

Examiners' Report  
June 2013

GCE history 6HI01 C

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2013

Publications Code US036127

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

# Introduction

Once again the vast majority of both centres and candidates are to be congratulated for the thorough preparation of topics studied in Unit 1. The June 2013 examination series showed that most candidates were able to produce a response that showed at least some attempt to provide an analytical framework to their answers. Many produced a response which provided a framework for discussion in the introduction, developed an argument in the main body of the answer, and attempted to reach some form of judgement in the conclusion. However, the most significant differentiators in the awarding of levels and marks were the explicit understanding of the focus of question and the quality of the supporting evidence.

The main features of high-level answers were:

- an initial plan focused on the demands of the question
- the development of a number of relevant points in the body of the answer
- relevant and secure supporting evidence
- an overall judgement in the conclusion
- secure qualities of written communication.

Despite this there are still some areas for improvement. For example, many candidates make general comments which either do not further their argument or which make it clear that the exact nature of the question is not fully understood. A large number of candidates refer to the time period of the question, e.g. ‘...the years 1939-45...’ throughout the whole response as if it is an event rather than a period of time to be analysed. This becomes particularly problematic for questions which require an analysis of change over time as in Options A1, B2 and F13. This trend is also apparent in questions which are focused on two issues or factors, e.g. ‘gain and consolidate’; when referred to together as one event it is clear that the focus has not been fully understood. Many candidates also begin their answers by using the phrase ‘Many historians believe...’ or ‘There is a debate amongst historians...’ This stock starting device does little to further the response unless reference is made to different historical opinions and as historiographical references are not required within Unit 1, should not be used unless reference to real historical argument or opinion is going to be made.

Most candidates are able to consider with some confidence the features of causation, but many find outcomes and consequences more demanding. This was particularly apparent in Option D, Question 4. Centres should work with candidates to consider the relative importance of consequences of events as well as causes, particularly where the specification clearly suggests that such questions might be set. This also applies to questions which refer to change over time.

Comments on communication skills made in previous reports continue to be relevant. A significant number of candidates struggle both with accurate historical terminology and their deployment within sentences correctly, e.g. ‘...*this is an example of Mussolini’s gain consolidate...*’ An increasing number of colloquialisms crept into candidates’ answers this summer and should be avoided in a formal examination. A handful of scripts remain very difficult to read, and as legibility is included in strand (i) of the quality of written communication criteria, candidates should be reminded that illegible scripts are not communicating effectively and this may undermine their response.

## **Option C – General Comments**

There were over a 1000 entries for Option C this summer and some centres appear to be studying this Option for the first time. Candidates are generally well prepared but there is some variability in depth of knowledge and the ability to analyse. It was also noticeable this summer that some candidates find it difficult to focus directly on the question being asked.

Also there are a significant number of candidates who find it difficult to establish a secure chronology within their answers. Less able responses are seen at Level 2 and these often exhibit the characteristics more suited to GCSE than AS level. However, as in previous sessions the better responses are often interesting and thought-provoking using supporting material which is not always from obvious sources. Above all it is clear that most of the candidates seem to enjoy studying the 'Empire' option and centres should be congratulated for teaching an area of study which is not always well resourced.

## **Question 1**

### **C1 – The Origins of the British Empire, c1680–1763**

This is a popular topic and most candidates have a good working knowledge of the major themes. However, there does appear to be some tendency for many candidates to be working from what might be described as a 'formulaic' response which does not necessarily lead to a well-focused answer. The two questions in this summer's paper did not necessarily lend themselves to a formula and some candidates found themselves trying to adapt what appeared to be learnt paragraphs to the set questions. This approach may ensure candidates are achieving at least at Level 3 but it appears to be preventing more able candidates from addressing the question carefully and thoroughly.

Q1. This was the more popular of the two questions. The question did not suggest that war was the most significant but asked how significant war was in the territorial expansion of Empire. The mark scheme allowed for candidates to produce a more focused discussion of the significance of war or to establish relative significance with reference to other factors. However, to achieve at the higher Levels there needed to be some recognition that war was the focus of the question. Some responses dismissed war briefly and then discussed a list of other more significant factors which often resulted in mid-Level 4 responses at best. Once again, with these types of question, responses were differentiated by the ability to determine significance in relation to territorial expansion. Candidates often had very little secure knowledge of actual territorial expansion as consequence of the armed conflicts and often confused different wars. It was also quite disconcerting to see confused chronology within paragraphs with references made to gains made in 1763 discussed before gains made in 1713, for example. Some responses failed to mention India at all. Many candidates also wrote long explanatory paragraphs on the role of the creation of the Bank of England in the expansion of Empire which were often not clearly linked to territorial expansion or were confused in their explanation. The best responses focused on the significance of war in bringing about territorial gains with some pointing out that it was not necessarily the extent of the gains but the location of the gains which were often more significant. Others suggested that war was more significant at different times and in different parts of the Empire.

## Question 1

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.)

<sup>1701</sup> Spanish succession - Treaty of Utrecht 1714 - gained Gibraltar + Minorca.

Nine years war - Louis gained Quebec, Rhine + Italy

The role of war in the territorial expansion of the British Empire in the years c1680 - 1763 was highly significant as it allowed Britain to gain power over their rivals and annex land. However Trading companies ~~were~~ and the navy were also of great significance of the territorial expansion of the empire.

~~There were~~ wars were rife in the years c1680 - 1763 due to the rivalry between ~~Countries like~~; Britain, Spain, France and the Dutch. A major war that highlights the significance of wars to the ~~the~~ territorial expansion

(This page is for your second answer.) Of the British Empire is the Spanish Succession which started in 1701 and ended in 1714 due to the treaty of Utrecht which gave the British Gibraltar and Minorca, this shows clear territorial expansion of the British Empire in the years c1680-1763 due to war. This further highlights the significance of war in the territorial expansion of the British Empire. However wars could also have a detrimental affect of territorial expansion as is show in the wine years war (1789-1698) were Louis XVII gained territory for France including Quebec, Rhine and Italy, this put the British at a disadvantage in terms of territorial expansion meaning that although wars are highly significant to the territorial expansion of the British Empire in the years c1680-1763 the results of the wars between rivals didn't always have a positive effect on the territorial expansion of the Empire.

