

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report
June 2011

GCE History 6HI01 C

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can contact our History Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk.

You can also telephone 0844 576 0034 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2011

Publications Code US028124

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2011

Introduction

General comments

This is the third year of GCE 2008 and the sixth examination session for Unit 1. Candidates are now aware of how to approach the examination. They understand the need to produce a balanced answer, and they know that the most effective way to structure this answer is to make a number of relevant points, support these with examples, and establish clear links to the question set. However, many of these well-focused and organised answers remain at mid-Level 4 rather than progressing to the top of Level 4 and into Level 5. This is due to a variety of reasons including a need to inter-relate or evaluate the points being made more directly, a failure to cover the whole date range of the question, a lack of chronological awareness and a lack of the convincing support required to gain the higher level marks. Fewer answers than previously were awarded Levels 1 and 2. Most candidates appear to have gained something from their course, and thus are likely to be awarded at least Level 3. Almost all answers include some kind of plan, though some were very long and detailed, to the detriment of their answer overall.

Many candidates still struggle to maintain a focus on the question set. Some are quick to assume that the questions set are similar to those they have met while revising. They must remember that past questions are exactly that, and cannot appear again in the same form. They need to read the questions carefully and respond to what is asked, rather than what they hope to see or have practised during revision. Knowledge needs to be adapted and employed effectively, rather than taking the form of a prepared answer that may not focus on the question set.

Equally, candidates must ensure that their entire answer focuses on the question. Question D7 required an analysis of the consequences of collectivisation. However, a number of candidates began with a lengthy explanation of the reasons for the introduction of this policy. Similarly, Question D10 required a focus on the civil rights movement, yet many discussed Black Power in their answers. Question C6 was often focused on why the slave trade rather than slavery was abolished in 1807 rather than why it took so long for slavery to be abolished. These issues could be of some relevance, but were rarely made so.

Past reports have highlighted the importance of focusing on the timescale set in the question. Many otherwise strong answers were weakened, sometimes substantially, by failing to cover the period set. Question A11 targeted 1455-61, but many ignored this and wrote only on the causes of civil conflict. Question B1's timescale was 1517-25. Some ignored this completely, focusing instead on the long-term causes of the German Reformation. Question D11 set the parameters of 1954-63, yet many candidates discussed the roles of Truman and Johnson in their answers. Question E/F 5 required a discussion of the period from 1896-1922 but many responses focused entirely on the period from 1915 whilst Question E/F 6 covered the years 1925-1943 in Italy not the rise to power of the Fascist Party. An understanding of chronology, and the accurate use of dates, was often a factor which discriminated between Level 3 and Level 4 answers.

It seemed that many candidates did not have the specific knowledge which is essential for accessing the higher levels, but provided generalised examples which showed little depth. Dates, numerical evidence, reference to key individuals and events are all important if candidates are to produce a convincing analysis. If we assume that each topic is studied for at least six weeks, the majority of candidates should have this depth of knowledge.

Many candidates appear to have been armed with a writing template for their answers. The formula appeared to be taking note of the factor raised in the question and then mentioning that other factors (usually three) were also significant. Key marker phrases, such as 'however' and 'on the other hand' were then deployed before reaching some sort of conclusion. The use of these connecting phrases often seem impressive and do lead to a more organised answer but too many candidates increasingly employ them without a real understanding of how they should be used. In many responses the use of 'however', 'consequently' and 'therefore' just led to the introduction of another factor rather than creating a discussion of the points being made. This approach can work as long as effective links to the question are established. Several answers looked at other relevant factors but failed to establish their significance beyond asserting that they were important.

Those candidates who were well prepared in terms of knowledge and understanding of their topics produced answers within Levels 4 and 5, and some of these have been included in this report. For students who completed GCSE just one year earlier, the best answers are remarkable examples of young minds at work.

Question 1-14

Option C General Comments

As usual it was a pleasure to read some of the interesting responses to the questions on the Option C paper. Candidates generally seem interested in the Topics studies and, despite, the limited amount of resource material available centres prepare candidates well. However, examiners noted that many of the responses this session, although often achieving Level 4, were not accessing the higher Levels and marks within the mark schemes. There was noticeably more factual and chronological inaccuracy than in previous examination sessions but more importantly many responses seemed to lack convincing evaluation of the importance of factors or significance of events. Many good answers were able to discuss the given factor or event and other factors/points related to the focus of the question but were lacking in discussion of comparative importance or showing how factors were inter-related. Many candidates undoubtedly thought they were making comparative statements but were often merely asserting that one factor was more important than another or that factors were linked to each other; to reach the higher levels evaluation needs to be convincing in its supporting evidence. As suggested in the 6HI01 general comments, there were also a large number of candidates whose responses appeared organised in presentation, with good paragraph construction, but which on further reading used connective and introductory phrases which made little logical or coherent sense. At their very best though, Option C produces some of the most perceptive and convincing responses across the whole Unit.

Topic C1 – The Origins of the British Empire, c1680-1763

This is a popular topic with centres and candidates are usually well prepared and knowledgeable. This examination session, however, the general comments made above were particularly applicable. Q2 was slightly more popular than Q1 but Q1 was answered with more confidence and responses provided more detail.

Q1. Most candidates were able to develop the given factor well and were able to identify other contributory factors. However, there was less comparative evaluation than in previous examinations sessions. Candidate responses were often differentiated by the ability to discuss the defeat of rival European powers as opposed to the influence of war in general. The best answers were able to discuss a range of factors, show change over time or make reference to different geographical areas of expansion. Some responses suggested that whereas the defeat of rivals was more responsible for expansion in India and parts of North America trade was more important in the Caribbean and West Africa. There has been much improvement in candidates specifying examples of territorial expansion to support general statements about expansion.

Q2. Although this was the most popular question many candidates failed to read the question carefully. Many good responses were unable to achieve more than mid-level 4 as they failed to focus directly enough on the growth of British trade. Candidates need to take care when reading questions and should note that the focus may not be exclusively on the growth of Empire. Level 3 answers often focused entirely on the growth of the slave trade itself or made assertions about the growth of empire/trade without showing links between different factors. When questions are set with the slave trade as the given factor many candidates seem to forget about the geographical areas of empire/trade where slavery was not practised. The best answers focused on the growth of trade, developed the influence of the slave trade in detail and were also able to evaluate the importance of other factors. Some very successful answers were able to contrast the expansion of trade caused by the slave trade with the North Atlantic trading system and trade with India.

This is a level 5 answer.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer ☒.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your first answer.)

The expansion of British trade between 1680-1763 was undoubtedly influenced by the growth of the slave trade. Trade itself was an extremely important contributor to the growth of the British Empire. The slave trade drove growth in trade, however it had a bigger effect in Atlantic trade, with the American and West Indies than with trade in the rest of the empire. Nonetheless the expansion of trade between 1680-73 was also due to the Mercantilist system functioning under the military fiscal state. As well as the positive involvement by the British government which helped trading companies a lot, which itself also led to the expansion of British trade.

(This page is for your first answer.) Slave trade led through the Royal African Company, a joint stock company to an expansion in British trade. The triangular slave trade was essential for the growth of the American colonies, who relied on African slaves to work on the plantations, harvesting sugar and other cash crops. Due to the nature of the American colonies which had no civilized system unlike India, slave trade was a necessity for the North American colonies. The exported ^{and traded} commodities such as cotton, sugar, which itself led to a lot of growth in trade. 9 million tonnes of sugar were traded with the American colonies, mostly harvested by slaves. However the growth of slave trade only affected and led to growth in the ^{cash cropping} southern American colonies, and West Indies such as Barbados. The northern colonies, did not rely on slavery to grow and nor did trade by companies such as Hudson's Bay company which traded fur, timber and grain without the direct effects of slavery.

(This page is for your first answer.) The slave trade was ~~the~~ very profitable ~~trade~~, and indirectly it led to huge growth in general trade throughout the empire. The Royal African Company took 3.5 million slaves over to the Americas and traders would get a return on their profit which in turn would be re-invested in other trading ventures in this way positively having an effect on the growth of trade. The nature of the triangular slave trade gave huge profits and its efficiency meant that ships would be carrying goods, slaves and crops to Africa then to America, and crops from America to Britain. The slave trade had a derived effect on Britain's economy which would be stimulated as products exported/imported by the slaves such as cotton would end up in the Lancashire Mills and would then be re-exported to Europe. The good economic climate meant that as a result of slave trade there would be further growth of trade as people would re-invest through other joint stock companies. Slave trade was undoubtedly a huge and key contributor to the growth

(This page is for your first answer.) of trade in the British Empire

Nonetheless although slave trade increased the growth of British Trade, it didn't influence the growth in areas such as India, and North America (Canada).

