
HISTORY

9769/57

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

May/June 2019

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 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

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)	<p>To what extent does Document A corroborate the evidence in Document B about Napoleon’s views about conquest?</p> <p><i>Similarities</i> Document B says that French conquest should respect laws, and Document A commands no unauthorised confiscation or looting. Document B says customs should be respected and Document A says that Egyptian customs are unlike those of Europe and the troops must ‘become accustomed to them’. Document B says habits and even prejudices must be respected, and Document A says that Muslim religious views must not be contradicted. Document B says conquest may have forceful actions and Document A refers to inflicting, by conquest of Egypt a great blow against England.</p> <p><i>Differences</i> The impact of conquest is greater in Document A than Document B – ‘a conquest that will change the world, and its effect on civilisation and world trade will be incalculable’. Document B gives a more general view of conquest which puts the French expansion in the broader context of ‘Today, by contrast’ with previous times. Document A is more specific about religion than Document B and is more in line with enlightenment views, and, as such, Document A is more practical and specific. The main aim in Document A is to defeat England; this is not mentioned in Document B where the focus is to introduce enlightened change.</p> <p><i>Provenance</i> Document A is a message to the army: it was important to maintain discipline and prevent as much opposition as possible from the local population. As a guide, it uses Napoleon’s experiences in Italy when he aimed to get local support, and it is also clearly a wartime document with its reference to the wider struggle against England. Document B is a more considered and ‘academic’ response, showing the progress France has made and the influence of the Enlightenment in understanding and respecting different customs and bringing the benefits of civilisation to those conquered, therefore, Bonaparte the scholar rather than Bonaparte the general.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Napoleon had shown greatness in his leadership before gaining power in November 1799? In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge, as well as to the documents in this set (A–E).</p> <p>Document A is an example of Napoleon’s ‘greatness’ as a communicator and inspirer of men. The troops are treated with a respect for their ability to understand the overall mission and to be inspired by the historic city of Alexandria. They are not seen as merely brutal and violent soldiery. The document shows Napoleon’s strategic vision of changing the world by establishing a power base in the eastern Mediterranean and weakening Britain, as well as an ability to think of state building and how to ensure that local populations accepted French rule. In context, this way of engaging the cooperation of troops rather than simply issuing remote commands, can be seen in Italy and was a feature of Napoleon’s greatness as a commander after 1798. The gap, however, between the rhetoric and the reality can be seen in the horrors of Document C and the callousness of Document D. Document B shows the soldier-scholar, the child of the Enlightenment, taking a lofty view of modern conquest and bringing the benefits of ‘reason and education’ and the enlightenment of the present century. So, not a mere successful general, but a thoughtful leader able to contribute to scholarly magazines; this was reflected in his later leadership and his wide range of interests. However, he was a soldier first and a philosopher second, and military priorities took precedence as Document C shows vividly. The greatness is serious undermined not only in a moral sense but, as the writer says, in causing resentment as ‘the blood of these 3000 victims will be avenged on us’.</p> <p>The bitter fighting in the rest of the campaign and the dogged resistance at Acre contributed to the failure of the campaign. The vein of expedient brutality runs through Napoleon’s rule and some will argue robs him of greatness. The origin of the source suggests an honest and immediate reaction, but the fact that Peyrusse was not alienated enough to cease serving Napoleon may indicate that the massacre was not considered a war crime.</p> <p>Document D finds Bonaparte in a dilemma as there was limited medical care, and plague was a scourge of eighteenth-century armies. In a dangerous situation, Bonaparte had to look at the wider picture: sick men would slow the retreating army down and suffering would be inevitable. Does this show a greatness in considering an unpalatable course of action or mere disregard for normal humanity? What may show a degree of greatness is the willingness to accept the surgeon’s advice and take the sick men back, accepting his moral position (‘I am not seeking to overcome your scruples’). The retreat was ‘undertaken in meticulous order’. However a certain indecisiveness is apparent, and the fact that a retreat had to be undertaken is a measure of the failure of the campaign.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>Document E, though a secondary source, is based on a contemporary account. Napoleon was courageous in not fearing the plague and in rationalising that fear made it more dangerous: he was calm in the presence of plague victims; he was observant in witnessing the treatment; and, he himself helped in a hands-on way by lifting a victim. The historian sees his view as 'characteristic', and this carelessness for personal safety had been evident in Italy as had his willingness to share danger with his men, so avoiding the aloof leadership common at the time. While this could be seen as calculated, it nevertheless marked out Napoleon's leadership style as distinctive, helped to gain the enduring support of his men and could be seen as 'great'. The context, however, of deliberate publicity-seeking by the bulletins and the promotion of image might be seen less as great and more as over ambitious and calculating.</p>	