However Trading Companies also hold some significance to the territorial expansion of the British Empire in the years c1680-1763 due ~~to~~ to the sheep profit they made for example in 1763 the East India Company exceeded a yearly profit of £1 million. With this extent of profit it was used to finance wars, so without the profit generated from trading companies the wars may not have been

(This page is for your second answer.) Successful. So although war directly contributed to the territorial expansion without the profit generated from the trading companies it wouldn't have been successful. Furthermore the trading companies <sup>helped</sup> ~~attained~~ territorial expansion by annexing land which ~~the~~ in 1570 they were allowed to do as well as mint money and create an army, this shows the great powers they were given which allowed them to gain territorial expansion of the British Empire in the years 1680-1763.

Another significant factor in the territorial expansion of the British Empire in the years 1680-1763 was the fact that the Navy was so powerful. ~~The~~ The Navy was a two power standard meaning they were twice as big as the second largest army, this created a great defence for the British Empire from Rivalries, it gave them power and authority meaning they could annex land and go wage war on their rivals meaning they gained territorial expansion ~~in the years~~ of the British empire in the years 1680-1763.

(This page is for your second answer.) ~~My~~ Overall it is evident to see that wars were highly significant in the territorial expansion of the British empire in the years 1680-1763 due to the fact that treaties such as; Utrecht 1714 allowed the Empire to gain territories. However the two power standard navy also held significance as it created a prestige and power for the British empire it helped win wars which resulted in the annexing of land. On the other hand the trading companies also hold evidently great significance due to the fact that their sheer profits helped finance the wars meaning without trading companies the British Empire wouldn't have the financial capability to wage so many wars in a short amount of time for example the Spanish succession was in 1701-1714, the Austrian succession was in 1739-1748 and the Seven Years war was in 1756-1763 this highlights the short <sup>period</sup> ~~amount~~ of time that major wars were fought in meaning without the vast profits from the trading companies the wars wouldn't have been successful. So with this in mind it is evident to say that ~~the trading companies~~ <sup>wars</sup> were highly significant in the territorial expansion of the British Empire in the years 1680-1763 however trading companies profits supported the wars meaning they are of higher significance.



## ResultsPlus

**Examiner Comments**

This is a Level 3 response. It attempts analysis with an understanding of the focus of the question and attempts a judgement in the conclusion. The given factor is briefly developed with reference to several other factors that have weak supporting evidence.



## ResultsPlus

**Examiner Tip**

If the points made in the conclusion had been used to begin paragraphs in the main body then it would have created a more sustained analytical response. Try to make sure that each point you make furthers the discussion of the statement in the question.

## Question 2

Q2. This was the less popular of the two questions but nonetheless a significant number of candidates attempted the question. A few failed to recognise that the question was focused solely on the role of the trading companies and required an analysis of their changing nature over time. These responses produced 'stock' answers with reference to the importance of trading companies compared to other factors and so were not well focused. Most candidates chose to look at the three main companies as case studies but a few traced the role of trading companies in general. Both approaches led to some interesting responses. A significant number spent far too long establishing the context of the trading companies in the 17<sup>th</sup> century rather than tracing their development from 1680 leading to responses with a lack of sustained relevant supporting material; this was particularly so with the East India Company. A few candidates suggested that the *assiento* was awarded to the Royal African Company. Some of the more able candidates were able to show the gradual metamorphosis of the East India Company from trading company to semi-autonomous imperial power, the decline of the Royal Africa Company in the face of commercial rivalry and demand and the specific role of the South Sea Company. Some responses showed how trading companies in general grew from being instruments of economic expansion to more physical tools of territorial expansion and political prestige.

### **Question 3**

#### **C2 – Relations with the American Colonies and the War of Independence, c1740–89**

Candidates are well-prepared for Topic C2 and usually have a good grounding of knowledge across the time period. However, there is still the tendency, noticed in previous sessions, for candidates to provide generalised rather than specific supporting evidence to prove points made.

Q3. This was the more popular of the two questions. Most candidates developed points relating to the economic, defensive and cultural relationship between the Colonies and Britain; fewer responses than expected dealt directly with the political relationship. Few mentioned the Albany Congress (1754) or political theories that were beginning to emerge which hinted at breaking away from the 'Mother Country'. There was also little reference to the differences and enmities between individual colonies. Responses were differentiated by their tendency to describe and explain or explain and analyse the relationship. Many candidates referred to the cultural ties between the two, the strengths and limitations of the mercantile system and the outcomes of the colonial wars against France. Most suggested that the relationship remained fundamentally strong but that by 1763 the underlying tensions which would lead to Independence had already been established. It would have been good to see more responses establish an analysis of change over time by determining the position in 1740 in relation to the situation by 1763. Some candidates unfortunately went on to discuss events post-1763 so seriously undermining the effectiveness of their 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.)

~~Merchants, Social Reasons, Wars~~

Britain and the American Colonies had a good relationship, but only to a certain extent, within the years 1740-63. At this time Britain had control over the Colonies, and tried to maintain this throughout the years. In some ways the relationship remained strong, in others it didn't, because of the following reasons, Merchants, Social and Political reasons and the effect of the Seven Years War and the War of Austrian Succession.

The first factor that ~~was~~ maintained a strong relationship was Merchants. This maintained a strong relationship as it allowed the colonies to have a protected market to

(This page is for your first answer.) Trade in, allowing the colonies to maximise their trade profits. The relationship was also strong because Britain and America had linked economies. One third of imports, to be sent to America went through Britain, which showed they ~~were~~ <sup>shared</sup> similar economic motives. Mercantilism also allowed growth of the American colonies' economy. This was because there was an annual growth of 0.5% per year of the economy, which benefited the colonies because it allowed ~~them to~~ more jobs to be created - leading to more employment for the people stationed in the colonies. Mercantilism also maximised profit, because of the exclusion of foreign ships. This benefited both the colonies and Britain, as the colonies were able to get money from Britain for building the ships - 43 of British ships were built in the colonies, ~~as well~~ and Britain could directly use the ships for trading. Mercantilism benefited both Britain and America hugely, mainly as they could boast secure economies, so the relationship was strong.

