NGAIZA SERIES OF ADVANCED HISTORY

ENJOY & MASTER ADVANCED HISTORY

HISTORICAL REVOLUTIONS

Topical Questions & Examinations

Ngaiza Books App
Scan to download on Google Play

Scan for interactive solutions, extra questions, and all Ngaiza titles on your phone.

Enjoy & Master Advanced History

Topical Questions and Examinations: Form Five Topics

Ngaiza Series of Advanced History

© 2026 Ngaiza Education Hub. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means: electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior written permission of the publisher, except for brief quotations in reviews or academic commentary.

First Edition, 2026

ISBN 978-9976-5530-1-7

Writers
Mr. Adam Rashid and Mr. Ahmed Abeid

Editor
Dr. Athuman Razzak

Series Creator and Director
Ngaiza Lusima

Published by

Ngaiza Education Hub

P.O. Box 60791

Mbezi Beach, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

www.ngaizabooks.com

contact@ngaizabooks.com

Every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the content in this book. The publisher welcomes corrections and suggestions for future editions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface i

Student Survival Guide iii

Part One: Topical Questions and Answers 1

1 Pan-Africanism 2

2 The Industrial Revolution in the 18th and 19th Centuries 25

3 Industrial Revolutions in the 20th and 21st Centuries 45

4 Administrative Systems in the Ancient World 63

5 World Religions and their Influence on Administrative Systems 91

6 Slavery and Feudalism in Ancient Administrative Systems 125

7 Political Revolutions and Modern Administrative Systems in Europe 154

8 The Capitalist Crises and Alternative Governance Systems 185

9 Administrative Systems in Post-Colonial African States 214

Part Two: Examination Questions 244

Part Three: Model Solutions to the Examinations 253

Index 393

PREFACE

This book was written because you deserve better.

Advanced Level History rewards understanding, yet many students arrive in Form Five having learned to narrate events they cannot explain and to recite dates they cannot reason through. History feels familiar, because we all grow up on stories of the past, of great leaders, famous wars and the rise and fall of nations, so it is easy to believe you understand it when you have only memorised it. Students memorise what happened, sit examinations that ask why it happened and how much it mattered, and leave believing History is a list of names and dates to be recalled under pressure. That is not History. That is memorisation dressed as understanding.

History is the study of how human societies came to be as they are: how empires were governed and why they fell, how revolutions in industry and in politics remade the world, and how religions, ideas and economic forces have shaped the way people are ruled. It is written in real events, real dates and real people, from the Pan-African congresses to the factories of the Industrial Revolution and the administrative systems of the ancient world. It is powerful, rooted in evidence, and far more logical than its reputation suggests. But mastering it under examination conditions takes more than a textbook to read. It takes practice: attempting real questions, building real arguments, and learning, answer by answer, how to turn what you know into marks. That is what this book sets out to give you.

Why a book of questions and answers?

You do not learn to swim by reading about water, and you do not learn History by reading model answers. You learn it by attempting a question, getting it wrong, finding out exactly why, and trying again. This book is built entirely around that truth. Every examinable topic in the Advanced History syllabus is turned into questions you must answer yourself, each followed by a full model answer that shows not only the correct history but the exact, connected English that earns examination marks. Used honestly, with the answer covered until you have written your own, it trains the two things the examination really tests: understanding the causes, and arguing them clearly.

How this book is organised

This volume covers the whole Form Five History syllabus, Historical Revolutions, in nine chapters: Pan-Africanism; the Industrial Revolution of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; the industrial revolutions of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries; administrative systems in the ancient world; world religions and their influence on administrative systems; slavery and feudalism in ancient administrative systems; political revolutions and modern administrative systems in Europe; the capitalist crises and alternative governance systems; and administrative systems in post-colonial African states.

The first part, Topical Questions and Answers, takes each chapter in turn. Every question is followed at once by its model answer, so you can attempt it and then check yourself immediately. Within each chapter the questions rise in demand, moving from the causes of an event, through its course and character, to the weighing of its significance, so that the difficulty grows as your confidence does.

The second part, the Examination Questions, brings together essay questions at full examination standard, phrased in the indirect manner of the real paper so that you must decide for yourself what each is truly asking. The questions come first; their model solutions follow in the third part, each closing with an Examiner's Note that names the demand of the question, the trap that costs candidates marks, and the single move that lifts an answer into the top band. In this way every question in this book, from the first to the last, has a complete, well-reasoned solution you can learn from, but only after you have attempted it with the solutions closed.

Before the questions begin, a short Student Survival Guide shows you how to study History, how to use this book, and how to beat the two traps, false confidence and narration in place of argument, that quietly cost good students their marks. Read it first. It is the shortest and most important part of the book.

