

SOURCE A: Extract from *The Rise and Fall of the British Empire*, by Lawrence James (1994)

There were plenty of real soldiers in exotic uniforms marching through London to celebrate Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee in 1897. Troops from every part of the empire took part in the festivities, which also included a review of the fleet at Spithead. The Jubilee was more than a display of imperial muscle; the Queen was at the heart of the empire and it was loyalty to her which helped give it a sense of cohesion. There was no other obvious bond to hold together white settlers from Canada or Australia who were now managing their own affairs; Indians governed from Delhi; Nigerians ruled by the privately-owned Royal Niger Company; and the subjects of protectorates and colonies ruled from Whitehall through local officials with the cooperation of their own chiefs. The Queen whose head appeared on their stamps and coins symbolised the unity of empire. Her genuine, maternal care for her subjects (she had deliberately chosen Indian attendants for her household) was widely publicised.

There was plenty of entertaining imperial pageantry, though not on the same scale, before and after the 1897 Jubilee. Bands played and crowds cheered as the Grenadier Guards, dressed in at the new khaki, marched through London in February 1885 on the first leg of their journey to the Sudan. As their train steamed out of Waterloo Station plate-layers waved their shovels, and there were hurrahs from workers in factories along the track. Guardsmen who stayed behind were hired out to take part in 'Lord' George Sanger's show *Khartoum*, which was performed at the Grand National Amphitheatre in London during March and included tableaux entitled 'The British Square at Abu Klea' and 'Gordon's Last Appeal to England'...

Thrilling front-line reports in mass circulation newspapers, like the popular boys' magazines and stories, coloured the public's view of the empire. Photographs and sketches in the Daily Graphic during the 1896-8 Sudan War showed various battle scenes, British and Egyptian orderlies treating wounded Dervishes, and, by way of contrast to this humanity, skeletons of tribesmen massacred at the orders of the Khalifah Abdullah. Further confirmation that Britain was fighting for civilisation came with an illustration in June 1896 of Muslim chiefs in northern Nigeria, swearing on the Quaran to renounce slavery.

...Even the nursery was not closed to imperialism. An *ABC for Baby Patriots* published in 1899 included:

C is for Colonies

Rightly we boast

That of all the great nations

Great Britain has the most

SOURCE B: Extract from *The Last Mughal: The Fall of Delhi, 1857* by William Dalrymple (2006)

The siege of Delhi was the Raj's Stalingrad: a fight to the death between two powers, neither of whom could retreat. There were unimaginable casualties, and on both sides the combatants were driven to the limits of physical and mental endurance. Finally, on 14th September 1857, the British and their hastily assembled army of Sikh and Pathan levees assaulted and took the city, sacking and looting the Mughal capital, and massacring great swathes of the population. In one *muhalla* alone, Kucha Chelan, some 1,400 citizens of Delhi were cut down. 'The orders went out to shoot every soul,' recorded Edward Vibart, a nineteen-year-old British officer.

It was literally murder ...I have seen many bloody and awful sights lately but such a one as I witnessed yesterday I pray I never see again. The women were all spared but their screams, on seeing their husbands and sons butchered, were most painful... Heaven knows I feel no pity, but when some old grey bearded man is brought and shot before your very eyes, hard must be that man's heart I think who can look on with indifference...

Those city dwellers who survived the killing were driven out into the countryside to fend for themselves. Delhi was left an empty ruin. Though the royal family had surrendered peacefully, most of the emperor's sixteen sons were captured, tried and hung, while three were shot in cold blood, having first freely given up their arms, then been told to strip naked: 'In 24 hours I disposed of the principal members of the house of Timur the Tartar,' Captain William Hodson wrote to his sister the following day. 'I am not cruel, but I confess I did enjoy the opportunity of ridding the earth of these wretches.'

Zafar [the last Mughal Emperor] himself was put on show to visitors, displayed 'like a beast in a cage', according to one British officer. Among his visitors was the *Time* correspondent, William Howard Russell, who was told that the prisoner was the mastermind of the most serious armed act of resistance to Western colonialism. He was a 'dim, wandering eyed, dreamy old man with a feeble hanging nether lip and toothless gums,' wrote Russell...

Nevertheless, the following month Zafar was put on trial in the ruins of his old palace, and sentenced to transportation. He left his beloved Delhi on a bullock cart. Separated from everything he loved, broken-hearted, the last of the Great Mughals died in exile in Rangoon on Friday, 7 November 1862, aged eighty-seven.

With Zafar's departure, there was complete collapse of the fragile court culture he had faithfully nourished and exemplified. As Ghalib noted: 'All these things lasted only so long as the king reigned.' By the time of Zafar's death, much of his palace, the Red Fort, had already been torn down, along with great areas of Mughal Delhi he loved and beautified. Meanwhile the great majority of its leading inhabitants and courtiers—poets and princes, mullahs and merchants, Sufis and scholars—had been hunted down and hanged, or else dispersed and exiled, many to the Raj's new, specially constructed gulag in the Andaman Islands. Those who were spared were left in humiliating and conspicuous poverty.

