

Examiners' Report  
June 2014

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 2014

Publications Code US039063

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

# Introduction

## 6HI01 – General comments

This year most candidates were able to provide some explanatory framework as a basic scaffolding for their answer, had a general understanding of the demands of the question and were able to sustain a focus on the question set. The ability to call on some relevant information, and to develop it to some extent, means that fewer answers were placed in Level 2. Level 1 answers were, as always, characterised by their brevity, often just one or two paragraphs of generalised material with no development. At the other end of the scale of attainment, many answers accessed Level 5. These answers were directly focused and analytical, considered a number of relevant points, and exemplified these with a range of detailed information. Moreover, most Level 5 answers came from candidates with good communication skills and the ability to use historical words and phrases confidently.

There was a variety of approaches towards questions which had a multi-factored focus, usually signalled by the phrase 'the most important reason'. Some of the most confident answers included an introduction which either agreed with the role of the stated factor or proposed an alternative. Many candidates, however, were more reluctant to commit themselves. Their introduction usually agreed with the stated factor 'to some extent' but did not propose an alternative. Weighing up different factors before reaching a clear conclusion often differentiated between Level 4 and Level 5 answers.

There have been some improvements overall in the quality of written communication, with far fewer abbreviations and colloquialisms scattered through candidates' answers. However the quality of handwriting on a small number of scripts meant that some words and phrases were impossible to decipher, and this factor weakened communication overall.

## Option C – General comments

Over 1000 candidates sat the paper this June. Both centres and candidates are to be congratulated on the general level of preparedness. The examining team found that in general the candidates produced interesting responses at all levels and provided a wide range of exemplification. The best responses were an absolute pleasure to read.

It was noticeable yet again this summer that a large number of responses referred to the whole time period of the question in sweeping general statements with little regard to change over time. This was particularly so with Q3 – topic 2 - where responses which required discussion of change over time continually referred to the period 1740-76 as if it was a universal unchanging time period.

There was much good practice amongst centres to promote the use of 'connecting' terms and phrases at the beginning of paragraphs to create more discursive answers, e.g. on the other hand, nevertheless, further etc. However, there was also an increasing number of responses where the use of these terms seemed to have become either arbitrary or formulaic. Both of these approaches often created the opposite effect to that which was intended, i.e. poorly reasoned and incoherent responses. Of most concern was the wide use of 'on the contrary' or 'on the other hand' when candidates were in reality discussing an extension of the previous point or developing a factor related to the previous point.

Many candidates this year produced sound Level 4 responses with good supporting material but were unable to fashion a response which moved securely into Level 5. This led to many responses following the pattern of a series of discrete paragraphs about the contribution of various factors to the process of unification with the focus of the question only really being addressed in the conclusion. Many excellent concluding statements were not supported by the material discussed in the main body of the essay. These responses could be improved with regard to the following:

- introductory sentences which clearly show an understanding of the stated factor and the focus of the question along with the relevance of the beginning and end dates of the time period – this may prevent discussion of irrelevant material particularly with regard to events after the end date of the question
- chronological awareness – may facilitate a greater awareness of change over time
- more focused analysis and explanation – many good responses produced well-developed paragraphs which outlined and expanded on the contribution of various factors but this often led to either inference or assertion rather than explanation and analysis
- linking related factors to create an overall impression of causation, consequence, significance or change over time – responses were often made up of a series of paragraphs about different factors with the assumption that they were completely independent of each other even where the links were obvious or fundamental.
- The best responses were those which created a discussion of the hypothesis or statement in the question by developing a balanced argument using accurate, well-selected supporting evidence and coming to a reasoned conclusion.

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

### ***Question 1***

This was a popular topic and most candidates had a good working knowledge of the major themes. The responses to this topic were more wide ranging and candidates increasingly provided more appropriate exemplification. The nature of the questions this summer meant that there was less scope for the more 'formulaic' answers but it was also clear that many centres had heeded the advice from last year, with higher level responses being more focused on the wording of the question.

Q1. This question was the less popular of the two. The question focused on the growth of British influence in India. Apart from a few candidates who wrote responses which focused on the growth of British power in general, candidates focused on events in India and were able to discuss a variety of factors with regard to Britain becoming the dominant power. Most candidates were able to show the reasons why Britain became dominant in India with more able candidates focusing on both the ability of Britain to become dominant and becoming the dominant European power. Many candidates referred to the influence of trade, the specific nature of the East India Company, the weaknesses of Indian rulers and/or the consequences of the Seven Years' War. Some more able candidates were able to show how dominance over the Dutch and the Portuguese was achieved in the earlier part of the period while victory over the French occurred later.

## Question 2

Q2. This was the more popular question. Most candidates were aware of a variety of different factors influencing the growth of empire during this period and attempted to evaluate these in relation to the consequences of the War of the Spanish Succession. Responses were often differentiated by the ability of the candidates to determine the most important influences in the years after 1713, rather than the period of the topic in general. Some candidates provided irrelevant material which was more appropriate to the period before this date, but at the higher levels candidates were able to select more relevant contextual supporting material. Disappointingly many candidates were only able to identify the acquisition of Gibraltar and Minorca, along with a general naval superiority, as the main outcomes of the War with fewer than expected referring to the asiento or territorial gains in the Americas. As a result many responses also failed to identify links between the various influences under discussion, for example, the slave trade, and so produced Level 4 rather than Level 5 responses. A few responses narrated the events of the war itself mainly in regard to the land warfare in Europe.

(This page is for your first answer.) How far do you agree that the outcome of the War of the Spanish Succession was the most important influence on the growth of the British Empire after 1713?

The notion that the outcome of the War of the Spanish Succession was the most important influence on the growth of the British Empire after 1713 is one that is not ~~totally~~ ~~fully~~ ~~completely~~ true. It is important to consider the events that occurred after 1713 and the effects that these had on the growth of empire. For example, the Seven Years War, Mercantilist policies, government encouragement of migration, the slave trade and joint stock companies. Although the outcome of the War of the Spanish Succession ~~greatly~~ allowed for growth of the empire it was not the sole ~~the~~ most important reason for growth but rather a culmination of factors.

If we first look at the ~~idea~~ idea that the Spanish Succession was the most important influence on the growth of the British Empire it is easy to see

(This page is for your first answer.) Why many believe this. Significant territorial acquisitions helped to grow the empire such as those made in Hudson Bay, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Gibraltar and Minorca, following the treaty of Utrecht. Of these acquisitions it was ~~the~~ Minorca and Gibraltar that were of the utmost importance as they made Britain a ~~global~~ Mediterranean power. There is also the fact that it increased the navy which was an important tool in the expansion and sustainability of empire. And by 1719 the Navy employed more women than any other industry. When looking at the outcomes of the War of the Spanish Succession it is vitally important to look at the Asiento that was granted to Britain. The hope was to capitalize on the abundant Spanish slave trade ~~which~~ which was thought could wipe out the £10 million debt from the war. It would be the SSC that would face up the debt in a bid to repay it. Although at first it seemed as though the abundant Spanish slave trade would allow for this to happen it in fact didn't. Both wars and the South Sea Bubble interrupted trade and only ~~was~~ 64,000 slaves were transported by the SSC from 1713-1730 this paled in comparison to the RAC who delivered 100,000 slaves from 1672-1689. It is important to note that as a result of the Asiento



(This page is for your first answer.) The SSC did have a move into the Spanish held Americas, when Spain itself was weak. Clearly, the outcome of the Spanish Succession did have quite a big outcome on the growth of the empire after 1713 as can be seen in the above points:

Although it is clear that the outcome of the war had a relatively big effect on the ~~growth~~ growth of empire after 1713, it is however, important to consider other factors. Undoubtedly one of the biggest factors in the growth of the empire was the Seven Years War. The outcome of this war was of crucial importance to the growth of empire. It gave the British the whole of French North America and a number of West Indian islands. Not only this but it meant French American and Indian ambitions were destroyed thrusting Britain into the spot of number one power in the world. It also meant that a rival was removed for over 50 years until the French Revolutionary Wars. Clearly, it could be argued this war of the utmost importance to the growth of empire after 1713. The Treaty of Paris helped Britain become a superpower:

Undoubtedly another important factor is the mercantilistic policies developed by Britain. These ensured a positive balance of trade ~~keep~~ was



(This page is for your first answer.) Rept - They allowed for the exploitation of colonies and in return the enrichment of the mother country. The colonies were very valuable as they had raw materials there was also the Navigation Acts that restricted the colonies to one partner - Britain. And there was taxation that brought in huge sums of money. Although the Navigation Acts were considered a burden they did for a time provide Britain with the wealth to build an empire. It could be argued without them this wouldn't have been possible.