Slave trade didn't occur in these areas, however the growth of trading companies such as the Honourable East India Company (HEIC) led to a growth in trade.

Trading 10 million tonnes of tea every year and making annual profits of £2 million ¹⁷²⁰, the HEIC was ~~pay~~ for the

growth of trade, more profit was made in trading ventures to India as they were more risky. Commodities traded

by the HEIC like tea were consumed daily and therefore shareholders of the company (3,000 of them 1720), profited

and were likely to re-invest. They traded in India stimulated equally the

British economy and industry and attracted confidence and investors that would in time re-invest. Other trading

companies such as the Hudson Bay also led to further growth in Canada in 1720.

(This page is for your first answer.) being the largest land owner this in time also led to growth.

As well as slave trade the role of the British government can arguably be seen as the most important factor that contributed to the growth of trade. The fiscal-military state functioned extremely effectively, through the Mercantilist system. What allowed such a 'boom' in trade was this system which helped eclipse some European rivals such as the French who simply lacked of such a system. Due to the profits done from trade the fiscal military state machine worked extremely well, excise duties and taxation meant that the government could grant effective monopoly powers and enforce them through the Navigation Acts and the Navy itself. The effects of wars such as the war of the Spanish Succession in 1701-1714 were so beneficial and aided the growth of trade by gaining key trading positions and routes such as Gibraltar and

(This page is for your first answer.) Minority, which came also as a result of such an effective system.

✱

The outcome of wars helped trade by creating ~~an~~ hegemony for the British which ~~could result~~ could result in the growth of trade. The effectiveness of the system created a rich government that could provide monopolistic power helped the growth of companies such as the H.E.I.C. which gained areas of influence such as Madras, Calcutta and Bombay, creating factories which benefited and led to the expansion of trade.

Slave trade can therefore be seen as an extremely important and profitable contributor to the expansion of trade directly and indirectly. In America it was slavery that allowed the Southern colonies to flourish, and led to growth of production of key goods which was extremely important. However slave trade didn't help directly in the growth of trade in

(This page is for your first answer.) ... areas of the Empire such as India or Canada which purely relied on trade, and shareholders. However profits from slave trade could be seen as having helped and added money which would have been re-invested in the system. However the effective governmental approach to trade in general through the effective mercantilist and military fiscal state was the basis from which the expansion of trade could depart from and be effectively maintained. The system allowed the Navy to be powerful and protect trading routes, win wars and protect trade throughout the Empire, which was what really helped significantly the expansion of British trade uniformly throughout the Empire as a whole.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response is directly focused on the expansion of trade rather than the expansion of Empire. It shows explicit understanding of the key issues and addresses not only the role of the slave trade but suggests that the development of the North Atlantic trade and the role of the British East India Company encouraged the development of trade without recourse to slavery.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Always try to make sure that the opening sentence of each paragraph creates an ongoing discussion. However, it is important that the use of connectives and opening phrases actually make sense as they do here.

Topic C2 – Relations with the American Colonies and the War of Independence, c1740-89

This is also a popular topic and candidates are generally well prepared. Candidates do have a great deal of detail to recall in the timeline of events involved in both the deterioration of relations and the War of Independence but this session there seemed to be less chronological security than in past sessions. In particular, many candidates seemed to be confused or unsure as to which countries entered into alliances with the colonists during the War and, more importantly, when. Q4 was more popular than Q3.

Q3. Candidates were able to discuss the economic grievances of the American colonists in some detail and most were able to contrast this with the search for political freedoms and liberties. There is good knowledge of the mercantilist system and the concept of 'salutary neglect' which allowed many candidates to produce well organised essays showing clear change over time from the 1740s. There were, however, as significant number of response that seemed to divorce taxation from economic matters and deal with the taxation laws completely separately from other economic issues. Many candidates, although aware of the broad pattern of deterioration, struggle to put events into chronological order. Some of the best answers were able to evaluate a variety of reasons for the deteriorating relations and links these to an underlying long term search for increased liberties.

Q4. This was a very popular question but many responses seemed to consist of prepared answers which focused on British failures and Washington's skills rather than addressing the question asked. Some candidates seemed to dismiss the given factor for discussion out-of-hand and just moved onto other factors which meant that they could access high level 3 at the most. Others addressed the given factor with varying degrees of detail and were thus able to move upwards within level 4. The best answers were able to evaluate a variety of factors while focusing directly on the extent to which territorial advantage helped the colonists to emerge victorious. Those with clear knowledge of the pattern of events of the War, i.e. those with sound chronological knowledge, produced some very effective answers suggesting that although other factors were probably more important at every significant turning-point territorial advantage played some part. There does, however, seem to be a widespread lack of knowledge of the number of Loyalists involved and the nature and geographic extent of their support. Those who could discuss the nature of the war in the Carolinas often produced high level responses.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer ☒.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your first answer.)

~~How far - due to defeat of mixed powers 20-63?~~

~~Woods - all of them - 88-98, 01-13, 29-48, 56-63~~

~~however, linked by fin system → 68, 1944~~

~~→ small part - no war~~

~~→ true relation - separate.~~

(This page is for your first answer.) In the period 1680 - 1763, Britain expanded from being a small country with developing trading relations to the world's first superpower, with territory all over the globe, from America to India. This could be due to a number of factors, including the defeat of European rivals in war, the fiscal-military system and governmental policy or ~~to~~ the growth of trade.

There is no doubt that Britain gained huge territorial and naval advantage in the series of wars over this period. The defeat of the French in the 9 years war from 1688-97 consolidated the anglo-dutch merger following the Glorious revolution of 1688. After this war, Britain was a united force behind William of Orange, which allowed it to develop from a secure foundation. The war of the Spanish succession also helped to expand the empire, as the treaty of Utrecht in 1713 gave Britain Gibraltar and Minorca, which were strategic bases used to protect trade in the future. By improving our skills of communication, this war was very important in understanding why the empire expanded. Although Britain gained no territory in the war of the Austrian succession - the treaty of Aix la Chapelle returned everything to 'status quo ante bellum' in 1748, winning this war and defeating the French was hugely important in establishing British hegemony. ~~APPARANT~~ Finally, the 7 years war of 1756-63 contributed most to the formal expansion of the empire. The treaty of Paris formalised British territory in America - for example we gained Quebec - and as well as in India. Therefore it seems clear that the defeat of European rivals in war was

(This page is for your first answer.) extremely important in the expansion of the empire in this period.

However, when considering these wars one must also look at why the British were successful in defeating their rivals. Arguably, what helped us to win the wars is more important than the consequences of winning. One of the main reasons why Britain was successful was because we were able to keep going long and expensive wars. The reason for this was the fiscal-military system adopted after the Glorious Revolution - an economic model borrowed from the Dutch. In contrast, the French did not have such a system, and hence was forced to raise higher taxes and then a recession economy, which meant they were unable to sustain fighting. However the British were able to draw money from the Bank of England, set-up in 1694, and hence accumulate debt against the government. A good example of this working was in the 7 years war, when 4% of the British economy was put into the war effort until, despite having to begin with, 1759 showed ^{that} the tables had turned, and was hence nicknamed the 'annus mirabilis.' Therefore it seems that perhaps the fiscal-military system that funded the wars may have contributed to the expansion of the empire even more fundamentally than the wars themselves.

On the other hand, the empire did not expand purely due to the war. Firstly, Walpole's government from 1721-39 avoided war, following the mercantilist policy of 'trade and tax.' It was in this period that trade really flourished, and Britain became

(This page is for your first answer.) extremely rich. Arguably, without this period without war, Britain would never have had the capacity to win the wars later on. Furthermore, there is an argument to suggest that perhaps the growth of trade in itself was an important contribution to the expansion of the empire. The trading companies, like the Hudson Bay company in Canada, the East India Company and the Royal African company set up areas of influence that became informal empire without the need for any wars. This trade was stimulated by a vibrant British economy, and the conversion of luxury goods like sugar and tea to everyday commodities meant that trade expanded rapidly. The more trade there was, the more important the overseas trading posts became. Arguably, the 7 years war was caused purely because of trade - for example India was simply too valuable to lose, and so Britain was prepared to fight to protect it. However, if the trade had not been so important and wealthy in the first place, then this would not have been necessary.