However, mercantilism wasn't all that effective.

(This page is for your first answer.) It caused problems actually.

For a start, ~~America~~ <sup>Britain</sup> tried to restrict the amount Britain could trade, by introducing the Navigation Acts, one example being the Molasses Act, which reduced the import of sugar. Also, the fact that goods imported such as sugar and tobacco had to be passed through Britain first showed a lack of trust between Britain and the colonies, this would have damaged their relationship. ~~Britain~~ America colonies were therefore doing well economically under mercantilism, but the British attempted to restrict their trade, which angered the colonists. The relationship, therefore, ~~was~~ <sup>had</sup> both strong and weak elements.

Another factor which maintained a strong relationship was the events of the War of Austrian Succession, and the Seven Years War. The relationship was strong, because the American colonies and Britain managed to capture Louisbourg in 1745. This ~~meant~~ showed unity between the colonies and Britain, so was clearly a strong relationship. Another example of ~~such~~ ~~a~~ sign of a strong relationship

(This page is for your first answer.) was the ~~fe~~ number of troops provided by the colonies and Britain to each other. In the war, the colonies provided Britain with ~~over~~ 60,000 men, ~~to~~ whilst Pitt gave the colonies 25,000 men, and money for another 25,000, to help deal with the French threat, in 1757. ~~These~~ These examples show that there was common purpose, and unity between Britain and the colonies, each ~~and~~ of them aided each other to ensure they beat France, so increased the strength in relations.

However, these wars, too, had a downside to relations. An example of a negative relation between the colonies and Britain was the fact that the Colonists felt betrayed. After capturing Louisbourg together in 1748, the ~~As~~ British returned it to France, on the condition that French forces were removed from America. This, ~~result~~ ~~that~~ to the colonists, seemed like Britain were acting on their own interests, and damaged relations, as the colonists were angered. Also, there was mutual contempt, during, and at the end of the war. The Americans

(This page is for your first answer.) were described as "ill-equipped" and "ill-disciplined", as well as General Wolfe, (British General) calling the Americans "cowardly dogs". This would have, once again, angered the colonists, as they felt they had greatly aided Britain in the war, and Britain weren't taking their help into account, they were taking it for granted. Reddick's were therefore, actually not as strong, as the colonists felt betrayed, both. By the British action over Louisbourg, and also the words from the British generals.

Some reasons also maintained a strong relationship. British culture had been inherited by the colonists, ~~there had been~~ Americans spoke the British language, and had similar laws. This coupled with the fact that over 80% of the colonists could vote, meant a strong relationship, the colonies and Britain shared similar cultural attributes. The people of America were also functioning well in terms of money and employment. 80% of the colonists ~~had~~ were "successful professionals", - having a good income and a good job.

(This page is for your first answer.) Relations improved because of this, the colonists were happy in ~~that~~ the respect of employment. Also, Britain ~~did~~ didn't impose any major laws on the colonists. Aside from the navigation acts, there was very ~~little~~ few ~~suggest~~ laws to restrict the colonists, so could effectively do as they pleased overall, as the colonists had a stable social and political culture, the relationship improved.

Again though, there were some negative aspects. Despite 50% of the colonists being successful professionals, there was still a high poverty rate, 20% of colonists were in some form of poverty. This shows that Britain weren't looking after the colonies very effectively, ~~again~~ neglecting them, so the relationship weakened. Also, immigration was becoming a major aspect. In the 18th century, ~~a~~ 220,000 immigrants came to the colonies. This gave the colonists a "new identity", separate from Britain, so the effect British culture had was decreasing, instead the immigrants became prominent. This weakened the relationship.

(This page is for your first answer.) because the colonists were becoming more separate from Britain, with many foreigners

To conclude, I do ~~but~~ believe the relationship remained strong, but only to an extent. Mercantilism, the war effort and several social reasons ~~was~~ maintained a strong relationship, as well as inter-colonial rivalry becoming more important than that of rivalry towards America, but the relationship was significantly weakened by the attempts to regulate trade, British betrayal and the colonists forming a new identity



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a Level 4 response. The answer is well-focused with an understanding of some of the key issues. The supporting evidence is secure but not always as well selected.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Always use the introduction to show that you understand the question asked. This introduction gives a brief answer to the question, gives some context and outlines the factors that will be addressed.

## **Question 4**

Q4. This was the less popular of the two questions and many candidates attempted to adapt a learnt response as to why the British lost or why the Americans won. This produced some confused responses which often had some relevant material but were not directly focused. Some responses described the course of the war while commenting on the reasons for the war continuing; this approach had some relevance but often candidates concentrated so much on events before Saratoga that they did not have time to finish the narrative. Many candidates also exemplify points made almost exclusively with battles fought towards the beginning of the war, most particularly Lexington and Concord. Those who were most successful were often those who took some time to think, wrote a clear plan and focused on the wording of the question set. Better responses suggested that the war was so lengthy due to British naivety at the beginning of the war, confused British aims and objectives once rebellion was clear and the need for the Americans to establish their own military response. Some responses suggested that far from shortening the war the arrival of foreign allies for the Americans prolonged the war and indeed the peace negotiations, as the conflict expanded onto a world stage. The question did produce some of the most interesting and thought-provoking responses of the whole paper.

## **Question 5**

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

This is by far the most popular of the topics with the vast majority of centres combining this with C1, C2 or C6. As stated before, this leads to a wide variety in the standard of responses ranging from simple developed statements to well-organised and focused analysis. Source material is often difficult to find that is suitable for AS Level but some candidates do appear to have a very superficial knowledge of events and will make bold assertions relating to individuals or factors relating to the abolition of slavery. There are also many candidates who have a weak chronological knowledge of events or who suggest strong causal relationships to events which happened many years apart. In particular, there are a significant number of candidates who confuse the timings of the main periods of slave revolt. In particular, many candidates suggest that Tacky's Revolt (1760) and the Sharp Rebellion (1831) were directly related to the abolition of the slave trade in 1807.