Another two factors to look at is both government encouragement of migration and the slave trade. Government encouragement of migration was vital for two reasons, it provided a labour force (indentured schemes) and also gained land for Britain such as pericles line force nullius. ~~The~~ Between 1680 - 1763 between  $\frac{1}{2}$  -  $\frac{2}{3}$  of Britons went to America and West Indies under indenture schemes it can be justly argued without this it ~~could~~ wouldn't have been possible to sustain the growth of empire as ~~good~~ the ~~stage~~ mercantile policies relied on settlers and also for a while producers like sugar and tobacco relied on indentured servitude. There is also slavery and the trade that was

(This page is for your first answer.) Vitally important: Slave labour generated huge sums of wealth that allowed for growth of empire. Sugar was the biggest product of slave labour. This is indicated by the fact in 1773 the goods from Jamaica were 5 times those in the colonies. Sugar was critical to the economy, like oil today. It can be argued that there would not have been a labour force to harvest this cash crop and the growth of empire wouldn't have been possible.

Finally, it is vitally important to look at joint stock companies mainly the EIC and RAC. Thanks to the victory in the Seven Years War the EIC got the Diwani and could tax ~~20~~<sup>20</sup> million people and get between £2-3 million. They also effectively colonized India on behalf of the British government. That originally expanded the empire ~~and~~ ~~substantially~~. ~~The RAC also helped~~ ~~expand~~ ~~forward~~ ~~on~~ ~~the~~ ~~West~~ ~~Coast~~ ~~of~~ ~~Africa~~. ~~The~~ ~~world~~ ~~later~~ ~~to~~ ~~be~~ ~~expanded~~. ~~They~~ ~~also~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~first~~ ~~to~~ ~~initially~~ ~~provide~~ ~~slave~~ ~~labour~~.

Victory at the Battle of Plassey effectively gained Britain the jewel in its crown and by ~~the~~ 1720 over 25% of imports came from ~~the~~ ~~East~~ India. The money from

(This page is for your first answer.)

The Diwani could sustain empire growth.

In conclusion I believe that it can be justly argued that although the outcome of the Spanish Succession made large contributions to the growth of empire after 1713 but rather it was a combination of other, vitally important factors that led to the growth of empire after 1713. No one factor was more important, they all played a role in the expansion of empire after 1713.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a high Level 4 response. It has a clear introduction, develops the stated factor well and discusses other factors. However, the organisation of the response means that the other factors are not always clearly located within the timeframe of the period or linked together where appropriate, i.e. it is not wholly clear that it took until the end of the period for the Seven Years' War to transform the extent of the Empire.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

The conclusion here suggests that all the factors discussed had an influence over the growth of the British Empire and so one factor was no more important than another. However, rather than just making this assertion try to summarise the contribution of each factor or show how all or some of the factors might be inter-connected. In this way you will reach a reasoned, well-supported conclusion.

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

### ***Question 3***

Candidates were well-prepared for topic C2 and usually had a good grounding of knowledge across the time period. It is also clear that centres were beginning to take note of previous Principal Examiner Reports and provide candidates with more specific supporting evidence. Although detailed knowledge of legislation, battles and campaigns were not necessary, key Acts, battles and turning points were being discussed. However, the future challenge is to ensure that these are discussed using a secure chronological framework.

Q3. This was the less popular of the two questions. Most candidates generally had a good understanding of changing attitudes between Britain and the colonies over the time period but chronologies often stopped around 1773. This prevented many candidates from being able to show the final stages in the deterioration of relations with the rejection of the Olive Branch petition and realisation that revolt had become a full-scale rebellion/revolution. As suggested in the Option C general comments, these candidates would have profited from introductory sentences which made it clear that they were aware of the significance of the beginning and end dates of the question. Most responses were able to show a pattern of change from salutary neglect to vested interest after 1763 followed by incomprehension and reaction. Responses were often differentiated by the amount of detail and secure chronological awareness. Some responses were less well focused concentrating on American attitudes rather than British attitudes.

### ***Question 4***

Q4. This was by far the more popular question and most candidates were well prepared to provide a well-balanced response. However, many candidates produced well-focused but imbalanced responses (Level 4) which dismissed the stated factor before launching into a discussion of other factors. More able candidates developed several different aspects of military leadership, such as decision-making, personal ambition and strategy in relation to other factors, such as foreign intervention, American tactics and territorial advantage. At the highest levels responses were able to show clear inter-relationships between the different factors. Exemplification was much improved this year but many candidates were unable to show a clear chronology of events; many candidates made reference to the events at Saratoga and Yorktown with little indication of which one came before the other. Less able candidates often provided either relevant but generalised supporting evidence or described some of the mistakes of the British military commanders and/or the strengths of Washington.

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

#### Question 5

As in previous years, this was by far the most popular of the topics with the vast majority of centres combining this with C1, C2 or C6. This led to a wide variety in the standard of responses ranging from simple developed statements to well-organised and focused analysis. Also once again some candidates appeared to have a very superficial knowledge of events and made bold assertions about individuals or factors relating to the abolition of slavery. There were also many candidates who had a weak chronological knowledge of events or who suggested strong causal relationships to events which happened many years apart. A significant number of candidates this year were convinced that Olaudah Equiano (d. 1797) and John Newton (d. 1807) were still operating in 1833, and that Thomas Clarkson was a Quaker who did not begin his real work until after 1807. There was also still a significant number of candidates who were confused as to the nature of the slave trade and slavery in general. However, it was clear that accurate knowledge is becoming stronger with each session of the qualification and it was a pleasure to see the quality of the supporting evidence for this topic increase in both relevance and detail.

Q5. This was the more popular of the two questions. The question focused on the methods used by the abolitionists in attempting to achieve the abolition of the slave trade using knowledge from three of the bullet points in the specification. The evidence of conditions on slave ships was integral to all elements of the abolitionist campaign and both the groups and individuals who fought to abolish the slave trade. More able candidates showed the links between the conditions on ships, the collection of evidence, the methods used to bring this to the attention of both the political elites and the general public and the nature of the abolition Act which was eventually passed in 1807. It was disappointing that many well-developed responses (Level 4) saw the work of individuals, the abolition societies and the evidence that they collected as being discrete influences to be explained and evaluated separately from each other. Some candidates suggested that, while the evidence opened the eyes of many to the iniquities of the slave trade, it was the wider political context of the time, particularly the events of the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic periods, which saw the Act passed in 1807.