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>How much did Napoleon’s military successes in Europe after 1799 depend on factors beyond his control?</p> <p>AO1/2 The factors beyond Napoleon’s control might include: the bravery and abilities of his subordinates (Desaix at Marengo, for example, or Davout in Prussia); the inheritance of the larger armies raised by Carnot and the Revolutionaries; and, the innovations of artillery and the corps system which he inherited. Other factors might include: the instability of the coalitions against him; the incompetence of leadership (for example, the Russians at Austerlitz); the lack of coordination between his enemies (the Ulm Campaign); and, the less developed battlefield tactics of his opponents. Factors within Napoleon’s control might include the way that he used and put into practice new ideas: his rapid movements in the War of the Third Coalition; his ‘eye for the battlefield’ at Austerlitz; his ability to inspire his forces so that he could rely on troops to sustain his plans; his control of both military and civilian government ensuring that he had resources; and, his ability to choose the marshals and commanders who were able to serve him well. However, his limited later successes when his enemies reformed their armies (e.g. Prussia) offered powerful resistance (e.g. Borodino), coordinated their efforts and maintained their coalitions, and offered generalship of comparable quality (e.g. Kutuzov, Blucher and Wellington), might suggest that it was more factors beyond his control that enabled his more egregious successes before 1807.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Did diplomacy play the most significant role in Britain’s struggle against Napoleon?</p> <p>AO1/2 The relentless efforts of British governments to form and maintain coalitions against Napoleon, and their unwillingness to accept the large-scale changes in the European balance of power because of the threat to British economic and security interests, can be seen as their most important contribution in the wars. The coalitions suffered from internal rivalries and from the impact of military defeats, but ‘Pitt’s gold’ was important in ensuring that Napoleon faced large-scale military opposition by Britain’s continental allies. The impact of British diplomacy, especially that of Castlereagh in ensuring that the allies stayed together and that Russian successes in 1812 did not lead to a reaction, can be seen as vital to the overall outcome and one of Britain’s greatest contributions. However, against that, are the effects of Britain’s contribution to the Peninsular War which Napoleon himself saw as a major element in his downfall. Wellington’s dogged resistance and flexible tactics kept large numbers of French troops bogged down and reduced the belief in French invincibility. The naval superiority of Britain confirmed at Trafalgar in 1805 ensured Britain’s trade routes could remain open and that Britain would not be invaded. The naval superiority meant that Napoleon resorted to economic warfare in the Continental System to defeat Britain with important consequences, in that it partly led to the invasions of Spain and Russia. It could be argued that the underlying factor in leading Napoleon to this strategy was the unrelenting diplomatic activity of Britain and that the factors in Britain’s war effort were linked.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>'Napoleon's European possessions were an Empire in name only.' Discuss.</p> <p>AO1/2 The Empire was divided into those areas absorbed into the <i>Pays Réunis</i>: 130 departments and 44 million people; these were distinguished from the conquered lands which supposedly enjoyed some independence but were ruled by appointees of Napoleon. Both became the Grand Empire of 1811 and, at various times, the Empire had allied states dominated diplomatically by Napoleon. The degree of control varied as in some regions French rule depended more on alliances with local elites, and sometimes the control was not established for long enough for the states to be part of a broader empire. However, many of the changes introduced into France were applied to the Empire, especially the <i>Pays Réunis</i>: the legal codes, the Concordat, the end of feudalism, and uniform administration. The burdens of empire too were applied, such as conscription, taxation and the practice of 'dotation'. In outlying areas, however, local privileges remained, and the coordination was uneven throughout a varied group of territories. The use of family members was a unifying factor, but this did not ensure uniformity of control: Louis Bonaparte was more inclined to see Holland, for example, as an independent state for which he was responsible, than as a key element in an empire which served the interests of France. The Continental System could not be enforced throughout the Empire with equal success and the Napoleonic constitutions did not always produce uniform or effective government. The degree of acceptance of French rule varied, but there is an argument that, benefits aside, the Empire was more than a collection of conquered territories. There were lasting effects of reforms introduced on the French model and though the strains of war – taxation and conscription – were considerable, there was not large-scale revolt or disintegration.</p>	30