

### Examiner's Specific Advice

In this question, a full, balanced assessment of the reasons for Napoleon's success as a general is essential, and a considered judgement should form the conclusion. The best answers will offer comparative assessments of different explanations and assess their *relative* importance before reaching a conclusion. Less effective essays are likely to supply more general comments without relevant supporting details. They will probably consider one or two reasons rather than several; they may describe campaigns and battles; and they will fail to use historical knowledge effectively.

### Exemplar Question

Assess the reasons why Napoleon was militarily successful in the period from 1799 to 1807.

[50 marks]

[Click here for a  
Chronology  
relating to this  
topic](#)

### Examiner's Exemplar Plan and Essay 1

#### Plan

- Introduction
- Napoleon
- French army
- Victories
- Enemies
- Conclusion (1)

Napoleon had a number of great military victories in this period. He was successful for a number of reasons. By 1807 he controlled most of Europe. He was possibly the greatest general of modern times (2).

(1) A very basic plan, which only serves as a reminder of the general areas to be covered, with no obvious or explicit line of argument.

(2) This is a relevant, if very general, start. There is an indication that the question has been understood and a general indication

**Access to History Online OCR European and World History Period Studies – Napoleon, France and Europe 1795–1815 – Standard AS Question**

Napoleon was a great general who won a series of battles such as Austerlitz. He used a range of strategies but perhaps his favourite was the envelopment manoeuvre. He was also a good battle commander who waited to see what the enemy would do and then adapted to that strategy using his reserve forces to defeat the enemy (3).

Such strategies and tactics were used in a number of victories over Austria, Prussia and Russia. He won at Marengo, Ulm, Austerlitz, Jena, Friedland and other battles between 1799 and 1807 (4). Austerlitz is often seen as his greatest victory because he defeated the Austrians and Russians with fewer troops. He planned the battle well and succeeded when he should have lost (5).

One reason why Napoleon was able to win was the French army. The French army he used in this period was the best and largest in Europe. It was a conscript army which had won battles in the 1790s, some under Napoleon. The army 'lived off the land' so could move quickly. It also moved in smaller groups called 'corps' so could move faster than in one big group. Each corps could fight on its own. It had good tactics for fighting developed by Guibert and others. It used artillery to soften up the enemy and then columns of infantry to break into enemy lines. Cavalry was also used (6).

Another reason why Napoleon was successful was that his enemies were weak or made mistakes. General Mack stayed at Ulm and was surrounded. Napoleon faced weak coalitions which often broke up, like the second coalition. Austrian and Russian forces did not work well together and did not agree about strategy at Austerlitz. Napoleon's enemies did not have good generals. Mack was a bad general (7).

The Battle of Austerlitz was Napoleon's greatest victory. He defeated the Austrians and Russians in one battle and forced the Russians to retreat and the Austrians to make peace. He tricked the enemy into attacking his right wing, which they thought was weak. In fact Napoleon had brought up more troops overnight. To attack Napoleon, the Austrians and Russians weakened their centre and then Napoleon attacked with troops hiding in the mist. He split the enemy into two and then destroyed them. It was a magnificent victory (8).

So Napoleon won many victories. This was because he had a strong army, he was a great general and the enemies he faced made mistakes and were weaker. They could not deal with Napoleon's attacking warfare and his army's speed and determination – esprit de corps (9).

### **Examiner's Assessment**

of the extent of Napoleon's victories. There is also an implication that this success has something to do with Napoleon's generalship.

(3) This is potentially a good paragraph dealing with an issue central to the question. Two elements which made Napoleon a good general – strategy and tactics – are given, but there is no mention of how he used these in particular campaigns or battles.

(4) There is some sound knowledge deployed here – the main battles. But a simple list is not enough. Knowledge needs to be used to answer the question.

(5) There is a fair general point made here and some explanation, but no supporting evidence about the battle cited – although the battle is described later in the essay.