(This page is for your second answer.) The use of evidence of conditions on slave ships was significant in the campaign to abolish the slave trade. I think there were other important factors too such as the arguments made in Parliament, and the campaigns of anti-abolitionists and abolition religious groups. Thomas Clarkson was the main abolitionist responsible for collecting evidence of the conditions on slave ships. Once he became interested in the campaign he travelled all over England



collecting evidence and speaking to anyone that would listen to him about the wrongs of the slave trade. He revisited slave ships at great risk, nearly being thrown into the harbour by a mob at one point, and gathered evidence such as

(This page is for your second answer.) chains and torture devices, and measurements of how little space slaves were packed into - making boxes to replicate the ~~size of the~~ ~~amount of~~ amount of room a slave would have. He created a model of the slave ship the *Brookes*, and used this to show how slaves were stored in ships. Evidence of conditions of slave ships also came from personal testimony. ~~John Adams~~ John Newton was an ex-slave ship captain, and he joined the abolition cause, giving evidence through his pamphlet, published in 1788. Equiano also gave ~~evidence~~ <sup>first hand</sup> evidence - he used to be a slave. He published his book 'The Interesting Narrative' in 1789 and sold 9 editions of it, travelling the country promoting it.

However, another important factor in achieving the abolition of the slave trade was William Wilberforce's efforts in Parliament. He spoke against the slave trade from 1789, his first speech lasting 3 hours. It can be argued that

had he not persevered, the slave trade would not have been abolished in

(This page is for your second answer.) 1807. However, much of the evidence he used in court came from Thomas Clarkson, so I think that they both men were instrumental in the abolition of the slave trade.

Religious groups such as the Quakers were an important factor in the fight to abolish the slave trade because they helped raise public awareness and were influential. The Quakers contained many key abolitionists such as Thomas Clarkson and Granville Sharpe, and they were able to effectively fight against the slave trade because they were very independent - they ran their own printing presses and so were able to circulate information arguing against the slave trade effectively. They also had groups all over the country so could have info meetings discussing the wrongs of the trade at very little notice. They were respected also, so were able to influence the peoples views on the trade without being thought of as too radical. Other religious groups included the Clapham sect, which William Wilberforce



(This page is for your second answer.) was part of, and various evangelicals who would preach against the slave trade. These groups all helped influence the public opinion and helped gain support for the campaign.

This public support must not be overestimated either. The public were influenced not only by evangelical groups, but also by abolitionists themselves. Thomas Clarkson gathered support for from the public, as well as gathering evidence, by publically preaching about the wrongs of the slave trade wherever he went. He travelled all over England gathering both evidence and public support. The work of John Newton and Equiano also helped. Equiano's book in particular was very very popular and he too travelled around Britain promoting it. The public also signed petitions which were used by Wilberforce in Parliament. So public influence was another significant factor in the campaign to abolish the slave trade.

In conclusion, I do not think one factor can be said to be the most important. The use of evidence was a

(This page is for your second answer.) Significant factor in the campaign to abolish the slave trade, and ultimately in achieving this abolition in 1807. However this evidence helped fuel Wilberforce's 3 hour long speeches, and Wilberforce's tireless efforts in Parliament are another important factor in the abolishing of the slave trade 1807. Public petitions also helped Wilberforce in Parliament, and this was another factor in the abolishing of the slave trade. The work of abolitionists and religious groups was also key to the abolition of the slave trade. I think that it was a culmination of all these factors that led to the abolition of the slave trade in 1807, and all these factors were significant. They all ultimately helped in the abolishing the abolition of the slave trade in 1807.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This is a Level 4 response. It clearly explains the significance of the use of evidence of the conditions on slave ships along with other factors. However, it generally treats each relevant point discretely and rarely makes explicit links between them. It is not clear from the penultimate paragraph concerning public support that the evidence being referred to is that of the appalling conditions found on the slave ships.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

Always try to show where there are clear links between relevant points/factors - this will allow you to evaluate/weigh up the importance of the stated factor more readily.

(This page is for your second answer.) Significant evidence conditions slave ship abolition slave trade 1807.

VERY

• Joseph Sturges? x

• Clarkson's pictures ✓

• Equiano's testimonies

• Dolben's Bill (Pitt) 1788 ✓

• John Newton

• Zang.

NOT

• No.

• 1788 → 1807.

• Other abolitionists, popular protest.

• That flag thing from the film.

Conditions on board slave ships were undoubtedly horrific during the 3,500 mile 'Middle Passage', the most infamously dangerous part of the 'trade triangle' of the Trans-Atlantic slave trade, and rightly so, with a 10% death rate by the late eighteenth century. These poor conditions were no secret, however, as an enquiry led by William Pitt (the younger) into conditions on board prompted the 1788 Dolben's Act, ensuring that ships ought not be too overcrowded by slaves (although they were still built for speed, rather than comfort of humans) and also made it so that

(This page is for your second answer.) every slave ship must carry a doctor on board, due to the spread of diseases such as <sup>dysentery</sup> dysentery in both "cargo" and crew.

Furthermore, the Zang case ~~of~~ publicised by Granville Sharp, a prominent lawyer, Quaker, and abolitionist, captured the public interest through the complete inhumanity with which some slave captains behaved. Captain Collingwood (of the Zang) for instance, had 133 slaves thrown overboard to their deaths, purely for insurance purposes. Other abolitionists also worked tirelessly to bring these conditions to public attention. Thomas Clarkson, for example, drew diagrams of slave ships displaying

the harsh conditions, and brought artifacts such as shackles and models with him on the lecture tours he took of Britain to gather popular support.

Olaudah Equiano, who toured with Clarkson, was perhaps the greatest asset to this cause. ~~He~~ <sup>As a</sup> former slave, Equiano had endured the Middle Passage himself, and offered an account that was both harrowing and accurate in his public speaking and bestselling book. John Newton, a former crew member, was also able to offer invaluable testimony from the European perspective.

It is important to note however, that the slave trade was not abolished solely on the basis of these testimonies, nor

(This page is for your second answer.) ... was the eradication of the middle passage the sole cause of abolitionists who hoped that, once slaves could no longer be traded, slave owners might treat them more as valuable workers rather than replaceable possessions. ~~Another~~ ~~very~~ important. In fact, although ~~the~~ these testimonies did inspire some small reforms (as in the case of the Dolben's Act), they had relatively little effect on ~~those~~ <sup>many</sup> who Parliament, ~~one~~ of whom represented the booming slave-trade cities of London, Liverpool, and Bristol, and/or had financial interests in the trade.

However, what did effect these <sup>members of</sup> Parliament, was popular protest. Economic boycotts, for example, although only sporadic in the latter part of the eighteenth century demonstrated clear intent, and saw Hannah More, a member of the Clapham Sect, inspire women, who could control nothing more than their homes, to ~~take~~ <sup>take</sup> a political stand.\* From 1783, the Quaker movement began to



(This page is for your second answer.) ...was the eradication of the middle passage the sole cause of abolitionists who hoped that, once slaves could no longer be traded, slave owners might treat them more as valuable workers, rather than replaceable possessions. ~~Another~~ ~~very~~ important. In fact, although ~~the~~ these testimonies did inspire some small reforms (as in the case of the Dolben's Act), they had relatively little effect on ~~those~~ <sup>many</sup> who Parliament, ~~one~~ of whom represented the booming slave-trade cities of London, Liverpool, and Bristol, and/or had financial interests in the trade.

