



History

Paper 1J (AS) Specimen Question Paper

Question 01 Student 3

Specimen Answer and Commentary

V1.0 05/01/16

Specimen Answer plus commentary

The following student response is intended to illustrate approaches to assessment. This response has not been completed under timed examination conditions. It is not intended to be viewed as a 'model' answer and the marking has not been subject to the usual standardisation process.

Paper 1J (AS): Specimen question paper

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 expansion in Africa in the late nineteenth century?

[25 marks]

Student response

Both sources have show that the move to Africa by Britain was fundamentally economic, however it is stated for 2 different reasons by the authors of the two different sources, with Oliver and Atmore being more of the offensive and Judd suggesting that it was more defensive.

Oliver and Atmore say in this source that the move was a "commercial penetration of the interior" which is true because Britain did have an interest in west Africa before 1806. This was due to the fact that slave trade was one of the big major ways of Britain getting external income but this was only until the 1806 when Britain had officially made slave trade illegal but even after slave trade had ended they still kept their colonies which were Gambia, golden coast, Sierra Leone and others. Another reason was that Britain was starting to have the industrial revolution in the 1880's which meant they needed a market as well as a place to collect all their raw materials to allow to work the machines. Britain also explored other parts of Africa in places like Cape Colony where they later found Gold and diamonds, these were lead mainly by Gentlemen Capitalist who wanted to find a bigger economy and find a mean of income. This brought people like Cecil Rhodes into the Picture and these people were backed by the government. The occupation of cape colony would lead to things like the Boar war. This theory of greed thought out be Lenin was said to be one of the main reasons the British even went to Africa.

Judd on the other hand suggested that it was a move for the protection of its key routes to places like Africa, saying there was an "overwhelming need" for Britain to protect its routes to places such as India and other places in Asia. This is true in a sense as the Suez Canal after being built by the French the British decided buy the 49% of shares of the Suez and this was also to help the economic growth in Britain and when there was a revolt in Alexandria in Egypt and this was when Britain decided to occupy Egypt however this was just for the sake of protecting the route to India and this was easier than going all the way round. The other places that Britain wanted to protect the trade routes were places like Cape Colony and the other western African countries, these places were where the British decided to use as places for refilling things like food and water and other resources. This was one of the main reasons why the British were in Africa to begin with.

Both of the sources agree on the fact that the British had to shift their original goals for other reasons. This is different in the two texts as Oliver and Atmore suggested that British interests, were 'speeded up and complicated' by the what happened to the other countries forced Britain to 'look beyond her immediate economic needs' which is again the more aggressive view by using words such as "speeded up", this statement might be seen valid as well as because after Germany had entered the

race in the early 1870's after its unification in 1871, the British seemed more the keen to expand from just their few colonies their colonies. The problem also was the French they were also expanding greatly in west Africa this might have also been a problem in the eyes of the British maybe this did stress the British and saw France and Germany as challengers as this is what is shown on maps before France and Germany the expansions seemed to be slow and in west Africa it just stopped, there was no actual change in that region of Africa.

Even though Judd agreed on the point that the British had to avert form the original reasons of actually going into Africa. Judd suggested that many British statesmen and military leaders were 'obsessed' with perceived 'foreign threat'; brought in a formal Empire to 'protect the old'. This might have been true because even after 1806 the British kept places like West Africa even after there was no intentional use of the colonies and this was due to the fact that Slave trade was abolished and the had had these colonies for a every long time with Golden coast being it first Colony in Africa. Another example is what became occupied Egypt. This was to protect the Suez Canal after being built Disraeli bought 49% of the Suez Canal, meaning they became a major part of the Suez. This meant that when there was rebellion in Alexandria, a port near the canal, Britain wanted to protect it so badly that cancelled their dual control with France. This all links with the fact that during the partition of Africa and 1914 the British became more formal in the way they were ruling in places like Africa, this might have been like Judd said in the source that it was the greed that made British statesmen and military leaders became 'obsessed' with protection of their assets in their colonies in Africa.

Even though sources do agree on the expansion of Britain was due to the economic benefits of Britain. This however wasn't fully true because Britain's actions in Egypt wasn't really in response to the 'African scramble' in fact the British really only occupied the territory due to the fact that Britain didn't see a economic benefit in Egypt to start with, they only wanted first hand knowledge of what was going on in Suez and the rebellion in Alexandria pushed Britain's need to occupy Egypt to secure it's now vital asset, the canal as the Kadives were not able to control their country enough to protect the canal for them. Maybe the reason why the French were not included has to do with the greed that Judd was talking about. Judd also mentions about the 'protect Indian Empire from imagined foreign threat' this might have played a major part in the large shares bought by Disraeli for Britain, this could be because Germany and Spain could also want access the route and so they can tax German and Spanish ships more because both the countries wanted part of the benefit that Britain was getting from India.

Oliver and Atmore suggest that the British were aggressively pursuing scramble for territory as result of Partition by stating 'compelled to enter the scramble...in order to reserve largest possible sphere for own future activities'. This could be believed to a certain extent because even though the British were expanding rapidly, they did refuse land given to them by King Bell and King Acque the leaders of Cameroon and instead gave this land to Germany which could mean that Britain even through the rapid increase in its interest in Africa and in the Scramble of Africa still cared about Public relations and diplomacy and even though they were at competition with Germany, this could mean two things that Britain had such a great economy they had the chances to give away land as it did or Britain just didn't see any use of the land given to them by the leaders of Cameroon. However in speaking about the public relations this is just to European countries only as they didn't even bother to respond to the letter sent to them.

In Conclusion both Sources provides convincing interpretation of British expansion in Africa in late 19th century. However the second extract provides more convincing interpretation of the expansion in Africa as in order for Britain to obtain even more colonies, it was due to this greed and need for

protection of not just India but places of value such as Cape colony because from India got things that the British loved things like tea and from Cape Colony the British had later found diamonds and gold and therefore needing to protect both for the benefit the economic growth of Britain.

Commentary – Level 3

The answer attempts to assess the interpretations in the Extracts (not sources, as the answer suggests), and is wide-ranging, but the response fundamentally lacks control and, in places, accuracy. The knowledge deployed to support the view of penetration of the interior is somewhat random and the areas cited that were important for the Suez Canal are too general rather than specific. Overall, whilst there is extensive deployment of knowledge, it is not sufficiently linked to the extracts to be fully effective. Fundamentally, the need to focus fully on how the extracts differ and which is the more convincing, has not been met.