



AS History

7041/1J-The British Empire, c1857–1967

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

June 2018

Version/Stage: 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

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.

The British Empire, c1857–1967**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 British occupation of Egypt in the late nineteenth century? **[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 James' argument, students may refer to the following:

- defence of the Suez Canal was a compelling reason for intervention as this waterway was so important to Britain's trade
- the future attitude of Arabi and his fellow nationalists could not be predicted
- the British remained in Egypt because there was a fear that other countries would take over if they did not do so; this concern grew over time.

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

- Britain's trade interests may be assessed by reference to the growing importance of the Suez Canal as a conduit of British trade (eg) through statistical evidence, or through reference to the shorter route to India and Australia; Britain's status as a great power may be seen to be dependent on its control of sea lanes
- the unpredictability of the situation and risk posed by Egyptian nationalists may be assessed (eg) by reference to the effect of the Alexandria riots and accounts of massacres of Europeans; the danger of other powers taking control in Egypt may be assessed by reference to the position of the French, the background of Dual Control, their reluctance to become involved in a joint intervention in 1882 and subsequent ongoing tensions between France and Britain
- the international relations context may be further assessed by reference to the interests of other countries and developments, including the Alliance System and co-operation between France and Russia, the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire, and Italy's colonial expansion in North Africa and how this placed British imperial links in jeopardy; Germany's later interest in the Mediterranean may be seen to be relevant.

Extract B: In their identification of Al-Sayyid-Marsot's argument, students may refer to the following:

- Britain officially presented its occupation of Egypt as temporary and altruistic, designed to restore order etc., but in practice, British governments did not have a clear or consistent policy
- there was division between 'liberals' and 'hard-liners' in Britain (and an implied division within government departments)
- Baring was pivotal in persuading successive governments to remain in order to carry out reforms of Egypt's finances and other areas.

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

- the emphasis given to the temporary nature of British involvement may be assessed by reference (eg) to the diplomatic fall-out given French interests, Liberal divisions etc.; the difficulties of creating stability in Egypt may be examined with reference to (eg) the weakness of the Khedive, ongoing pressures from nationalists and Islamists etc.
- the idea of 'mission creep'/change over time may be explored; differences of approach between the Gladstone government and subsequent Conservative administrations may be seen as relevant; students may analyse political differences in approach through reference to (eg) the Sudan and/or defence of the Nile
- Baring's ambitions may be analysed, with reference (eg) to his stated principles, his background, reforms in Egypt, including public works, agricultural reforms and financial measures; reforms may be seen to represent the subordination of the Egyptian economy to Britain.

Students may conclude that Extract B is more convincing by virtue of the importance attached to the influence of the 'man on the spot' (which may be set in the broader context of British imperial practice). The absence of a single consensus policy towards Egypt and/or its evolution over time may be seen to be more convincing. Students may also infer that the author of Extract B attaches importance to practical, administrative considerations and financial pressures and see these as compelling. Students may see Extract A as more convincing because of its emphasis on British strategic interests and by presenting the occupation of Egypt in the context of international relations. In arriving at a judgement, students may see the differences as essentially matters of 'emphasis' – the reference to the Foreign Office in the final sentence of Extract B may be seen to echo Extract A. The limitations of both analyses may form part of the analysis and judgement. Any substantiated conclusion as to which is the more convincing will be fully rewarded.

Section B

- 02** 'The ruthless suppression of the 1857 Indian Mutiny was the main reason Indians did not challenge British rule in the years 1857 to c1890.'

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 supporting the view that the ruthless suppression of the 1857 Indian Mutiny was the main reason Indians did not challenge British rule in the years 1857 to c1890 might include:

- the ‘ruthless’ treatment of mutineers by British authorities, including barbarity of punishment/showcase executions designed for ‘shock and awe’, would have deterred Indian nationalists and may have had a psychological effect
- the removal of the obvious alternative to the Raj through the execution of the Mughal Emperor’s sons
- most Indians, who had not participated in the 1857 uprising, were appalled by the atrocities committed by both sides and the breakdown of order.