The team behind this book

Enjoy and Master Advanced History is the work of the Ngaiza Education Hub, built by a team of experienced history educators who share one conviction: that Tanzanian students deserve world-class materials written for their context, their syllabus, and their aspirations.

Writers: Mr. Adam Rashid and Mr. Ahmed Abeid.

Editor: Dr. Athuman Razzak.

Designer: Mr. Frank Mwita.

I am grateful to every member of this team for their dedication, their expertise, and their refusal to settle for "good enough." I thank too the students whose hard questions and honest struggles shaped every answer in this book. They reminded us, again and again, that a question a student cannot learn from has failed, no matter how correct its history may be.

To every student of Advanced History opening this book for the first time: History is not as hard as its reputation, and it is not as easy as it first feels. It is as logical as the chain of cause and effect that made the world you live in, and as satisfying as an argument that finally comes together. Give it your honest effort, with the answer covered and your pen moving, and this book will give you its honest best in return.

Ngaiza, Lusima
Series Creator and Director

STUDENT SURVIVAL GUIDE

How to turn what you know into marks.

Why History Feels Easy, Then Betrays You

You have been told stories of the past all your life: of kings and empires, of wars won and lost, of leaders who set nations free. History is the one subject that arrives already sounding like a story you half remember, and that is exactly what makes it the most deceptive paper on your timetable.

The first trap is false confidence. Because you can tell the story of an event, it feels understood, and that easy feeling fools thousands of candidates every year. The examination does not ask what happened; it asks why it happened and what it meant. You can name the year the slave trade was abolished, but explain why abolition came when it did, and the easy feeling vanishes. The distance between telling a story and explaining it is where most marks are won or lost.

The second trap is narration instead of argument. Even when you know the causes, under pressure the pen slips into telling the tale: what happened first, then next, then after that. Narration answers the question what happened; the examiner is paying for why and how far. To recount the storming of the Bastille earns almost nothing, while to explain why the French monarchy had lost the power to prevent it earns the marks.

On the answer sheet the two traps look identical: a confident, fluent essay that narrates events and still bleeds marks. The cure for both is the same discipline, and this book is built to drill it into you, for every model answer leads with its argument and follows the chain of cause and consequence to a judgement, anchored in real, dated fact.

One example makes the difference clear.

The same question, answered by two students.

The question. Why did the Industrial Revolution begin in Britain?

The confident answer that fails. The Industrial Revolution began in Britain because Britain had many factories, clever inventors and a large empire, and soon became the richest and most powerful country in the world. *(It names and narrates, yet explains nothing, and scores almost nothing.)*

The answer that scores. Britain industrialised first because several advantages met in one place. Profits from her Atlantic trade and colonies supplied the capital to build factories; the enclosure of farmland freed a landless workforce for the towns; coal and iron lay side by side to power and build the machines; and a growing colonial market gave her manufactures somewhere to sell. Each condition reinforced the others, so that the breakthrough came in Britain rather than in France or China, as the cotton mills of Lancashire were the first to show.

Both students had learned the same period; only the second explained it, and only the second scores. That gap, repeated across a three-hour paper, separates a pass from a distinction. This guide, and every answer that follows it, exists to put you on the right side of it: from knowing to answering.

How to Use This Book

This is not a book to read. It is a book to work. A model answer you have only read feels learned and is forgotten by morning; a model answer you have struggled toward, and then compared against your own, is learned for good. Work every question in four steps.

1. **Cover the model answer.** Read the question, then answer it in full on paper, in proper paragraphs, before you look at anything.
2. **Uncover and compare.** Read the model answer twice: once for the history, and once for the way it is built. Did you find the same causes? Did you argue them as the model does, and did you anchor each in dated fact?
3. **Mark yourself honestly.** Award yourself a point only where your answer truly made the same point. A near miss is a miss.

4. **Fix one thing, then move on.** Correct your single biggest weakness in your own words, and carry that lesson into the next question.

Rise with the questions, and do not skip the early ones. Within each chapter the questions climb in demand, from the causes of an event, through its course and character, to the weighing of its significance. The gentle opening questions build the foundation the harder ones stand on; a student who leaps to the final questions before owning the first is trying to enter a house through the top window. Work each chapter in order.

Meet the three parts in turn. Part One teaches, question by question, with the model answer beneath each. Part Two sets examination questions in the indirect manner of the real paper, their demand concealed in the wording. Part Three gives a full model solution to everyone, each closing with an Examiner's Note that names the demand, the trap, and the move that wins the top band.

Treat the examination questions as real examinations. The essays at the back of this book, each worth twenty marks, are not extra reading. Sit them in a quiet room, against the clock, with the solutions closed, then mark yourself against the model solutions. That is the closest rehearsal for the real day you can get.

