Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

HISTORY **9769/57**

Paper 5g Napoleon and Europe, 1795–1815 **May/June 2018**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

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

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 2016–18 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 whilst 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 2016–18 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 yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 4 mark.

(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 a measure of 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 answers 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 whilst 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.

Section A

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**How far is the evidence for attitudes towards Napoleon in Document A corroborated by Document B?** Similarities – There is enthusiasm shown in both – both quote 'Long Live Bonaparte' being shouted by crowds. Document A refers to admiration for his military qualities and Document B supports this by reference to saving France from the military setbacks. Both have the idea of France being saved or redeemed: Document A – 'the restoration to us of what we thought we had lost' and Document B – 'save France from the crisis…'. Document B refers to a personal ecstasy of the author, and this is also implied in the enormous enthusiasm in Document A. There are hints of contrasting the successful general with the present government: Document A refers to the 'ludicrous pomp' of the Directors and Document B to 'the pitiful government'. Differences – Document A is more specific about the different classes and their attitudes than Document B. Document B is also much more explicit about admiring Napoleon as an alternative to the Directory than Document A, which is more about the military victories and their effect on confidence. Document B is much more about saving France from the crisis brought by pitiful government and anticipates more support for regime change than Document A. Provenance: Both look back. As Boulart served under Napoleon, his personal engagement is more pronounced than is the case with Document A, which is somewhat more objective in tone. Document A is written about the situation in 1797, in the aftermath of what were seen as stunning victories in Italy. Document A is written later and closer to the Coup of Brumaire; the victories in Egypt had more mixed results and here it is the attitude of saving France from an unpopular government, rather than the immediate aftermath of victory that is predominant.	**10**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Napoleon became First Consul in 1799 largely as a result of the weakness of the Directory? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).** Document A is more about the popularity of Napoleon deriving from military success 'victory to victory' and shows widespread enthusiasm from the government to the middle classes and the crowds. There are hints of the unpopularity of the Directors – 'ludicrous pomp' – and reference to financial problems. The context is the spectacular Italian campaign and the Peace of Campo Formio which helps to explain the enthusiasm, especially as it was cleverly promoted by Bonaparte in his bulletins. At this stage, the idea of Napoleon as leader of a coup was not widespread but the successes laid the basis for Brumaire. By the time of Document B, there was more discontent with the Directory and more splits within the government. The dramatic successes in Egypt did not seem to be overshadowed by the failures, but this document reveals the greater criticisms of the Directory – seen as 'pitiful' with 'crisis' and 'setbacks by our armies'. Though this could be questioned, nevertheless the Directory had faced opposition from left and right and resorted to force to maintain its position, and there had been economic and financial problems, so this could be evidence for the interaction between the reputation of Napoleon and a deepening sense of crisis. However, this is not an impartial source and some may question its view of the Directors. Document C mirrors clearly the unfavourable view of the Directors. The Constitution of 1795 had indeed been roughly handled by the Directors. There were opposition groups to both right and left. The document is less sure that the Directory was losing international respect, but it is a justification for the very dubious actions taken by Napoleon and the plotters aiming to strengthen the executive in Brumaire. Its claim that Liberty was being restored is very doubtful, and the weaknesses of the Directors may well be exaggerated, but the thrust of the document is an explanation based on that. Document D, rather unsurprisingly, suggests it was Napoleon's abilities – his political judgement. He shrewdly took advantage of splits in the Directory by pretending to support Sieyès. He manipulated the support of Jacobins and Royalists. He made himself a mysterious figure to the public, 'Everyone was caught in my nets', he boasts to Madame de Remusat. Napoleon, now secure as Consul for Life, rewrites history, not mentioning his halting and lacklustre performance at Brumaire and attributing all to his wisdom, rather than to splits and his unpopularity in the Directory, and the choice of the plotters being driven more by Napoleon's military record than his political sense.	**20**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	Document E suggests that explanations based on the weaknesses of the Directory may be flawed, stressing that it was creative, had broad support, did allow elections and some press freedom. It argues that Bonaparte precipitated rather than used the crisis. It doubts his military abilities because of the failures in Egypt taking resources from the war in Europe. There is a case for seeing the Directory as more successful – it had managed inflation, it had allowed some political development – but this may be seen as a roseate view and contrasts with Document B and Document C, though these are by no means impartial. Though a corrective to simplified views of the Directory and the abilities of Bonaparte, Document E does not really engage with the divisions within the government, the economic problems of deflation and the image of Bonaparte, which belied some of the less successful reality and which is strongly represented in Document A and Document B.	

