



Cambridge Pre-U

HISTORY**9769/57**

Paper 5g Napoleon and Europe, 1795–1815

October/November 2020

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 October/November 2020 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 B confirm the evidence in Document A about events just before, during and after the Battle of Vitoria?</p> <p>Similarities- Both sources indicate a defeat. Both see the French fleeing. Both refer to food and drink being lost by the French. Both see guns being lost. Both refer to dead and dying.</p> <p>Differences – There is no mention of Wellington in A but he is shown in B. A refers to half-starved British and Portuguese troops but the soldiers in B look well-nourished and strong. There is no indication of the scaffolding mentioned in documents A in B. The scavenging of British troops in A is not shown in B where they are not rushing to pick up the food and drink. The scale of captured guns and enemy dead and wounded mentioned in A is not shown in B. There is no indication of the physical weakness of the French shown in B in Wheeler’s account.</p> <p>Origin – the realities of military life in the Peninsular come over more strongly in A which is an eye-witness account by a private soldier likely to experience them, given the limitations of supply and the reliance on plunder. B is for home consumption by an artist not present and who did not share the hardships of A; and its intentions are to show albeit somewhat grotesquely the vigour and manly qualities of the British troops and the weakness of the enemy. The horrors of the dead and dying are changed to crude humour and Wellington’s role is shown without exaggeration to stress the calm quality of leadership for his readers.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the British army had only a limited effect on the outcome of the Napoleonic Wars? In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge, as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E)</p> <p>The secondary source E establishes the case for the limited role with the Peninsular War, so celebrated in B, as a sideshow (rather than the prelude to victory seen in D). The view is that Napoleon did not see the Peninsular campaign as very significant and neither did Metternich. The contribution of the army did not cement the support of Britain's allies and even Spain was not thought to be reliable even with Wellington's efforts. Britain's army did not give Britain a very strong voice in discussions with its allies. Napoleon did not fight personally in Spain after 1808 and the major efforts were in Russia and then in Germany. The huge losses in Russia were obviously more significant than the losses in France. However, he did refer to 'the Spanish Ulcer' and the war did distract him and weaken resources and prestige. The analysis in E does not include the battle of Waterloo which D links to the Peninsular War which is a prelude if not as great an achievement.</p> <p>D gives considerable weight to Waterloo as decisive, outshining previous battles and reflecting the courage and ability of Wellington. Certainly, after Waterloo it was not possible for Napoleon to sustain resistance, but the role of the British army can be seen as less significant than the weaknesses of Napoleon and his flawed strategy of detaching Grouchy and also the contributions of Prussian forces. This is the view of Napoleon writing in C who does not see the battle as decisive ('all is by no means lost' and 'there is still time to repair all the damage done at Waterloo' because of the ability to raise new forces and because of the weaknesses of her enemies). However, this is not a realistic view and does not give enough credit to the British army's dogged defence depleting Napoleon's army and preventing a victory before the Prussians arrived.</p> <p>B shows a victory at Vittoria but the well fed and purposeful army conflicts somewhat with the picture given in A of a poorly supplied force reliant on scavenging. The defeat was humiliating for Joseph Bonaparte and did lead to an invasion of southern France by Wellington but its overall significance, despite the success shown in both A and B, may be questioned by putting it in context of developments in central Europe at the Battle of the Nations and the relative importance of Britain's diplomatic policy and subsidies in ensuring an effective coalition against Napoleon which did not make a separate peace.</p> <p>In terms of provenance, A is by a private soldier and his account written at the time has no motive in glorifying the position. B is hardly a reliable account but does accord with some of the testimony in A and is indicative of pride in the achievements of Wellington and his men which is justified by the skill and fortitude shown in the war. C is more wishful thinking by a defeated leader than a realistic analysis of the situation after Waterloo and does not convincingly undermine Wellington's contribution to the emperor's final fall. However, the patriotic account in D even if written near the time does not take into account how 'near run' Waterloo was or the importance of other factors than Wellington's leadership and the tone is flattering. E rightly suggests that Britain's military contribution made it difficult for it to rely on its allies not making a separate peace but nevertheless Castlereagh did keep the coalition</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	together and this would have been difficult had there been no commitment of British troops to Europe and if there had been no victories even if diplomacy subsidies and naval power were probably more significant.	