Overall, it seems that there are a number of interconnecting reasons why the British empire expanded in this period. War with European rivals was extremely important, as on the surface it was the only way in which Britain gained formal empire. However, if we look a bit deeper, it seems that there were some other factors as well. The fiscal-military economic system essentially funded the wars, making it possible for Britain to win, which was obviously vital. Furthermore, several of these wars were only necessary to fight because of the important trade relations already

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~established.~~ If trade had not been so important to the empire, then defeating European rivals would not have contributed to the growth of the empire to such an extent. Overall it seems that defeating European rivals was indeed the most important reason as to why the Empire expanded in this period, but one must also take into serious consideration that factors behind why the wars were fought in the first place and why we won them, as they are also important in their own right, ~~and so the fact that we won was also responsible for helping the empire expand.~~

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer . Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice. If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your second answer.)

~~How far was territorial expansion due to...
 1760-75?
 clear for greater economic freedom?~~

How far... territorial advantages of the colonists?

Yes - home ground, guerilla warfare, know the land

but ~~→ British military incompetence → leads to avoid decisions
 → other British problems → political → economic
 → foreign intervention → no impact~~

(This page is for your second answer.) It seems astonishing that Britain, at the time the world superpower, was defeated in the war of independence by the rebelling American colonists. This defeat could be ^{attributed} ~~down~~ to a number of reasons including ^{the} colonists' territorial advantages, ~~but also~~ British problems and foreign intervention. We will also consider ^{the} ~~colonists'~~ ^{other} advantages of the colonists.

There is no doubt that the colonists' territorial advantage played a huge part in explaining why the British lost, particularly in the years to 1777, culminating in Burgoyne's defeat at Saratoga, when foreign intervention was not yet official. Firstly, they were fighting on familiar territory and were used to the terrain, unlike the British who were fighting across the Atlantic in an unfamiliar country. The colonists also had advantage territorially in that they had the sympathy of the locals, whereas the British were regarded as the hostile enemy. Especially as the colonists shifted their tactics from pitched battles to guerrilla warfare, their territorial advantage served to ~~had~~ weaken the British position immensely. As previously mentioned, the colonists' victory at Saratoga shows that simply from having this territorial advantage, the colonists were able to turn the tables on the British.

However, the British' defeat was also due to a number of other factors. Firstly, Britain faced a number of problems, including political, economic and military ones. Politically, Britain had the problem that its own people were divided over whether the colonists ought to have freedom or not. Whilst the Tories wanted to keep the

(This page is for your second answer.) Colonies. The whigs were interested in 'ancient liberties', and hence were keen to see the colonists free independence. Economically, Britain was struggling with problems all over its empire, particularly in India. What the colonists only had to deal with one problem - British rule - the British were trying to run an empire of which America was one part. Militarily, Britain's problems were numerous. Firstly, most of the first-rate generals had either gone to India ~~in the 1750s~~ by this point, or retired. This meant that the generals in charge including Howe, Burgoyne and Cornwallis, were not necessarily the best leaders. For example, Howe himself was a colonial sympathiser, as well as being commander in chief of the war effort. Secondly, the army had some inherent problems in fighting this war. The 'red coats' proved extremely impractical in fighting guerrilla warfare, and getting supplies was problematic. Furthermore, regiments of soldiers from Hanover were shipped in, which did not help as they were not committed to the ideology of the war effort anyway. Finally, Britain also faced the problem of trying to keep the loyalists on side as well as the natives, and ~~was~~ had to avoid making either group feel betrayed. Therefore it seems that Britain faced a huge number of problems when fighting this war, which may explain why we lost.

However, although the colonists had improved their situation by using British advantages by 1777, there is not enough evidence to suggest that this alone ensured them to win the war. Foreign intervention was also a vital factor. In 1778, the French officially

(This page is for your second answer.) joined, along with Spain in 1779, the rest of Europe from the 'League of Armed Neutrality' in 1780, leaving Britain fighting the war alone. This was the first failure of the 'Blue water' strategy developed by 1750 that helped Britain win previous wars, which states that Britain should always keep a European ally. The presence of France in the war also meant that British trade supplies were disrupted crossing the Atlantic. The actual defeat of the British was also engineered by the French, as they cut off the navy leaving Cornwallis cornered at Yorktown and here forced him to surrender. Furthermore, despite the fact that France officially joined the war in 78, they had been supplying the colonists with arms for years previously, which suggests that their territorial advantages alone were not enough responsible for their victory at Saratoga.

Finally we now consider the ~~territorial~~^{other} advantages of the colonists. As well as having territorial advantages, they also had the advantage of brilliant military leadership. George Washington made some extremely sound decisions that stopped the colonists from being defeated earlier on - for example by allowing Philadelphia to fall but saving the army in the process. They also had the ideological advantage, in that they were fighting for a united cause. ~~This was~~ ~~strengthened by propaganda~~ ~~which~~ ~~was~~ These two advantages contrast markedly to the British situation, which may also help explain why we lost.

PTO

(This page is for your second answer.) Overall it seems that Britain's defeat was due to a number of interconnected factors. Firstly, the colonists held a number of inherent advantages, most importantly that they were fighting on familiar home territory. These advantages became even more important when contrasted ^{with} the British problems - such as the huge distance they had to travel to simply get to the war. However, Britain was also facing a number of other problems at the time, which meant that fighting this war was not the top priority. Arguably these were more significant, as the cumulative effect of the political, economic and military problems of the British administration gave the colonists greater advantage than those gained by their territorial advantages anyway. However, all of this pales in comparison to the effects of foreign intervention. Without it, Britain could have turned the war around again and perhaps been victorious. However, fighting a war not just against one nation but against several others was simply impossible. Therefore it seems that although the colonists' territorial advantages were important to begin with, they do not explain why the British lost the war. ~~To understand that~~ At first the British position was weakened by inter problems across the empire, but in the end the real reason why we lost was ~~because~~ because of the devastating consequences of foreign intervention.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Both of these answers not only answer the question directly but evaluate and attempt to provide a more nuanced judgement. Q1 suggests that victory over foreign rivals definitely lead to the formal expansion of Empire but there were underlying influences that may have been more important. Q4 suggests that whilst territorial advantage might have helped the colonists early on this did not ultimately win the war for them.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Always try write the supporting material for a paragraph in chronological order. The second paragraph of the answer to Question 1 shows the advantages gained by Britain in defeating European rivals.

Topic C3 – The Slave Trade, Slavery and the Anti-Slavery Campaigns, c1760-1833

Topic C3 is by far the most popular topic across the whole Option. Candidates obviously find the topic interesting but responses show varying degrees of knowledge and understanding. Quite often there are very simplistic assertions made about the slave trade and slavery and there are more level 2 responses than in the other topics. Q5 was more popular than Q6.

Q5. Most candidates were aware of the growth in consumer demand for slave produced goods during the later 18th century and most responses focused on the demand for sugar. There were a disappointing number of references to tobacco and cotton despite candidates clearly stating a link to the beginnings of industrialisation. Many responses remained in level 3 through a list-like organisation of developed assertions about other factors, often quite simple in understanding, or low-to-mid level 4 with greater explanation but a lack of evaluation. Some candidates also seemed unaware of the timeframe involved and referred to factors which were really more relevant to the period before 1760. Very few candidates commented on the influence of the American Revolution and the continued growth of the trade despite the loss of the American colonies. The best answers were those which made some attempt to be specific to the time period and to show how each of the different factors involved in the Triangular Trade were intertwined.

Note: centres which study both topic C1 and C3 need to ensure that their candidates are aware of the differences in the nature and growth of the slave trade within the two different time periods. Many candidates are used exactly the same material for Q2 and Q3 despite the two time periods being distinctly different. Although there are some issues which are relevant to both time periods the role of the joint-stock companies and the move to slave labour in the Caribbean is more appropriate in discussions of slavery pre-1760.

Q6. Once again this question highlighted the difficulties many candidates have with recognising the difference between the slave trade and slavery. Most responses were able to show reasons why there was such a substantial gap between the abolition of the slave trade in 1807 and the abolition of slavery in 1833 but many were not able to explain why it took so long to achieve. There were a significant number of candidates who produced answers with very confused chronology. These responses often suggested that significant individuals such as Equiano and Dundas were still alive in 1833 and that Grenville was responsible for the Great Reform Act. Also references to slave revolts in the early 1800s and the Zong case were seen as directly impacting on the events in 1833. Some of these candidates seemed to have been well prepared for an answer to a question about why the slave trade and not slavery was abolished in 1807 but their responses remained limited to the earlier part of the period and so were not able to progress above low-level 4 with a lack of range. Although the arguments used in 1807 to persuade Parliament to abolish the slave trade while maintaining slavery are valid many candidates were unable to show how events in the intervening years prevented a rapid movement towards the abolition of slavery. However, there were some excellent responses which were able to show how a combination of the pro-slavery lobby, external political influences and the divisions within and apathy of some the key abolition campaigners conspired together to keep slavery legal in the Empire until 1833.