Q5. Very few candidates attempted this question which required the analysis of the changing nature of both the slave trade and the plantation system over time. It was hoped that the candidates would be able to use some of the key legislation over the time period to determine the changing experiences of slaves, or even slave owners. However, many of the answers were often simple descriptions or explanations of the slave trade with a fleeting reference to Abolition followed by a description of the gang system on plantations with a suggestion that things may have improved as slave owners began to 'breed' their own slave replacements. Many of these responses were awarded at Level 2 and the majority were in Level 3. There were some very good responses which were able to discuss how minor changes were made to the carriage of slaves across the Atlantic pre-1807, the knock-on effects of the 1807 Act on plantations, the subsequent 'illegal trade' and the attempts to ameliorate slavery leading to the Act of 1833. There was little mention of the effects of the 1833 Abolition on the plantations system. Very few candidates chose to develop the answer by establishing the situation in 1760 and comparing it to the changes that had occurred by 1833 which would have led to an effective analysis.

## **Question 6**

Q6. This was attempted by the overwhelming majority of candidates. It had been hoped that candidates would take the opportunity to produce a well-rounded discussion of the debate surrounding Wilberforce's real contribution to the 1807 Act. However, although some candidates were able to produce well-reasoned and, above all, well-supported responses, a large number of candidates produced poorly organised responses with either a brief dismissal of Wilberforce followed by a discussion of the other individuals involved or a long description of Wilberforce's early career followed by a discussion of other factors. A significant minority failed to recognise this as a question about the abolition of the slave trade and discussed factors or individuals more relevant to 1833. There was little discussion of the forces required to get the Act passed through parliament or factors in relation to 1807. Often direct causal links were made to court cases or revolts that took place decades before rather than establishing their contribution to the groundswell of popular support. Descriptions or explanations of Wilberforce's role were often limited to the earlier part of his career and there was often little awareness of what he actually did within parliament except to make one long speech in 1789. Those responses which referred to other factors often asserted their contribution rather than showing how they contributed to the abolition itself. Stock paragraphs about individual abolitionist were often listed with little real focus on 1807. Although there were many who viewed Wilberforce as the 'voice' and Clarkson as the 'campaigner', there were few responses which clearly showed the inter-relationship between the creation of a mass popular movement, Wilberforce's work within parliament and the external influences which led to abolition in 1807.

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.)

William Wilberforce, was a young non-conformist MP for Hull. He played a pivotal role in the abolition of slavery through tireless efforts to introduce legislation and things such as presenting petitions to parliament. One way that we can argue William Wilberforce's importance is to point out that his ~~world~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~was~~ perfectly placed to influence the men who ultimately made the decision to abolish the slave trade. ~~He~~ ~~provided~~ ~~access~~ ~~to~~ ~~politics~~. He was known as a very capable public speaker and frequently presented persuasive arguments to the House of Commons. Furthermore, he provided a ~~of~~ ~~voice~~ for the main group of non-conformists, the Quakers. The Quakers were a highly literate, well funded group, but were excluded from participating in politics. Wilberforce's position as an MP meant that this group had a way of

(This page is for your first answer.) <sup>making</sup> ~~being~~ their voice heard where previously it had been ignored. Another reason why Wilberforce may have been the most important person in the push for abolition ~~was~~ <sup>is</sup> that he convinced his old school teacher to give evidence to support the cause. The man had been the captain of a slave ship and as such was able to give an accurate, first-hand account of the horrors of the middle passage between Africa and the West Indies. This had a large impact on the British public as no one directly involved with the trade had spoken out before.

However, there were certainly other men who played a big part in abolition, who may well have been equally as important as Wilberforce. One of these men was Olaudah Equiano. An ex-slave, Equiano had bought his freedom and travelled to England. One of his key contributions was the writing of an auto-biography detailing the brutal conditions of his time onboard a slave ship. He then toured the country giving speeches and talking about his book in order to raise awareness. This was very important as it meant that a growing number of people were being educated in the realities of the slave trade. Also

(This page is for your first answer.) it directly refuted the lies told by the pro-slavery lobby who said that the slaves were well looked after on the crossing and sang and danced on the top deck. Equiano was also important in contradicting the myth that Africans were somehow sub-human and ~~not~~ unintelligent and of a lower status than Europeans. He could read and write and speak eloquently, proving himself to be any man's equal. Perhaps even more importantly, he was a Christian. This offered a moral problem to many who thought that you could not make a fellow Christian a slave.

Another man who may have been as important as Wilberforce is Thomas Clarkson. After catching Wilberforce's eye with an essay he had written on the wrongs of slavery, Clarkson became a key figure in the struggle for abolition. He travelled to the West Indies to collect evidence to show the mis-treatment of slaves. At public meetings he would show the implements such as manacles and chains used to subjugate the slaves and keep them in line. This had a profound effect on the public who had yet to see such visual proof of cruelty. Clarkson also had a hand in the production of a poster showing how tightly packed the slaves were on board.

(This page is for your first answer.) This was very effective as it did not rely on people being literate (as many were not)

~~A final group that may reduce the importance of Wilberforce's impact is the work of women~~  
In conclusion, I would argue that although Wilberforce was extremely valuable to the abolitionists cause, you cannot place him as being individually more important than the others such as Equiano or Thomas Clarkson. He was the link between many influential people but without them he would probably have been able to do very little to bring about the end of slavery.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a typical Level 3 response it has an understanding of the focus of the question and attempts to explain the role of other individuals but is more focused on the success of the campaign than the achievement of abolition. The role of Wilberforce is understood but limited in development with some less relevant material.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

A sense of chronology is very important. Most questions include dates which have some significance and should be addressed - this response does not mention 1807 which is the year in which the abolition Act was passed. Always try to focus on the dates in the question.

