
A-level
HISTORY
7042/2H

Component 2H France in Revolution, 1774–1815

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Component 2H France in Revolution, 1774–1815

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the coup of Brumaire. **[30 marks]**

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- written by Napoleon who not only gave the speech, but was also one of the leaders and the person who benefited the most and therefore, it is highly valuable
- it was spoken originally, and then written, in order to convince the Ancients of the purity of his motives and to that extent is more valuable in demonstrating how he wished to be portrayed than the reality of the events of the coup
- it is written just a day after the coup of Brumaire, when the public were just hearing about what had happened and shows how important it was to Napoleon to try to win over opinion in the immediate aftermath
- it is a very personal statement in which Napoleon stresses his innocence and servant attitude. This suits his purpose as he is clearly trying to convince them that his motivations are honourable, and at the time of the speech, had been trying to persuade the Ancients to agree to his plan on the basis that he could be trusted.

Content and argument

- Napoleon's claim here is that he was not involved in any kind of planning but was 'staying quietly in Paris when I was summoned' is valuable in highlighting the way he wished this to be portrayed, rather than the reality which is that he was involved in planning this with Sieyès
- Napoleon argues that the Republic has abdicated as though his actions have only been in response to that. In reality, this was an organised coup in which council members were bribed, troops deployed around Paris and Directors persuaded to stand down
- in support of his trustworthiness in this situation, Napoleon refers to his devotion to his country, reminding them of his success in war on behalf of France and his role in crushing dissent, something which will be fundamental to his leadership of France and which he has already deployed much propaganda to promote
- the charge of outlawry to which he refers is something he was charged with by some in the Council of Five Hundred, from which he required the protection of his brother, Lucien. Here, he speaks of himself as enjoying the patronage of 'the gods of fortune and of war'. This suggests someone who though trying to convince people of his innocence in the coup, is also promoting his own greatness and, perhaps, fitness to fill the gap caused by the coup.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is a proclamation by the three Consuls, all of whom were involved in the planning of the coup and who therefore would wish to justify their actions as soon as possible to ensure a peaceful transition and their own positions. The fact that it was issued by the three shows that at this point Bonaparte was not acting on his own and reflects the plan as created by Sieyès
- again it was issued the day after the coup, making it valuable in showing their sense of urgency in getting out an official message in order to pacify the people and put themselves in a good light
- the tone of this proclamation is one of patriotism which stresses the importance of the Republic, suggesting that the coup has been all about rescuing the Republic from those who would bring it harm and restoring it to glory. This language is valuable in showing how the Consuls wished to win over the people by using the words of the revolution, stressing equality and liberty, rather than focusing on the illegality of the coup and the scheming which brought it about
- the source is emphasising the necessity of this coup in rescuing the Republic from ruin and restoring it to its glorious potential.

Content and argument

- the source refers to the problems faced by the Directory, and particularly the disregard they displayed for the Constitution in the coups of Fructidor and Floréal which certainly weakened support and respect for it
- it also refers to France as entering the last stage of general disorganisation. It is true that there was a breakdown in law and order in many parts of France with many localities unwilling to impose unpopular laws. On the other hand, Sieyès himself was involved in some of the destabilisation and unpopular laws, and the Directory also presided over much success
- the stress here is on the idea that patriots have rescued France and have dealt with those who wished to do them harm. This is referring to the rumour put about by Sieyès that action needed to be taken because of a Jacobin conspiracy to overthrow the Republic. It was this rumour which was used to persuade the Councils to move to Saint-Cloud. However, there was general fear about the resurgence of the Jacobins seen in the elections of 1798
- the Consuls stress their own loyalty to the Republic by swearing an oath to the Republic and recalling to mind the original principles of the revolution upon which it was founded and from which the Directory had wandered. Given that Sieyès wanted a stronger government than that provided by the Directory, and that Napoleon's form of government largely disregarded liberty, it would seem that these words are used mainly to win support.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is from a book written by Madame de Staël, a prominent woman in this period who was very interested in political ideas. She was therefore able to observe these events at close quarters and is well-qualified to comment on them. On the other hand, she wasn't physically present at the events discussed
- this book was completed in 1817 which would give her the benefit of hindsight, which might well affect her account of the event, particularly given her banishment from Paris by Napoleon, but could also add value as she would have had more evidence at her disposal than an immediate reaction
- the tone is initially descriptive of the events but then becomes condemnatory of Napoleon's actions, describing his success in 'destroying...the dignity of the deputies'. This might betray her dislike of Napoleon, making it potentially less valuable, although it could also reflect her concern for liberty and national representation

- the source particularly emphasises the role of Napoleon and the military in the coup and is highly critical of their treatment of the representatives of the people.