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>‘Bonaparte rose to power as First Consul mainly because of the weaknesses of the Directory.’ Did he?</p> <p>The divisions among the Directory and the plots to strengthen the executive and to use military power to strengthen the power of a faction; the reliance on plunder from conquest; the succession of attempted coups and the reliance on Bonaparte and his ‘whiff of grapeshot’ and the financial and economic difficulties have made the Directory seem weak. However, the attempts to overthrow it failed; the war had been waged with some success; there had been substantial financial reform; the coup of 1799 was not viewed with universal rejoicing. Also, although he was not the only possible choice for ‘the sword’ to bring about a coup, his distinct political and military abilities might argue that it was not merely weaknesses of the regime that was responsible for his rise to power. He had distinct achievements from the siege of Toulon onwards. His victories in Italy though overrated in some ways were still the most spectacular in the Revolutionary War. The defeat of the Mamluk forces in Egypt were indications of considerable tactical skill even if the enemy was poorly equipped. He also showed personal bravery and resourcefulness. However, it was his ability to make the most of his achievements in effective bulletins and his ability to gain the trust of the conspirators of 1799 that were important even if the coup itself showed his limitations.</p> <p>Answers may question the weaknesses or support the view that overreliance on military support and facing a series of attempts to end the regime indicate a fundamental lack of adaptability and support. No set answer is required.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>What best explains why Napoleon decided to become emperor in 1804?</p> <p>AO1 – There had been demands within France for Napoleon to regularise his position. Since 1802 he had been ‘Consul for Life’, a title which was associated with both republicanism and authoritarian rule. The danger was that the gains of the Consulate for many of the French propertied and professional classes might be lost if Napoleon’s death resulted in a civil war. To declare a hereditary monarch would be to ensure continuity. Thus, the Empire did not come about solely for reasons of naked ambition or Napoleon’s desire to become a new Charlemagne and to be on equal footing with the hereditary monarchs, but it came about at least in part because the beneficiaries of the consulate feared what might happen if the First Consul were to die.</p> <p>Napoleon had been the subject of royalist plots that were made public in 1804. There had been increasing concerns about conspiracies. The royalist leader Cadoudal was hunted down and shot as a result of his involvement. Fear of a royalist restoration led to the kidnap of the Duc d’Enghien. If Bonaparte became an actual monarch, the appeal of restoring a king might lessen. It did not even matter if there was no direct heir as Napoleon might name one. The matter was discussed in the Council of State, the Tribunal and the Senate so went beyond a matter of personal ambition. Army leaders petitioned for the creation of an Empire. The basis of the petitions was that France must continue to enjoy stability and protection against extreme political views and parties; that France should equally be protected from a royalist restoration that would undo the elements of revolutionary change that the consulate protected such as the Civil Code. The way forward might have been to have Napoleon declared a constitutional monarch or an elected king. However, neither was seen as a successful position. The position of a revolutionary emperor offered the best alternative. The matter was referred to the people by plebiscite and was approved, though with more abstentions than had been the case in 1802 when voters approved the lifelong consulship. Not only was the Empire approved by the people it was based on law. The announcement in May coincided with the publication of the Civil Code. Thus the Empire was within the boundaries of the Revolution and did not necessarily overthrow it. Many Republicans approved of this popular Empire. The way that it was begun showed continuity with the Revolution with Napoleon crowning himself in the presence of the Pope - he had risen to the highest position by his own merit.</p> <p>The Empire allowed Napoleon to pass on his throne and put him on a stronger footing when dealing with the hereditary monarchs of Europe. It did not give him more power, but it opened up the possibilities of more ceremony and grandeur and allowed rewards to be given to his ‘masses of granite’ in the form of aristocratic imperial title.</p> <p>Discussion could be between explanations which stress personal ambition – hitherto a strong aspect of Napoleon’s career and explanations which relate it to fears for the future and safeguarding what he had achieved if there were no successor. Practical advantages in diplomacy and patronage might be considered.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>How well did the Congress of Vienna deal, in 1814 and in 1815, with the problems it faced in reorganising Europe?</p> <p>Successes might be seen in reconciling conflicting claims, in balancing security against a future resurgence of France with the possibility of the new regime returning to the European community; with keeping peace in Europe; with rationalising the political map of central Europe by the new Confederation of 39 states; of rewarding key participants in the downfall of Napoleon.</p> <p>Less successful aspects might be seen as the failure to factor in nationalism and liberalism thus setting up problems for the future. For example in giving Prussia lands not directly connected to the main state; by boosting Austrian control of Northern Italy in disregard of any national unity; of creating Austrian domination of central Europe despite the contribution made by Prussia and disregarding the changes made by Napoleon towards greater German unity; by the arrangements regarding Napoleon himself in 1814 which led to the Hundred Days and the need for further military action.</p>	30