhelming loyalty, patriotism and enthusiasm for glory and conquest.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- as a civilian police bulletin, this source contains information that would have been gathered by the 'administrative police', whose duty it was to report on any stirrings of discontent, so it may be considered a reliable factual account. As the report had been passed to Fouché and deemed serious enough to be sent on to Napoleon himself, it can be assumed the report provides worrying detail of the reaction of French people to the reintroduction of titles in France
- the source follows immediately upon the Imperial decree of March 1808 which founded the 'Imperial nobility'; although Napoleon had already awarded princely titles to his own family from 1804 and ducal titles for senior figures from 1806, the new decree extended the nobility across a much wider range of people and, to many, must have looked alarmingly similar to the titles of the Ancien Régime; the source provides a valuable immediate reaction – although gathered from Paris only
- the fact that the police had been asked (or saw fit) to report to higher authority on the attitude to the new decree suggests some concern, on Napoleon's part, as to the way his reintroduction of titles would be viewed; the source provides valuable evidence of the doubtful and even hostile views of a number of different social groups in France
- the tone is quite familiar for an official bulletin (maybe edited by Fouché and suggestive of his 'easy' relationship with Napoleon) but it is clear and frank (with no reason to be otherwise); it contains some opinion and its reference (probably added by Fouché) to the need to 'enlighten' the French people comes as a warning that Napoleon cannot assume full approval without working to keep everyone onside.

Content and argument

- the source makes it clear that the promulgation of titles has caused much consternation in Paris and provides detail on the reaction of different groups. Firstly, it contains valuable evidence of the concern of the surviving ancient nobility who regard the establishment of the imperial nobility as a far more serious threat to their position than the creation of the Légion d'honneur – set up to award (mainly military) service in 1802; they fear for the future but some hope to survive by acquiring the new titles; in practice just under a quarter of the new ennoblements went to such nobles as part of Napoleon's policy of ralliement
- the evidence of the discontent felt by the poorer nobles is valuable for its explanation; despite the revolution, this group remained proud and regarded the term 'bourgeois' with horror; Napoleon, on the other hand, courted the bourgeois and could afford to ignore poorer nobles who had little to offer his regime unless prepared for service
- the report is particularly valuable in offering a view of the reaction among members of the bourgeoisie, suggesting that some feared a return of the old nobility and even the shopkeepers worried about being 'snubbed'; it is with respect to this group that Fouché's comment that 'People need to be enlightened to understand the intentions' is primarily addressed; reports like this would have worried Napoleon who regarded the bourgeoisie as the backbone of the state; however, in reality, the new nobility would not be like the old – only a seventh of the size and mostly linked to service, so the report's fears proved unfounded, making it less valuable for a longer term appraisal of reaction
- the source almost ends with a warning that there are those who feel uneasy about the growing power of the Emperor; this is again valuable evidence of the way some of Napoleon's self-promotion (and disregard for revolutionary gains) worked to nullify his attempts to unify the nation; although generally still well-regarded in 1808 – and yet to take the Empire to its greatest extent in 1810, the imposition of the continental system (1806/07), the peninsular war (1808+) plus the demands of continual military involvement in Europe and elsewhere would come to sap the loyalty of his own French people; in this respect this section of the source shows remarkable foresight.

Section B

0 2 'In the months of May to September 1792, it was the sans-culottes, rather than the deputies in the Assembly and Convention, that brought an end to monarchy in France.'

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 supporting the view that in the months of May to September 1792, it was the sans-culottes, rather than the deputies in the Assembly and Convention, that brought an end to monarchy in France might include:

- the sans-culottes' influence grew as the war (begun in April 1792) went increasingly badly for France bringing high bread prices and dislocation of work; grievances were directed against the monarchy, thought to be in league with the enemy; the arrival of the fédérés in Paris, (June+) increased sans-culotte strength; the fédérés had no respect for monarchy, ignored the King's anti-camp veto, provided soldiers and arms and made the National Guard a more revolutionary anti-monarchy force
- the sans-culottes mounted two radical journées forcing deputies to action; the first humbled the King with a demonstration of 8 000 (20 June) and forced even moderate Girondins to accept Louis' demise; it was the sans-culotte action which emboldened more extreme politicians, particularly Robespierre, who declared for a Republic (July); sans-culottes met almost continuously in the Parisian sections July-September 1792 – putting constant pressure on deputies
- the journée of 10 August, carried out by 20 000 sans-culottes plus 20 000 fédérés/National Guardsmen, which led to the massacre of the King's Swiss Guard, effectively forced the King from power; the action showed that the sans-culottes controlled the deputies – the King was forced to shelter in the Assembly and then taken to the Temple; the sans-culottes were the dominant force behind new insurrectionary commune
- the Deputies were powerless during sans-culottes-led September massacres; the sans-culottes even 'controlled' elections – no Girondins were returned in Paris; it was in response to sans-culotte pressure that the new Convention announced a Republic (2 September).