However, what did effect these <sup>members of</sup> Parliament, was popular protest. Economic boycotts, for example, although only sporadic in the latter part of the eighteenth century demonstrated clear intent, and saw Hannah More, a member of the Clapham Sect, inspire women, who could control nothing more than their homes, to ~~take~~ <sup>take</sup> a political stand.\* From 1783, the Quaker movement began to create and circulate abolitionist propaganda, and to present petitions, often collected by Thomas Clarkson on his tours with Equiano, to ~~parliament~~ <sup>Parliament</sup>, voicing the opinions of those that they had promised to represent.

These petitions, coupled with the almost relentless efforts of William Wilberforce (an MP, who acted as the 'face of abolition' in Parliament) to pass Bills against the slave trade, despite continuous ~~efforts~~ rejection, forced ~~the~~ ~~both~~ <sup>both</sup> swayed the judgement of those in Parliament - aided by ~~testimonies~~ <sup>testimonies</sup> the pro-abolition

(This page is for your second answer.) Government that succeeded Pitt, comprised of pro-abolitionist Lord Fox, and the promise of the monarchy to remain neutral on the topic of the slave trade, into the Abolition of the Slave Trade in 1807.

From this I believe that one can conclude that, although evidence of the atrocious conditions aboard slave ships inspired many abolitionists to take a stand against abolition, the abolitionists use of this evidence, as a starting point to utilize empathy and religious morality, and the power of political ~~effi~~ manipulation, <sup>combined,</sup> deserves as much credit as the evidence itself; therefore, <sup>use of</sup> the evidence of conditions on slave ships was hugely significant in the 1807 abolition of slavery.

\* playing on their empathies for those who lived, as they did, without civil liberties. In this way the abolition campaign also saw unprecedented support from the marginalised and the working class.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a Level 5 response. It engages with the question directly by outlining a variety of different individuals who used the evidence of conditions on board slave ships to publicise the iniquities of the slave trade and discusses them further in relation to other conditions which were required to achieve the actual abolition of the slave trade.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Always try to develop the stated factor in a variety of ways when the focus is on the significance. Then try to find links with other factors and/or establish other relevant points. Also try to come to a conclusion which clearly sums up the argument developed in the main body of the response. Here a succinct judgement is made with reference to all the relevant points made.

## Question 6

Q6. This was the less popular of the two questions but most of those who chose to answer this question were able to compare the situation in 1807 and 1833 quite effectively. Some candidates did confuse events in 1807 and 1833 but far fewer than in previous years. The greatest confusion was with regard to the appointments of Grenville and Grey as Prime Minister. In particular, there was only a handful of candidates who were unable to distinguish anti-abolitionists from the abolitionists; this was a clear indication of the progress made in the delivery of this topic since the beginning of the qualification. Most Level 4 candidates tended to produce an imbalanced response with more discussion of events either in 1807 or 1833. The more able candidates showed a direct comparison between events surrounding the two dates while also indicating separate developments which had appeared by 1833. Some responses showed a complex understanding of the compromises made by abolitionists before 1807, the strength of the West India lobby well into the 1820s and the significance of the Jamaican slave revolt of 1830-31. There was a growing recognition of the work of women abolitionists both before and after 1807. Also many candidates could identify some of the most prominent anti-abolitionists. Less able candidates produced either descriptions or general explanations of the failure to achieve the abolition of slavery in 1807.

(This page is for your second answer.) *Plan:*

#1: Political climate

#4: Revolts

#2: attitudes

#3: abolitionist efforts    gradualism → Agency Committee

~~But~~ During the years 1760-1833, anti-abolitionists fought to prevent the abolition of slavery, experiencing a minor failure when the slave trade was abolished in 1807 and failing utterly when slavery was totally abolished ~~after~~ in 1833. There are several reasons for ~~this~~ the way these events turned out, including the political climate in Britain at the time, ~~stagnant~~ attitudes towards slavery, the efforts of abolitionist campaigners, and slave revolts in the West Indies. All in all, the political climate is the main reason for this period of relative success for anti-abolitionists.



(This page is for your second answer.)

Anti-abolitionists managed to prevent ~~abolition~~ the abolition of slavery in 1807, yet failed in 1833, because of the changing state of politics in Britain. Although it could be argued that Pitt's death in 1806 (Pitt wasn't an abolitionist) paved the way for the abolition of the trading of slaves in 1807, there was no way that ~~also~~ the emancipation of slaves would be ratified in Parliament, because anti-abolitionist interests were securely protected by ~~Parliament~~ representatives who supported the West India Interest. Even by 1830, the West India Interest still had around 35 advocates in the House of Commons, making it very difficult for abolition to be achieved. Nonetheless, when the Great Reform Act of 1832 was passed, the political climate had shifted and a newly elected Whig government, elected from a much wider franchise, was willing to work towards abolition, passing the Act of Emancipation the following year. This political climate no longer catered ~~to~~ for anti-abolitionists and this is why they failed to safeguard their interests in 1833.

Another reason for the gap between the anti-abolitionist success and failure was the societal attitude towards slavery. In 1807, the majority of people were led to

(This page is for your second answer.)

believe that slavery the slave trade operated in a manner that was unscrupulous, this attitude ~~was~~ stemming from Thomas Clarkson's

shocking evidence. In spite of this, the ancient belief that slaves ~~was~~ were counted as private property was still engrained in the minds of many, therefore rendering many voters against the full abolition of slavery itself. By 1833, however, attitudes had shifted and the newly enfranchised ~~and~~ burgeoning middle-class acted to elect a government that sympathised with the growing abolitionist cause. As societal attitudes towards slavery changed, so too did the hopes for anti-abolitionist success.

The abolitionist cause was, in itself, another reason for the anti-abolitionists' ability to ~~prevent~~ prevent total abolition in 1807. At this point, the abolitionist cause had gained momentum, however, leading figures, such as William Wilberforce, were fighting under the banners of the Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade, making their efforts far less radical and therefore making it easier for pro-slavery leaders, ~~to~~ such as Stephen Fuller, to remain victorious. Many of the powerful abolitionists were

(This page is for your second answer.) gradualists, that is, if in 1807, they believed in emancipation at all. ~~These~~ This meek strand of abolitionism made it easier for anti-abolitionists to initially succeed, yet by 1833, various pressure groups, including the Agency Committee, worked in and out of Parliament with a more radical streak, making their greater

demands ~~at~~ heard and eventually leading to emancipation. It was the gradual growth of radical abolitionism that eventually defeated the pro-slavery movement.

Finally, the gradual build-up of tension in the West Indies destroyed any hopes for retaining slavery. Three key revolts, including Barbados in 1816, Demerara in 1823 and Jamaica in 1831-32, revealed how uncontrollable slavery was becoming and thus encouraged greater ~~aboliti~~ abolitionist sympathies. In 1807, this level of slave resistance was almost unheard of, the only serious threat being posed in the French colony of St.

Domingue. Consequently, the anti-abolitionists had fewer obstacles and would have appeared more rational in their claims. Yet by 1833, this was no longer the case, especially after the Jamaican revolt the previous year, where some

(This page is for your second answer.) 634 slaves were tried, half later being executed. Regardless of being pro-slavery or anti-slavery, controlling the slaves was becoming a major difficult and as calls for emancipation gained more weight, anti-abolitionists no longer seemed viable in their claims. This inevitably led to ~~loss~~ their defeat in 1833.