How to Write History for Marks

Marks in history are not awarded for knowing. They are awarded for showing that you know, in writing, in the right order. Four habits carry most of those marks.

Open by defining and positioning. Begin every essay with a short introduction that defines the key terms and states the argument you will make. An essay that opens by narrating, with no introduction, forfeits marks the examiner is waiting to give and leaves your whole answer without a compass. Say what the terms mean and where you stand before you march.

Lead each paragraph with its point, then prove it. State the point the paragraph will make in its first few words, set in bold in this book, then give the evidence and reasoning behind it. The examiner is trained to find the point, tick it, and read on for the proof that earns the rest. Bury the point at the end and you force a tired examiner to hunt for it, and a point that cannot be found cannot be marked.

Join your ideas with the words that carry cause and consequence. A historical explanation is a chain in which one condition produces the next. The words that build that chain are because, so, as a result, which in turn, therefore and consequently. Use them on purpose. They are the whole difference between a list of true statements and an argument.

Anchor every point in specific, dated evidence, and end by judging. History is argued from proof, so supply it: the date, the name, the place, the event. Write "the 1884–85 Berlin Conference," not "a European meeting"; "Nkrumah," not "an African leader." A point tied to hard fact is worth far more than the same point floating free. Then close with a conclusion that answers the question directly and reaches a verdict.

One example shows the habits at work.

The same history, written two ways.

The question. Account for the outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789.

A list of true facts (low marks). France had an absolute monarchy, the people paid heavy taxes, Enlightenment writers criticised the old order, and the treasury was empty. *(Every statement is true, yet nothing is joined, so it reads as memory, not argument.)*

The same facts as a chain (full marks). By 1789 the absolute monarchy of Louis XVI had lost the means to reform itself. Years of war and court extravagance had emptied the treasury, so the crown was forced to summon the Estates-General for the first time since 1614; there the Third Estate, its confidence armed by Enlightenment ideas of liberty and equality, refused to be outvoted by the privileged orders. As a result a financial crisis became a constitutional one, and when the king seemed to gather troops against the new National Assembly, the people of Paris rose and stormed the Bastille in July 1789.

Notice that the second answer adds no new facts. It only joins the ones already there, and ties them to dates. That joining is the skill this whole book is teaching you, answer after answer.

How to Handle Dates, Maps and Tables

History is written in prose, but a few marks live in the disciplined handling of fact.

Get your chronology right, for dates are the skeleton of an argument. An essay that places events in the wrong order argues for the wrong causes. Learn the key dates of each topic as carefully as its themes, and use them to show that one thing truly came before, and helped to cause, the next.

Reach for a timeline, table or sketch-map only where it earns its place. A short comparison table can sharpen an answer that weighs two systems, capitalism against socialism or one administrative system against another, and a rough sketch-map can locate an empire or a campaign faster than a paragraph. Where the question invites such an aid it earns marks; where it does not, it wastes time. Prose remains the primary vehicle, and a diagram never excuses a thin argument.

How to Fail Productively

You will get questions wrong. Every strong student does. What decides your grade is the five minutes after you get one wrong.

The unproductive response is to cross out your attempt, read the model solution, nod, and move on. Your page looks complete and your memory has learned nothing, because you only watched someone else answer.

The productive response is to stop, and not cross out. Set your answer beside the model and find the exact point where they part. Then name the cause: was it the history, because you did not know the facts or their order; the structure, because you narrated events instead of explaining and judging them; or the question, because you answered what you expected instead of what was asked? Fix that one thing, cover the model again, and rewrite the answer from the start.

Those three faults need three different cures, and naming yours is half the cure. A wrong answer you have diagnosed is worth more than a right answer you copied.

How to Revise on Your Own

Most revision feels productive and is not. Re-reading model answers, highlighting them and copying them out neatly all feel like work, but your eyes move while your memory rests. A beautiful notebook is not understanding. These methods are.

Sit the examination questions under the clock. The essays at the back of this book are your single best revision tool. Work a set in a quiet room, timed, with the solutions closed, then mark yourself. Nothing else rehearses the real pressure.

Explain a development out loud, as if to someone who knows nothing. Trace aloud how the Industrial Revolution remade society, or why Pan-Africanism arose in the diaspora rather than in Africa. Where you stumble is precisely what you have not yet understood. The silence is the lesson.

Teach a friend, and let them ask why. The moment you cannot answer their "why" is your revision target for the evening.

Redo the questions you got wrong, not the ones you got right. Return after a week to the answers you missed and work them again from a blank page.

Learn your dates and examples, not only your themes. An argument you can state but cannot date or illustrate is half an answer. Keep, for each topic, a short list of the names, dates and events that prove it, and learn it as carefully as the argument itself.

Revise your weakest topic first, not your favourite. The topic you enjoy is the one you already know; the topic you avoid is the one the paper will ask.

