
AS

History

The British Empire, c1857–1967

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

7041
June 2017

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

June 2017

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 the impact of British rule on the economic development of its colonies in the years 1857 to 1890? **[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 Gann's and Duignan's argument, students may refer to the following:

- British colonisation was a positive force aiding economic development
- with respect to Africa, the British freed workers from former constraints, removed restrictions on trade and production, provided physical and human capital and offered public and private investment
- the impact of British rule was limited by the fact that there were too few capitalists.

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

- British action against slavery and the high level of investment in Africa (and the wider Empire) would corroborate
- Britain's ascendancy in technology and its ability to organise/improve infrastructure permitted economic growth that would not otherwise have been possible at that time
- development was, however, only undertaken where British merchants and entrepreneurs could make profits and the well-being of the colonial peoples was not generally paramount; this extract is also limited to the African experience – there was variation in different parts of the Empire.

Extract B: In their identification of Dilley's argument, students may refer to the following:

- British colonisation brought exploitation and economic damage
- with respect to Africa and India: British trading houses gained monopolies in products and used these to maximise profits; the workers were poorly paid and 'forced' in Africa; colonial enterprise was restricted to a narrow range of products and over-susceptible to market fluctuations
- British policies in India actively prevented industrial growth.

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

- colonial economies were developed in the interest of the Mother country – primarily as suppliers of raw materials and agricultural products; such concerns predominated over native development
- the Lancashire cotton lobby ensured Indian cotton manufacture was restricted in favour of the export of raw cotton to Lancashire mills

- economic development was nevertheless fostered by the British who provided facilities and investment.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, students may suggest Extract A offers a more convincing interpretation because British colonisation certainly raised the economic level of African colonies and, whatever workers were paid, it was certainly no less than they had received in the past. Alternatively, they may argue that Extract B is more convincing, since the British developed the economies of their colonies to their own ends and for their own profits. Reward any valid and well-supported answer.

Section B

- 02** 'British explorers were responsible for the increase in popular support for imperialism in Britain in the years 1857 to 1890.'

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.

Arguments suggesting that British explorers were responsible for the increase in popular support for imperialism in Britain in the years 1857 to 1890 might include:

- the tales of explorers (e.g. David Livingstone, John Kirk, Richard Burton and John Hanning Speke) were spread through newspapers, magazines, lectures at a time when literacy ensured a wide readership; interest in these exploits contrasted with earlier popular indifference to Empire
- tales of exploration were given religious/moralistic overtones which accorded with Victorian attitudes. Explorers, e.g. Livingstone received funding from missionary societies
- exploration came at a time of a greater interest in science and self-confidence as a result of industrial change. Discovery also had an exoticism which appealed to the popular imagination.

Arguments challenging the view that British explorers were responsible for the increase in popular support for imperialism in Britain in the years 1857 to 1890 might include:

- imperialist literature embraced a wide variety of themes of which exploration was but one part; just as important were reports and accounts of the work of missionaries and traders
- imperialism was encouraged by success (in conquest/annexations/trade) and the use made of this by politicians at the time of the broadening of the franchise
- Disraeli's conservative imperialism/jingoism associated imperialism with patriotism; events such as crowning of Victoria as Empress of India 1877 and the Afghan and Zulu wars were a focus for imperialistic values
- Darwin's *Origin of the Species* (1859) excited particular interest in anthropology – as did Imperial exhibitions which were well attended.

The surge in popular support for Imperialism was in many ways deliberately manufactured – partly by those who sought sponsorship – partly by those who wanted to make political capital out of it. The part of explorers was important but the spread of imperialism also reflected greater literacy, of political awareness and the growth of the press.

N.B. This question sup be drawn from across the period. ce canporting eviden ers the period 1857-90 and supporting evidence can be drawn from across the period. Evidence from before 1857 or after 1890 is not strictly relevant but should not be penalised, especially if it is used to demonstrate a relevant factor e.g. the role of the press in fuelling support for imperialism.

Not

03 ‘The British government was entirely to blame for the breakdown in British relations with the Boers in the years 1877 to 1902.’

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.

Arguments suggesting that the British government was entirely to blame for the breakdown in British relations with the Boers in the years 1877 to 1902 might include:

- the British enforced annexation in 1877 (following the discovery of diamonds in 1867 near the Orange/Vaal Rivers), so provoked Afrikaaner nationalism and the first Boer War (Transvaal Rebellion) of 1880
- it was feared that the discovery of gold on the Witwatersrand (1886) would make the Transvaal a political and economic threat to British supremacy in South Africa (at a time when Britain was engaged in the scramble for African colonies with France and Germany)
- the government was complicit on Cecil Rhodes's scheme to back the Jameson Raid, of 1896 in an attempt to overthrow Kruger's Transvaal government; Rhodes and other imperialists could not have provoked war had government not chosen to intervene
- Chamberlain and Milner exaggerated the threat from the Transvaal and Milner deliberately became involved in the domestic issues of the Transvaal (the Uitlander vote) Britain provoked the second Boer War 1899–1902 (by refusing to compromise and rejecting the Transvaal ultimatum).

Arguments challenging the view that the British government was entirely to blame for the breakdown in British relations with the Boers in the years 1877 to 1902 might include:

- the Boers themselves share some blame – talk of an Afrikaaner alliance with the Germans in SW Africa from 1884
- high tariffs imposed by the Boers damaged British trade; Transvaal ambition seen in the extension of its territory over Swaziland
- it was less the fault of the British government than the men on the spot – particularly Rhodes and Milner
- Paul Kruger – equally ambitious politician strengthened by Gold; the wars were a battle for capitalist ascendancy.

Students are likely to argue that the British government must bear a good deal of the responsibility for the breakdown in relations although they are likely to see this tempered by the action of the 'men on the spot'. They may argue that the Boers were provoked into war or they may see the Boers as equal protagonists. Reward any well-substantiated argument.

N.B. Although the main thrust of this question is about the causes of the Second Boer War, the period covered by the question extends to 1902. Answers which include material about the war years, 1899-1902, should be credited if this made relevant to the issue of British relations with the Boers, but this cannot be expected even at the higher levels.