In conclusion, ~~the~~ the ~~all~~ power of anti-abolitionists would have prevailed had Parliament, the very institution that had, hitherto, upheld their interests, ~~all these years~~ not been overwhelmed by the pressures of chaos ~~in~~ in slave colonies and the changing political climate. The Act of Emancipation would not have been passed in 1833, had it not received enough votes in the Commons. The very fact that the Reform Act had paved the way to a more radical (in 19<sup>th</sup> century terms) government made it possible for this pivotal piece of legislation to be passed. If the dominantly pro-slavery Tory party had remained in power, then perhaps the anti-abolitionists would have seen the interests retained. Therefore, it was the state of politics that granted anti-abolitionists success in 1807 and failure in 1833.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a Level 5 response. It focuses explicitly on the question asked and it shows a controlled and logical deployment of the argument being put forward. The paragraphs are organised to show direct comparisons between 1807 and 1833 but also introduce new points of relevance which developed after 1807. There is a clear and secure sense of progression and change over time.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Try to make your argument flow by using sentences at the beginning of paragraphs which show logical progression between points being made. This response uses relatively simple connectives to create a clear discussion through the main body of the answer which leads to a well-reasoned conclusion.

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

### ***Question 7***

There were only a handful of responses to either question for this topic. In general the responses were generalised discussions of the expansion of British control which required greater focus on the key words of the question and more specific exemplification.

## **C5 – Commerce and Imperial Expansion, c1815–70**

### ***Question 9***

There were no responses to Q9 and only a few responses to Q10. These responses were generally sound with some understanding of the different roles of the British Navy during the period c1815-70.

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

### Question 11

Candidates for this topic were 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 many were able to focus on the wording of the question sufficiently to achieve Level 4 or above and to provide extremely well detailed regional case studies. It was noticeable this year that Bishop Hannington in Uganda had been replaced by Cecil Rhodes and the Rudd Concession as an example of choice by many candidates. The most significant development in this topic, along with C7, was a much improved use of the metropolitan, peripheral and international theories of colonial expansion as tools of analysis. Rather than responses full of assertion, the theories have been combined with explicit exemplification to create interesting and directly focused answers. There were a significant number of high Level 4 and Level 5 responses seen this year.

Q11. This was by far the more popular of the two questions. Many candidates did not fully engage with the concept of the expansion of British influence, choosing to define this as almost exclusively territorial expansion, but the level of secure detailed knowledge in most responses was outstanding. Some candidates choose to approach these questions thematically while others choose a regional approach, both were equally valid and both produced sound responses. However, those centres who used the regional approach should note that responses would be even more effective if the order in which the regions were dealt with were more logically related to the stated factor of the question. In this case, a discussion of West and southern Africa before dealing with the North and East would have been a logical approach. Some candidates argued that there was no expansion of influence in East Africa at all with regard to raw materials and mineral wealth because none were actively exploited but the question referred to the 'desire' to gain such goods. Most candidates were able to identify the presence of palm oil and gold in West Africa, gold and diamonds in southern Africa, cotton in Egypt and various other commodities. There was a clear focus on the evaluation of factors in most responses.

(This page is for your first answer.)

~~The expansion of British influence in Africa in the years c1875-1914 was a result of numerous factors including the desire to gain raw materials and mineral wealth~~

The expansion of British influence in Africa in the years c1875-1914 was a result of numerous factors; the desire to gain raw materials and mineral wealth being one of them. Other factors such as imperial rivalry, local crisis, strategic interests and man-on-the-spot all had weight to driving Britain to expansion.

In Egypt the expansion of British influence was mainly stemmed by strategic concerns rather than desires to gain raw materials & mineral wealth. The opening of the Suez canal in 1869 gave strategic importance to Britain as it was a ~~key~~ link to the red sea to the mediterranean. Economic factors ~~help~~ held significant importance in this region.

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~It~~ however, it was the <sup>local crisis</sup> ~~imperial rivalry~~ factor that threatened the 1878 anglo-French dual control which led to British occupation of the region in 17<sup>th</sup> July 1882. As said by Palmerston in 1860; 'we do not want Egypt we want to trade [& travel] through [it]'. This proves that Britain didn't extend its control over Egypt due to desires of raw & mineral wealth it was the threat of losing the canal that stemmed colonisation. Furthermore, in Sudan the threat of losing the region to French destroyed Brit strategic interests. The fact that ~~sudan~~ the Nile ran through Sudan, and the prospect of building the Aswan dam was of great strategic importance to Britain. Until the ~~local crisis in~~ French threat (Fashoda incident 1898) was present, Britain didn't feel the need to expand into that region.

In East Africa, desires to gain raw materials and mineral wealth were apparent in the ivory & leather trade however, this type of trade wasn't as economically advertising as the gold for example in South Africa. Mackinnon exemplifies the idea that ~~even~~ gain of raw materials was not a large factor in this region as his company went bankrupt. Rather than the desire to gain mineral wealth, ~~strategic~~



The imperial rivalry was the predominant factor that forced British expansion, due to the German challenge of Karl Peters, who in 1884 began making treaties

(This page is for your first answer.) with chiefs who swore to be separate of the Sultan of Zanzibar. His ~~the present~~ presence in East Africa forced British expansion as Britain didn't want to lose areas in Eastern Africa, as the Cape to Cairo railway would not be able to occur & furthermore, seeing an imperial power stationed in Uganda; the source of the Nile would effect British interests in Sudan and Egypt. The Anglo-German treaty of Oct 1886 allowed Britain to take Kenya and Uganda and Germany Tanganyika. In East Africa the desire to gain mineral wealth was apparent but was definitely not a motivator or catalyst for expansion in this area.

In Southern Africa the desire to gain raw materials and mineral wealth was a ~~the~~ paramount factor for British Expansion in this region. Gold discoveries in 1886 and diamonds ~~discovered~~ in Witwatersrand meant that South Africa was a very wealthy region in which profits could be made. The annexation of Griqualand west in 1873 due to economic worth proved this. ~~Pro~~ However, desires to expand in this region was also caused by Cecil Rhodes (and De Beers Company). Expansion ~~was~~ in this region is highly accountable to this man as he made the Rudd concession with Lobengula in 1885 giving him exclusive mining rights, & the fact that Britain gave him a royal charter in 1889 proved his importance. Desires to gain mineral wealth is apparent

(This page is for your first answer.) in the local crisis of the uitlander rights in which 41,000 uitlanders in Transvaal were not given the right to vote. Cecil overexaggerated this factor in order to have access to the mineral wealth of the Boer region. The Jameson raid in which 500 troops marched into Johannesburg proved that expansion was due to mineral wealth as Cecil forcibly wanted to take control of region. Strategic importance of Bechuanaland also contributed to expansion as it was annexed in 1885, but the fact that the 2nd Boer war of 1899 was stemmed by the economic interests of mineral wealth shows that desires to gain raw materials assisted with Cecil Rhodes to a very large extent caused the expansion of Britain.

In West Africa mineral wealth was apparent in trade in palm oil. However, its importance is subsidised by the more apparent threat of imperial rivalry. The Berlin West Africa Conference Nov 1884 - Feb 1885 brought the idea of effective occupation. This allowed Brit to give Goldie a royal charter in 1886 as it would provide effective occupation. The most paramount event that proved imperial rivalry to hold the most important factor for expansion was the fact that Britain signed Anglo-Portuguese treaty in 1884, which Liverpool merchants complained about, proved imperial rivalry factor.

(This page is for your first answer.) to be a cause of expansion as they didn't want to see French occupation of the Congo. Mineral wealth is present in this region, ~~however~~ however it didn't ~~stem~~ motivate expansion. It was imperial rivalry that did so.

In conclusion, British expansion of British influence was driven by the desire of mineral wealth & gain. However, it is this factor accompanied with other ~~the~~ factors that truly drive expansion. This desire of mineral wealth is present in more regions than in others so depending on the region the motivators for expansion differed.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is an example of a high level response which uses the 'regional approach' to answer the question - here, each paragraph clearly evaluates the stated factor with regard to other factors within each region before coming to an overall conclusion at the end.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

If using a 'regional approach' try to ensure that the stated factor remains the main focus of the response throughout.