How to Face the Examination

The examination does not test how clever you are. It tests whether you can show what you know, clearly, under pressure, in a fixed time. That is a skill, and skills can be practised.

Read every question twice before you write. Most lost marks come from answering the question you expected instead of the one on the paper. Advanced History hides its demand in the wording, so the second reading catches the word the first reading missed.

Obey the command word. Each command word asks for a particular kind of answer, and giving the wrong kind loses marks even when your history is sound.

Command word	What it asks for
Account for; Explain	Give the reasons or causes, joined in a chain. Every point answers "why".
Analyse	Break the topic into its parts and show how they relate and combine to produce the result.
Examine	Look closely at each part of a topic, setting out and weighing each in turn.
Assess; Evaluate	Weigh the strengths against the weaknesses, or the case for against the case against, and reach a clear judgement.
To what extent; How far	Argue how far a statement holds true, giving both sides, then a reasoned verdict.
"…" How valid is this claim?; Discuss	Test a quoted assertion from both sides before committing to a judgement.
Compare; Contrast	Set similarities and differences side by side, point against point, not two separate accounts.
Trace	Follow a development in order through time, showing how each stage led to the next.
Justify	Defend a stated position with reasons and specific, dated evidence.
Describe; Outline	Give an orderly account of what happened; the lightest demand, and rarely enough on its own.

Know the shape of the paper. In the History examination you answer five essay questions in three hours, the first compulsory, each carrying twenty marks. That is a little over half an hour for each essay, planning included. Divide your time before you start, and hold to it.

Plan an essay before you write it. Jot the points you will make, then write a short introduction that defines the terms and states your line, a paragraph for each point led by its key idea, and a conclusion that delivers a verdict. A planned essay scores more than a longer one written without a plan.

Scale your answer to the marks. A twenty-mark essay wants six to eight developed points, not three long ones or a dozen thin ones. The demand of the question tells you how much to write.

Show your reasoning, not just the conclusion. A bare statement scores little; the marks live in the steps between the question and the answer. Write the chain.

Watch the clock, and leave nothing blank. Marks are easiest to win at the start of an answer and hardest at the end, so two essays half answered beat one finished and one never reached. Spend your time by the marks, not by your interest.

The night before, do not cram. Your brain files what you have learned while you sleep. A calm student who rests well outperforms a tired one who revised until midnight. Rest is part of the preparation.

You now carry what the strongest candidates bring into the hall and most never receive: a way to use this book that turns reading into practice, the language to write history that scores, an honest method of revision, and a clear plan for the examination itself. Turn the page, cover the first model answer, and begin. The past is waiting, and it rewards those who do more than remember it.

.

PART ONE
TOPICAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Chapter 1

PAN-AFRICANISM

Attempt each question in full on paper before you read the model answer beneath it. The questions follow the chapter topic by topic and rise in demand.

The concept and origins of Pan-Africanism

Question 1

In 1900, a Trinidadian lawyer gathered a few dozen men and women of African descent in a London hall and gave a scattered people a single name for their hope.

Define Pan-Africanism and account for the factors that gave rise to it in the New World.

Model Answer

Pan-Africanism is the political and cultural movement founded on the belief that all people of African origin share a common identity, culture, destiny and history of oppression, and should therefore unite to fight racial discrimination, colonial domination and imperialism. It was founded by Edward Wilmot Blyden (1832-1912) and strengthened by Henry Sylvester Williams (1869-1911), and it arose first among Africans in the New World for the following connected reasons.

The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade scattered Africans into one community. The forced shipment of millions of Africans to the Americas from the fifteenth century tore them from their homelands and threw peoples of many nations together on the same plantations. Yoruba, Igbo, Akan and Kongo laboured side by side, stripped of nation and name, until the only bond left to them was a shared suffering. Out of this forced mixing grew the first feeling that all Africans, whatever their origin, shared one fate, and it was this feeling that Pan-Africanism would later organise.

Racial discrimination and segregation created a common grievance. Africans in America were treated not as human beings but as property, and after the Virginia Assembly of 1619 declared that black people should be slaves forever, their inferiority was fixed in law. Segregation, the colour bar and daily humiliation pressed upon every black person alike, regardless of talent or wealth. Because the oppression was collective, the search for a remedy became collective too, and unity appeared as the only shield against a system that despised them as a race.

The denial of political rights taught the need for collective action. African-Americans were excluded from voting through devices such as literacy tests, which they were bound to fail because they had been denied schooling, so that even the independence of 1776 left them without a voice. Shut out of the institutions that might have protected them, they learned that no individual could win justice alone. This lesson pushed them toward organisation and solidarity, the seedbed from which Pan-Africanism grew.

