

AS
HISTORY
7041/1J

The British Empire, c1857–1967

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

Mark scheme

June 2020

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 Examiner.

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

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2020 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of Benjamin Disraeli's attitude towards the British Empire in the years 1868 to 1880?

[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.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretation/arguments/views.

In their identification of the argument in Extract A, students may refer to the following:

- Disraeli believed that the Empire made Britain strong and respected and it needed to be protected
- Disraeli had been angry at the Liberals for not being strong enough in foreign affairs
- Disraeli had encouraged the Conservative government to demonstrate that Britain was a strong power.

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

- Disraeli's Crystal Palace speech made in 1872 could be used to corroborate the interpretation as he stated that the maintenance of the Empire was one of the main aims of the Tory Party and that he believed public opinion was in favour of this. Disraeli's actions whilst in power demonstrate the fulfilment of this aim and the demonstration that Britain was a strong power. These actions included buying shares in the Suez Canal and making Queen Victoria Empress of India as these were seen as actions which would protect India and hence the Empire. Also, his brinkmanship over Russia's declaration of war on Turkey in 1877 was designed to ensure India and the Suez Canal were protected
- Disraeli believed the Liberal Party was willing to allow the Empire to crumble and felt they had been too willing to appease the actions of Russia between 1870 and 1873. Disraeli had also previously criticised the Liberal Party for offering self-government to the colonies of settlement without accompanying arrangements for a customs union. He also criticised them for trying to force the Dominions of Canada and New Zealand to pay for their own defence
- the interpretation could be challenged as it can be argued that, regarding Afghanistan and the Transvaal, Disraeli showed little interest and left decision-making to the men on the spot – Lord Lytton and Bartle Frere. Disraeli's lack of interest in the Empire can be corroborated by the fact he left colonial policy in the hands of the Colonial Secretary, the Earl of Carnarvon, who wasn't an expansionist either.

In their identification of the argument in Extract B, students may refer to the following:

- Disraeli was only interested in the Empire if it gained him and the Conservatives support
- Disraeli was critical of the colonies in the Empire
- Disraeli did nothing to implement the ideas he put forward in 1872 once he got into power in 1874.

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

- the extension of the franchise, in 1867, meant that the working-class vote was now there to be won and many felt that Disraeli's previous lack of support or indifference to the Empire demonstrated that he was only interested in it as a means to gain him and his party support. There were no new administrative or economic policies for the Empire enacted by Disraeli as Prime Minister. He also demonstrated little interest in the settler colonies
- prior to 1872, Disraeli had made several anti-Empire criticisms, including referring to colonies as 'wretched' and 'a millstone around our neck'

- the argument that Disraeli did nothing to implement his ideas on Empire after 1874 could be challenged by the expansion that occurred, for example British control in West Africa and the Malay States, the annexation of Fiji in 1874, the purchase of the Suez Canal shares, the annexation of the Transvaal in 1877, the occupation of Cyprus in 1878 and the attempts at expansion in Zululand and Afghanistan in 1879.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, students might conclude that Extract A is more convincing as Disraeli's actions were seen by contemporaries as ushering in a new stage of imperialism and, by the time the 1880 election occurred, he had cemented in voters' minds the idea that the Conservatives were the 'party of Empire'. Alternatively, students may argue that Extract B is more convincing as Disraeli has been seen by many as a pragmatic politician calculating what was in the best electoral interests of his party.

Section B

0 2 'Britain's imperial expansion in Africa, in the years 1890 to 1902, was for economic reasons.'

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 Britain’s imperial expansion in Africa, in the years 1890 to 1902, was for economic reasons might include:

- British expansion into the Transvaal and Natal can be seen to have been motivated by economic reasons due to the value of the gold mines in the area and the threat of the Boers establishing their own independent rail network. Many contemporary commentators felt the Second Boer War was undertaken for economic reasons
- Britain’s actions in Sudan, in 1896, can be seen as being undertaken to ensure a buffer zone was created to protect the Suez Canal and Egypt, which was viewed as economically important
- the expansion into East Africa was argued at the time to have been for economic reasons. Zanzibar, Uganda and Kenya were all viewed as desirable due to the export of tea, coffee and ivory. The investment in the Ugandan Railway, to connect the coast with the highlands bordering Lake Victoria, demonstrates the economic potential the area was thought to have
- West Africa was a source of essential tropical products and trade was well-established through the Royal Niger Company. It could be argued that when this trade was threatened by the French, Britain expanded formally into Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast and the borders of British influence in the Niger area were fixed.

Arguments challenging the view that Britain’s imperial expansion in Africa, in the years 1890 to 1902, was for economic reasons might include:

- the changing international situation in Europe may be argued to have been more important and the threat of France, Germany and, to a lesser extent Italy, forced Britain to react and expand into countries they previously had been happy to exert only an informal influence
- the role of individuals could be argued to have been important in the expansion of the Empire, particularly regarding the Second Boer War. The role of Rhodes, Chamberlain and Milner could be seen to have been more important in provoking the conflict
- strategic reasons could be argued to have played a role. The need to protect the Suez Canal and the expansion into Zanzibar was seen as strategically necessary to move troops to India if needed
- party political reasons may be argued as a reason, especially after 1895 when the Conservative Party were in government. They still portrayed themselves as the ‘Party of Empire’ and felt they represented the will of the people and would point to the 1900 election result to demonstrate this. Imperial expansion was viewed as a vote winner.

Students may argue that although the impetus for expansion was the threat from other countries that became more pronounced after 1890, the only reason Britain felt it had to act was because of the real, or perceived, economic benefits from the countries under threat. Alternatively, students may argue that Britain’s status as the world’s leading power was under threat and maintaining that position became more important than economic motivations and hence countries were annexed which had previously been ignored.

0 3 'Britain strengthened its rule over India in the years 1899 to 1914.'

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 Britain strengthened its rule over India in the years 1899 to 1914 might include:

- the reforms made by Viceroy Curzon in response to opposition from groups, such as the Indian National Congress, provided benefits to the Indian people which made rebellion less likely. These reforms included the founding of the Imperial Cadet Corps, reform of universities and police, changes to the tax system and railway expansion
- the creation of the North West Frontier Province and the invasions of Tibet could also be argued to have strengthened British control of India against the external threat of Russia
- the Indian Councils Act of 1909 and 1910 allowed for greater Indian participation in government, which could be argued to have appeased the Indian people and reduced the threat of opposition against British rule which had started to arise from some groups
- the reunification of Bengal in 1911 and the moving of the capital from Calcutta to Delhi can be seen to have strengthened British rule as it reduced opposition which had arisen due to the partition of the province.

Arguments challenging the view that Britain strengthened its rule over India in the years 1899 to 1914 might include:

- the partition of Bengal in 1905 led to opposition to British rule, such as through the Swadeshi movement, and can be seen as laying the groundwork for later more successful nationalist campaigns
- the increasing criticisms of British economic policies and the impact on India made by the Indian National Congress worried some contemporaries at the time about how strong British rule was. Also, in 1913 the All India Muslim League adopted self-government for India, a clear threat to British rule
- the presence of groups, such as Young India, and the creation of nationalist newspapers demonstrates opposition to British rule was not deterred by the reforms carried out
- the reforms carried out by Curzon, and later in 1909, did little to alleviate the economic hardships faced by many Indian people which could lead to opposition.

Students may argue that the lack of any successful Indian nationalist movement demonstrates that Britain strengthened its rule during this period due to the reforms that were made both economically and politically. Alternatively, students may argue that growing resentment to British rule was beginning to emerge, and hence Britain failed in strengthening its rule.