

Title: To what extent did the direct involvement of Napoleon Bonaparte in the warfare lead to the failure of the Russian Campaign 1812?

Criterion A: 3 marks

An appropriate and interesting question for the investigation has been stated. The candidate has identified and selected two relevant secondary sources (not tertiary): one is an article published in a professional journal for historians (*The Journal of Modern History*) in 1966, by a historian, and the other one is a book about “*Napoleon and Russia*” written by a Russian historian in the year 2000. This evaluation is not complete – some aspects are missing and the reference to the sources value and limitations is limited.

Criterion B: 6 marks

The main text – the investigation is a bit confusing. The structure would have been better if the candidate had been able to finish the work on time. This is very much a “raw copy” that was not commented on. It’s a pity since several important factors are present in the text. There is a certain structure, but the different parts lack clarity. After a short introduction of Napoleon’s role, the main text should clearly show the arguments for Napoleon’s direct involvement in the Russian campaign and why he therefore can be held responsible for the failure. Then the next part should show other reasons for the failure of the Russian campaign. The lack of clarity and organization has a negative effect on the analytical part – there is really no analysis – just some comments. A pity – since the topic and this text had some potential

Criterion C: 3 marks

The reflection focuses on the methods used by historians as well as the problems that occurs and it’s connected to the investigation. I would have suggested a shorter text in this part and advice the candidate to use them in the discussion of the investigation – if I had given a chance to comment on this work. Now this part is a bit longer – and it’s fairly well-written.

Total: 12 marks