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.) William Wilberforce was a Yorkshire MP who, following a religious experience and inspiration from Thomas Clarkson's 1785 Mory essay, was persuaded to take on the abolitionist role in Parliament. Through his tireless effort, connections and skills led to the 1807 Abolition of Slave Trade act, it would be wrong to overstate his importance in light of botched tactics, moral concerns and a postponement during the French Revolutionary wars from 1792-1802. There are also many other factors to consider, such as individual roles of Thomas Clarkson, John Newton and Granville Sharp, groups such as the Abolition of the Slave Trade committee ~~the~~ founded in 1787 and world events - the Procrustic Crisis, the issue of the French Revolution and later Napoleon, and the instatement of the Fox-Grenville Government. I shall therefore overall argue that, though Wilberforce played a primary role, he was not mainly responsible for the 1807 Slave Trade Act.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Wilberforce was a Yorkshire MP in 1775, who was a good friend of the Prime Minister William Pitt the younger and an evangelist. The 1775 Slavery essay of Thomas Clarkson had given Wilberforce a firm moral stance against the Slave Trade, and with his ties in Parliament he took the Parliamentary front in the Abolition movement. Wilberforce was a great orator, once speaking 3 hours to Parliament on the horrors of the Middle Passage, and with his respectability and kind manner he was a favoured politician. He presented many arguments, public petitions and proposed legislations to Parliament, almost annually, until finally the Slave Trade was abolished in 1807.

However, I feel Wilberforce's importance has been greatly overstated. His persistence was not consistent - not only was he concerned with other moral measures such as censorship but he postponed the abolition cause during the French Revolutionary wars between 1789-99. Furthermore, Wilberforce had bad tactics, with the passing of the Slave Trade Act in 1792 demonstrating this, as it failed when it came to Cornwall. Wilberforce had not campaigned against them.

(This page is for your first answer.) As well as this, Wilberforce relied on a lot of evidence and petition gathering done by Thomas Clarkson. Clarkson, who travelled 35,000 miles on horseback in the 1790's alone, interviewed slave ship crews, gathered testimonies and physical evidence as well, and ~~travelling~~ publicly spoke across the country to gather thousands of public petitions. Other influence from people, such as John Newton's accounts on slave voyages and the publication of Olaudah Equiano's biography in 1789 demonstrated why the Slave Trade and it's barbarity had to stop.

Other groups responsible for the Abolition Act in 1807, arguably more important than Wilberforce, were the Group for the Abolition of the Slave Trade, the Group of Friends (alongside the Quakers) and the British Missionary Society. The Quakers, a religious group who found the Slave Trade to be deplorable, continued the work of George Fox and Anthony Benezet and utilized their vast literacy and printing press power to distribute anti-Slave Trade pamphlets across the UK. ~~The Quakers~~ Some Quakers began the Society of Friends for this cause, and later joined with Methodist abolitionists to create the Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade in ~~1789~~ 1787, continuing their campaigning efforts.

(This page is for your first answer.) to parliament and the public alike. The British Missionary Society, established in 1792, also tried to provide religious and moral arguments to the UK to abolish the slave trade, notable members such as John Smith and William Knibb later spending time sympathising slaves in the Caribbean.

However, vast changes in world circumstances in the 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> century, I argue, were driving factors mainly responsible for the Abolition of the Slave Trade in 1807. The Evangelical religious revival of the late 18<sup>th</sup> century and the Scientific Enlightenment encouraged a greater amount of thought and moral consideration to be taken into the Slave Trade, with engraving shocking people into the cause of Abolition. The French Revolution and Revolutionary wars also played a significant part - rebellious Jacobin ideas present in the 1789-99 French Revolution and the Haiti revolt of slaves, led by slave Toussaint Louverture between 1792 and 1804, worried the British Government with the prospect of rebellious attitudes elsewhere enacting the gradually anti-slave trade public to take action forcefully. But it was in the beginning of the new 19<sup>th</sup> century which ended the Slave Trade for Britain - the resumption of the war with France against Napoleon in 1804.

(This page is for your first answer.) Which prevented the British Navy from concentrating on protecting British vessels crossing the Atlantic, alongside the fall of the Pitt the Younger Government and the rise of the Fox-Grenville Government was the final blow to the Slave Trade. The ministry of all ~~the~~ the Talents was established in 1806, and in 1807 Wilberforce's anti-Slave trade abolition act was passed.

So on evaluation, there is no doubt that Wilberforce as the voice in Parliament for the abolition movement contributed to the abolition of the slave trade in 1807, but the overwhelming amount of evidence demonstrates he was not mainly responsible for it - in fact, the key individual figure for the abolition in 1807 I would claim is Thomas Clarkson, who campaigned across the country, endlessly gathering support and disseminating the abolitionist sentiment - this was even recognized by a sonnet to him by Wordsworth! Also, other abolitionist groups and their power, and the French Revolutionary events with the war with Britain and the Jacobinism threat, and the parliamentary change in 1806, all demonstrate that Wilberforce's contribution was significantly little by itself, and I therefore disagree strongly that

(This page is for your first answer.)

*he was the main responsible for  
abolition in 1807.*



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a Level 5 response. Although there are still areas of development that could be more detailed particularly to Wilberforce himself, this is a wide ranging response that discusses Wilberforce's strengths and limitations in relation to other individuals, the work of the Abolition societies and the political climate at the time. The supporting evidence is succinct and well-selected if not always detailed. This is a sustained, focused response.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Try to use the beginning sentences of paragraphs to construct your argument - this will lead to an effective conclusion. In this response the opening lines of the paragraphs clearly indicate how the discussion is developing.

## Question 6

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.)

William Wilberforce was one of the key campaigners for the abolition of Slavery in the slave trade in 1807. However, there were various other factors that also contributed massively to the campaign. Other campaigners also played a key role, such as Thomas Clarkson, who essentially risked his life for what he believed. Also, the St Domingue rebellion, led by Toussaint L'Ouverture, also contributed dramatically to the abolition of slavery, as the government questioned the direction slavery was going in. But, ~~with~~ without Wilberforce, the abolition of the trade would have happened, just not in the year 1807, ~~due~~ His drive and determination and non stop activism in parliament was the main reason for the abolition in 1807, nothing else.

William Wilberforce started his campaign, along with various other campaigners in the ~~1780s~~ <sup>1790s</sup> when the Abolition Committee

(This page is for your second answer.) was started. The abolition committee had various different reasons for wanting the slave trade to be abolished. They argued that it was unjust and was against God's will. William Wilberforce was the spearhead of the committee in Parliament, as he spoke on behalf of the committee. He was repeatedly shot down by the large opposition to his ideas of abolishing the slave trade. But, he was a religious man and knew that what was happening was wrong. This led him to work even harder in his quest for the abolition of the trade. The campaign committee ~~had~~ worked hard in getting their message across, and gave various alternatives to the slave trade as a source of income. Bills were often rejected. But, the change in economic interests helped Wilberforce gain support in parliament. People were realising that the slave trade was becoming less valuable, and Wilberforce made sure everybody knew it. His role in parliament and speaking on behalf of the committee led to abolition in 1807, and without his passion, drive or determination, he would not have gained what he had spent of over 20 years of his life working on.