Economic exploitation under capitalism bred a shared consciousness. Africans supplied the unpaid labour that dug the mines and worked the plantations on which New World capitalism was built, producing vast wealth while owning nothing themselves. The experience of being used as a race, and discarded when no longer profitable, taught them that their exploitation was not personal misfortune but a common condition. From this grew a shared consciousness of resistance that bound the exploited together across colony and country.

Educated black leaders gave the feeling of unity an organised voice. The diaspora produced a class of educated black professionals, clergymen and writers, among them Blyden and Williams, who could put the common sense of suffering into words and action. Rather than let grievance remain scattered and mute, they convened the first Pan-African Conference in London in 1900 and gave the movement its name. Leadership thus turned a shared emotion into an organised cause with aims, meetings and a programme.

Cultural humiliation drove a search for identity and dignity. Slavery and racism had attacked not only the bodies of Africans but their culture, religion, history and very sense of worth, teaching them to despise what was their own. In answer, black people began to reassert the beauty, dignity and equality of their

identity and to reclaim their spiritual unity as a people. This reassertion of pride against contempt became the moral core of Pan-Africanism and gave it a strength beyond mere protest.

Pan-Africanism was therefore the organised answer of a scattered people to a shared history of enslavement, racism and exploitation; born in the diaspora, it would in time become a worldwide movement for African dignity and self-determination.

Question 2

The idea of African unity was first dreamed not under an African sky, but in the cities of America and the Caribbean.

Explain why Pan-Africanism originated among Africans in the diaspora rather than on the African continent.

Model Answer

Although Pan-Africanism sought the unity of the whole African world, it began among Africans of the New World and not on the continent itself. The reasons lie in the different conditions of the two societies in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The diaspora felt a common identity first. Africans in the New World had been stripped of their separate homelands, languages and kingdoms and lumped together simply as black, so that their many nations dissolved into a single identity. Continental Africans, by contrast, still lived within their own peoples and states and continued to identify as Yoruba, Kikuyu or Zulu rather than as Africans in general. The diaspora therefore arrived at the sense of one African people decades before the continent did, and that sense was the foundation Pan-Africanism required.

Oppression was sharper and more uniform in the diaspora. Slavery, segregation and the colour bar pressed on all black people in America alike, creating one clear and common grievance around which to unite. Colonial oppression in Africa, though real, took many different local forms from one colony to the next, so that it did not yet produce a single shared enemy. The uniform racism of the New World thus welded its victims together more quickly and more tightly than the varied burdens of colonial rule in Africa.

The diaspora produced educated leaders. Life in the New World, for all its cruelty, gave rise to a class of educated black professionals, lawyers, clergymen, scholars and writers such as Blyden, Williams and Du Bois. These men had the learning, the confidence and the command of language needed to articulate grievances and to organise conferences and associations. The continent, still largely denied Western education in this period, had not yet produced such a body of leaders able to speak for the whole race.

Black people in the diaspora had the freedom to organise. After emancipation, black people in America and Europe enjoyed at least a margin of freedom to hold meetings, publish newspapers and form associations. Colonised Africans, living under direct colonial control, were watched, restricted and punished for any hint of political organisation. Because the diaspora could assemble and speak with comparative safety, it became the natural birthplace of an organised movement that the continent was not yet free to build.

The diaspora had access to global platforms. Living in the great cities of London, Paris and New York, diaspora leaders stood at the very centres of imperial power and world opinion. From there they could appeal directly to the colonial governments and to international gatherings such as the Versailles Peace Conference of 1919. Continental Africans, isolated in the colonies and cut off from these platforms, had no comparable means of pressing their case before the world.

The continent was still being conquered. During the late nineteenth century Africa itself was being partitioned and occupied in the Scramble that followed the Berlin Conference of 1884 to 1885. The energies of its peoples were absorbed in primary resistance to invasion and in the struggle simply to survive conquest. There was neither the peace nor the freedom for continental Africans to build a movement for continental unity, a task that fell first to their kinsmen overseas.

Pan-Africanism thus grew where the sense of common blackness, the freedom to organise and the educated leadership first existed, in the diaspora, before its later shift onto African soil after 1945.

Question 3

Strip Pan-Africanism to its bones and a handful of core beliefs remain, each a pillar of the whole.

Explain the main features of Pan-Africanism.

Model Answer

Pan-Africanism, the movement for the unity and dignity of all people of African origin, rests on a set of defining features that together give it its character.

It is founded on a common identity. At its heart lies the belief that all people of African descent, whether on the continent or scattered across the diaspora, are one people. This identity is held to spring from a common origin, a shared history of suffering and a bond of blood and culture deeper than the borders that divide them. Because it treats black people everywhere as members of a single family, this belief in a common identity is the foundation on which every other feature of the movement rests.

