

A-LEVEL

History

Paper 1J The British Empire, c1857–1967
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version: 1.0

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

A-level History Paper 1 Specimen Mark Scheme

1J The British Empire, c1857–1967

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the impact of the Suez Crisis on Britain’s role as an imperial power in the years after the Second World War. | [30 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: | Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. | 25-30 |
| L4: | Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | 19-24 |
| L3: | Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historic context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. | 13-18 |
| L2: | Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. | 7-12 |
| L1: | Either shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only or addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. | 1-6 |
| | 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.

Note: 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 analysis and evaluation which may be relevant.

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

- the claim that the ‘Age of Empires’ was over and that the Suez venture was ‘doomed’
- the view that Suez was also a catastrophic failure because of the mismanagement and dishonesty of Eden
- that pressure from the USA led to the abandonment of the move.

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

- whether it is justifiable to argue that Suez ‘ended for good’ Britain’s role in the Middle East, some might provide contextual knowledge of how British influence there persisted much longer
- Suez was more a specific series of failures rather than a general indication of decline.

Extract B: In their identification of Reynolds and Dimbleby’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- the claim that Suez failed because of British weakness and British pretensions, not by an ‘American stab in the back’
- the claim that Britain was under-prepared and ill-equipped, both militarily and economically
- the claim that world opinion was antagonised and Suez was the ‘worst humiliation in Britain’s 20th century history’.

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

- it could be argued that the down-playing of the importance of US pressure is dubious, many interpretations would place this factor top of the list
- contextual knowledge could be used to challenge the detailed analysis of a number of contributory factors.

Extract C: In their identification of Brendon’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- the claim that Eden’s biggest mistake was not consulting the Americans
- the related claim that Eisenhower still thought of Britain as an important ally; so the damaged relationship could be and was repaired
- the central theme that ‘the legions did not march home’ after Suez but Britain’s Empire and Commonwealth ambitions remained important on the global stage.

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

- the extent to which Britain did not have any ‘independent’ role in world affairs may be questioned
- the analysis of later developments in British-American relations ‘shoring up the Middle East’ might be seen as convincing in the light of British imperial policies in the 1960s.

Section B

0 2 'British rule in India combined self-interest with an arrogant attitude of racial superiority towards the native population.'

Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1857 to c1900.

[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 British rule was indeed based on self-interest and arrogant racial superiority, having harmful effects on native populations might include:

- British rule marginalised native rulers and did nothing to develop self-rule for the future. Democracy was a myth, for the British rulers only
- class divisions within India were widened, not narrowed. Women were more suppressed, not less. The poor got poorer, not better off
- the suppression of native customs and traditions was often insensitive and harsh
- the ruling elites stayed utterly British and did not mix with, or learn from, native societies. They stayed isolated in bungalows and hill stations, sent children home to be educated, never learned native languages
- native industries were suffocated and by-passed and India became an offshoot of the British economy, for example in textiles.

Arguments challenging the view that British rule was indeed based on self-interest and arrogant racial superiority, having harmful effects on native populations might include:

- many officials and administrators were principled and dedicated, taking their roles seriously and carried through reforms, acting against local corruption
- British rule promoted education and gave the sub-continent a unifying common language (and a unifying national game, cricket, still all-pervasive 60 years later)
- the empire promoted democracy, to an extent, and ensured religious tolerance
- British rule modernised the economy and gave India its infrastructure, above all the railway network
- there may have been a sense of racial superiority but this was mostly benevolent paternalism
- many aspects of Indian life have deteriorated since independence.

Students may conclude that whilst there was an assumption of racial superiority, British rule was more than just arrogant and self-interested.

0 3 'The consolidation and expansion of the British Empire in Africa in the years c1880 to 1914 owed more to the ambitions of key individuals than to economics.'

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 key individuals were the main reason for consolidation and expansion in Africa, might include:

- men on the spot wielding local authority were often able to set and implement policy with little interference from London, such as Baring in Egypt and Lugard in Uganda
- men like Cecil Rhodes (and Dr Jameson with his raid) had a decisive influence in forcing issues so that the British government was compelled to intervene; they knew this and deliberately manipulated situations to bring it about
- Alfred Milner and Joseph Chamberlain virtually engineered the Second South African War by acting independently
- many key individuals were non-British opponents, such as the Mahdi in Sudan and Paul Kruger in the Transvaal
- all the above factors relate to the fact that the British government was a long way away, had limited means to exert local control and was almost always reacting to events.

Arguments challenging the view that key individuals were the main reason for consolidation and expansion in Africa, might include:

- many people who supported imperial expansion did so in the assumption that Britain would benefit from it
- equally, many critics of the empire, from Lenin to Hobson to Hobhouse, believed that the empire was driven by economic exploitation
- many key individuals, including Cecil Rhodes were men out to make their fortunes
- it was frequently argued that possessions in Africa were vital to safeguard their route to India, seen as Britain's economic jewel of empire (there had been powerful economic motives behind taking control of the Suez Canal in 1875).

Students might conclude that key individuals played a huge part in the development of empire in Africa but their actions often reflected wider British interests including economics.

0 4 'The end of the First World War unleashed anti-imperialist national movements that successive British governments were unable to understand or control.'

Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1919 to 1939.

[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 national movements were unleashed due to the First World War, that Britain could not understand or control, might include:

- there were pressures on British India, from the rise of Gandhi and the impact of the Amritsar Massacre
- the white dominions, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and South Africa, contributed to Britain's war effort and were likely to demand further autonomy
- Britain acquired new territories as a result of the break-up of the Ottoman Empire. These territories were gained at the expense of national leaders who felt cheated of the independence promised to them (such as Faisal and the Arab revolt)
- Britain faced particularly difficult issues in Palestine, where conflict between Jews and Arabs was fierce and intractable
- Britain's imperial rule was mostly a thin veneer, dependent upon obedient native populations believing in the 'colonial mystique'. The First World War had damaged this mystique
- the rise of the Labour Party after 1919 weakened support for the empire.

Arguments challenging the view that national movements were unleashed due to the First World War, that Britain could not understand or control, might include:

- the First World War was a shock but not a destructive blow; it was the Second World War that really caused the system to crack
- British rule remained secure in India, supported by a strong political consensus
- the war strengthened the loyalties of the white dominions much more than it led to demands for change
- British rule in places like Cyprus, Egypt, Iraq and the Gulf States was effective and relatively untroubled until well after the Second World War
- national movements had mostly moderate reformist leaders who rarely demanded outright independence.

Students might conclude that whilst the First World War threatened imperialism in general and encouraged nationalist movements, Britain did succeed in controlling its empire until the late 1940s.