However, ~~the~~ Thomas Clarkson also played a key role in the abolition of the slave trade in 1807. He went around the country, collecting evidence of how brutal slaves

(This page is for your second answer.) was, so that the committee could show the public just how badly these people were being treated. He ~~collecting~~ collected over 10000 items, and due to his amazing work being noticed, whilst in Liverpool, a key area where anti abolition was prominent, he was nearly assassinated by a group of sailors. The ~~his~~ evidence became known as Clarkson's boxes, which had pieces of ~~other~~ art on that slaves had created to counter arguments stating that Africans were not humans like whites were. His ~~hard~~ work with real evidence was noticed throughout parliament, definitely swaying opposition towards Wilberforce's charge against ~~the~~ slavery. Although Clarkson collected the evidence that shocked and horrified parliament, such as the Brookes diagram, which showed just how slaves were kept on ships, Wilberforce was the lead man in parliament, who presented this evidence and showed everybody just how disgusting the trade was. Yes, Clarkson was also key, but if Wilberforce wasn't in Parliament fighting for the cause, the trade simply wouldn't have stopped in 1807, ~~as~~ Parliament wouldn't have comprehended the unjust slavery the trade was causing.

Another key factor was the St Domingue uprising. This was led by a ~~slave~~ man named Toussaint L'Ouverture, who led an uprising amongst slaves in St Domingue (modern day Haiti). This was due to the French

(This page is for your second answer.) army trying to exploit the area. Toussaint L'Ouverture and his men killed off the french troops and fought for their freedom, so much so that the french eventually fled the island. The slaves were so successful that in 1804, the leaders changed the island's name to The Republic of Haiti. This quickly spread amongst other plantations in the colonies and the plantation owners were terrified of a similar uprising occurring. The fact that the slaves had defeated an Army scared Parliament, and showed the government the sheer power and determination of the slaves. This led to the government questioning the trade, as they thought it may cause more harm than good if it continued. This came at the perfect time for Wilberforce, who used the rebellion to get more supporters. He timed his bill to perfection, when he knew there was no hope for slavery. ~~Without this, slavery in the slave trade.~~ Without this, the act of abolition of the slave trade would still have passed, due to free work that was already going on. This was however an added bonus for Wilberforce.

In conclusion, the abolition of the trade did have other big factors that contributed alongside Wilberforce in the abolition. But without him Parliament would not have seen



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a Level 4 response. Well-focused with an understanding of some of the key issues. There is some focus on the year 1807 and Wilberforce's role is discussed in relation to several other factors. The supporting evidence is relevant but not always detailed or convincing.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Try to focus on the wording of the question to reach a judgement. This response reaches a judgement on the role of Wilberforce in the passing of the 1807 Act rather than a discussion of his role in the abolition campaign in general.

## ***Question 7***

### **C4 – Commerce and Conquest: India, c1760–c1835**

There were no responses to either question for this topic.

## **Question 11**

### **C6 – Britain and the Scramble for Africa, c1875–1914**

Candidates for this topic are usually very well prepared and there were some very interesting and thoughtful responses produced for both of the questions. There were some candidates who attempted to adapt 'stock' answers to the questions asked but the vast majority were able to focus on the wording of the question asked.

Q11. This proved to be an effective question with most candidates focused on a discussion of the relative importance of the two factors identified. Some responses did attempt to introduce a list of other factors as well but most were clearly focused. The answers brought out a wealth of knowledge regarding both military conflict and the different treaties and agreements signed throughout Africa. Some Level 4 responses were imbalanced by spending too much time developing one or other of the factors. Some answers suggested that expansion often started with treaties as in Matabeleland and then led to war while others suggested the opposite, often citing the Boer War. Others suggested that the nature of expansion depended on geographical region contrasting West Africa with Egypt or Southern Africa, for example. Candidates often have detailed knowledge of specific areas, in particular, East Africa and can deploy arguments with skill. These responses were often the most enjoyable to read across the whole paper as candidates were challenged to select the most appropriate knowledge to fit the statement in the question.

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 period of years between 1875 and 1914 saw great colonial expansion by many of the European powers in Africa, to such an extent that this period has been named "THE Scramble for Africa". However, the way in which Britain expanded in Africa is a matter of great debate for historians, with some saying that expansion was more due to treaties than to conflict, and others arguing the opposite. However, the evidence better supports the idea that agreements were responsible for expansion.

This idea is backed up particularly by events in East Africa. British colonial gains here can certainly be put down to the treaties that were negotiated, as is shown by the formation of the Boundaries Committee in 1885. This was a Committee formed of representatives from France, Britain and Germany, and their aim was to determine which powers got which pieces of territory. On the

(This page is for your first answer.) whole, Britain gained more out of this agreement than either of the other powers, gaining the colonies of Kenya and Uganda, while the Germans merely attained Tanganyika. This would show that Britain's imperial expansion was due to treaties rather than armed conflict in East Africa.

Further evidence for this point can be found in West Africa, where large tracts were gained through treaties with tribal chiefs and other powers. Firstly, in 1882, there was an agreement between Britain and France, which resulted in the British colony of Sierra Leone expanding to cover an area of 27,000 square miles. Furthermore, Britain's largest coup in this region was to come as the result of some cunning work from George Goldie, the head of the National Africa Company, and from the treaties Goldie agreed with the Niger chiefs. In 1884, Goldie's NAC undercut the prices of the French companies operating in the lucrative palm oil market on the Lower Niger. They did this as they feared that the French were about to agree treaties with the chiefs to trade with them for palm oil, which would have led to a protectorate. However, once the NAC undercut the French prices, the chiefs saw the British as their best business partners and so signed treaties which left Britain

(This page is for your first answer.) with a monopoly of the palm oil trade on the lower Niger and a protectorate in all but name. Therefore, British expansion in West Africa can be seen to be largely down to treaties.