Arguments challenging the view that the ruthless suppression of the 1857 Indian Mutiny was the main reason Indians did not challenge British rule in the years 1857 to c1890 might include:

- the post-conflict reforms and policies of the first viceroy ‘Clemency’ Canning, including greater religious and cultural sensitivity on the part of British authorities; subsequent viceroys and humanitarian campaigners might also be seen as significant in winning hearts and minds
- the ‘mutiny’ itself may not be seen as a broadly based nationalist movement; most Indians may be seen to have had limited political consciousness at this time; the sepoys’ grievances may be seen to have been very specific – military reorganisation mitigated threat of repetition of military-based insurrection
- the extension of consultative initiatives and measures to consolidate the loyalty of traditional elites, including princely rulers may be seen as important, together with the development of educated middle-class who collaborated and identified with British rule and bought into its professed benefits of fairness and equality
- good government during what has been described as the ‘Golden Age’ of the Raj would have impressed Indians, including the development of the economy, railway and communication networks, land improvement schemes

Students may conclude that repression was the main reason why a generation of Indians were reluctant to risk challenging British rule, but may see it as one factor amongst many. Whilst the psychological impact of the events of 1857–1859 would undoubtedly have influenced Indian (and British) attitudes, and may have had the deepest emotional leverage, this needs to be seen alongside other reasons why Indians might not challenge British rule. Alternative explanations of what was the most important factor may be advanced. Some might go so far as to argue that most Indians perceived benefit from the Raj and supported it, particularly in the absence of a better alternative.

- 03** 'The discovery of gold and diamonds was the most significant development in southern Africa in the years 1867 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 supporting the view that the discovery of gold and diamonds was the most significant development in southern Africa in the years 1867 to 1902 might include:

- the influx of capital and mass British migration on the back of the new diamond and gold industries transformed the region and so affected both the Boer and African ways of life; British colonial acquisitions in the region may be seen to directly or indirectly support the needs of industry; the 1899–1902 conflict may be seen to have been about control of the region's wealth
- the wealth at Rhodes's disposal had implications for his ambitions in the region, while the BSA Company was an active player in the later part of the period; this was significant for tribes such as the Matabele and Mashona as well as the Afrikaaners/Boers
- the region's new wealth and strategic importance meant that there were more reasons for Britain to come into conflict with the Africans and Boers; the conflicts with the Boers and successive military campaigns against the indigenous peoples of southern Africa, notably in the late 1870s, may be seen to have been driven by economic imperatives of the mining industries

Arguments challenging the view that the discovery of gold and diamonds was the most significant development in southern Africa in the years 1867 to 1902 might include:

- political ideas emanating from Britain, rather than the needs of industry, may be seen to have shaped the region and so affected its peoples; the federalist agenda of Carnarvon and Frere triggered the wars of the late 1870s and early 1880s; the imperial ideology of Chamberlain and allies such as Milner and Rhodes might also be seen to be significant, notably in bringing about the Boer War
- war itself may be seen as more significant: the destruction of African societies may be seen to have been brought about by war; similarly, the 1899–1902 Anglo-Boer war may be seen to have destroyed Boer society
- the resurgence of Afrikaaner nationalism may be seen to be significant: the wealth generated from taxing gold mining initially strengthened the Boer republics, particularly the Transvaal, and so may have helped perpetuate the Boer ascendancy and influence; it took war to break this ascendancy
- wider international relations may be seen to be significant: German interest in the region may be seen to be significant in its own right (eg annexation of South West Africa) and as a catalyst for British ambitions (eg annexation of Bechuanaland).

In arriving at a conclusion, students may see that the development of diamond and gold mining had political and societal implications, or alternatively argue that economic changes did not necessarily give rise to wider societal changes. Students may distinguish between differing perceptions of significance (eg Boer, Zulu etc.) or recognise that perceptions differed at different times. Students might challenge the extent to which all of southern Africa was affected by the development of diamond and gold mining etc. and might see other factors as more important in certain regions. Students may conclude that southern Africa was shaped by a number of developments and these causal factors were interconnected.