This is a script that has two level 5 answers. The responses are directly focused and use well developed supporting evidence. The supporting material could have been better managed to create a series of smaller paragraphs but there is an explicit understanding of the key issues.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your first answer.)

~~Economic Sugar, Stamp, Townshend, Tea~~
~~constitutional Declaratory Stamp, Coercive Acts~~
~~Judicial Important administration of Justice & Vice admiralty courts~~
~~other - focus was enlightenment~~

By 1775, relations between Britain and the American colonies had worsened to the point where violent conflict broke out at Lexington and Concord before any official declaration of war. This can be examined by dividing the reasons into economic, constitutional and judicial reasons.

Originally, the Mercantilist system of the British Empire benefitted the colonies, however, once Britain began to interfere more in colonial affairs, the economic situation in the colonies began to worsen and tensions rose. After the Anglo-French war ended in 1763, the British were left with a national debt of £123 million whereas the American colonists only had a debt of £1 million.

(This page is for your first answer.) To recoup some of the money lost in the war, the British implemented a series of taxes and acts in the colonies to repay the debt. The sugar act of 1764 put a 50% duty (3d) on barrels of molasses, a 50% decrease on the last sugar act of 1733, however it was greatly enforced with officials caught being bribed being fined £500 and smugglers having their cargoes confiscated and put on trial. This act would have been disastrous for the American rum and sugar trade had smuggling not continued. The act attempted to give a monopoly to West Indian sugar planters which would greatly increase American planter prices. This would have worsened tension between the colonies and Britain. Another act, introduced in 1765, was the Stamp Act which placed a tax on paper used everyday in the colonies for newspapers, letters and other documents. This caused outrage in the colonies as it affected everyone, merchants organised boycotts of British goods in response and the house of the chief stamp distributor Andrew Oliver was besieged until he agreed to not to enforce the act. The act was repealed in 1766 as the boycott was damaging the British economy since 40% of British exports went to the colonies, however during the short time it was in place, it clearly caused great tension. In 1767, the Townshend duties were introduced placing a tax on everyday imports in the colonies such as lead, paint, paper and tea. Again this led to boycotts of British goods and Rhode Island declared the duties illegal and

(This page is for your first answer.) refused to pay. Due to protests these duties were also repealed except for the tax on tea, but the increased interference in the American economy by the British was causing greater discontent throughout the American colonies. It is clear that the British interference was restricting colonial economic freedom and that this was worsening relations.

However, a large amount of protest arose in the colonies as a matter of principle rather than economic discontent. The Stamp Act was an internal tax which the Americans believed to be unconstitutional as they were already taxed internally by their own colonial assemblies. The Virginia House of Burgesses led by lawyer Patrick Henry denounced the Stamp Act arguing that there should be no taxation in the colonies without proper representation in the Westminster parliament. The idea that they were virtually represented by parliament was rejected. This was clearly a sign of discontent amongst the Americans, they had begun to reject the British governmental system as the idea of no taxation without representation spread. This protest then spread to internal taxes when the Townshend Duties with more people deeming them unconstitutional as well as economically unfair. The Tea Act of 1773 aimed to give a monopoly to tea from the East India Trading Company (EITC), in response, 60 members of the radical group 'Sons of Liberty' boarded a ship in Boston

(This page is for your first answer.) Harbour and dumped £10,000 worth of tea into the water. This ~~act~~ was undoubtedly a principled stand as the colonies did not stand to gain economically by doing this and the British reaction worsened the American economic situation further. The Coercive Acts were introduced in 1774, one of which, the Port Act, closed Boston Harbour till the cost of the tea was repaid. This was a fair reaction, but the Massachusetts Government Act, which removed the colonial power in Massachusetts and gave it to Gage, commander in chief in the colonies caused outcry. They had been stripped of the right to govern themselves. As a result, the first Continental Congress met in 1774 which called for a Patriot government in Massachusetts to be set up as well as announcing the Suffolk Resolves which denounced the coercive acts declaring them unconstitutional. Militias began to form in Massachusetts and Gage worried asked Britain for a further 20,000 soldiers, fearing an uprising. As the reaction to these constitutional grievances was so great and severe, these factors were arguably some of the most important reasons for worsening relations.

Further more, there were several judicial grievances in the colonies at this time which angered the colonists. The vice admiralty courts set up to prevent smuggling were a trial by one judge who earned 5% of all seized goods, clearly an incentive to give guilty verdicts. It also removed the

(This page is for your first answer.) the colonists' right to trial by jury which was greatly distressing the colonists. Also, as part of the coercive Acts, the Impartial Administration of Justice Act was introduced which meant colonial murder trials would be held in England, increasing the likelihood of a guilty verdict. Although not massively influential, these grievances would have contributed to tension between America and Britain.

One major factor was the end of the French war in 1763 which removed the threat of the French in America and therefore reduced American dependence on the British military for whom they were expected to pay to enforce the Proclamation Act of 1763, £440,000 per annum was a large sum when the colonies were effectively in recession.

In conclusion, although the economic factors were greatly influential towards turning American opinion away from Britain, it is unlikely that they were the most important factors. The considerable colonial responses to constitutional matters were far more severe and it was these which led to militia forming and conflict beginning. These causes also came at a time of enlightenment when American people began to accept things on reason, not tradition. Thomas Paine's 'Common Sense' was greatly influential in turning American

(This page is for your first answer.) *opinion towards independence. Therefore it is likely that the Declaration of Independence was a principled stand on constitutional matters rather than for economic freedom.*

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer .
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your second answer.)

*Weaknesses of Abolts - Wilberforce, grey men, gradual abolition, jordan
 strength of opposition - West Indian Lobby, Parliament ^{criticised}
 slave revolts - Demerara 1823, Jamaica, 1831 ^{cropped & macaulay} still profitable
 changes in parliament - Test & Corporations Act repealed, Great Reform, Lord Grey, PM*

After the slave trade was abolished in february 1807, it took a further 26 years for the abolition of slavery to come about. This may be down to weaknesses of the abolitionists, the strength of the opposition, the late coming of the slave revolts or the fact that parliamentary reform came so late in the abolition campaign.

The campaign for abolition only really began in 1823 when Wilberforce handed over leadership of the Campaign to Thomas Buxton, however the abolitionists had many weaknesses which may have delayed emancipation. Wilberforce had become

(This page is for your second answer.) Old and his speeches were no longer inspiring but instead drawn out and boring, he was not swinging parliamentary opinion towards emancipation of slaves. Furthermore, he therefore didn't believe in abolition until 1823, believing it was better to keep slaves and convert them to Christianity. The fact that one of the most prominent figures of the abolition of slave trade was no longer inspiring, or seemed to truly believe in emancipation would have delayed abolition considerably. Even though Buxton took over, he was still not a particularly inspiring man, indeed he and many other abolitionist MPs have been described as grey committeemen who did not wish to mobilise the masses. The historian, Jordan, criticised the leadership of men like Cropper and Zachary Macaulay, saying their leadership was weak and unhelpful. Moreover, the decision to achieve gradual abolition was most likely a mistake, 'The Society for the Mitigation and Gradual Abolition of Slavery' was set up in 1823 but it was not proactive and gradual abolition had no timeline, leaving room for slavery to continue indefinitely. It was not until 1830 that Buxton called for a debate on full abolition, before this, Curzon's proposal of gradual abolition was completely rejected in Barbados, almost completely in Jamaica and only a few colonies accepted any of the proposed reforms. Gradualism seemed to be a mistake which cost the campaign dearly. The weaknesses of the abolitionists would have greatly contributed

(This page is for your second answer.) to the delay between abolition of the slave trade and the abolition of slavery.