Content and argument

- the source corroborates the fact that some deputies demanded Napoleon be outlawed but focuses on Napoleon's rescue of Lucien, rather than Lucien's previous rescue of Napoleon. This could reflect the fact that accounts of exactly what happened are confused, but it also fits with her narrative which seems to suggest that Napoleon was directing events and therefore was most responsible, particularly for the use of armed force.
- it also accurately describes the way the deputies were forced to escape through the window into the gardens of Saint-Cloud. Her description of them escaping in their senatorial robes emphasises her point that they had been 'rendered ridiculous' by the military for the first time since the revolution. This is valuable in highlighting the fact that this was a military coup which paid little heed to the rights of the elected deputies. In reality there had been previous examples of elected deputies being treated unlawfully, for example the coups of Fructidor and Floréal, but perhaps on those occasions it was a less 'ridiculous' spectacle.
- her focus on 'Bonaparte' rather than any of the other people involved in the coup might reflect the fact that she could adjust her writing with the benefit of hindsight. The fact that there is no mention of his moment of weakness when he had to be rescued might be because she knew what happened afterwards and blames Napoleon for the destruction of national representation, linking it to the specific events of the coup and describing him as taking pleasure in it.
- she also focuses on the military nature of the coup, emphasising this by referring to Napoleon as 'General Bonaparte' in two of her three references to him. This is valuable as it was indeed through his military success that Napoleon was best known at the time and why Sieyès had decided to work with him in the coup. According to this source, civil power was destroyed by the military, even though, in reality, it was conceived of by Sieyès with the military as a mere tool. However, there is no mention of Sieyès here.

Section B

- 02** To what extent did the constitutional reforms of 1789 to 1791 bring about equality in France? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments/factors suggesting that the constitutional reforms of 1789 to 1791 brought about equality in France might include:

- titles, veniality and privileges were abolished. This meant the Church and the nobility had to pay tax and they had to face the same justice as everyone else. Therefore, this increased equality in France
- no distinctions were made between people so that previous titles of 'master' and 'mistress' to denote status within a trade disappeared and everyone became a citizen
- Protestants and, eventually, Jews, were given full citizenship, granting them equality with other citizens
- all people were equal before the law and everyone was entitled to a free and fair trial. Furthermore, a single legal system was established granting equality of treatment throughout France
- all citizens were to be eligible for all ecclesiastical, civilian and military positions.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the constitutional reforms of 1789 to 1791 brought about equality in France might include:

- divisions still existed between citizens as they were divided into 'active' and 'passive' citizens for political purposes, depending on the amount of tax they paid. Those who were passive citizens were unable to vote and involvement in political life was reserved for those who paid high levels of tax. For example, only one in a hundred were eligible to stand as a deputy
- although major improvements were made to taxation, the burden faced by land owners and property owners varied across the country according to department which meant inequality remained until there was a systematic valuation of the land and this was not completed until the 1830s
- employers were favoured over employees. The Assembly passed the Le Chapelier Law which forbade trade unions and employers' organisations. Strikes were made illegal, as was picketing and collective bargaining. Workers also had to carry a livret which could potentially make it harder for them to get work
- women did not gain equality
- although in theory many offices were open to all regardless of background, it was the bourgeoisie who benefited from the new system as education and literacy were requirements for positions of responsibility in local government etc.

The reforms of the Constituent Assembly certainly increased equality by removing privilege and laying the groundwork for a more meritocratic society. However, the reforms passed reflected the concerns of the bourgeoisie who formed the majority of the Assembly. Their concern for property and stability led them to limit democracy and restrict the rights of workers. As a result there was greater equality than had existed under the Ancien Régime, but it left many disappointed.

03 'Military defeat was the main reason for the development of the Terror in 1793.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments/factors suggesting that military defeat was the main reason for the development of the Terror in 1793 might include:

- the CPS was set up in April 1793, primarily in order to oversee all aspects of the conduct of war as a result of very mixed fortunes in war and the expansion of war to include Great Britain, the United Provinces and Spain
- amongst other duties, representatives-on-mission were sent out across France to ensure compliance with conscription and to improve morale amongst troops
- a levée en masse was proposed on 23 August 1793, which called on the whole population to contribute to the war effort which increased government control over every individual and laid some open to arrest after the Law of Suspects in September if they were not sufficiently patriotic
- 17 generals were executed in 1793, as a result of military defeat. Accusations were made, especially against those with a noble background. Carnot replaced them with men committed to the Revolution, such as Jourdan and Lazare-Hoche, under whom the French army started to enjoy victory. From then on, any military defeat or failure to follow through on victory was viewed as a political crime which could result in execution
- all necessary steps had to be taken to ensure that the nation had all the resources necessary to conduct war. This included Revolutionary Armies confiscating church silver and bells against the wishes of local people, thus developing the Terror.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that military defeat was the main reason for the development of the Terror in 1793 might include:

- the Republic also had to deal with the threat faced from insurgents in the Vendée and from the Federal Revolts which followed the expulsion of the Girondins
- the growing power of the sans-culottes was another reason for the development of the Terror. Their successful overthrow of the Girondins in May 1793, meant that their demands were hard to ignore in this period, and they were largely responsible for the introduction of economic and religious terror, although in both these cases the demands of war were also partly met as a result and it was fear of military defeat which contributed to the radicalisation of the sans-culottes.
- individuals were also important in the development of the Terror, particularly those who were dominant in the CPS, including Robespierre, Saint-Just and Couthon. Although they had to be responsive to the issues already mentioned, they were in a position to direct the Terror to a large extent, particularly from September 1793. The introduction of the Law of Frimaire, in December 1793, increased the power of the CPS despite French success in war
- the Jacobins wanted greater centralisation of power. The war provided the justification for them to do this.

Students might argue that defeat in war was responsible for the development of the Terror, to a very large extent. The Republic faced very real challenges from their enemies and survival required them to harness all their resources for that purpose. However, internal revolts were potentially just as problematic, if not, more so. They might alternatively argue that, the Jacobins and the sans-culottes were both in favour of the greater centralisation and control which the Terror brought about, and that the war provided the justification for them to push forward with these policies, rather than being the real reason. The best responses will see the link between these factors, with fear of military defeat driving the radical action of the sans-culottes, as well as putting pressure on the economy which made them more vociferous in their demands for maximum prices.

- 04** 'Napoleon's downfall was the result of his own weaknesses and mistakes in the years 1812 to 1815.'

Assess the validity of this statement.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments/factors suggesting that Napoleon's downfall was the result of his own weaknesses and mistakes in the years 1812 to 1815 might include:

- Napoleon was defeated as a result his own mistakes. For example, his decision to go to war against Russia was partly because of his obsessive dislike of the British and his anger at the Russian failure to uphold the Continental Blockade. As a result he overextended himself, as the Peninsular War was ongoing and he was forced to be heavily reliant on conscripts who were not as well-trained or as loyal
- furthermore, he made tactical errors in the 1812 campaign, which contributed to its failure, such as presuming his soldiers would be able to live off the land, despite the problems they had already faced in Spain
- his failure in the 1812 campaign against Russia led to the formation of the Fourth Coalition against France, leaving Napoleon heavily outnumbered
- it could be argued that Napoleon was unrealistic. He refused to accept a generous peace deal in 1814, which would have enabled France to keep the 'natural frontiers' of the Rhineland, instead trying to raise yet more conscripts, which only succeeded in strengthening the resolve of the coalition to utterly defeat him. Although initially, he was surprisingly successful in his attempted return to power in 1815, he underestimated the strength of the opposition he faced.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Napoleon's downfall was the result of his own weaknesses and mistakes in the years 1812 to 1815 might include:

- the Spanish fought the French using guerrilla war tactics, something which the French army was much less used to and found difficult to overcome. This meant that the war dragged on, absorbing men and money
- France's enemies learned from their experiences of fighting the French. For example, the Russians purposely used scorched earth tactics knowing that the French relied on living off the land in order to move quickly
- defeat also prompted his enemies to increase the size of their armies and to improve the quality of their training and equipment in order to be a greater challenge for Napoleon
- the persistence of the British in frustrating the Continental Blockade as well as the skills of Wellington in Spain, contributed to Napoleon's final defeat
- there is also the simple fact that, while divisions between countries such as Britain, Prussia and Russia might have made them easier to defeat, when they came together, as they inevitably would, they were a force to be reckoned with, and by 1814 their combined strength was greater than that of a diminished France.

Many of the reasons why Napoleon had defeated his enemies initially was because of new tactics he adopted. However, over time it is not surprising that his ability to surprise his enemies waned and that they adopted some of the tactics which had made him so successful. Therefore, his enemies became increasingly difficult to defeat, especially as he became more reliant on conscripts. Furthermore, Napoleon's ambitions seem to have blinded him to the difficulties inherent in controlling such a large area in Europe and he overestimated what he could achieve.