(This page is for your first answer.) Desire to gain raw materials and access  
to <sup>minerals</sup> wealth.

Yes: raw materials in South / minerals / cotton in Egypt  
<sup>Economies</sup>

↳ imperial rivalry - triggered by Berlin Conf

strategic - Egypt Suez route, Cape Route

During the years of 1875 and 1914, the British Empire had expanded throughout regions in Africa. Economic concerns and the desire to gain raw materials and minerals were a significant reason for this. However, it is argued that expansion in Africa cannot be fully credited to this; other important factors such as strategic hegemony and <sup>the</sup> issue of imperial rivalry must also be considered.

Britain's expansion in Africa <sup>were</sup> ~~was~~ certainly driven ~~by~~ by the desire to secure access to raw

(This page is for your first answer.) materials and minerals. In the South, <sup>the</sup> mineral revolution induced by the discovery of diamonds in 1889 and gold in the Witwatersrand in 1886, ~~was~~ <sup>Britain's</sup> ~~per~~ provoked interest in the area; the British government was desperate to profit from this economic powerhouse. In the North, vast sums were invested into the cotton trade, to ensure Britain had access to these raw materials. Thus, therefore, expansion ~~was~~ of British influence in Africa was certainly due to the desire to secure  $\neq$  access to these raw materials and minerals. However,



although economic interest led to initial involvement in Africa, this did not result in immediate formal acquisition. This suggests that another factor was needed to provoke this. Furthermore, concerns over raw materials and minerals fail to explain expansion in areas with no viable economic potential, such as the East region. Thus, another factor was needed to prompt formal expansion.

Arguably, expansion in Africa was a result of ~~Britain~~ the British government's desire to protect economic interests from imperial rivals. For ~~example, French as Italy~~ Fear of ~~the~~ increasing rival influence was arguably ~~the~~ prompted by

(This page is for your first answer.) the Berlin Conference of 1885, which resulted in the policy of "effective occupation". In the ~~west~~ <sup>East</sup>, ~~French~~ <sup>German</sup> activity in the area prompted the chartering of Mackinnon BEAC in 1885, despite ~~the~~ several attempts at achieving a charter. Similarly, ~~Goldie's~~ ~~the~~ increasing French influence in the west prompted the British government to provide official backing for Goldie's company in 1886 to become the Royal Niger Company. Britain needed to secure ~~the~~ its dominance in the region to prevent any imbalance of power. Therefore, ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> British government's fear of increasing rival influence ~~led~~ led to expansion of formal control by granting <sup>charters to</sup> British companies. However, without <sup>concerns over</sup> economic interests, there would have been

nothing to protect from imperial rivals; raw materials and minerals were still important in provoking expansion.

Britain's strategic concerns in Africa also prompted expansion of influence. In the North, the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 provided a quicker and shorter route to Britain's colonies in ~~the~~ East Asia, particularly India; the 'jewel in the crown'. The importance

(This page is for your first answer.) of the Suez Canal in Britain's strategic position is highlighted by Prime Minister Disraeli's purchase of Suez shares in 1875. Further strategic concerns were importance was found in the South. The ~~Cape Route~~ of Cape Route in the South also provided access to Britain's colonies in the East, but more importantly the Cape Route was considered to be a safer course than through <sup>the</sup> Suez Canal. If the Suez Canal had been threatened by surrounding rivals, Britain could still gain or prevent access to British Eastern colonies, through the Cape Route in the South.

Overall, although economic interest and the desire to secure access to raw materials led to initial involvement in Africa, these concerns were not ~~at~~ substantial enough to provoke formal expansion; this is arguably to have been sparked by threat of the imperial rivals. However, it must also be

acknowledged that without ~~the~~ the desire to obtain the raw materials, there would have been nothing to compete over, or protect from rivals. Therefore, expansion of British influence was driven by the desire to gain ~~the~~ raw materials.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a higher level response which uses the 'thematic approach' to answer the question - here the contribution of various factors are evaluated with evidence being drawn from several different areas within each paragraph.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

When using the 'thematic approach' always try to provide examples from the various different regions within Africa throughout the response.



## Question 12

Q12. The overwhelming majority of candidates who chose this question were clearly focused on the period post-1885 and were able to discuss a variety of influences on the territorial expansion of Britain in Africa up to 1914. Responses were often differentiated by the level of knowledge and understanding shown of the Berlin (West Africa) Conference itself. A significant number of candidates just asserted the significance of the Berlin Conference without explaining or expanding on the actual agreements made. Several well-developed responses remained at the top of Level 4 rather than moving into Level 5 because although the significance of the Berlin Conference was clearly understood, it was not wholly clear what agreements were made. Some candidates were also somewhat confused by the location of the Congo within Africa and/or were under the impression that King Leopold was also the Emperor of Germany or that Stanley had gained the Congo for Britain. Many candidates could have profited from introductory sentences which clearly defined both the Berlin Conference and the extent of British territorial expansions after 1884 (see Option C General Comments).

(This page is for your first answer.)

North → Sudan Foreign rivalry → Protection

West → MOTS → Conference

East → MOTS → Conference Tanganyika

South → Diamonds → MOTS → Foreign rivalry

Conference

MOTS

Foreign rivalry / Strategic

Economic

The Berlin West Africa Conference in 1885 declared the need for 'Effective Occupation' in order to claim colonies. It is widely seen as a marker for which informal empire

(This page is for your first answer.)

The West Africa conference was called, hence the name, to resolve conflicts on the west coast of Africa, especially that of the Portuguese claims to almost half of it. Post 1885 saw the biggest changes to Britain's western colonies because of it. The Royal Niger Company was given its charter in 1886 after Gladstone's government realised the need to protect it. It was only Heriot's treaty signing in the <sup>area</sup> that further justified Goldie's

presence and the conference was the real reason behind ~~so~~ doing so. The conference's ~~off~~ effect in galvanising the other colonial rivals ~~that~~ also forced Britain's hand, German treaties in the Cameroons and France's apparent occupation of Porto Novo put them under pressure to react. Due to the Berlin Conference, this reaction was 'effective occupation' and in turn, expansion.

German activity in response to the conference also had an effect in East Africa. Karl Peters and his treaties in the area meant Britain had been outmanoeuvred and lost the possibility of the Cape to Cairo railway as Tanganyika emerged. This loss sparked government expansion into Mackinnon's company which soon won its charter. ~~to become the British Overland~~

The Conference did not really give rise to Britain searching for new colonies, instead expanding and formalising the areas they already had. It was this process that

(This page is for your first answer.)

was key to the 'Scramble' for Africa as Britain could no longer leave rich businessmen to their own devices.

Men on the Spot were key of vital importance to the developing of empire. It was Goldie's altercations with the French along the Niger that ~~helped~~ contributed to the causes of the conference, it was Mackinnon in the East allowing the government to keep interests near the White Valley and it was Rhodes in the South driving the imperialist dream. After that the conference when France took action in the west Goldie and Aberdare ~~was~~ persuaded the

government to that stopping the French was a 'national necessity'. Without him the government would have had no where to start when they began the colonisation of the area that became Nigeria. Likewise in the East Mackinnon was begging for government intervention while his company was stalling and German treaties were being signed. To an ~~some~~ extent Karl Peters can be ~~include~~ included as a 'man on the spot' as it was him who deceived the British ~~agent~~ under ~~these~~ ~~these~~ ~~these~~ giving ~~some~~ cause for action. Finally Cecil Rhodes ~~with~~ with his ~~negotiation~~ dream of a Cape to Cairo railway became President of the Cape in 1890, giving him power ~~and~~ and resources to expand ~~the~~

(This page is for your first answer.)

northwards. The men in Africa ~~he~~ did have undeniable influence in Britain but to an extent, they were essentially ignored ~~after~~ prior to the conference. It was only after 1885 that charters were granted and these men listened to. Certainly these men on the spot made it possible for government to colonise but it is harder to say that they ~~was~~ caused it.