(6) A better paragraph here where a number

**Access to History Online OCR European and World History Period Studies –  
Napoleon, France and Europe 1795–1815 – Standard AS Question**

The answer uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence that demonstrates some command of the topic. The essay is not well organised – note the detachment of the description of Austerlitz from points made about the battle earlier in the essay – but is generally clear in its communication. This element of the essay merits a Level IV mark of 13 (AO1a). There is a limited and patchy understanding of a few issues in their historical context, and analysis of the importance of developments could be stronger. This part of the essay merits a Level III mark of 17 (AO1b). The overall total mark is 30 (Grade C).

of points about the French army are explained. A pity that these points are not linked to actual campaigns/battles .

(7) Another better paragraph with some basic supporting explanation. It could be developed more fully and precisely.

(8) This shows good detailed knowledge about Austerlitz. However, opportunities to make substantive points in relation to Napoleon's generalship are missed and the evaluation therefore is not explicit.

(9) What a pity these lines did not come earlier in the essay and so developed further. A key point is added at the tail end of the conclusion.

(10) The initial task in any essay is to decide what the question is about and what the key words in the title mean. Every question set should indicate

## **Examiner's Exemplar Plan and Essay 2**

### **Plan**

- Extent of success/context. Reasons: Napoleon as leader, general; French army; European situation; deficiencies of enemies; resources
- Napoleon = most important factor: ruler of France/c-in-c, motivator, strategist, battlefield commander, offensive warfare (campaign examples)
- Link to French army: 'ready-forged weapon', strength, organisation, tactics/movement (examples), generals
- Link to France and Empire: resources/political situation
- Link to European situation: circumstances/coalitions/resources
- Develop deficiencies of enemies: politics, generals, armies

(10)

**Access to History Online OCR European and World History Period Studies –  
Napoleon, France and Europe 1795–1815 – Standard AS Question**

Between 1799 and 1807, and between 1805 and 1807 in particular, Napoleon scored a series of decisive military victories which arguably brought him to the high point of his power in Europe. These victories – Marengo and Hohenlinden (1800), Ulm and Austerlitz (1805), Jena and Auerstadt (1806) and Eylau and Friedland (1807) – led to the humbling of the continental great powers of Austria (twice), Prussia and Russia (11). Perhaps the single most important factor explaining these victories is Napoleon himself, but his role needs to be seen in the context of the nature of the French army and state, the European situation and the deficiencies of his enemies (12).

Napoleon had one supreme advantage over his enemies: he was both the effective commander-in-chief of the French army and the ruler of the French state – a combination which meant that whenever necessary the state could be organised to support the needs of the military (13). For example, Napoleon could order the formation of a reserve army, which he would use to cross the Alps in 1800 to defeat the Austrians at Marengo, and in 1805 could assemble the Grand Armée on the Channel Coast to face Britain.

But Napoleon was also a great military leader, even if the degree and nature of his talents are still debated by historians. Few would dispute his ability to motivate men and Napoleon set great store by knowing his men. He gave the appearance, when reviewing troops, that he knew each soldier, passing a comment here and there and tweaking the ears of favourites. On the eve of the Battle of Austerlitz, Napoleon toured the lines to be met with adulation and cries of ‘Vive l’Empereur’. His men were ready to march for him and fight for him partly because he gave the impression of knowing them, partly through appearing to share their privations on campaign and perhaps mainly because he was a winning general with a string of impressive victories behind him before he became First Consul and then Emperor. Wellington estimated the moral effect of Napoleon’s presence on the battlefield to be equivalent to 40,000 men (14).