However, it may not be that the abolitionists were so weak but rather that the strength of the opposition was so strong. 18 Members of parliament had considerable investments in the slave trade, Perant, a strong anti-abolitionist owned 600 slaves and 8,000 acres of plantation. Furthermore, many members of ~~parliament~~ of the British Aristocracy in government and the House of Lords. The Duke of Clarence (future King William IV) was a prominent figure in the House of Lords and was strongly pro-slavery. Members of royalty would have had considerable influence over other lords who were on the fence about whether or not abolition should be passed. Even after the abolition of ^{the} slave trade, the West Indies lobby still had considerable influence in parliament and had control over a number of rotten boroughs. Many anti-abolitionists argued that slavery and the plantations were still profitable and that to abolish slavery would greatly damage the ~~the~~ British and West Indian economy. The fact that opposition was so great in parliament, where the final decision on emancipation would be made, would have greatly contributed to the delay in the abolition of slavery.

One of the greatest contributions however, was the reforms in parliament which occurred towards the end of the campaign

(This page is for your second answer.) and had one of the most significant effects of anything that happened during the campaign. In 1828, the Test and Corporation Acts were repealed which allowed dissenters (non-anglicans) to obtain seats in parliament, this would have greatly increased the number of abolition minded people in parliament after the next election. Furthermore, when George III died, an election was held and the reform minded Lord Grey became prime minister, during the election it is likely that many more abolitionists obtained seats. In 1832, the Great Reform Act was introduced which removed the rotten boroughs and thus much of the West Indies lobby's influence and gave new seats to new industrial cities where many people believed in free trade. The act also increased the electorate by 45% meaning that the public could exert greater pressure on parliament. The fact that these reforms happened so late would have delayed abolition greatly as once these reforms were passed, it is likely that emancipation was inevitable.

In conclusion, the strength of the opposition was massively influential in delaying abolition as it was not until 1832, the year before abolition, that much of their power was removed. The fact that abolition came so soon after is unlikely to be a coincidence.

~~The fact that~~ As the parliamentary reforms come so late

(This page is for your second answer.) abolition was unlikely to occur before then so the greatest contributing factors to the delay are most likely the strength of opposition to abolition and the parliamentary reforms.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Question 3 - it would be very easy to produce a narrative response to this question but this answer has developed the issues thematically whilst maintaining a contextual awareness of change over time.

Question 6 - this answer has identified three inter-connected explanations for the length of time it took to abolish slavery. The answer suggests that the weakness of the abolition movement and the strength of the pro-slavery lobby meant that it was not until the political environment in Britain changed in the early 1830s that the abolition of slavery was possible.

Topic C4 – Commerce and Conquest: India, c1760-1835

Unfortunately, there are very few centres preparing candidates for this topic. The very few examples seen suggest that candidates have a general rather than specific knowledge of events during the period. The specification outlines a clarification of the bullet points to be covered and there is a suggested scheme of work on the Edexcel history website.

Topic C5 – Commerce and Imperial Expansion, c1815-1870

There are very few centres preparing candidates for this topic. However, the responses of the candidates are improving each session and answers have moved on from generalised statements about the expansion of Empire and trade towards discussion of the key issues with solid exemplification. There is still room for more exemplification but responses are now able to access all levels of the markscheme. There were very few answers to Q10 but there were some solid responses to Q9 with a clear understanding of the role of industrialisation in driving the expansion of Empire in comparison to other factors. There was a tendency, however, for candidates to see different aspects of industrialisation such as the search for markets and the need for raw materials as separate factors unconnected to the given factor itself.

This is an example of a low level 4 response.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your first answer.)

Plan :-

Navy's ^{role} ~~Policy~~ 1815 - 1875

✓ Abolition of slave trade - 1807, inter-continental ships

✓ Support merchant ships - stop pirates (P.C.), mercantilism

~~Preserve as water~~ - Trafalgar, mercantilism ✓
gunboat diplomacy → intimidation factor

The abolition of the slave trade was a
very pressing issue to the British government
and its Empire. Abolished within Britain in
1807 and emancipated throughout empire in 1833,
it is clear this is something that had
become ~~more~~ favourable and ~~needed~~ ^{necessary} ~~to be imposed~~.

The Royal Navy was used as a tactic
to make this consistent throughout the
empire. The Royal Navy intercepted many slave
ships in the middle passage, and liberated

(This page is for your first answer.) Thus, the moral force of
Britain's Empire and Navy alike in the
form of Pax Britannica was exercised
in using the Navy as a means to
intercept slave ships and to enforce abolition
of the slave trade. Whilst this was a key
role of the navy it is not the
most important role, or its only function.

The Royal Navy also sought to protect
the merchant ships, ^{whom} delivered British manufactured
goods across the Empire. It would have
been very easy to intercept a merchant
fleet ^{by} pirates or foreign competition.

So the Navy is used as a protecting
escort. They could easily deal with any
threats from pirates or foreign competition,
however this was not within the
merchant fleets capacity thus they ^{Navy} ~~would~~
~~were~~ a necessary force that aided
the merchant navy. Merchant ships making
the lengthy voyage to India would be
carrying substantial wealth on board and
could very easily be intercepted.

The navy's prerogative was to
stop this happening whilst the Navy

(This page is for your first answer.) as a moral force
Sought to abolish slavery they focused
more upon protection of merchant
Navy as they held the Empire's profits,
which is more important in the eyes
of the Empire than the slaves.

Considering the Navy's massive concern
with foreign competition, the policy of
mercantilism was ~~intended~~ ^{undertaken} by them to
make the oceans of the world ~~dependent~~
monopolised under British rule. Similar
to abolition of the slave trade the
Navy took this as a key role, however
this becomes more ^{of a} impractical policy as there
is an economic incentive unlike abolition
of the slave trade. The Navigation Acts and
Corn Laws force ~~high~~ extremely high tax
on colonies trying to buy more British goods
this diminishes foreign ~~trade~~ trading with colonies.
Mercantilism saw a key return for
the Empire and Royal Navy hence
why it was so important to them
however abolition of the slave trade
had little incentive so is put
on as a secondary goal for the Navy.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Since 1805 and the startling victory at Trafalgar when 22 twenty ships of the line only took ~~to~~ lost one casualty vessel and beat a force out numbering them, the Navy had produced a legacy, unchallenged in ~~world~~ the Sea in Naval Battle for over 100 years they remained the most intimidating force. The relating role was to be an intimidating force, this was exercised through their legacy and gentle reminders gunboat diplomacy and the construction of a iron clad show piece the warrior. Although the warrior never fired a shot in anger, it managed to keep the myth alive that the Navy were the best in the world. The Empire relied on peace to trade and remain profitable, the Navy's strong presence and reputation avoided any large conflicts. This is more of an important role to the navy than abolishing the slave trade as this presence is the very fabric of maintaining the status quo in the empire. However these two policies also aid each other, liberating slave ships was

(This page is for your first answer.) much easier considering the reputation of the navy.

To conclude whilst the Royal Navy made efforts to be a naval force they were more interested in being keeping the Empire profitable by protecting merchant fleets and maintaining their presence on the waters. The Empire relied greatly on the Royal Navy "the Empire floats on the Royal Navy" Admiral Jackie Fisher famously said, it is true that so many parts of the Empire relied on the navy so it could continue to run efficiently, however abolishing the slave trade is less important. The incentive for the navy to make this it's key policy isn't great enough hence why the navy merely concerned itself with supporting merchant fleets.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

In this response the focus of the question is well-developed and there is discussion of the given factor and other factors as well. The other factors are developed mainly through assertion and explanation rather than development. Although the conclusion does produce some discussion the range of other factors and the security of the knowledge is not developed enough to move up in level 4.

Topic C6 – Britain and the Scramble for Africa, c1875-1914

Candidates are generally very well prepared for this topic and have very good knowledge of specific examples across a wide geographical area of Africa. As mentioned in other topics, however, there seemed to be less evaluation and judgement in many of the answers this examination session. Also, once again, those centres who use the peripheral and metropolitan theories of expansion to teach the causes of the Scramble for Africa need to ensure that their candidates can give specific examples of such expansion rather than writing in generalisations. Some of these candidates also confused the role of individuals in the process by assuming that they were all acting at the periphery. Q11 was more popular than Q12.

Q11. This question was dealt with confidently by most candidates. Responses showed a good knowledge and understanding of underlying economic causes and other factors. Answers were differentiated by both the amount of narrative commentary as opposed to evaluative reasoning and the selection of relevant supporting knowledge. Some candidates who attempted a geographical approach ran out of time and a more thematic approach is often more successful. There were also many candidates who spent far too much time outlining the events in Egypt and along the Nile to the detriment of being able to create a more wide-ranging discussion. Overall most answers were sound and there were some excellent answers which clearly argued that economic interests were the fundamental bedrock of British expansion or showed directly the inter-relationship of different economic, strategic and international influences. Those candidates who are able to discuss the Robinson and Gallagher theory confidently often produce outstanding answers.