It rests on a shared destiny. Pan-Africanism teaches that the fortunes of Africans everywhere are bound together, so that none can be truly free while others remain oppressed. The humiliation of black people in one land is felt as an injury to black people in all lands, and the liberation of one is seen as a step toward the liberation of all. This sense of a single, shared destiny gives the movement its solidarity and its reach across oceans and continents.

It is defined by opposition to oppression. The movement was born in resistance and remains defined by its struggle against the forces that have degraded black people. It sets itself against racial discrimination, the slave trade, colonial domination and imperialism wherever they are found. This opposition gives Pan-Africanism its fighting spirit and its clear enemies, and it explains why the movement has always been a movement of protest and liberation rather than mere sentiment.

It demands self-determination. Pan-Africanism insists that Africans have the right to govern themselves and to decide their own future free of foreign control. It rejects the claim that black people are unfit to rule and asserts their full right to sovereignty and independence. This demand for self-determination made the movement the natural ideology of the anti-colonial struggle and the driving force behind the winning of African independence.

It asserts African dignity and culture. Against centuries of contempt that taught black people to despise themselves, Pan-Africanism affirms the worth, beauty and equality of the black race. It reclaims and honours African history, culture and religion, insisting that they are the equal of any other. This proud assertion of dignity restores self-respect to a humiliated people and gives the movement a positive and spiritual dimension beyond politics.

It pursues unity and cooperation. The movement holds that black people can overcome their oppression only by acting together, and so it calls constantly for solidarity and united action. This pursuit of unity runs from the early congresses through the Back-to-Africa Movement to the Organisation of African Unity and the African Union of today. The drive to bring Africans together, on the continent and across the diaspora, is thus the practical expression of all its other features.

These features, common identity and destiny, resistance to oppression, self-determination, dignity and unity, are the enduring core of Pan-Africanism, binding its many phases into one continuous movement.

Question 4

Before the congresses and the crowds, two men from the Caribbean gave the movement its first shape.

Assess the contribution of Edward Wilmot Blyden and Henry Sylvester Williams to the early growth of Pan-Africanism.

Model Answer

Edward Wilmot Blyden (1832-1912) and Henry Sylvester Williams (1869-1911), both of the Caribbean, were the founding fathers of Pan-Africanism. Their contribution was foundational, though the movement they began was still small and elite.

Blyden founded the intellectual tradition. Edward Wilmot Blyden is regarded as the founder of Pan-Africanism because he first worked out its guiding ideas. He developed the concepts of the African personality, of racial dignity and of the essential unity of all people of African descent. In giving the movement a body of thought on which to stand, Blyden supplied the philosophy that later leaders would organise into a mass cause.

Blyden defended African culture. At a time when Europe dismissed Africa as a continent without history or civilisation, Blyden argued powerfully for the worth of African culture and religion. He insisted that African societies had their own dignity and genius and need not imitate Europe to be respected. By restoring pride to a people taught to despise themselves, he laid the moral foundation on which Pan-Africanism was built.

Williams organised the first conference. Henry Sylvester Williams, a Trinidadian lawyer, turned ideas into action by convening the first Pan-African Conference in London in 1900. Where Blyden had supplied the thought, Williams supplied the organisation, gathering people of African origin from three continents to meet and confer. This first conference gave the movement its earliest institutional form and set the pattern of the congresses to come.

Williams gave the movement its name. It was at the London Conference organised by Williams that the very term Pan-Africanism was coined and adopted. By naming the movement, the conference gave it a clear identity and a banner under which its supporters could gather. Williams thus provided not only the first gathering but the language in which the movement would henceforth be known and understood.

They brought forward new leaders. The work of Blyden and Williams drew a new generation into the cause, above all the young scholar W. E. B. Du Bois. Du Bois attended the 1900 conference and went on to lead the Pan-African congresses that carried the movement into the twentieth century. By inspiring and launching such successors, the two founders ensured that the movement would outlive them and grow.

Their movement, however, was still narrow. For all their achievement, what Blyden and Williams founded remained a small and largely elite affair confined to educated men of the diaspora. It had neither a mass following nor a base on the African continent, and its methods were those of appeal rather than of struggle. The broadening of Pan-Africanism into a movement of the masses would have to wait for later leaders such as Garvey.

Blyden and Williams were therefore the indispensable founders: Blyden gave Pan-Africanism its philosophy and Williams its first organisation, and though their movement was still narrow, they lit the flame that others would spread.

Slavery, the slave trade and the roots of Pan-Africanism

Question 5

When Columbus stumbled upon the New World in 1492, he opened not only a continent but three centuries of forced African migration.

Account for the rise of the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade from the fifteenth century.

Model Answer

The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade was the forced shipment of Africans across the Atlantic to labour in the Americas. It rose from the fifteenth century onwards for a set of connected economic and historical reasons.