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**With what justification can France under the Consulate be seen as 'a police state'?** AO1/2 – Candidates should establish the characteristics of a police state. The arguments against may refer to: the continuing existence of constitutional rule; the plebiscites; the lack of the widespread repression and compulsion available to a modern police state; Napoleon's own belief in the principles of the Revolution; and, the intent to further key ideas of the Revolution in domestic policy. The arguments for may refer to: the lack of respect for legal procedures with the measures taken after the failed assassination attempt, and the spectacularly illegal abduction and execution of the Duc d'Enghien; the establishment of spies, informers and secret police; the strengthening of the gendarmerie; the increasing trend towards authoritarianism, and the limited influence of the legislative elements; the power of the prefects; the use of the Church for propaganda; and, the establishment of the Consul for Life bolstered by censorship. No set answer is expected.	**30**

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**What best explains why Napoleon was <u>not</u> able to overcome Britain's naval dominance in the period 1799–1814?** Napoleon's predominance on land was not matched at sea. The balance of sea power had been favourable to France after the Revolutionary War, but the British used their commercial wealth for a large ship building programme which was accompanied by considerable investment in infrastructure, for example the dock facilities at Plymouth and Portsmouth. They relied on and maintained control over naval supplies from the Baltic which gave them high quality timber, hemp and Swedish ore. The French had fine ships but lacked the maintenance facilities and, after 1793, sufficient access to quality naval supplies. The administrative and technical back-up and the supply of officers were disrupted by the Revolution. Though the French were able to mass strong naval forces through their allies after 1799, the quality of repair and maintenance was less good. In terms of tactics, the French tactic of destroying masts was less brutally effective than the British tactic of raking the lower decks and attempting to kill as many of the enemy as possible. This was the basis of `Nelson's gunnery'. Also the British tactic of breaking the lines was highly effective. Superior British gunnery and the policy of aiming not to disable the ship, but rather the crew, was telling at Trafalgar. The British percentage of killed to total casualties was just over 25 per cent, i.e. three wounded for every one killed. But for the enemy, the percentage was 55 per cent, i.e. for every four wounded five were killed. The speed with which the guns were loaded and fired by the Royal Navy gun crews was also higher than the French and Spanish, and a factor in the higher casualty figures for the enemy fleets. Technological advances like copper-sheathed hulls and flintlock cannon were important but probably less so than the British way of fighting, which put less emphasis on manoeuvring than direct and violent assault with crews firing below the water line. The availability of seamen was also important, as was the shared motivation of prize money. Some candidates may stress leadership, especially Nelson, but he benefited from tactical advances by others. Historians such as N. A. M. Rodger have been critical of Napoleon's interventions in the lead up to Trafalgar. Both sides had long seafaring traditions, and the French were able to make use of Italian, Spanish and Dutch experience at sea. Britain had more maritime labour available. So much of Britain's economy was based on sea trade, that there was always a massive pool of highly trained seamen to serve aboard naval vessels. The British mixture of deferential discipline on board with shared motivation of prize money was often effective, while the Revolution had led to a disruption of trained shipwrights and officer recruitment. Candidates should balance the factors, perhaps making a distinction between British strengths and French weaknesses.	**30**

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**How effectively did the Congress of Vienna deal with the problems of peacemaking?** AO1 – The problems of peacemaking may be seen as: how to ensure that France did not endanger the peace of Europe by territorial expansion, that victor nations were rewarded without creating an imbalance in Europe; that peace and stability could be maintained not by preventing war between the major powers, but also by containing the popular forces of revolutionary change which had created instability. For some, problems lay in containing liberal constitutionalism in Europe and nationalism which would threaten their multi-ethic empires. The wars since 1792 had been highly costly and had allowed revolutionary ideas to spread, as well as throwing up an expansionist military regime in France which threatened Europe; so, it was a problem for all the powers at Vienna to prevent this recurring. AO2 – Candidates should distinguish between the different problems. In terms of preventing France from dangerous expansion, territorial changes had hemmed France in: the Kingdom of the Netherlands; a neutral Switzerland; and, Austrian domination of Northern Italy. From the absolute monarch's point of view, a resurgent reactionary France was a success and Russia, Austria and Prussia supported French intervention in Iberia against liberalism. For Britain this amounted to a continuation of French expansionism and bitterly opposed intervention. The solutions gave rise to additional problems. Belgium resented Dutch rule and broke away. Poland resented being divided between Russia, Austria and Prussia and remained restless. There was rivalry between Austria and Russia and the resentment of Prussia at not gaining Saxony was accompanied by territorial gains in the West which gave it more economic and potentially more military power, thereby adding to future problems. The on-going consultation in the Congress System led to increasing disagreement between Britain and the other powers about ideologically based policies and, in the end, attempts to maintain opposition to liberalism and to restrict nationalism were abortive. However, the general peace in Europe was maintained: the powers cooperated at key moments, as with the Greek Revolt, so the aim of maintaining peace and preventing a resurgence of a militant and expansionist France was, perhaps, broadly fulfilled. Also, the key powers were rewarded: Britain by colonial gains; Russia by gains in Poland; Austria in Italy; and Prussia by the Rhineland. While a balance was sustained by limitations; for example, the division of Poland.	**30**