Another treaty that was important to British expansion in Africa was the agreement reached by the imperial powers at the Berlin Conference in late 1884 to early 1885. One of the main agreements here was that the powers had to be in formal occupation of the colonies, and so Britain was able to push her troops around the continent in order to secure these. However, one could say that this agreement caused conflicts in the colonies and so perhaps it is more likely that the Berlin Conference made British expansion more due to armed conflict than treaties.

There are indeed many examples where one can say that British colonial expansion was due to armed conflict. In South Africa, for instance, Cecil Rhodes did initially agree treaties with Lobengula, the Matabele king, but did invade Matabeleland and Mashonaland in 1893 and 1890 respectively, in order to colonise them for Great Britain. Indeed, once Rhodes had invaded Matabeleland, he and his "Pioneers" had

(This page is for your first answer.) to put down a rebellion from the Matabele tribe, who were furious at what they viewed as a betrayal of their trust. Therefore, South African expansion between 1875 and 1914 was mainly due to colonial conflict.

Further conflict arose during Britain's expansion into North Africa. Britain invaded Egypt in 1882, supposedly to avenge the deaths of the 50 Europeans killed in the riots in Alexandria in the same year. Britain put down the revolt led by Arabi Pasha, who they exiled, and began to control Egypt like the rest of the tropical colonies in Africa.

Further violence came in 1884, when the British expanded into Sudan. Indeed, the fighting here was so fierce that one of Britain's best generals, Gordon, was killed at the siege of Khartoum.

Therefore, one could argue that North African expansion was mainly due to conflict, although Gordon was admittedly killed in an attempted withdrawal, and one also has to acknowledge that initial British involvement was mainly due to the agreement that the British and French governments would jointly control the economy, so perhaps one could also argue that British expansion in North Africa was due to treaties, rather than conflict,

(This page is for your first answer.) *especially as the main conflict arose when Britain attempted to withdraw.*

*In conclusion then, although one can indeed say that expansion in South and, to an extent, North Africa was due to armed conflict, one cannot apply this to all of Africa, or even to all of the previously mentioned areas. For example, Rhodes agreed treaties before invading Matabeleland, and British involvement in North Africa was initially secured by a series of treaties. Furthermore, without Goldie's plan to "steal" the treaties from the French, Britain never could have secured a protectorate or a monopoly of the Lower Niger. Finally, the agreements made by the Boundaries Commission in 1885 handed Britain two large tracts of land and so one can indeed conclude that British expansion in Africa between 1875 and 1914 was mainly due to treaties and agreements.*



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a Level 5 response. It is directly focused on the question and has an explicit understanding of the key issues with well-selected evidence. The argument is balanced coming to an evaluative judgement in the conclusion.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Conclusions are very important - they should clearly state the argument and the judgement which you have come to. This conclusion agrees with the statement in the question in general but shows that in some areas of Africa the situation was slightly different.

## **Question 12**

Q12. This was the more popular of the two questions and required an analysis of the effect of the Boer War on attitudes towards Empire in Britain. Candidates often found it difficult to develop well organised answers but almost all attempted some analysis of the changes brought about by involvement in the War. There are now fewer candidates making apocalyptic claims for the end of Empire in 1902 and most candidates are aware that the War had a significant impact on attitudes but did not turn everyone against Empire. However, some sweeping statements were still made concerning the attitudes of classes, particularly the working class and even individuals. Some candidates confused attitudes to the War with attitudes towards Empire. A large number of responses were able to discuss confidently changes in political attitudes and all were aware of the effect of the short-comings and atrocities of the War. There were some interesting points made about the long-term effects on both Conservative and Liberal politicians and on imperial and foreign policy. Most candidates chose to determine change through the events of the War but might have been more effective had they established attitudes before the War in relation to attitudes after.

## **Question 13**

### **C7 – Retreat from Empire: Decolonisation in Africa, c1957–81**

Most centres studying topic C7 combine it with C6 and so are well prepared for the topic. As with C7 many candidates have good knowledge of the different geographical areas involved and the wider context of decolonisation. However, there can be a tendency for responses to make general comments without supporting evidence from the experience in Africa itself. Although most candidates have some knowledge of the growth of African nationalism this would appear to be an area of the specification which leads to less confident responses. Also some candidates are confused as to the chronology of events in Southern Rhodesia/Rhodesia/Zimbabwe where events moved less quickly and responses often refer to events that happened post-1965 in questions focused on the period up to 1965.

Q13. This was the less popular of the two questions. Most candidates had a good knowledge of the growth of nationalism but a few produced confused responses that appeared to be focused on the decline of Empire. Some responses had a detailed knowledge of the nationalist experience in different geographical regions and there were a few candidates who were able to deal admirably with the complexities of events surrounding the Central African Federation. Very few candidates confuse the different nationalist organisations or leaders. The best responses were able to show the complex relationship between the wider post-War political world climate, Britain's declining prestige and the situation on the ground in Africa itself.

## **Question 14**

Q14. This was the more popular of the two questions. The focus on increased unrest allowed candidates to discuss more than just the influence of African nationalism although most focused on nationalist unrest. As in previous questions related to this focus, differentiation tended to be related to those candidates who could explain factors in relation to the speeding up of decolonisation and those who discussed decolonisation in general. There were some interesting discussions as to whether Mau Mau activity speeded up or slowed down Kenyan independence. A few responses did bring in references to Rhodesia which were out of the time frame of the question. Many responses suggested that underlying forces were already moving inexorably towards decolonisation and, after 1956, Macmillan was convinced that it should be speeded up, but that was dependent on the situation on the ground unrest could either accelerate or slow down the process. It should be noted that a significant minority of candidates are unsure when Macmillan made his 'winds of change' speech and this can often undermine the argument being made.

## Question 14

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.) African colonies had ~~been~~ been offered independence after world war two. However, it was meant to take 10-15 years at least to organise it properly and withdraw successfully. This wasn't the case though, decolonization in Africa ~~set~~ happened extremely fast. Unrest in African colonies was the major cause. However this was intertwined with other factors such as the growth of the communist fear, the cost-benefit analysis, African nationalism which led to unrest in the colonies and the British financial dependency along with the fact that the British saw through Algeria and Angola that forced Empire wouldn't work anymore and oppression wasn't accepted anymore.