Q12. The quality of response to this question was more variable than those which answered Q11. At the lower levels of response candidates often just developed ideas of jingoism and Scramble followed by a fall in popularity as a consequence of the Second Boer War. However, there has been a great improvement overall in responses to questions covering attitudes towards Empire and most candidates provide a more subtle awareness of change over time and are less inclined to see the Second Boer War in simplistic terms. As a result there were some excellent answers which were able to chart the changes in attitude across the time period and within different sections of British society. Some of the best answers were able to show the transition from 'millstones round the neck' to jingoistic excess tempered by the shock of the Second Boer War followed by the re-invigoration of patriotism as World War 1 approached.

Topic C7 – Retreat from Empire: Decolonisation in Africa, c1957-81

Candidates who study this Topic generally have a good knowledge of the long and short term causes of the decolonisation process. However, their chronological awareness of events is often less secure. Many responses assume that the post-war Labour government were active supporters of speedy decolonisation in Africa and that Macmillan was a Labour Prime Minister. There also seems to be a tendency to give arbitrary dates to the gaining of independence by various African nations. If candidates are to make links between the external events which influenced decolonisation and the pace of change or the growth of African nationalism then they need to have a greater grasp of the chronological order of events. Q13 was overwhelmingly more popular than Q14. Those candidates who did attempt Q14 were either very weak in their understanding of the transition to independence or outstanding in their knowledge of factors influencing post-independence political development.

Q13. There is no doubt that candidates were well prepared for a question concerning the Suez crisis but too few candidates read the question carefully. The question asked candidates to consider the significance of the impact of the Suez crisis rather than whether it was the most significant factor. Candidates could establish significance either through focusing in some depth on the impact of the Suez crisis itself in a yes/no type responses or by establishing the relative significance of the crisis in comparison to other factors. Responses were differentiated in their ability to discuss the actual consequences of the crisis. Many candidates produced a narrative of the events of Suez followed by a brief discussion of its importance rather than addressing significance. It was clear also that a significant number of candidates believed that Ghana was granted independence as a direct result of the Suez crisis and Mau Mau developed as a result of it. Some of the best responses were able to put Suez into the context of the international situation pre-Suez, pre-Suez planning for Gold Coast/Ghana independence and the post-war rise in African nationalism suggesting that Suez merely speeded up a situation already ripe for decolonisation.

Both topic C6 and topic C7 are often studied together for obvious chronological reasons. The following script is an example of a script which included two high level 5 answers. The most important aspect of both responses to note is that each paragraph continues and develops an overall discussion that directly focuses on the question asked and is supported by well selected factual information.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .
 If you change your mind, put a line through the box
 and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your first answer.)

How far do you agree that British territorial expansion in Africa in the years 1875-1914 was primarily due to economic factors.

Yes - South - gold + diamonds + Rhodes

↳ however speed due to foreign comp

WEST - Cobbe got middle man + original Anti port
 EAST - reason McKimmer there ↳ but no action taken
 Egypt - dual control

clearly ~~mainly~~ big reason

↳ Sudan - French Action
 South - German interest + Action + Natal + Bechuanaland
 West - Berlin Conf + effective occupation
 East - Harb Peter

Circumstances → Uprising in Egypt

→ Mahdi Sudan

→ Civil War East

(This page is for your first answer.)

~~Economic~~ Expansion in Africa in the years 1875-1914 was undeniably largely due to economic factors, however, the nature of the ~~speed and of the~~ process must also be credited to issues of foreign competition, as well as circumstantial African events.

At face value, yes, economic factors were clearly the key reason why Britain was interested in expanding in Africa in the first place. In the South, once the mineral ~~revolution~~ ^{was} revolution kicked off with the discovery of diamonds in 1869, followed by Gold in Witwatersrand in 1886, suddenly Britain was desperate to ~~expand~~ expand territory to profit from this economic powerhouse. The Kimberly region was rapidly annexed under the pretext of bringing law to the diamond diggings, and Britain pursued control of the Transvaal area due to the Gold. Rhodes, the man on the spot in the area, annexed Bechuanaland in 1884 in order to secure the 'Missionaries' Road' and prevent the Germans or Boers meeting there. Interestingly, this touches on the element of foreign competition present, as Britain tried to avoid the conceding of economic power to foreign competitors. ~~This then follows into~~ ^{in the} West, ~~where~~ George Goldie came up with ~~the~~ the idea to 'cut out the middle man' when trading with chiefs on the Niger delta for palm oil to maximise economic benefits. However, despite creating the National African Company in 1879, government backing

(This page is for your first answer.) to expand territory did not follow, implying that a different factor needed to act as a trigger to provoke ~~the~~ expansion of territory. A similar story occurred in the East, where Scotsman McKinnon ~~Established~~ travelled to the East, lured by the ~~mysticism and~~ economic potential he felt was there. ~~He~~ He established the McKinnon Scheme to administer vast areas of the Sultan's domain for economic profit, yet the economic reason alone was still not enough to ~~the~~ provoke government official expansion.

Finally, in Egypt, economic factors played a highly significant role in expansion of power. After Disraeli purchased 45% of Suez shares from Ismail in 1875, ~~the~~ further investments poured into the country. When Ismail accumulated debt from £3-100 billion and was on the verge of bankruptcy, Colvostone realised Government responsibility to protect investments, even if it meant unwanted ~~ext~~ extension of power. However, while this economic factor led to involvement in ~~debt~~ ^{control} of 78-82, it did not lead to formal acquisition, so cannot take full credit as the major factor towards territorial expansion.

Clearly, from the above argument, economic motivations were a long present factor, but not substantial enough on their own to result in expansion of power. The trigger for this was largely foreign competition, kicked off ^{properly} by the Berlin Conference of 1884-85. Rivalries in Africa had been long present. In the West, Britain was feeling increasingly threatened

(This page is for your first answer.) ^{French} over French action, beginning with ~~this~~ annexation of Porto Novo in 1883, for no apparent reason other than to ~~stop~~ break the sphere of influence Britain had from Lagos to the Gold Coast. Once they then started probing British position on the Congo ~~Bay~~ through De Brazza's expeditions up the Ogooué, Britain panicked and signed the Hasty Anglo-Portuguese treaty. This triggered the Berlin Conference, which resulted in the policy of "effective occupation" and rival countries feeling the need to exert their presence on the ground ^{like never before} ~~as before~~. Britain now needed to discard their "informal influence" policy ~~set~~ in order to protect their spheres from foreign influence. This is what led to the Charter of Addis company into the Royal Niger Company in 1886, due to French action in the area. Mckinnon finally received Government backing ^{and} therefore expansion of power in 1888 after German Karl Peters set up the rival German East Africa Company in 1884. In both these cases, foreign competition was the trigger factor that led to formal and increased expansion.

In the Sudan, the role of foreign competition is even more ~~directly~~ directly obvious. Withdrawal from the Sudan was ordered in 1883 after the Mahdi uprising and Hicks' ambush, however after the establishment of "effective occupation," the French saw the Sudan as free land, while the British saw it as in their sphere due to their position in Egypt. Britain did not want France getting a foothold in

(This page is for your first answer.) The mouth of the Niger after 1893 prompts ~~papers~~ ~~#~~ of theory to construct a dam in the Nile to cut off the life line of ~~the~~ Egypt. When Marchand ~~con~~ began an expedition West to East to the Sudan in 1896, Britain panicked and ordered reconquest of the Sudan that very year.

~~Finally, one of the major reasons behind acquisition in the South, was prevention.~~

However, despite the significance of foreign competition as the trigger towards expansion of power, circumstantial occurrences of Africans must also be credited as an underlying factor. In Egypt, what turned de-facto control into Occupation ^{and} expansion was the Nationalist uprising in 1882 which Britain had to step in and crush to protect their investments. This left a leadership vacuum Britain had to fill. Also in the East, the Civil War in the 80's and the death of missionaries such as James Flannington led to Britain being required to step in and expand power in order to achieve stability.