On campaign Napoleon had a clear purpose – to search out and destroy the enemy’s main forces (15). In this offensive type of warfare Napoleon would move his troops rapidly to find the enemy, pin them down and then concentrate his forces to secure a decisive victory. In 1806 Napoleon moved rapidly north into Prussia, spread his corps wide in the ‘bataillon carré’ formation, located the Prussians at Jena, concentrated his forces and destroyed the enemy (16). This was his preferred strategy, especially when he had superior forces and was able to deploy envelopment. This was employed in the Ulm campaign in 1805, when he marched his Grand Armée to the Danube in October 1805 and surrounded General Mack at Ulm, forcing a humiliating surrender before he could escape. In

the content area (Napoleon’s military success), the focus (reasons for) and the key instruction ‘Assess’. Assess means to evaluate and judge the relative merits of different aspects – in this case, reasons for military success. ‘Military success’ restricts treatment to issues relating to the battles and campaigns more or less directly. There is therefore no need to include reference to domestic or foreign policy success *except* insofar as they have an impact on military success. The essay plan here indicates a number of directly relevant areas and includes a reminder to ‘link’ factors together.

(11) This is an effective opening, indicating a clear understanding of the context of Napoleon’s military success. The litany of battles listed is impressive, although strictly speaking Hohenlinden was not Napoleon’s victory, but Moreau’s.

**Access to History Online OCR European and World History Period Studies –  
Napoleon, France and Europe 1795–1815 – Standard AS Question**

battle, he prepared in detail and, whilst he would have a plan, his basic approach was to engage the enemy and then, in his words, 'to wait and see', keeping back a reserve to deploy when he detected the enemy weakness. At Austerlitz in 1805, both elements occurred. The Austrians took the bait of Napoleon's apparently weakened right wing, moving their main force against it and so weakened their centre. Napoleon then used his reserve to smash through the weakened centre to score a decisive victory (17).

For all Napoleon's skills and power, however, he would not have been able to score such impressive victories without a powerful and skilled army. The French forces he commanded in this period were the best in Europe, with a core of veterans from the wars of the 1790s and a steady supply of fresh troops trained on the march through the policy of the 'amalgam', mixing new and experienced troops together. The French army was also 'a ready-forged weapon' (Chandler), already versed in the type of warfare Napoleon was to employ to devastating effect (18). It was organised in flexible divisions and corps, able to move separately and fight on their own (each corps contained infantry, cavalry and artillery). They 'lived off the land', enabling rapid movement unencumbered by lengthy supply trains (as in the Ulm and Jena campaigns). In battle, they could deploy in line (for defence) or column (for attack) or in mixed order as appropriate, could concentrate artillery to blast gaps in the enemy line, could deploy skirmishing troops in front of the main forces to break up enemy attacks and so on (19).

Napoleon also benefited from having some very able generals. Partly, these were a product of the Revolutionary system of 'careers open to talents' from which Napoleon himself had benefited, partly the results of Napoleon's own appointments. The talent and decisive action of particular generals helped secure victories at crucial times. The best example is, perhaps, the initiative Desaix showed in marching his division to the 'sound of the guns' at Marengo to turn a seeming defeat into a victory. Equally impressive was the generalship of Davout, who defeated a force three times the size of his at Auerstadt whilst Napoleon was winning at Jena. Less obviously, Napoleon had an excellent staff officer in Berthier, who helped organise the logistics of campaigns. On the other hand, of course, Napoleon also had some weaker, less reliable officers such as Bernadotte, whose division failed to engage at Jena-Auerstadt (20).

For each victor in battle, there was a loser, so any explanation must take account of the strengths and weaknesses of the enemies Napoleon faced (21). Certainly Napoleon controlled the most powerful state in Europe and could call on the resources of satellites and allies. This meant Napoleon could outgun any single opponent, be it Austria, Prussia or Russia.

(12) The opening paragraph must be focused on the question. Here we have a clear indication of the line of argument and some idea of the relative importance of factors.

(13) A sound paragraph which places military success in a wider context. This kind of point is often missed from more modest answers, which tend to focus more exclusively on battles and campaigns.