Unrest in African colonies was the leading force in ~~the~~ the speeding up of decolonization of Africa. This was especially the case with countries with a white settler population such as Kenya and Northern Rhodesia.

(This page is for your second answer.) In Kenya, oppression led to the banning of the KAU which in turn increased discontent. The Kikuyus were the largest Kenyan tribe and they ~~lost~~ ~~lost~~ ~~lost~~ lost a lot of fertile land to the whites who in turn created the "white highlands". This led to the Africans being crowded in the most unfavorable conditions. Leading to the creation of the Mau Mau which the official British reports claimed was a mixture of "pseudo-religion, nationalism and evil forms of black magic". This rebellion led to unrest between 1952-60 and Britain declared a state of Emergency in 1952, imprisoning Kenyatta who was believed to have sparked off the rebellion. ~~It lasted~~ This civil war lasted for a long time and 80,000 Kenyans were detained in camps. Once news leaked about the Hola massacre though the British government was embarrassed. 11 Kenyans were ~~beaten~~ <sup>killed</sup>. This caused outrage and forced the British Parliament to push for independence which was promised at a Lancaster election in 1960. Had it not been for unrest pressure wouldn't have been applied on Parliament to withdraw a fast. The British police killing 11 detainees was seen as outrageous.

Similarly in Northern Rhodesia the imprisonment of Kenneth Kaunda and the British imposition of the CAF led to public unrest. The public believed

(This page is for your second answer.) that this wasn't sustainable or desirable. The uncompromising stance is what led to a large extent to the granting of independence of Nyasaland (Malawi) and Northern Rhodesia (Zambia). However these 2 cases were created due to nationalism. This isn't always what created unrest. In Nigeria for instance the 250 different ethnic groups made governing the country extremely difficult.

However unrest wasn't always the problem, the growth of African nationalism didn't always lead to unrest for instance in 1949 when Kwame Nkrumah formed the CPP it got a lot of support. Leaders like him who were educated such as Nyerere, Hastings Banda and Kenyatta made it difficult for the British government to ignore especially as oppressive measures were condemned at this point.

Changing attitudes also led to the speeding up of decolonization. The British public had just seen the horrors of world war two and were unwilling to send troops to another continent for another fight. Especially one which was <sup>based on</sup> ~~based on~~ silencing another nation. This lack of support of the public meant that the British couldn't ~~repress~~ ~~put down~~ the rebellions through violent means making matters

(This page is for your second answer.) complicated.

In addition to this, Britain's new dependency on the USA jeopardized Empire as the Americans viewed ~~formal~~ formal Empire as unnecessary. This was highlighted in the Atlantic Charter of 1941 which promised that allies should recognize the right of self government of their colonies. This added to African nationalism and ~~pe~~ allowed the British to see that decolonization was inevitable.

Furthermore, the communist threat was very persistent during the cold war. Cuba had already fallen to it, the group of rebels from the "Partido ~~de~~ Africano de independencia da Guiné ecabo verde" of Guinea Bissau were armed by the Russians, FRELIMO in Mozambique was a communist group and MPLA in Angola had a leftist approach to politics. All this worried the British and Americans who believed that independence should be granted to appease African radicals, and so bya/ leaders were chosen as opposed to democratic ones.

This is something which was made very clear in the 1960 wind of change speech made in Ghana and South Africa. Macmillan claimed that the real question was whether the colonies would swing to "the

(This page is for your second answer.) west or to the "East" showing that the communist threat made the British wanted to leave fast ensuring a pro-western government rather than slowly and efficiently. This can be seen with the fact that the British withdrew from Tanganyika in 1961 leaving behind ~~at~~ only 5% literacy rate despite the Hailey report of 1944 promising a better level of education for Africans. Similarly the British completed the draft of independence in council of Uganda one week before granting it independence.\*

Lastly Macleod and Macmillan got together and drew up what became known as the "cost-benefit analysis" to see whether Britain was gaining any benefits from this occupation. This was done because after all Britain needed to reform domestically and needed financial aid to make it happen. The government couldn't maintain empire and reform Britain. The result of this was that Britain wasn't losing or gaining anything out of Empire. However it's debatable whether this is what led to the speeding up of decolonization. Rather, it led to the realization that Empire was unnecessary. Although it could be argued that this

(This page is for your second answer.) realization led to the government simply wanting to withdraw.

A more likely cause though was that all the African colonies that were granted independence joined the UN. Something which applied international pressure on the British.

In conclusion unrest in African colonies was an important factor. This is because the British sped up decolonization when they realized the level to which they were undesired there. This though was increased by changing attitudes, moral values changed and this restriction of imposing violent means upon colonies restricted the abilities of the government, speeding up decolonization. The communist threat was also a very important factor which wouldn't have been a problem, had it not been for a growing sense of nationalism.

\* Once the Gold Coast was granted independence in 1957. Nkrumah agreed to ban all communist literature and to confiscate the passport of any African communist who wanted to travel behind the ~~the~~ "Iron curtain". This showed the significance of the threat.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a low Level 5 response. It acknowledges and develops the given factor with clear links to other factors. Supporting evidence is well-selected. There is explicit reference to the speeding up of events. The inter-relationship is not well enough established to move up within the level.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Always focus clearly on the exact wording of the question. This response is about the speeding up of decolonisation not the general factors involved in decolonisation.

## Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- Don't attempt to predict questions or create model answers based on the presumed wording of a question. This can limit revision, lead to lack of choice and/or to a lack of explicit focus, resulting in lower levels being awarded.
- Analyse causation using a variety of methods. Factors influencing causation are usually addressed with confidence but questions which require learners to weigh up the relative significance of long-term against short-term/immediate factors less so.
- Pay greater attention to the analysis of concepts other than causation; also consider the relative significance of a number of outcomes and reflect on issues concerning change over time within the period of study.
- Use historical words and phrases appropriate to the period of study and to deploy these with some fluency.
- Finally, centres are strongly advised to acquaint candidates with the format of the answer booklet before sitting the exam, particularly in which part of the booklet to write the two answers.

## **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>



Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



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