Overall, it can be seen that economic factors were indeed the initial reason of why we are involved and interested in Africa in the first place. However, the very speed and nature of the scramble that occurred in this time period is dependent on the foreign competition that drives frenzied expansion. While economic factors are limited in their effect

(This page is for your first answer.) On their own, it must be acknowledged, that without the economic potential, there would have been nothing to compete over and to protect from foreign competition. In this sense, while ~~the~~ circumstances of Africans were a supplementary reason, ~~it~~ foreign competition clearly ~~was the~~ ~~main~~ ~~factor~~ ~~that~~ ~~triggered~~ the expansion of territorial power, ~~however~~, this would not have occurred without the underlying factor of economic potential.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer .
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| • Question 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| • Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| • Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 9 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| • Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 12 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| • Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 14 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | |

(This page is for your second answer.)

How ~~was~~ significant was the impact of the Suez Crisis in the decision to grant African Colonies independence in the years 1957-65

Yes → - pressure from home and America
- exposed military weakness and reliance on America
- increased Nationalism
- paved way for MCM

However, all these factors already present. Suez merely highlighted this

② Nationalism
- precedes Suez
- effects of WW2 + ~~back~~ exploitation
- Ken Mau Mau Accra Riots
wind of change

① economic issues post WW2 → starting area
→ cost benefit
little reason to resist pressure

③ cold war context

(This page is for your second answer.)

The Suez Crisis of 1956 traditionally carries the credit for being ^{the most} significant factor in the decision to grant African Independence in the years 1957 to 65. However, the reason may be more due to the highly publicised and dramatic nature of the Crisis, and not due to actually introducing any factors ^{of economic weakness or nationalism}, but merely highlighting them.

At face value, yes the Suez Crisis can be seen to be somewhat of a turning point towards decolonisation. For the last time, Britain was seen to be acting as an aggressive imperialist in a modern world that would no longer stand for it. Britain had lost her position as a 'top player' in the post-war world, highlighted by the fact she had to humiliatingly withdraw from Egypt at Eisenhower's request. The reason Britain was so compliant to US demands was due to the disastrous run on Sterling and their debt to America after WW2, and they couldn't afford to not retain their special relationship with the USA.

This action received international condemnation, and British position of 'world's policeman' was in shatters. "Pay Britannica" was now seen as a weak force, and Britons were anxious to distance themselves from it. This crisis paved the way for Eden's resignation and

(This page is for your second answer.) opened the door for MacMillan, who was to have much more of a home-ward focus, and less of a desire to retain Empire.

Finally, Suez can be seen to spur nationalism ten-fold, as after British withdrawal, Nasser was hailed as a hero and presented as defeating the French, British and Israelis. This showed Britain to no longer be an indestructible force and that the status quo could realistically change.

However, there are of course flaws with this argument, such as that any political set-back, or health issue would have ended Eden's term anyway and MacMillan would have eventually had to adopt anti-Empire policies due to the ~~area~~ zeitgeist of the times. Also, while Nationalism was a major factor driving independence, it by far pre-dates it, as does other factors that Suez ~~is~~ highlights.

To Begin with, ~~yes~~ ^{while} Suez highlighted Britain's economic weakness, it did not create it. This was a long term factor present after Britain was squeezed from both ends after WW2. They were in huge debt (£3.75 bil from USA alone) and had to increase defence spending from £2.7 to 4.6 billion. Attlee's government had tried to make the Empire an economic benefit through Sterling Area trade, to absorb British exports and increase the taxation in order to fund itself. However, this only increased nationalism through

(This page is for your second answer.) exploitation and failed to become profitable. Trade with Europe rose 26% in this period as opposed to only 17% with ^{the} Sterling Area. MacMillan turned his focus to the EEC in light of this evidence to solve their financial problems, and in order to gain entry had to start cutting ties with Empire and Commonwealth through the granting of independence. Arguably this would have had to inevitably happen at some point, Suez merely acted as a catalyst towards this realisation. Also, after MacMillan's Audit of Empire in 1957, he realised that there was not enough benefit derived from Empire to ~~even~~ justify the effort and cost it was now taking to administer and suppress nationalism. Therefore economic weakness ^{was} a significant ^{and underlying} factor towards the acknowledgement that independence needed to be granted. Suez merely highlighted and speeded it up.

Also, ~~and~~ perhaps what most directly pressured the government to grant independence, was the Nationalist movements, which had their origins rooted firmly since 1945. WW2 had increased the sense of entitlement among Africans, as they had fought alongside the British for a better, democratic future. The process of colonisation in itself had provided Africans with the education, resources and economy necessary for revolution, and many future leaders had travelled to Europe for education, opening their eyes to histories and new

(This page is for your second answer.) forms of government. Also, after Sterling Area trade, widespread discontent began to fester. Britain had previously maintained control through the benefits Africans received through trade and protection with Britain, and once this was lost due to the taxation and acts like 1946 Obnoxious Ordinances, Britain effectively lost control of their colonies. The Accra Riots kicked off in the Gold Coast in 1948, and the CPP won elections in '51, '54 and '56; all before even a whisper of Suez. The Mau Mau rebellion, while not strictly nationalist, also predates the Suez Crisis, proving that Nationalism ~~was~~ already had significant momentum and support before the Suez Crisis. ~~This is not further~~ The increase in Nationalism after Suez can only have given a final boost to an already underway revolution of ideas, which also undermines Suez's significance towards the granting of independence.

Finally, the context of the post-war world is highly significant in Britain's decision to grant independence, ~~and~~ ^{yet} was merely highlighted, and not caused by Suez.

After WW2, two new superpowers had emerged, USSR and the USA, the spread and containment of Communism was the new big issue of the modern world, and Imperialistic struggles were becoming increasingly insignificant. America was so incensed over Suez due to the fact it made America

(This page is for your second answer.) look foolish and could have undermined Anti Communist pacts in Israel and Egypt. Britain was clearly not in touch with current issues, and the changes of the post-war world, and in order to appeal to the electorate, MacMillan was keen to change ~~this~~ this by reversing colonial policy and granting independence. Suez was effective in only as much as it highlighted how old-fashioned and outdated Britain's Empire was in the new cold war context.

Overall, it is clear to see that Nationalism and Britain's economic weakness pre-dates Suez, and at the end of the day they are the two main factors that lead to the granting of independence in African colonies. ~~It is~~ ~~by no means~~ Without Empire providing any economic benefit ~~or~~ to help Britain's already weak economy, there was clearly no reason to hold on to it in light of growing pressure from Nationalist movements, the USA ~~and~~ ~~the public at home who would have wanted this~~ ~~and~~ the UN. Clearly ^{the} Suez Crisis can not be seen as the causal factor for any of these underlying reasons, that clearly would have led to the granting of independence eventually. The Suez Crisis merely highlighted them all in a single, dramatic occurrence, and acted as a catalyst towards the granting of independence.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Although Q11 has a brief introduction it clearly shows what the main argument of the response is going to be. Each paragraph is well developed and the discussion relates to geographical areas as well as themes. Although not always relating to event in chronological order the key dates are clearly mentioned and so the time period under discussion is clear.

Question 13 appears in the introduction to suggest that it is going to focus on whether the Suez crisis was the most significant factor but the rest of the essay has clear focus on the significance of. It shows clear contextual understanding of where the Suez crisis fits into the decolonisation process.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Conclusions - try to ensure that your conclusion clearly summarises the main points which you have made in the main body of the response but also reaches a judgement.

There were a lot of responses this June which included very good conclusions which were not justified in the main body of the essay - if you read both of these conclusions they are clearly summing up the argument made by the candidate in the main answer. This candidate has underlined the key points they wish to make in creating an evaluative answer.

This is a level 5 answer. The answer shows a clear understanding that the question requires an evaluation of the extent and nature of change over time.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your first answer.)

How accurate is it to say that attitudes within Britain towards the expansion of the African empire became less positive during the years 1875-1914?

PLAN:

- Governmental reluctance - Gladstone (men on the spot)
- Public support - shift to formal imperialism
- ↳ Propaganda
- Boer War as a turning point
- ↳ aftermath - anti-imperialism due to slipping morality of Empire.

With the outbreak of war in 1914, attitudes towards empire in Britain had become less positive, with a new Liberal Government having held the fort for a period since 1905. ~~But~~ However before then, (namely before the Boer War) while governmental policy towards expansion had not been overly

(This page is for your first answer.) strong, public opinion gave a huge deal of support to empire. The turning point in all attitudes was the Boer War (1899-1902), and after this point it is ~~as~~ wholly accurate to say that attitudes towards empire were more negative.

Yet governmental policy towards empire had never been particularly progressive and attitudes were never that enthusiastic. I support the view of Gallagher and Robinson here that Britain were reluctant imperialists, drawn into expansion through rivalry with other European powers (France in the west and Germany in the east of Africa) or problems in areas of informal influence (eg financial problems and governmental collapse in Egypt from 1870s onwards).