(14) While this is an important point effectively made about Napoleon's leadership quality, arguably too long is spent on it. In an exam, this might create pressure later in the essay to rush points or leave them out.

(15) This is a good point which is often missed. Napoleon's overall approach to warfare was to seek rapid and decisive victory – a concept foreign to those schooled in the more sedate pace of

**Access to History Online OCR European and World History Period Studies –  
Napoleon, France and Europe 1795–1815 – Standard AS Question**

However, if these powers had managed, with the economic support of Britain, to combine effectively together, Napoleon's task would have been more difficult. As it was, the fragile coalitions that faced him at this time never included all of the great powers, were poorly coordinated and broke up as individual enemies were defeated. In 1805 Mack advanced to Ulm without waiting for the Russians to arrive and in 1806 Prussia (which had not been a member of the coalition in 1805) believed it could take on Napoleon without Russian support (22).

A further advantage to Napoleon, arising from the situation of his enemies, was that their armies had not fully adapted to the new methods of warfare honed by the French in the 1790s. Press-ganged troops under strict codes of discipline and inflexible in manoeuvre were, in general, no match for the more motivated and flexible troops under Napoleon's command. Relative slowness in manoeuvre was exposed, for example, in 1806 when Napoleon advanced towards Prussia to find the Prussian forces divided, and, at Auerstadt, Davout's victory is partly explained by the fact that the Prussians feared they were facing Napoleon. Historians have also criticised the poor generalship of opponents like Mack and the divided command apparent at Austerlitz, for example, where Russian and Austrian generals and rulers could not agree on strategy (23).

So Napoleon's military success arose from a combination of factors. Napoleon's own talents as a military leader were a necessary but not sufficient factor in the remarkable series of victories he scored. It is clear that the strength of the French army and state behind him gave him the secure foundation on which he could build victory, whilst the deficiencies of his enemies, from quality of officers and troops through to the fragility of coalitions, provided Napoleon with weaknesses he could exploit (24).

### **Examiner's Assessment**

This is a well-constructed, focused and clearly argued case. The language and style are easy to read and suggest that the candidate is in full control of the material. The use of factual knowledge is also very sound: names, dates and events are accurately cited and, most importantly, used relevantly to illustrate the answer. It merits a Level IA mark of 24 (AO1a). The essay is mostly analytical and substantiated, and judgements about the relative importance of factors are made. Links between factors are stressed and explained and the conclusion draws the essay together well. Perhaps there is a little imbalance in the treatment of factors and the essay does rather gloss over some enemy weaknesses (perhaps under time pressure). The plan indicates an intention to deal with the

strategic manoeuvre and avoiding battle typical of 18th-century warfare.

(16) The 'bataillon carré' was the system of movement by which separate army corps stayed within one day's march of each other, enabling a wide net to be spread and so improving chances of finding the enemy.

(17) This is an effective paragraph because not only does it show an understanding of general strategy and tactics, but supports this knowledge by accurate reference to particular and relevant campaigns and battles.

(18) Brief quotations, like this from David Chandler, can be useful and enhance a candidate's writing, but, in general, long quotations are to be avoided.

(19) This is a good paragraph which sets out the intended points –

**Access to History Online OCR European and World History Period Studies –  
Napoleon, France and Europe 1795–1815 – Standard AS Question**

general European situation, but reference to this in the essay is at best implicit. Even so this is a very impressive piece and deserves full credit. This AO1b skill gains a Level IA mark of 26.

The overall total for the essay is 50 marks, and worthy of a Grade A.

the strengths of the French war machine. There are supporting battles and campaigns, but the examples perhaps need a little more explanation to drive the point home.

(20) This is an effective paragraph with some good examples. It is also worth noting how the point at the end is qualified, to suggest that not all Napoleon's officers were the most effective.

(21) This is a good linking sentence to show the interconnection between French strengths and enemy deficiencies.

