



Cambridge Pre-U

HISTORY

9769/57

Paper 5g Special Subject: The Napoleon and Europe, 1795–1815

For examination from 2020

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Specimen

This specimen paper has been updated for assessments from 2020. The specimen questions and mark schemes remain the same. The layout and wording of the front covers have been updated to reflect the new Cambridge International branding and to make instructions clearer for candidates.

This syllabus is regulated for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document has **12** pages. Blank pages are indicated.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Special Subject: Source-based Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2019–2021 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

- (a) This question is designed to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.
- (b) Examiners will be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.
- (c) The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (d) In marking an answer, examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Question (a)**Band 3: 8–10 marks**

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7 marks

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the focus of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

Band 1: 1–3 marks

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Question (b)**Band 4: 16–20 marks**

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

Band 3: 11–15 marks

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary.

Band 2: 6–10 marks

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected or, especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated.

Band 1: 1–5 marks

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely while understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Special Subject: Essay Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2019–2021 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and should be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners will give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They will be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit will be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may still be able to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 4 mark, by virtue of the intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Band 5: 25–30 marks

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 4: 19–24 marks

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 3: 13–18 marks

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 2: 7–12 marks

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be some irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Band 1: 1–6 marks

The answer will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated while investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>To what extent does Document B corroborate the evidence given in Document E about Napoleon’s Prussian campaign of 1806?</p> <p>Both Documents refer to Prussian weaknesses. Document E’s dismissal of the Prussians as formidable only in reputation may be supported by the reference in Document B to the failure of the Prussian charges to break the French line. The tactics of Blücher referred to in Document B are seen as being ‘old’, while Document E suggests that the Prussian army was like an antique in a museum.</p> <p>There are also differences between the Documents. Document E suggests that Napoleon did little that was new but in Document B the formation of squares is seen as a new tactic – although this seems unlikely. Document E indicates that the French troops were poorly prepared, but there is no suggestion of this in the resilient French defence mentioned in Document B. There is a suggestion in Document E of a hasty French attack, although it might be seen that the French had to fall back into squares to meet a robust if ineffective Prussian attack. The vigour of the Prussian assaults and the bravery of the commander, mentioned in Document B, is somewhat at odds with the pejorative tone of Document E.</p> <p>In terms of provenance, Document E is hostile to Napoleon and may be playing up Prussian weaknesses to undermine the French achievement in what Barnett sees as a poorly-planned and unnecessary war. Document B, however, is taken from a favourable biography of a Prussian general by another Prussian militarist, so could be seeking to blame failure on Napoleon’s ‘new tactics’, which in fact were only ‘new’ in a limited sense, having been already used in the 1790s.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the main element in Napoleon’s military success was his ability to inspire and motivate his men? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge, as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).</p> <p>Document A suggests that Napoleon was inspirational in his approach, reassuring his men that they have beaten the Russians before and that after an assured victory they will be able to rest. However, the crucial element is the deployment of men and the use of a feint to the right to lure the Russians – a tactic which proved very effective. Document B suggests that the ‘new tactics’ of linked squares and Blücher’s failure to adapt old ideas are the key to military success, rather than motivation, although candidates may argue that smaller squares did demand courage and were only possible with a confident and well-motivated army. Document C shows the influence of Napoleon as an inspirational and popular presence, even on a bitterly cold day. However, this letter was written in the emotion of the moment and not against a background of great and costly battles. Candidates may provide other examples to show the importance of Napoleon’s personal appeal.