**SOURCE C: Extract from 'Historical Notes: God and England made the Irish famine',
The Independent, Brendan Graham, Thursday 3 December 1998.**

On 20 August 1845, the day the potato blight *Phytophthora infestans* was first discovered in Dublin's Royal Botanic Gardens, the population of Ireland stood close to nine million people - almost half the combined population of England, Scotland and Wales. Mostly Catholic. Mostly poor.

What was to happen over the next few years was to ensure that by the turn of the century half of Ireland's population had disappeared.

Two million acres in Ireland - one-third of all tilled land - was given over to the cultivation of the lumper potato. While five to six million people were heavily dependent on the crop, some three million souls depended on it totally. The lumper was highly prolific and highly nutritious.

The powerful combination of high yield and high nutrient content in this root would, in its absence, also prove to be a deadly combination. For how else were the people to be fed?

The Union of Ireland with Great Britain in 1800 had not been a Union of equal partners. Ireland was regarded by Westminster as little more than England's granary. Sir Robert Peel, Prime Minister of the Tory Government up to June 1846, neatly captioned the British viewpoint when he uttered, "The real issue is the improvement of the social and moral condition of the masses of the population", a theme oft repeated.

Charles E. Trevelyan, who served under both Peel and Russell at the Treasury, and had prime responsibility for famine relief in Ireland, was clear about God's role: "The judgement of God sent the calamity to teach the Irish a lesson, that calamity must not be too much mitigated".

John Mitchel, the Young Ireland leader, transported in 1848 to Van Diemens Land, had a different view, calling the famine "an artificial famine. Potatoes failed in like manner all over Europe; yet there was no famine save in Ireland. The Almighty, indeed, sent the potato blight, but the English created the famine".

Soup kitchens did keep the Irish alive for a while, some three million daily which is a lasting testament that where there is Government will, so too is there a way. However the free "Soyer's soup" - Alexis Soyer being the French chef at the Savoy hotel who was called in to design a soup for the famine-ridden Irish - if life-preserving for the body, was certainly not the thing for the moral rectitude of the Irish spirit. The soup kitchens were closed.

... Was Britain to blame? Tony Blair in his May 1997 "apology speech" stated that those who governed in London at the time failed their people through standing by while a crop failure turned into a massive human tragedy.

Blair's speech was important to Irish people all over the world in that it officially recognised, for the first time, that the famine was more than just the "Irish potato blight". His words became part of the healing process between the two islands. Next follows admission of culpability and the asking for forgiveness. Finally there is the forgiveness itself. Are we, the Irish, ready yet?

SOURCE D: Extract from Amia Srinivasan, 'Under Rhodes' in *London Review of Books*, 31 March 2016. Srinivasan writes in support of 'Rhodes Must Fall', a campaign to have a statue of Cecil Rhodes removed from Oxford University.

At the Rhodes Scholarship interview, candidates are often asked how they intend to 'fight the world's fight', a phrase inherited from the scholarship's founder, Cecil Rhodes. The exceeding ambition that has always been demanded of Rhodes scholars takes its cue from Rhodes's own imperial fantasies: 'Why should we not form a secret society with but one object, the furtherance of the British Empire and the bringing of the whole uncivilised world under British rule ... What a dream, but yet it is probable; it is possible.'

Rhodes's dream was never realised, but not for want of effort on his part. A year before he took office as prime minister of the British Cape Colony in 1890, in which capacity he stripped much of the black population of its property and voting rights, he founded the British South Africa Company, the vehicle of British hopes in the colonial 'scramble for Africa'. (In 1870, only 10 per cent of the continent was under European control; by 1914 only Ethiopia and Liberia remained unconquered.) The BSAC was licensed by the crown to rule over and make new treaties in the territories between the Limpopo River and Lake Tanganyika, and Rhodes used it to further his mining interests; he had begun buying up mines at the age of 18 with the backing of Rothschild, and founded De Beers in 1888. When the territories rebelled, Rhodes used the BSAC's own police force to crush the rebels. (The company was charged in the House of Commons with deliberately provoking the conflict in order to seize the territory, but was cleared.) In 1895 Rhodes consolidated the land and named it Rhodesia. He died in 1902, aged 48, of a long-term heart condition, one of the richest men in the world.

Rhodes recognised the material advantages of colonial subjugation, but he also believed in its ethical necessity. 'I contend that we are the finest race in the world,' he wrote in the will that established the Rhodes Scholarship, 'and that the more of the world we inhabit the better it is for the human race. Just fancy those parts that are at present inhabited by the most despicable specimens of human beings what an alteration there would be if they were brought under Anglo-Saxon influence.'

Last year student protests at the University of Cape Town brought down a bronze statue of Rhodes on the campus. The Oxford chapter of Rhodes Must Fall took aim at a statue of Rhodes that stands on the façade of Oriel College, of which Rhodes was an alumnus and benefactor. Critics have been quick to register their disapproval. Some historians have compared RMF to Islamic State. Mary Beard warned that to remove the statue would be to erase history.

...RMF Oxford has in a way been a victim of its own success. Neither the Cape Town nor the Oxford campaign has ever been just about statues. RMF Oxford says its ultimate goal is to 'decolonise' the university, a broad campaign – of which changing public symbols is only one part – to address what it sees as Oxford's deep racism.