(22) The paragraph here appears a little rushed. While there is an example to support poor coordination and a nod to weak coalitions, the points being made in the paragraph perhaps deserve fuller explanation.

(23) There is a

rush of points in this penultimate paragraph, but the writer still appears in control of the material.

(24) A sound conclusion effectively drawing the strings of the argument together.

[Click here for a Mark Scheme that accompanies the exemplar answers provided above](#)

[Click here for further sample Questions to test your skills](#)

### [Mark Scheme]

Examiners use Mark Schemes to determine how best to categorise a candidate's essay and to ensure that the performances of thousands of candidates are marked to a high degree of consistency. Few essays fall neatly into the mark levels indicated below: some answers will be particularly well argued but offer little supporting detail; others may be factually full but poorly organised or contain few judgements. Examiners therefore seek to find the 'best fit' when applying the scheme. Each essay has a final mark based on two Assessment Objectives (AO1a and AO1b) worth 24 + 26 = 50 marks. As the standard of the two essays lies between Level I and Level IV, only the descriptors and marks for these levels have been tabulated below.

	<b>AO1a Mark Scheme for Levels I, II, III and IV</b>
<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	<b>Recall, select and use historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding clearly and effectively</b>
<b>Level IA</b> <b>21–24 marks</b>	Uses a wide range of accurate, detailed and relevant evidence. Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology. Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly.
<b>Level IB</b> <b>18–20 marks</b>	Uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence. Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology. Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; writes accurately and legibly.
<b>Level II</b>	Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence, which demonstrates a competent command of the topic. Generally accurate use of historical terminology. Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and



**Access to History Online OCR European and World History Period Studies –  
Napoleon, France and Europe 1795–1815 – Standard AS Question**

<b>16–17 marks</b>	communication is generally clear.
<b>Level III 14–15 marks</b>	Uses accurate and relevant evidence, which demonstrates some command of the topic but there may be some inaccuracy. Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used. Most of the answer is organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated.
<b>Level IV 12–13 marks</b>	There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant. Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication.

	<b>AO1b Mark Scheme for Levels I, II, III and IV</b>
<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	<b>Demonstrate an understanding of the past through explanation and analysis, arriving at substantiated judgements of key concepts and of the relationships between key features of the period studied</b>
<b>Level IA 24–26 marks</b>	Clear and accurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic. Clear and accurate understanding of issues in their historical context. Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed and substantiated explanations, some of which may be unexpected. The argument evaluates a range of relevant factors and reaches clearly substantiated judgements about relative importance and/or links.
<b>Level IB 22–23 marks</b>	Clear and accurate understanding of most key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic. Clear understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context. Answer is mostly consistently and relevantly analytical with mostly developed and substantiated explanations. Substantiated judgements about relative importance of and/or links between factors will be made but quality of explanation in support may not be consistently high.
<b>Level II 19–21 marks</b>	Mostly clear and accurate understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic. Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context. Much of the answer is relevantly analytical and substantiated with detailed evidence but there may be some description. The analysis of factors and/ or issues provides some judgements about relative importance and/or linkages.
<b>Level III 16–18 marks</b>	Some uneven understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to their historical context. Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also simple description of relevant material and narrative of relevant events <b>OR</b> answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin.

**Access to History Online OCR European and World History Period Studies –  
Napoleon, France and Europe 1795–1815 – Standard AS Question**

	<p>Answer considers a number of factors but with very little evaluation of importance of or linkages between factors/issues. Points made about importance or about developments in the context of the period will often be little more than assertions and descriptions.</p>
<p><b>Level IV</b> <b>13–15 marks</b></p>	<p>Understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and the topic is variable but in general is satisfactory. Limited and patchy understanding of a few relevant issues in their historical context. Answer may be largely descriptive/narratives of events and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained <b>OR</b> answers will mix passages of descriptive material with occasional explained analysis. Limited points made about importance/links or about developments in the context of the period will be little more than assertions and descriptions.</p>

