



---

AS

# History

The British Empire, c1857–1967

7041/1J The High Water Mark of the British Empire, c1857–1914

Mark scheme

---

7041  
June 2016

---

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](http://aqa.org.uk).

June 2016

The British Empire, c1857–1967

AS History Component 1J The High Water Mark of the British Empire, c1857–1914

### Section A

- 01** With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of British India from the Indian Mutiny to c1900? **[25 marks]**

*Target: AO3*

*Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.*

### Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. They will evaluate the extracts thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated judgement on which offers the more convincing interpretation. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion as to which offers the more convincing interpretation. However, not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements may be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show a reasonable understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. Comments as to which offers the more convincing interpretation will be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will show some partial understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be some undeveloped comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will show a little understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be only unsupported, vague or generalist comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **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.**

In responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach to individual arguments. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate or challenge.

**Extract A: In their identification of Palmer’s argument, students may refer to the following:**

- Palmer sets out the view that Britain adopted a new policy after the Mutiny – ruling India directly, in collaboration with the Indian upper classes
- the new policy would last until the end of the Indian Empire
- the policy worked because the British protected the interests of the Indian elites and became more indulgent of Indian culture – ‘superstition’.

**In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:**

- detail of the establishment of the British Raj in 1858 would confirm the ‘radically new course’
- contextual knowledge of the longevity and stability of British India might also be used to support the view that Palmer is convincing
- contextual knowledge of examples of heavy-handed attitudes suffocating the desire for Indian self-determination might be used to challenge Palmer’s interpretation.

**Extract B: In their identification of Roberts’ argument, students may refer to the following:**

- Roberts gives the view that the Mutiny inflicted a damaging ‘wound’ on British rule in India, especially in terms of confidence and goodwill
- he believes there was a change in attitudes due to the ‘myths’ of ‘atrocities’
- British rule after 1857 involved ‘repression and social exclusiveness’.

**In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:**

- the atrocities of the Mutiny and untrustworthiness of the Indians may be questioned (although Roberts does make it clear that perception was more important than the reality)
- contextual knowledge of the changed nature of British rule after 1857 could corroborate Roberts – with examples such as Curzon as viceroy, or emergent Indian nationalism reacting against British repression
- contextual knowledge might be used in the opposite direction to emphasise the longevity and stability of British rule – for example the loyalty shown by Indians employed in the civil service, education, railways etc.

Answers might conclude that Extract B is more convincing because it has more depth and differentiation. Extract A offers a clear-headed analysis of change in the direction of British policy after 1857; but Roberts in Extract B delves deeper into the motives and psychology behind this change. Alternatively some may argue that Extract A is more convincing because it accords more strongly with their contextual knowledge. Reward any convincing judgement.

**Section B**

- 02** ‘British aims in Egypt and Sudan in the years 1875 to 1898 were defensive, not expansionist.’

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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.**

The focus of this question is on the aims and objectives of British colonial policies in Egypt and Sudan: from securing control of the Suez Canal in 1875, through the extension of British rule from 1882, to the climactic events of Fashoda and Omdurman in 1898. Answers will need to provide a balanced assessment of factors that underpinned the extension of British rule in order to reach a judgement as to how far this was 'defensive'.

**Arguments suggesting that British aims in Egypt and Sudan in the years 1875 to 1898 were defensive not expansionist might include:**

- Great Power rivalry, especially with France, was a clear and consistent impulse, pushing Britain to intervene in Egypt, as was seen in 1875, in 1878 at the Congress of Berlin, and in 1882
- the overriding concern with defending British India dictated a strategic concern to prevent other powers, such as France in the Middle East or Russia in Central Asia, threatening India or the Suez Canal; British actions in 1898 were a defensive response to the French expedition to Fashoda; and against the fear of a power vacuum in the Upper Nile region
- deep concern about the decline of the Ottoman Empire was a major (and defensive) theme in British policy everywhere in the Eastern Mediterranean
- the lack of expansionist aims behind British rule in Egypt and Sudan was shown by the reluctance of Gladstone and the Liberals to support Gordon at Khartoum.

**Arguments challenging the view that British aims in Egypt and Sudan in the years 1875 to 1898 were not defensive and more expansionist might include:**

- the establishment of British rule in Egypt was part of a consistent and coherent expansion in Africa as a whole. For example, the expedition of Hicks Pasha in 1883 was not defensive but part of a 'forward' policy
- policy was driven forward by ambitious, interventionist men-on-the-spot, like Baring (as with other parts of Africa, such as Cecil Rhodes in the South) who sought territorial aggrandisement
- Egypt and the Nile basin were consistently *thought* to be economically important and worth acquiring
- public opinion and 'popular imperialism' was jingoistic and expansionist, as was shown by the pressures on Gladstone to act in 1885.

The focus of this question is mainly on 'causation': on the motives that led to British interventions in the years 1875 to 1898. It may also be seen as a question about change over time, differentiating between actions that may have varied explanations.

**03** 'The Boer War strengthened Britain.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view of the years 1899 to 1914. **[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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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.**

The focus of this question is on the impact of the Boer (or Second South African) War of 1899–1902 for Britain. Answers should consider the war itself and its aftermath to 1914 and provide a balanced argument to support or refute the quotation.

#### **Arguments suggesting that the Boer War strengthened Britain might include:**

- the war ended in British victory and a fair and moderate peace agreement in 1902 and the constitutional settlement of 1909 resolved relations between Britain and South Africa in the long-term, allowing a harmonious relationship to develop
- the patriotic response of South Africa to the First World War revealed how strong the bonds of 'kith and kin' still were
- British public opinion rebounded after the end of the war, restoring imperial pride; the agonising over the war at the time did not last
- the lessons of the war led to significant military and naval reforms and a drive for 'National Efficiency'.

#### **Arguments challenging the view that the Boer War strengthened Britain might include:**

- the length of the war and the humiliating failure of Britain's military machine to deal promptly with 60 000 Boers was a shattering blow to national self-confidence
- moving soldiers to South Africa to fight in the war left the rest of the Empire, particularly India, dangerously exposed
- the revelations of the horrors of the British concentration camps proved a humiliation
- political and public opinion initially turned against imperialism; this was shown in the rise of the New Liberalism, increased support for the Labour Party, and the growing feeling that 'splendid isolation' was no longer a feasible policy.

Answers may conclude that the Boer War weakened Britain at the time, showing the limitations of the military in particular, but that in the years up to 1914 it brought changes which strengthened Britain and enabled it to enter the First World War with renewed confidence.