As ~~the~~ men like Giddings and Mackinnon ~~permitted~~ got in the way of other countries, more serious foreign rivalry was ~~also~~ also brewing. In the North and South especially, Britain's strategic and economic interests were being encroached upon. French behaviour towards the Nile Valley was seen as 'unfriendly' by ~~the~~ by the British while they saw areas like the Sudan as Free Land. Rumours of French involvement in the Italian defeat

at Abyssinia were the spark to send Britain into full scale invasion of Sudan. Kitchener led men all the way into the Nile Valley in order to protect it and ~~the~~ Egypt from the French. Likewise German presence in South of Africa gave ~~governor~~ government cause for concern. The mounting pressure they put on by supporting the Boers and expanding neighbouring colonies is arguably one of the main causes of the Boer War. Although ~~Foreign~~ foreign rivalry had ~~always~~

always ~~existed~~ existed in Africa it can be argued that it was the conference that intensified it. To an ~~an~~ extent this can be agreed upon but foreign ~~state~~ rivalry was dangerous to varying British interests and with or ~~was~~ without the ~~the~~ conference, it is likely the British would have ~~been~~ fought to protect it.

To conclude, the Berlin ~~the~~ West Africa Conference ~~was~~ did ~~not~~ change the entire behaviour of all countries ~~colonising~~ colonising Africa but as an influence over expansion it is less clear cut. Britain did not simply seize colonies because they were the rules laid out by the conference, it was done for other reasons. The conference ~~was~~ was a catalyst and marker ~~in~~ in how the Scramble ~~was~~ changed but it was not a significant influence over British ~~colon~~ colonial expansion.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a Level 5 response which explicitly engages with the question creating a discussion with regard to the stated factor. The agreements made and the significance of the Berlin (West Africa) Conference is clearly established so that evaluation can be effectively carried out.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Always try to explain and analyse the stated factor in the question in a well-developed paragraph(s) before discussing alternative factors or areas of less/more significance or importance.



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

### Question 13

Most centres studying topic C7 combined it with C6 and so were well prepared for the topic. As with C7 many candidates had good knowledge of the different geographical areas involved and the wider context of decolonisation. However, there was a greater tendency than in C6 for responses to make general comments without using supporting evidence from the experience in Africa itself. Many responses were also less chronologically secure than for topic C6.

Q13. This was by far the more popular of the two questions. In many ways the quality of the responses to this question was quite disappointing. A significant number of responses showed little clear understanding of the outcome of the Suez Crisis in relation to decolonisation but instead made implicit references or asserted a connection to the consequences of the crisis for Anglo-American and Anglo-European relations. Few made explicit links to African nationalism or to the appointment of Harold Macmillan as Prime Minister. There was also evidence of weak chronological awareness. For example, many responses asserted that the 'wind of change' speech was a direct cause of the speeding up of decolonisation in the late 1950s when it was made in 1960. Responses were often differentiated by those that discussed decolonisation in general rather than the speeding up of the process. Many responses would have profited from both a clear reference to the decision to speed up the process of decolonisation and to the key elements of the humiliating consequences of Suez in introductory sentences (see Option C General Comments). The more able responses were often those which suggested clear links between 'humiliation' at Suez and the decision to speed up the withdrawal from Africa citing growing confidence amongst African nationalists or its impact on Macmillan's decisions as Prime Minister.

(This page is for your first answer.) From 1914, Britain's position as a superpower had been waning. The Suez Crisis can be seen as the turning point in which government, for accepting that to hold onto a crumbling Empire was effectively futile, the due to the economic and prestigious effects the crisis had. However, ~~decolonisation had been a process~~ indeed, the crisis led to the election of Macmillan, who can be said to have seen the primary 'decider' or driving force behind Britain's withdrawal from Africa. Yet, the impact of international the second world war and the growing influence of both the USA and the USSR also dictated Britain's decisions to an extent, whilst the growing nationalism within Africa added another, albeit more minor, pressure.

The Suez Crisis of 1956 explained Britain's fall from power. Britain had attempted to place itself



(This page is for your first answer.) as he claimed 'whether we like it or not this growth of national consciousness is a fact'. Many have argued to the disadvantages of Empire though his avowed Macmillan began to see the fewer benefits and the growing pressure of African independence, and as more Macmillan's realisation of it, more decolonisation was pronounced his official policy - Macmillan's ~~readjust~~ attempts to increase however, ~~at the expense of his~~ <sup>in</sup> ~~own~~ ~~country~~ ~~crisis~~ ~~imposed~~ influenced Macmillan's position, for he only created British strength to the capabilities demonstrated in the crisis. Furthermore, ~~the~~ ~~of~~ Eden's failures as a conservative and Macmillan's subsequent election meant Macmillan was certainly trying to correct the mistakes of Eden: the mistake of clinging to Empire. Macmillan therefore re-adapted Atlee's decolonisation policy, and increased its speed, by getting ~~the~~ ~~out~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~previous~~ ~~requirements~~ of ending the ~~conventional~~ ~~protectorate~~ ~~system~~ was ready for independence in his desperation.

§ ~~The~~ International relations also played a major part in the speeding up of decolonisation. The second world war had exposed Britain's as no longer the invulnerable 'unconquerable' power as colonial 166,500 troops joined Britain in Singapore to see their humiliating defeat. Furthermore, Britain had emerged from the war considerably weakened economically: the Anglo-American alliance Treaty of 1948 meant Britain was consequently in major debt to the U.S. This debt even drew Roosevelt





(This page is for your first answer.) ~~It was due to lack of economic~~  
~~findings, it was the loan she had applied for from the IMF~~  
~~declined. Thus the fact that Britain was not only~~  
~~worried from the Suez Canal by one of its former colonies,~~  
~~and was expected to pay but the IMF also~~  
~~questioned by the IMF, for the nation was not seen as~~  
~~able likely to pay the loan back. Britain had fallen,~~  
~~and was not seen as a~~ The US also only promised  
to lend Britain money if she withdrew; thus the US  
became excited her post world war two dominance over the  
nation. ~~Her~~ Eden's desperate attempt to reclaim Britain's  
~~prestigious status was failed, not due to military inferiority,~~  
but due to economic ~~inferiority.~~

~~The~~ ~~fact~~ The impact of ~~the~~ Macmillan when the  
British government can also be seen as the primary factor for  
increased decolonisation: Macmillan's audit of Empire, a 'profit-  
loss' analysis of each African nation revealed that only  
3% of British exports had gone to Africa ~~before~~ ~~since~~  
the ~~1945~~ World War. ~~It~~ ~~is~~ subsequently, the major factor  
for ~~the~~ decolonisation in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, of ~~economic~~  
~~exploiting~~ the economic benefits of Africa, became  
void. Furthermore, Macmillan's audit provided ~~for~~  
Britain to focus its efforts elsewhere, on Europe, as  
Britain ~~was~~ attempted to join the EEC in 1961 ~~is~~  
~~that~~ ~~yet~~ Macmillan's winds of change speech in 1960  
~~can~~ can be said to have been ~~not~~ ~~not~~ effective.