**Further sample questions**

1. To what extent did Napoleon's domestic policies during the Consulate follow the principles of popular sovereignty, liberty and equality?
2. 'From the start, he was a dictator, pure and simple.' How far do you agree with this view of Napoleon's rule of France?
3. How far do you agree that Napoleon was a military genius?
4. Compare the importance of the Peninsular War and the Russian campaign in explaining the downfall of Napoleon.
5. Assess the reasons for Napoleon's downfall to 1814.
6. 'The benefits Napoleonic rule brought outweighed the disadvantages.' How far do you agree with this judgement of Napoleon's government of France during the Consulate (1799–1804)?
7. Assess the impact of Napoleon's reforms on the people of France.
8. Assess Napoleon's strengths and weaknesses as a general.

**Chronology: Key Events in Napoleon and Europe, 1799–1807**

- 1799: Napoleon seizes power in the Coup of Brumaire.
- 1800: Battles of Marengo and Hohenlinden force Austria to make peace at Luneville (1801) and the Second Coalition breaks up (1).
- 1802: Without a Continental ally, Britain makes peace with France at Amiens (2).
- 1804: Napoleon becomes Emperor.
- 1805: Britain organises the Third Coalition (Britain, Austria and Russia) against France.  
October: Britain wins the naval victory at Trafalgar; Napoleon defeats the Austrians at Ulm.  
December: Napoleon defeats the Austrian and Russian armies at Austerlitz; Austria leaves the Third Coalition.
- 1806: Prussia joins the Third Coalition (3).  
October: Napoleon defeats the Prussian armies in the twin battle of Jena-Auerstadt (4).  
December: Napoleon, having entered the Prussian capital Berlin, institutes the Continental Blockade against Britain in the Berlin Decrees (5).
- 1807: January: Napoleon and Russia fight the bloody but indecisive battle of

**Access to History Online OCR European and World History Period Studies –  
Napoleon, France and Europe 1795–1815 – Standard AS Question**

Eylau (6).

June: Napoleon inflicts a decisive defeat on Russia at Friedland and subsequently Alexander I of Russia and the king of Prussia sign the Treaties of Tilsit (7).

(1) The military strategy that culminated in the Battle of Marengo involved an enveloping manoeuvre by which Napoleon led his army across the Alps into northern Italy behind the Austrian forces under Melas which were besieging Genoa. Napoleon's advance towards Melas lacked proper reconnaissance and, with only a portion of his forces, Napoleon ran into the main Austrian force near Marengo. It was only the timely arrival of Desaix and the cavalry charge of Kellerman which saved Napoleon from defeat. The victory was decisive in that it secured Napoleon's reputation and position in France and forced Austria to open peace negotiations. Austria, however, did not sign a peace treaty until after General Moreau, in command of the French forces in Germany, inflicted a second defeat at Hohenlinden in December 1800.

(2) It is probable that neither France nor Britain regarded Amiens as more than a truce. Both sides were guilty of breaching its terms and inevitably tensions rose. As France gathered an army to invade Britain, Britain, promising subsidies, negotiated a new coalition against France including Austria and Russia. It was to deal with this new continental threat that Napoleon abandoned any plan to invade Britain and marched his Grand Armée to the impressive victories at Ulm and Austerlitz. The manoeuvre towards the Danube is a good example of the speed of march of the French forces divided into separate corps and the strategy of envelopment. Austerlitz is remembered as perhaps Napoleon's finest victory, although some historians like Corelli Barnett question how far the battle was planned.

(3) Prussia had been kept out of the Third Coalition partly by the timidity of the Prussian King, Frederick William III, and partly because Napoleon dangled the tempting bribe of Hanover (once British) to Prussia to stay out of the war. Once it became clear that Napoleon could not be trusted, Prussia joined the coalition, confident its army, which had been pre-eminent in the eighteenth century, could defeat France.