</p> <p>By itself, however, Napoleon’s ability to inspire and motivate his men may be only a secondary factor compared with strategic elements, such as the creation of corps and the rapid movement that led to victories such as at Ulm, and the concentration of force, the use of artillery and the weaknesses of the enemy. In Document D, Napoleon begins by emphasising the need for a leader to inspire confidence but does mention other factors such as troop numbers and organisational methods. This gives an impression that rigid planning and sound method was the key, which is contested by Document E and the view that Napoleonic warfare was ‘blundering to glory’. In Document D, Napoleon was manufacturing the legend of the popular and well-organised leader rather than offering an objective analysis. Document E casts doubts on motivation of the troops as Napoleon did not provide proper equipment. It also casts doubt on the organisation of the military effort and suggests instead that enemy weakness was the major factor. This is confirmed in Document B and by knowledge of other occasions, for example at Austerlitz, where poor decisions by enemy commanders were crucial. No set answer is expected and candidates may judge that for this type of fast-moving warfare and reliance on smaller units it was essential for Napoleon to win the confidence of his troops. Others may consider that the personal appeal of Napoleon was exaggerated by Napoleonic propaganda and instead regard enemy weakness as the key: when Napoleon’s enemies did reform and became familiar with his tactics and how to overcome them, the French victories were less common and harder won.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>What best explains Napoleon’s rise to power as First Consul by 1799?</p> <p>AO1 – Candidates should consider the following: the rise of Napoleon as a successful military leader at Toulon and in Italy; his ability to turn even defeat to his advantage as in the Egyptian campaign; his ability to inspire loyalty and to overcome larger forces; and his political ability to see his opportunity.</p> <p>AO2 – Candidates could discuss: the skilful self-promotion of the bulletins; the obvious military skills and daring shown during the Austrian campaign; the vision, if not the execution, of the Egyptian campaign and Napoleon’s ability to avoid being damaged by its failures. Alternative explanations might include: the favourable context of weak enemies, with the Austrians unable to respond effectively to Napoleon’s speed and daring in Italy; the opportunities afforded by the Revolution; and the weaknesses of the Directory, beset by challenges from right and left. The counter-argument might also consider the importance of individuals such as: Lucien Bonaparte, who was of considerable importance in the coup of 18 Brumaire in 1799; Barras, whose patronage ensured promotion; and Abbé Sieyès, who was also influential in the coup. Bonaparte’s own abilities were not strongly in evidence during the actual coup of 18 Brumaire, when he spoke ineffectively and seemed to panic.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>‘The greatest contribution made by Britain to the defeat of Napoleon was the Peninsular Campaign.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>AO1 – Candidates may focus on the persistent support offered by Britain to opposition in Spain and Portugal even after the retreat to Corunna. Wellington managed to maintain the campaign from his base at Torres Vedras, and his campaigns cost France losses of manpower and prestige. They also distracted Napoleon from his eastern European concerns and may have weakened the Russian campaign.</p> <p>AO2 – Candidates may consider other ways that Britain contributed to the defeat of Napoleon, such as the naval blockade, the destruction of the French and Spanish fleets at Trafalgar, ‘Pitt’s gold’ and the relentless diplomatic activity. However, British military successes in Spain underpinned Britain’s diplomatic credibility, while the naval successes kept supply lines to Spain open. Thus, the activities are interlinked. Had Napoleon given his full attention to Spain and not been distracted, then the outcome may have been different, so the Peninsular War does have to be seen in context.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>‘In the rule of his European Empire outside France, Napoleon should be seen as more of an oppressor than a liberator.’ How valid is this judgement?</p> <p>AO1/AO2 – In terms of liberation, Napoleon’s impact may be seen in the ending of the power of the Church and of the rulers of the <i>ancien régime</i>, and the introduction of some of the ‘benefits’ of the French Revolution: uniform central administration; equality before the law; religious freedom and toleration; and the ability to rise through talents. In practice, French rule varied and in some areas the French rulers merely formed alliances with existing elites and introduced only superficial reforms. Better answers will draw distinctions between different parts of the Empire. Candidates may also consider: the repression of political opposition; the imposition of taxation; and the restrictions of the Continental System and the economic controls imposed to avoid competition with French manufacturers. The imposition of monarchical rule by family members may seem oppressive but some of these rulers proved more effective and enlightened than others, for example Louis Bonaparte in the Low Countries.</p>	30

BLANK PAGE