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~between Britain and Kenya~~ (1952 to 1956) - ~~the~~ similarly, the growth of African nationalism in ~~Tanzania~~ <sup>Tanganyika</sup> under Nyerere who led the TAD acted as another pressure ~~with~~ ~~the~~ ~~desire~~ ~~for~~ ~~independence~~ ~~from~~ ~~Africa~~ ~~was~~ ~~spreading~~. ~~The~~ Nyerere's 'Arusha Declaration' pro-independence within Tanzania, ~~also~~ ~~promoted~~ all African protectorates to rise up against British repression. ~~The~~ The Gold Coast desire for independence can be seen as the starting point for all African consciousness. ~~→ peacefully, ~~as~~ ~~was~~ ~~being~~~~ under the leadership of Nkrumah. The independence movement was so strong under his individual that the nation refused to accept self-governance unless Nkrumah led them ~~→~~ he received 20,000 of 23,000 votes in the 1946 election. However, the growth of ~~the~~ ~~independence~~ ~~idea~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ a major factor as Britain did have the capabilities to suppress the forces at least temporarily, as seen in the Mau Mau war, when Britain won in 1955, leaving only 100 of the terrorists left alive. Yet, the cost of such conflicts also increased the need for decolonisation: to quell ~~the~~ ~~war~~ ~~→~~ each Mau Mau it cost £10,000. For Britain to have not increased decolonisation, ~~the~~ its depleted economic state would have been ~~even~~ ~~worsened~~.

The rapid ~~British~~ increased process of decolonisation can be said to have been catalysed by the Suez Crisis, which exposed it for the fallen superpower.

(This page is for your first answer.) The nation had become. 40; decolonisation had been a considered policy within Britain since Atlee's post-second world war era. Macmillan formalised it in policy over more in 1957, through his speech ~~and~~ reflecting the British attitude of apathy, or even embarrassment towards the Empire, ~~to~~ all other colonies ~~to~~ power began to decline, leaving Britain to look awkward. The pressure of the US, and the growing African independence ~~of~~ ~~decisions~~ left decolonisation as an inevitability, but it was ~~the~~ the growth of African independence, ~~also~~ which gave Britain a final push out of its former Empire.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This is a high Level 4 response. It has a series of well-developed paragraphs which explain the role of the stated factor and other factors in the process of speeding up decolonisation. By using this approach the paragraphs become almost 'list-like' leaving the conclusion to make links between factors rather than creating a discussion with regard to the hypothesis/statement in the question.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

Try to begin paragraphs by finding links or stating clear differences between the points you are making, this creates a discussion of the question rather than an outline of the different factors involved; the judgement made in the conclusion becomes more effective this way.

(This page is for your second answer.)

From Winston Churchill's belief in his second term as Prime Minister that decolonisation should be 'slow and gradual', the independence movements across Africa substantially sped up in the latter half of the 1950s. ~~The~~ The Gold Coast would achieve independence as Ghana in 1957, and several other states were on the verge of following in its footsteps. There were a number of factors that caused this decline in empire; one of which was the Suez Crisis of 1956. When President Nasser announced the nationalisation of the ~~the~~ canal during a speech, Anthony Eden's reaction was to invade with force. The outcome was disastrous for the British.

The crisis undoubtedly changed attitudes towards the empire on the world stage. In the continent itself, Nasser became something of a hero defending against the great power of the Empire. It can be said that he inspired other leaders such as Nkrumah, Kenyatta and

(This page is for your second answer.)

Nyerere ~~in~~ in their hatred of colonial rule. It made independence seem possible. The invasion was also met with stark disapproval by the USA. The United Nations refusal to fund the ~~the~~ Aswan dam, as well as British refusal to withdraw their 80,000 troops were seen as morally justifiable reasons for ~~the~~ nationalisation. The invasion caused a disastrous run on sterling which only the USA could prop. This <sup>confirmed</sup> ~~was~~ a dramatic shift in world power and belittled the empire.





'leader of government business'. Here, independence was surely inevitable, and <sup>virtually</sup> granted ~~before~~ before the Suez Crisis. ~~In~~ In Ghana, the natives proved that independence could be reached in a smooth and peaceful fashion, and it is therefore argued that it was the behaviour of the Africans, and not the decision of Parliament, that decided independence. This was also the case in Tanzania, where a university-educated Julius Nyerere established a political party, TANU, which appealed to a wide range of classes. The popularity and talent of himself and other

(This page is for your second answer.)

effective leaders may also have influenced Britain's decision to decolonise.

Another factor that surely ~~was~~ influenced MacMillan was the financial damage still being felt by world war II. Britain had a debt so large it was not paid off until 2006, and it was owed to an anti-imperial country. MacMillan realised that ~~the~~ ~~was~~ holding onto the empire in Africa was costing the nation money that it could not afford. Other, domestic issues were put in priority, such as promised tax cuts, and a continuation of the welfare state. He also wished to establish a nuclear deterrent, Polaris, as the Arms Race was hotting up, ~~with~~ and the Cold War escalating with the Hungary Revolution in 1956. Such a project could only be affordable if Britain cut back on expenditure on retaining the empire.

The outcome of the Suez crisis undoubtedly played a vital role in ending the empire. The decolonisation of nearly all African colonies by 1964 shows an extent

of the impact. The smooth transition and peaceful protests in states such as Ghana, The Gambia, Uganda and Tanzania must also have played a factor in convincing MacMillan to withdraw, but the same cannot be said for Nigeria or Kenya. Here, tribal squabbles and divisions, as well as a population of white settlers, made the road to independence ~~was~~ a very rocky one.

(This page is for your second answer.)

indeed. There must, therefore, be other factors to MacMillan's decision, and it can be concluded that domestic political and economic factors come into account. It is obvious many of these factors derive from the appalling outcome of the Suez invasion, and it therefore played a vital role in decolonisation.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This is a Level 5 response. This response is explicitly focused on the outcome of the Suez Crisis in relation to the speeding up of decolonisation. The consequences of the crisis are clearly inter-linked with other factors and there is a clear sense of why decisions were made to speed up the process.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

Try to define or contextualise the focus of the question in the introduction. In this case the decision to speed up a process already in action is outlined and the stated factor is succinctly dealt with.

## **Question 14**

Q14. Candidates who chose this response had a good grounding in the knowledge required for the fourth bullet point of the specification. Most were able to discuss a variety of reasons as to why it took so long to achieve majority rule including nationalists divisions, the strength and determination of the white Rhodesian minority, the attitude of the British and the support for white minority rule from South Africa. As with other questions on this paper many responses would have been more effective if the parameters of the question had been defined in a few introductory sentences; here a sense of beginning and end dates and clear references to African nationalism and majority rule would have been useful.



## Paper Summary

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

- Do not attempt to limit your revision by trying to predict questions or by producing model answers based on past questions. This may lead to a lack of choice or a lack of focus on the demands made by the question.
- Try to analyse causation by using a variety of different methods. This year the factors which influence causation have been largely addressed with confidence. Differentiation between candidates' answers has often arisen when candidates come to evaluate and weigh up the relative significance of conditional against contingent factors and then suggest which factor seems the most important.
- Try to understand issues concerning change and continuity over the whole timescale of your period of study. Consider how things stayed the same, how they changed and, most importantly, why change did or did not take place.
- Develop the skill of using appropriate historical terms with fluency and use these in your answers where appropriate.
- Plan your answer beforehand. This will help you to organise your thoughts before you start to write.
- Familiarise yourself with the format of the examination booklet. You should begin your first answer on page 4 and your second on page 12. On each of these pages you should place a cross to indicate which answer you have chosen. Knowing the format of the examination in advance should help to relieve the stress of the examination overall.

## **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