The discovery of the New World opened vast lands to exploit. The voyages of the Italian explorer Christopher Columbus, sailing for Queen Isabella of Spain, opened America to Europe in 1492. The discovery revealed enormous territories rich in land and minerals that the European powers were eager to seize and to work for profit. This sudden opening of a new world created the appetite for large-scale production that would soon demand a vast and cheap supply of labour.

The opening of mines and plantations created a demand for labour. Across the Americas the Europeans established gold and silver mines and great plantations of sugar, tobacco and cotton. These enterprises were profitable only if worked on a large scale by cheap and controllable labour. The scale of the demand was

far beyond what free migration from Europe could supply, and so the colonists looked for a captive workforce that could be compelled to labour without wages.

The native peoples of America could not supply that labour. The Amerindians, set to work in the mines and fields, died in great numbers from European diseases such as smallpox to which they had no resistance, and from sheer overwork and cruelty. Their populations collapsed within a few generations, leaving the colonists desperate for an alternative. It was this labour vacuum that turned European eyes toward Africa as a source of workers who were both numerous and, it was believed, more resistant to the tropical climate.

The rise of mercantilism made the trade central to national wealth. The dominant economic doctrine of the age, mercantilism, taught that national power lay in the accumulation of wealth and bullion through trade. The plantation colonies, and the slave labour that made them profitable, became central to the wealth and strength of the European states. Slavery was therefore not a marginal cruelty but a pillar of national economic policy, defended and expanded as a matter of state interest.

Africa lay within reach and was vulnerable. Africa lay close to the Atlantic sea routes and possessed large populations, which made it the obvious source of the labour the Americas required. Its division into many separate and often rival states meant that no single power could resist the trade, and existing systems of servitude could be turned to European ends. European merchants exploited these divisions, obtaining captives through African intermediaries who exchanged them for foreign goods.

The triangular trade made every voyage profitable. The trade was organised as a three-sided circuit in which no ship need sail empty. Manufactured goods went from Europe to Africa, enslaved Africans from Africa to the Americas, and plantation produce from the Americas back to Europe. Because each leg of the voyage yielded its own profit, the system was immensely lucrative, and this profitability drove merchants to expand and prolong the trade for some three hundred years.

The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade therefore rose from the meeting of European greed, New World opportunity and African vulnerability; its human cargo built the wealth of the Americas and, in time, the shared suffering from which Pan-Africanism was born.

Question 6

The same ships that carried Africans into bondage carried, unknowingly, the seed of their future unity.

Explain how the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade laid the foundation for the rise of Pan-Africanism.

Model Answer

The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade, though an instrument of oppression, created the very conditions out of which Pan-Africanism later grew. It did so in the following ways.

It created the African diaspora. By carrying millions of Africans across the Atlantic to the Americas and Europe, the trade produced a vast community of displaced black people living far from their homeland. It was among these scattered descendants of the enslaved, and not on the continent, that the idea of African unity would first take shape. Without the diaspora that the trade created, there would have been no community in which Pan-Africanism could be born.

It forged a common identity. Captives were taken from many different African nations, each with its own language, religion and custom, yet in the New World they were all treated simply as slaves and as black. This levelling stripped away the old distinctions of nation and kingdom and left a single shared identity in their place. That new identity, born of common bondage, became the essential foundation on which the sense of one African people would rest.

It generated a shared grievance. The common experience of capture, of the terrors of the Middle Passage and of a lifetime of enslavement gave black people everywhere a single historical wound. This shared memory of suffering became a powerful bond, uniting the descendants of the enslaved in a common sense of injustice. A people with one great grievance in common had every reason to make common cause, and Pan-Africanism gave that cause its voice.

It bred racial consciousness. Because the enslavement of Africans was justified by the claim that black people were an inferior race, its victims came to understand their oppression in racial terms. They saw that they suffered not for anything they had done but simply for being black, and so their resistance too took a racial form. This racial consciousness, the awareness of a shared fate as a race, is the very foundation on which Pan-Africanism is built.

It produced leaders in the diaspora. Over the generations the descendants of the enslaved gained education and produced thinkers and organisers of great ability. Men such as Blyden, Williams, Du Bois and Garvey were the children of the diaspora that the trade had created. It was these leaders who would give the scattered sense of grievance an organised voice, and they could only have arisen among the displaced community that the slave trade brought into being.

It tied Africa's fate to the diaspora's. The trade bound the history of continental Africa to that of its scattered children overseas, for both had suffered from the same system. As the diaspora came to see its own dignity as bound up with the freedom of Africa, it began to work for the liberation of the continent. This link between diaspora and continent, forged by the slave trade, became one of the central themes of Pan-Africanism.