(4) To deal with Prussia, Napoleon advanced rapidly northwards, aiming to defeat Prussia before the Russians arrived. The rapid advance found the Prussian army split into two main forces. Napoleon defeated the first at Jena, sending Davout (and Bernadotte) in an enveloping manoeuvre to cut off the Prussian line of retreat. Davout's force ran into the second main Prussian force at Auerstadt and defeated it with only 10,000 men. The victories were decisive and Prussia was rapidly overrun.

(5) The Continental Blockade was Napoleon's attempt to defeat Britain using economic warfare by closing off the Continent to British trade. It did not work.

(6) Napoleon claimed Eylau as a French victory on the grounds that at the end of the day the Russians withdrew from the battlefield. This bloody battle was not planned by Napoleon and was fought in a blizzard. Casualties were high on both sides. Even if French claims to victory are accepted, it was not a decisive battle. That came in the summer at Friedland.

## Access to History Online OCR European and World History Period Studies – Napoleon, France and Europe 1795–1815 – Standard AS Question

(7) After his victory at Friedland, peace terms were negotiated. Napoleon charmed the Russian Tsar during discussions and meetings at Tilsit and Russia (and Prussia) agreed to become French allies and to impose the Continental Blockade against Britain. Prussian interests were largely ignored, but the King of Prussia, without Russian support was forced to accept humiliating terms.

### Teaching Activities

Try the following with your students:

(1) Using the two exemplar essays, discuss the importance and purpose of essay planning in successfully answering an AS essay question. What makes a good plan?

(2) Compare the introductions and/or conclusions of the two exemplar essays. Which is the more effective and why?

(3) Both essays refer to a number of reasons for military success. Ask students to rank the reasons in order of importance and, more importantly, to justify their ranking to each other. This should focus minds on reasons why one factor is more significant than another and how reasons can be linked together.

(4) Using extracts from both essays, discuss how the two candidates have examined the Battle of Austerlitz. Which is better and why? This could lead to discussion on how to use knowledge effectively to back up analytical points.

(5) Take one of the 'more important factors' – such as Napoleon's generalship. Ask students to research this area carefully. Ask some students then to produce a case that Napoleon was a military genius, and others to produce a case criticising his generalship. Class discussion could then focus on where the balance of the argument lies. To consolidate, students could write up a balanced assessment and conclusion.

### Resources

- C. Barnett, *Bonaparte* (Wordsworth, 1997)
- M. Broers, *Europe under Napoleon, 1799–1815* (Arnold, 1996)
- D. Chandler, *The Illustrated Napoleon* (Greenhill, 1991)
- O. Connolly, *Blundering to Glory* (Scholarly Resources, 1987)
- G. Ellis, *Napoleon* (Longman, 1997)
- C.J. Esdaile, *The Wars of Napoleon* (Longman, 1995)
- M. Lyons, *Napoleon Bonaparte and the Legacy of the French Revolution* (Macmillan, 1994)
- A. Matthews, *Revolution and Reaction, Europe 1789–1849* (Cambridge University Press, 2001)
- F. McLynn, *Napoleon* (Jonathan Cape, 1997)
- J. Tulard, *Napoleon: Myth of the Saviour* (Methuen, 1987)

### Weblinks

- [www.napoleon.org](http://www.napoleon.org)
- [www.napoleonbonaparte.nl](http://www.napoleonbonaparte.nl)
- [www.napoleonguide.com](http://www.napoleonguide.com)

**Access to History Online OCR European and World History Period Studies –  
Napoleon, France and Europe 1795–1815 – Standard AS Question**

[www.napoleon1er.com](http://www.napoleon1er.com)

[www.napoleon-series.org](http://www.napoleon-series.org)

[www.historytoday.com](http://www.historytoday.com)

[www.britannica.com](http://www.britannica.com)

[www.amazinggrades.co.uk](http://www.amazinggrades.co.uk)