Arguments challenging the view that in the months of May to September 1792, it was the sans-culottes, rather than the deputies in the Assembly and Convention, that brought an end to monarchy in France might include:

- the deputies were responsible for pushing Louis into an untenable position; they passed decrees against refractory priests, the King's Guard and allowed a fédéré camp (May/June) that the King was bound to oppose/veto; Girondin ministers put pressure on the King who could only dismiss them creating a power vacuum
- the deputies retained the initiative when faced with sans-culotte pressure; the first journée was quite limited in its aims (anti-vetoes and pro-reinstatement of pro-war ministers) and the mobs withdrew when Louis appeared in a bonnet rouge
- Robespierre – a deputy – led the demands for a republic (speech 29 July) and electoral change uninfluenced by mob action; this only became vehement after the Brunswick manifesto (published in Paris, 1 August) threatened vengeance if the King was harmed
- although deputies briefly appeared to lose control after the second journée (10 August); they quickly regained the initiative; they declared the King 'temporarily suspended' – ignoring the sans-culotte clamour for his overthrow; they chose to amend voting system; they made Danton Minister of Justice with a committee as the executive; revolutionary measures were carried out legally by deputies
- deputies ensured elections and the creation of the National Convention; the September massacres were not political and it was the deputies that declared a Republic (2 September), bringing the monarchy to an end.

Students will need to make a judgement on who was directing policy in the months of May to September 1792 – the 'rulers' – deputies in the Assembly, or the 'ruled' – the sans-culottes in the Parisian streets. Both had an interest in curbing monarchical power and, at least some of the former in destroying it

altogether, but argument should hinge on whether the destruction of monarchy was led by the deputies or forced by the action of the mobs. Reward any convincing judgement based on solid evidence.

- 0 3** To what extent was Robespierre's fall from power in July 1794 due to his decision to execute Danton and Desmoulins in April 1794?

[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 supporting the view that Robespierre’s fall from power in July 1794 was due to his decision to execute Danton and Desmoulins in April 1794 might include:

- the decision to eliminate the Indulgents turned moderate opinion in the National Convention against Robespierre; Danton and Desmoulins had been close friends and allies and were widely popular in Paris; their crime was to support the ending of the Terror – yet this was something many in the Convention agreed with themselves
- the clearly trumped-up charges were regarded with suspicion, especially by the Plain, whose hostility to Robespierre had increased since the Law of Frimaire (4 Dec 93) which had perpetuated the Terror, creating a highly centralised regime under the CPS; their fears that Robespierre would stop at nothing seemed to be confirmed by the launch of the Great Terror in the Law of Prairial (10 June)
- outside the Convention the trial swelled Danton’s popular support and weakened sans-culottes’ support for Robespierre; this was to prove crucial after his arrest on 27 July as only a third of the sections supported the Commune’s efforts to raise an army to save him
- the decision to execute Danton and Desmoulins showed that Robespierre would not hesitate to attack former supporters; this alarmed Montagnards, who, when harangued by a long speech by Robespierre on 8 Thermidor (26 July), accusing (unnamed) members of the Convention of treason, felt unable to trust him – hence their action the next day when Saint-Just tried to speak further and Robespierre was arrested.

Arguments challenging the view that Robespierre’s fall from power in July 1794 was due to his decision to execute Danton and Desmoulins in April 1794 might include:

- Robespierre was already regarded with unease before the elimination of rivals in June 1794 because of the way he ruled through the CPS, by-passing the Convention – suggesting dictatorial ambitions; his decision for the CPS to assume direct power over government in Dec 1793 was of greater importance in turning the Plain against him
- despite the suspicions roused by the execution, Robespierre was still elected President of the Convention in June and enjoyed a good deal of support/popularity in Paris when he led the Festival of the Supreme Being (8 June); this would suggest his fall from power was not predetermined before July
- the Law of Prairial (10 June) which speeded up convictions did much to intensify fear of Robespierre’s ambitions and even his sanity; the CGS was antagonised as it was not consulted on the measure; this added to the existing hostility to the Cult of the Supreme Being and the separate police network established by Robespierre and Saint-Just
- Robespierre’s behaviour in the Great Terror (June-July 1794) was the real reason for his overthrow; he appeared to believe himself the sole arbiter of right and wrong; local government broke down; Robespierre overestimated his authority in the Convention where he had too few supporters (and also in the Paris sections); he was too arrogant/aloof which made him vulnerable and defenceless when called to account
- Robespierre’s behaviour in withdrawing from public life for 3 weeks (July) gave an opportunity to those who had previously feared him, to build support in the Convention for his removal; his last speech (26 July) added to the fear and confirmed how out of touch he had become; when arrested on 27 July, even the Montagnards silenced him with heckling.

It is clearly impossible to identify a single point at which it became certain that Robespierre would fall from power in mid-1794. The actions of the National Convention deputies on 9 Thermidor (27 July) explain the exact timing, but it is difficult to see how he could have lasted much longer, given the

ever-widening gulf that opened up between him and the Convention from December 1793 and the fall-off in sans-culottes' support that Robespierre experienced, particularly in the final stage of the Terror. Students need to assess the part of the execution of the highly-popular Danton and Desmoulins in this process. Reward those who are able to balance the outcome of this event against other valid reasons for Robespierre's fall and draw supported and convincing conclusions.

- 0 4** 'Napoleon's attempt to re-establish himself as ruler of France in the 'Hundred Days' shows his total misunderstanding of the situation in 1814/15.'

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 supporting the view that Napoleon's attempt to re-establish himself as ruler of France in the 'Hundred Days' shows his total misunderstanding of the situation in 1814/15 might include:

- the situation in France changed while Napoleon was on Elba; the French were no longer in a position to decide their own fate; Napoleon had been decisively defeated in Europe, and the allies would never condone his return to power; Napoleon showed little understanding in believing he could carry off a coup
- France (and Napoleon) had been generously treated by the allies: First Peace of Paris (May 1814) allowed France to keep 1792 borders, with no indemnity or army of occupation; Napoleon had been awarded an allowance (£200 000) and Elba; Napoleon failed to appreciate this liberality and totally misunderstood that a challenge to the settlement could only bring harsher terms
- France had a new ruler, Louis XVIII, who had a legitimate claim and a carefully limited position, being bound by the Charter; he had allied support behind him; he offered the French the peace they needed; Napoleon totally misunderstood a France glad of stability and exhausted after the constant years of war
- the powerful Coalition which had fought against Napoleon (including the Great Powers, Britain, Russia, Austria and Prussia) were ready to protect the new France and could call on far greater numbers of men and resources; Napoleon totally misunderstood a situation in which the military odds were firmly stacked against him.

Arguments challenging the view that Napoleon's attempt to re-establish himself as ruler of France in the 'Hundred Days' shows his total misunderstanding of the situation in 1814/15 might include:

- Napoleon's bid for power was not totally misguided; many French were ready to welcome him back; he could expect military defections to provide an army; in the event even higher-ranking men joined him, eg Marshal Ney; he enjoyed triumphal entries into cities including Lyons and Paris; he retained his charisma and rapidly built support
- the return of Louis XVIII was very unpopular – maybe Napoleon understood this better than the allies; Louis refused to accept responsibility to an assembly, maintained high taxes and conscription and brought rumours that the biens nationaux would be seized; Louis XVIII was a pompous, but characterless, Bourbon, reliant on the allies for his power
- Napoleon showed understanding in his actions: he put together a new constitution (Acte Additionel) which was likely to be acceptable because of its liberal features such as free elections, free press and constitutional monarchy; the Acte was supported by plebiscite – suggesting Napoleon understood the wishes of the French
- Napoleon well understood that the allies were disunited; the Russians were not in a position to intervene in the west, and, with the Austrians and Prussians, disagreed with the British at Vienna; it was not unrealistic for Napoleon to believe he could defeat them, given his military record; he understood the need to engage each separately and believed this strategy could be effective.

Napoleon's motives for leaving Elba in the 'Hundred days' can never be known exactly and it is up to students to debate how well he understood the changes that had come about in 1814/15 when he embarked on his bid for power. Some will argue that his challenge to the first peace settlement was born of a sensible, perhaps even perceptive, understanding of the political and military situation within France and undertaken with a carefully thought-out strategy. Some may see it simply as a huge gamble based on a (perhaps even wilful) misunderstanding of the actual situation. As always, reward any line of argument that is well-supported and convincing.