



Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

HISTORY

9769/57

Paper 5 Napoleon and Europe, 1795–1815

May/June 2017

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

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

This document consists of **11** printed pages.

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 C challenge the view of Document E about Napoleon’s impact on the development of nationhood?</p> <p>Similarities: Both comment on the considerable impact that Napoleon had on nationhood in Spain. Napoleon argued that his rule increased unity of principles and helped to bring about a separate nation state. The unity is shown in Document C by the proclamation urging opposition ‘because we are all Spanish’ and it ends with ‘Long live Spain!’</p> <p>Differences: However, the unification of Spain against Napoleon was obviously not his intention. Document C sees not conscious encouragement of nationhood but tyranny and oppression, not just of Spain but of ‘all Europe’. There is direct reference to French rule tyrannizing independence. This is direct contravention to the Emperor’s claim that he guided, guaranteed and hastened national education and increased unity of principles of law. Indeed Document C sees French rule as destructive and lawless, despoiling churches and causing desolation and havoc.</p> <p>Provenance: Obviously there are very different origins here. Document E is the Emperor looking back in lonely exile and attempting self-justification for posterity. Document C is in the heat of the revolt against French rule calling for resistance to Godless and tyrannical French. Neither is wholly reliable. Napoleon’s rule did offer unification in terms of legal reforms and the modernisation of administration, but the source ignores elements of exploitation and oppression. Document C does not speak for the enlightened Spanish middle class who did see hopes for greater reform and unity from France, but more in terms of provincial Catholic loyalism.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that Napoleon’s rule brought little benefit to the subjects of his European empire? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).</p> <p>Documents B and E see benefits. Document C sees only tyranny and Document D sees economic exploitation. The intention of Document A is probably to show selfish manipulation of Europe but the old is being swept away and some contemporaries might have seen this as beneficial, though the portrayal of both Talleyrand and Napoleon is not very flattering and comparison between the great man and a gingerbread baker is intended to ridicule.</p> <p>The positive benefits are stressed in Document B, written when Napoleon was at the height of his powers in Europe. The elements of equality of opportunity were features of the Napoleonic system. The Revolution had abolished serfdom and the Code Napoleon had confirmed it, and the legal changes brought about in France were seen as one of the great Napoleonic achievements. However, while these benefits were indeed applied to parts of the Empire, the liberal regime was not. The police state, censorship and repression of discontent were equally features of the Empire, so this source should not be accepted at face value. As Document E was written when Napoleon was trying to establish a place in history after defeat and exile, the claims to be a promoter of nationhood and nationalism need to be treated critically. However, the greater unification of Italy and Germany did have long term effects on the growth of nationalism. In Spain, there was more conquest and repression, as Document C suggests, but the appeal to Catholic feeling ignores the hopes that Spanish liberals had to reform the ancien régime in Iberia. Document D insists that French economic interests come first. By 1810, the idealism of 1807 had subsided. The interests of France were being promoted above the economic needs of his Empire in the Continental System and the idea of putting France first was also applied in other parts of the Empire, for example the Netherlands. After his Italian campaign, Napoleon did see Italy as an area which had been conquered by the sacrifice of French lives and traditionally Italy was seen as more of an area of French influence than German. Both Documents D and B are written by Napoleon to family members whom he had installed as rulers. This is commented on in Document A. The implication is that French ambition, aided by the selfish interests of Prussia, is recasting the monarchs of Europe, reducing them – and interestingly the French Republic – to detritus. Ending traditional monarchs to be replaced by his own chosen standardised ‘kinglings’ would not have been seen as at all beneficial by most of Gillray’s rulers in 1806 after the domination of Europe as a result of Napoleon’s military victories.</p> <p>Needless to say this is not an impartial consideration of the possible benefits that French rule might bring (as in B or E). No set answer is expected – in terms of the many divisions and the repressive nature of much of Europe before 1789 there is a case that the French Empire did bring the modernization and sense of unity that B and E suggest. However, pressures of war brought conscription, taxation, economic controls and repression as well.</p>	20