This reluctance is particularly true in Britain's expansion into Egypt, where the PM Gladstone was a liberal and firm anti-imperialist, expansion of the African Empire was never his plan but he was forced into occupying Egypt in 1882 due to the financial investments made in the country (including supporting Ismail's vast modernisation program and purchasing Suez's 45% share of the Suez Canal) and the need to protect Suez from falling into enemy

(This page is for your first answer.) hands and jeopardising the trade route to India.

However, while the government were reluctant to expand empire the British public in this time started to develop a huge enthusiasm for empire ^(with many criticising Gladstone for being outdated) ~~as seen~~ fed on the swell of imperialist propaganda which was widespread after 1880. With literacy levels in the population up to 90%, the media and popular press had become the perfect vehicles for stirring up nationalistic rigour. Yet as seen in the more negative governmental attitudes towards empire, this was not a deliberate attempt to indoctrinate and the imperialists who produced this literature, eg Lord Harcourt who founded the Daily Mail, were simply supplying a public demand. Harcourt knew that war would sell paper as people found the expansion of empire truly exciting to follow. This is seen in the reception of Churchill's reporting on the Battle of Omdurman in 1898 where 20,000 British defeated 52,000 Sudanese. There was also the presence of Kipling, the father of imperialism in English literature who developed people's embryonic racism. Among the British youth,

(This page is for your first answer.) fervour for empire was perhaps even stronger with imperialist authors like G.A. Henty achieving great success, together with the popularity of imperialist magazines like the 'Boys Own Paper', 'Gem' and 'Hotspur'.

Among the working classes as well there was a hugely positive attitude towards empire caused by the Music Halls which were the core of entertainment in almost every town. The hit 'By Jingo', gave its name to the whole idea of jingoism which infiltrated Victorian popular society.

That is until the Boer War. This again acts as a demonstration of governmental reluctance to expand the empire as it was men on the spot (Rhodes, and later Milner and Chamberlain) who forced a reluctant cabinet into war. Ironically, the war was initially another great success of propaganda and inspired public support. With the election of a conservative government in 1895, ^{and subsequent success in the 'Khasi election', 1900.} ~~the~~ attitudes seemed in fact to be shifting towards expanding empire at the time, despite the horrors of 'Black week' and the 'Plaugher of the British at Spion Kop'. The continued public support came from a mentioned imperialist propaganda,

(This page is for your first answer.) with the British public lapping up stories of the success of Roberts, Kitchener and later Baden-Powell and his infamously overplayed success at Mafeking which spawned the verb 'to maffick' (celebrate widely).

But the Boer War was to take on a much more sour turn with the change in British tactics to the 'scorched earth policy' and use of concentration camps to house homeless Boer women and children. It is estimated that by the end of the war, these camps held 110,000 people and 28,000 people had died in them. This, partnered with the deaths of 25,000 Boers, 22,000 British and 12,000 Africans seemed to be the end to British imperialism. The peace terms at Vereeniging in 1902 reflected the image of the war as a blunder, with Britain forced to pay reparations for all the damage they had done, with 63,000 Boer farmers making compensation claims, the war came to be incredibly costly financially.

The Unionist government took the brunt of the blame, with the war stamping down firmly on Britain's image as a world protector. The period before the war also saw the rise

(This page is for your first answer.) of liberalism, Henry Campbell-Bannerman elected as PM in 1905. The Boer war had turned imperialism sour, and there were mounting socialist and liberal ideas in Britain with the new Labour Party also being formed in this time.

While the strength of these anti-empire sentiments did wane off slightly by 1914, the fact remains that the Boer war marked a definite negative shift in public and governmental opinion towards the expansion of empire which was even more marked due to the ~~the~~ high level of support in Britain for expansion at the war's outbreak. It seems the Boer war was the beginning of the end.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer .
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your second answer.)

How significant was the impact of the Suez crisis in the decision to grant African independence in the years 1957-1965?

PLAN:

- Didn't cause new factors, revealed existing ones:
- Debt caused by war ^{changing attitudes} (no to colonies)
- ↳ new relationship with America (influence on f.p.)
- ↳ new trading patterns (colonies less important)
- nature of African nationalism
- ↳ cold war implications

When the Suez crisis sparked off in October 1956, it seemed to be highly revelatory of the weaknesses of British imperialism: they were wholly dependent on America, in huge financial debt and had lost their position as a leading world power. Yet Suez was not overly significant as it didn't introduce any

(This page is for your second answer.) new factors into the shift towards decolonisation, indeed this shift long pre-dated it. It was more a manifestation of existing factors: the impact of the 2nd world war on trade and finance and the reliance this caused on the US, Britain's declining influence ^{as a} world power coupled with the growth of African nationalism. Hence we see that the war was a much more important factor than Suez, which merely underlined these problems.

Yet ~~over~~ the Suez crisis did influence a number of changes, with Eden being forced to step down as PM and the pro-decolonisation Macmillan taking his place in 1957. Though it could be argued that Eden's premiership was on the rocks anyway due to his ill health and irrational decision making.

While Suez was also said to have encouraged African nationalist movements, they in fact long pre-dated the crisis ^{with Egyptian independence 1922 and Sudanese in 1956} ~~and~~ ^{it was in fact} their organisation and assimilation of the western values of equality and liberty which Britain had ironically impressed upon them that made an impact on the decision to grant independence. This is particularly true of Ghana, where

and the CCP were
(This page is for your second answer.) Nkrumah ~~was~~ able to write the whole of the south of the country in nationalism regard, winning landslide victories in the 1951, 1954 and 1956 elections. We can also look to the example of Nyerere and TANU in Tanzania where again an august, western-educated leader (Nyerere attended Edinburgh university from 1949) was able with his party to unite his country in nationalism: Suez was almost irrelevant - Ghana achieved independence only the following year and Tanzania in 1961 - but it is perhaps true that it signalled to the nationalists Britain's weakness caused by the key factor in decolonisation, the 2nd world war.

By 1945, Britain was left with a debt of £3bn to overseas creditors and with trade patterns disrupted by war she had lost her place in world markets with Germany and Japan now dominating in manufactured goods and America in shipping. In turn trade with the ~~the~~ commonwealth / colonies seemed less important, particularly after deliberate attempts by the CIO from 1948 to get more money from empire proved fruitless, as seen in the failure of the grand

(This page is for your second answer.) new scheme in Tanganyika

All this signalled changing attitudes to empire in Britain which existed before ^{and continued} after Suez, although a major change which was particularly underlined by Suez was British reliance on ~~the~~ the USA. During the crisis, America was able to completely control British foreign policy, forcing them to withdraw by initially blocking the IMF loan which was desperately needed to prop up the pound.

This was the major importance of Suez: to underline the pound's weakness and Britain's loss of independence regarding foreign policy and it was the former of these factors together with growing African nationalism which made Macmillan ~~is~~ pro-decolonisation (as seen in his 'winds of Change' speech made to South African parliament in 1960.)

The relationship with the USA also put another factor on decolonisation though. Roosevelt had made clear during initial cooperation ^{in the 1940s} the USA's stance on Empires - Britain's had to go - and coupled with their ideological clash was the factor in decolonisation of the cold war implications which threatened empire. America and Britain worked together

(This page is for your second answer.) to curb communism, as seen in the Greek civil war 1945-9 and the fear of the 'domino effect' meant Britain were forced to cooperate with nationalists in Africa for fear of saw relations turning them over to communism, as aptly demonstrated by Nasser's ~~that~~ growing link with the USSR after Suez.

Hence overall we see that Suez did not have that much of an impact as it was just an accumulation of other factors which served mainly to open Britain's eyes to reality; that they were no longer a leading world power. As Macleod pointed out, Britain's powerlessness after the war and Africa's growing national consciousness meant Britain had little choice but to grant African colonies independence, and so we see how after Ghana's independence in 1957, 31 more African colonies were relinquished. Suez undoubtedly had some impact in enforcing attitudes towards decolonisation, all the factors for granting African independence were already in place. Suez was just a tipping point.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Change over time questions often require less detail than other types of question but need well selected supporting material to make a wide range of points. This response attempts to cover not only the whole time period but a variety of response from different groups in Britain - the political and the popular.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

With 40 minutes to choose, plan and execute a response, introductions are often difficult to do well. Answers need to show an understanding of the focus of the question and the key dates involved. This introduction shows the importance of the end date of the time period, the date of the key turning point and sums up the situation before that date.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US028124 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