SOURCE E: Extract from the 'Introduction' to *Empire: How Britain Made the Modern World* by Niall Ferguson (2006).

Many charges can of course be levelled against the British Empire; they will not be dropped in what follows. I do not claim, as John Stuart Mill did, that British rule in India was 'not only the purest in intention but one of the most beneficent in act ever known to mankind'; nor... as General Smuts claimed, that it was 'the widest system of organized human freedom which has ever existed in human history.' The British Empire was never so altruistic. In the eighteenth century the British were indeed as zealous in the acquisition and exploitation of slaves as they were subsequently zealous in trying to stamp slavery out; and for much longer they practiced forms of racial discrimination and segregation that we today consider abhorrent. When imperial authority was challenged - in India in 1857, in Jamaica in 1831 or in 1865, in South Africa in 1899 - the British response was brutal. When famine struck (in Ireland in the 1840s, in India in the 1870s) their response was negligent, in some measure positively culpable.

...Yet the fact remains that no organisation in history has done more to promote the free movement of goods, capital and labour than the British Empire in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. And no organisation has done more to impose Western norms of law, order and governance around the world.

...As I travelled around that Empire's remains in the first half of 2002, I was constantly struck by its ubiquitous creativity. To imagine the world without the Empire would be to expunge from the map the elegant boulevards of Williamsburg and old Philadelphia; to sweep into the sea the squat battlements of Port Royal, Jamaica; to return to the bush the glorious skyline of Sydney; to level the steamy seaside slum that is Freetown, Sierra Leone; to fill in the Big Hole at Kimberley; to demolish the mission at Kuruman; to send the town of Livingston hurtling over the Victoria Falls - which would of course revert to their original name of Mosioatunya. Without the British Empire, there would be no Calcutta; no Bombay; no Madras. Indians may rename them as many times as they like, but they remain cities founded and built by the British.

It is of course tempting to argue that it would all have happened anyway, albeit with different names. Perhaps the railways would have been invented and exported by another European power; perhaps the telegraph cables would have been laid across the sea by someone else.

...The British Empire was the nearest thing there has ever been to a world government. Yet its mode of operation was a triumph of minimalism. To govern a population numbering hundreds of millions, the Indian Civil Service had a maximum strength of little more than 1,000. Chapter Four asks how it was possible for such a tiny bureaucracy to govern so huge an empire, and explores the symbiotic but ultimately unsustainable collaboration between British rulers and indigenous elites, both traditional and new.

...For better for worse - fair and foul - the world we know today is in large measure the product of Britain's age of Empire. The question is not whether British imperialism was without a blemish. It was not. The question is whether there could have been a less bloody path to modernity. Perhaps in theory there could have been. But in practice? What follows will, I hope, enable the reader to decide.

Essay Title: 'The British Empire was a global force for good.' Do you agree with this statement?

Introduction: Why is the British Empire still such a controversial topic of debate today? What will your argument be in this essay?

Paragraph 1. Point:

Paragraph 2. Point:

Paragraph 3. Point:

Conclusion: Overall, how do you think the British Empire should be remembered? As a force for good, or for bad?

Success Criteria

- This essay will be marked out of A* to U, according to our expectations of outcomes for your year group (not according to GCSE expectations).
- Three features of your essay will be taken into consideration for your essay:
 1. Spelling, punctuation, grammar and presentation.
 2. Accuracy of content
 3. Quality of argument

1. Spelling, punctuation, grammar and presentation. Your essay should :
 - have accurate spelling, in particular for key people, places and words.
 - be punctuated correctly, in particular the use of capital letters, full sentences, full stops, commas, and quotation marks.
 - have accurate grammar, in particular the use of the correct tense and verbs which agree with subjects.
 - be written in a formal, academic language (no slang or conversational language)
 - be written neatly, legibly and clearly.
 - clearly be divided into separate paragraphs, with a line left between each paragraph.

2. Accuracy of content. Your essay should :
 - Use accurate dates for important events.
 - Include the names of important figures.
 - Include key words and concepts that we have studied with the topic.
 - Show a clear understanding of the chronology (timeline) of the period.

3. Quality of argument. Your essay should:
 - Give your *own opinion* throughout: what impact do *you* think the British Empire had on the nations it governed? Positive or negative?
 - start with an introduction which captures the reader's attention; briefly explains why the British Empire remains such a controversial historical topic, and what your argument will be in this essay.
 - have at least three main paragraphs (not including introduction and conclusion). Each paragraph should have a different point, backing up your overall argument. You can make the same argument the whole way through—it does not have to be 'balanced'.
 - include content from all the topics that have studied this half of term, including Queen Victoria, the Indian Rebellion, Ireland and Home Rule, the Scramble for Africa, and Ruling the Empire.
 - You can also draw on content we have learnt in previous terms, such as the colonisation of Australia, the abolition of slavery, the American Revolution etc. Keep your arguments rooted in history, and don't project forward about what the Empire's legacy is today too much.
 - End with a conclusion, deciding overall whether the British Empire was a force for good or for bad.