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>How far did Napoleon's rise to power in 1799 depend on political intrigue?</p> <p>AO1 – Candidates could refer to aspects of the Church such as its leadership, relations with the Papacy, monasteries and priests, and worship.</p> <p>AO2 – Napoleon was one of the generals who might have been installed by those intriguing to end the Directory and to install a strong man to offer protection against enemies to right and left, and to bring an end to the constitution. Though his bulletins had made him famous and his victories in Italy and Egypt had made his military reputation formidable, there was little chance of a military coup without the assistance of leading political figures within the Directory. Answers could set Bonaparte's self-promotion, reputation for state building and independent diplomacy, and his military skills, against the plotting. Answers might also look at the political and economic weaknesses of France under the Directory to challenge whether political intrigue could have been effective without these long-term weaknesses. Answers which consider the events of the actual Coup and point to the role played by Lucien Bonaparte and Napoleon's own lackluster performance need to be sure to relate this knowledge to the question.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>'An unoriginal commander dependent for his success on the weakness of his enemies.' How valid is this judgement on Napoleon Bonaparte in the period 1800 to 1809?</p> <p>AO1 – Candidates could refer to aspects of the Church such as its leadership, relations with the Papacy, monasteries and priests, and worship.</p> <p>AO2 – Accusations of lack of originality are usually based on the key ideas which he adopted such as the division of forces marching towards the battlefield followed by the concentration at the battle, to be attributable to some elements of eighteenth century military practice, for example by de Saxe. His use of artillery is said to derive from Gribeveau, and the use of column and line from the columns used by the Revolutionary armies from the larger forces made available from Carnot's military reorganisation. Many of the tactics were not in themselves original. However, apologists have argued that the way Napoleon used and synthesised ideas amounted to originality, and some military historians have seen originality in the idea of the strategic battle and the <i>manoeuvre a la derrière</i>. The originality may lie more in having an eye for the battlefield and being able to use different ideas in a new way, exploiting the weaknesses of his enemies. Detractors have seen Bonaparte 'blundering to glory' by dint of weak enemies; for example, the famous time gap between Russian and Austrian forces prior to the disaster for Austria at Ulm; or, the decision to attack on the left by the Tsar at Austerlitz, falling into Napoleon's trap. When enemy forces were less weak and error prone, results were far less decisive. Also Napoleon depended a lot on luck; for example, at Marengo, rather than enemy weakness or his own natural ability. There is no set answer expected.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>Did the Hundred Days stand any chance of success?</p> <p>AO2 – Against this proposition that there was little chance of success is: the obvious lack of appeal of the restored Bourbon monarchy and the squabbles and divisions of the allies at the Congress of Vienna; and, the huge residual loyalty of Napoleon’s old followers and the magic of his name and reputation. The greater liberalism of the Constitution may have attracted some of the elements which looked back to the Revolution. Candidates might consider his ability to raise forces quickly and conduct a complex campaign in Belgium before the allies could respond by sending large forces.</p> <p>For the proposition that there was little chance are the divisions and resentments which caused his abdication. The Bourbons had been wise enough to accept a constitutional monarchy, so some of the gains of the Revolution had been secured. Napoleon showed limited interests in political support and he had paid limited regard to previous constitutions, so the new one was often seen as a mere paper exercise. The emotions of the journey from the South of France may well have been fleeting. There was again a reliance on raising forces and invading another country, and much depended on the outcome of the battlefield. However, by then it was clear that the powers of the Emperor were fading, and his lethargic performance and lack of imagination at Waterloo, together with the failure to control his subordinates and the determination of both British and Prussian resistance overcame him. The prospect of heavy taxation, conscription and military adventures was not appealing to many in France and, even with the disputes between the allies, it is difficult to see acceptance of the chronic instability in Europe that a revived Napoleonic regime would bring could be very acceptable.</p>	30