The slave trade thus laid the foundation of Pan-Africanism by manufacturing, out of a crime, a single people with a single grievance and the leaders to give it voice.

Question 7

A continent that lost its youngest and strongest for three centuries could not but be changed by the loss.

Assess the effects of the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade on Africa.

Model Answer

The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade drew off millions of Africans over some three centuries, and its effects on the continent were overwhelmingly destructive, though a few African groups gained in the short term. On balance the losses far outweighed any gain.

It caused depopulation and a loss of labour. Over three centuries the trade removed millions of people from Africa, and those taken were mostly the young, the strong and the able-bodied. The continent was thus drained of the very people it most needed to farm its land, defend its communities and develop its economies. This haemorrhage of population left whole regions weakened and thinly peopled, crippling Africa's capacity for growth for generations to come.

It spread insecurity and warfare. The European demand for captives placed a premium on human beings and encouraged raids, kidnapping and war between African communities. Neighbour turned against neighbour to seize prisoners who could be sold for firearms and foreign goods, and fear spread across whole regions. This climate of violence and mistrust destroyed the peace on which settled life and trade depended, and it poisoned relations between African peoples for generations.

It distorted African economies. The trade turned African energies away from productive activities such as farming and craft-making and toward the capture and supply of slaves. Local industries like ironworking and cloth-making were undermined by the flood of cheap European manufactures exchanged for captives. In this way African economies became dependent on a destructive trade and lost the skills and self-reliance they had built, a distortion from which recovery would be slow and painful.

It disrupted African societies. The removal of so many people, and the manner of their removal, tore apart families and whole communities. Populations were left unbalanced, often stripped of their young men and women, and the social order was shaken by constant fear and loss. A culture of raiding, suspicion and violence took root where cooperation had once prevailed, weakening the bonds that held African societies together.

It brought short-term gain to a few states. Certain coastal states and merchant groups, such as Dahomey and the Asante, grew rich and militarily powerful by acting as middlemen, exchanging captives for firearms and imported goods. Yet this strength was bought at the price of their neighbours' ruin and rested on a trade

that impoverished the continent as a whole. The gain was therefore narrow, temporary and parasitic, and it did nothing to advance Africa's general development.

It laid the foundation of underdevelopment. By draining Africa of people and wealth while enriching Europe and the Americas, the trade began the long divergence between a developing West and an impoverished Africa. The historian Walter Rodney described this process as the way in which Europe underdeveloped Africa. The slave trade was thus not merely a passing cruelty but the starting point of a lasting economic backwardness whose effects are still felt today.

Weighed together, the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade was a catastrophe for Africa; the enrichment of a few states cannot balance the depopulation, insecurity and economic ruin that crippled the continent's development for generations.

Question 8

Three continents, three cargoes, one cruel circuit of profit.

Examine the operation of the triangular trade.

Model Answer

The triangular trade was the three-sided Atlantic commerce that carried the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade. It operated in three connected legs, each yielding profit to the European merchants.

The first leg carried goods from Europe to Africa. On the first side of the triangle, European ships sailed to the African coast laden with manufactured goods. These included cloth, firearms, gunpowder, spirits, iron bars and cheap metal wares that Africa did not yet produce for itself. On the coast these goods were exchanged with African rulers and merchants for captives, so that European industry was turned directly to the purchase of human beings.

The second leg carried captives from Africa to America. The middle and most terrible leg of the trade carried the purchased captives across the Atlantic to the Americas. Packed tightly into the holds of the ships in the horrors of the Middle Passage, great numbers died of disease, suffocation and despair before they ever reached land. Those who survived were sold in the slave markets of the New World to labour on the plantations and in the mines.

The third leg carried produce from America to Europe. On the final side of the triangle, the ships returned to Europe loaded with the produce of the plantations. Sugar, tobacco, cotton and coffee, all grown by slave labour, were carried back and sold in the markets of Europe at great profit. Thus the very crops that the enslaved had raised enriched the merchants and manufacturers of the lands that had bought them.

African middlemen fed the system. The trade could not have functioned without the participation of coastal African states and merchants. These middlemen supplied the captives, often seized in wars, raids and kidnappings in the interior, and exchanged them for European goods. Drawn by the profits and the firearms they gained, they became essential agents of a trade that ultimately impoverished their own continent.

The plantations were the engine of demand. At the far end of the circuit lay the mines and plantations of the Americas, whose insatiable hunger for labour drove the whole system. Because the native peoples had died out and free European labour was scarce and costly, the planters demanded an endless supply of enslaved Africans. It was this demand that set the middle leg in motion and kept the triangle turning for three centuries.

The profits enriched Europe. Each side of the triangle yielded its own profit, so that the merchants grew rich at every stage of the voyage. Port cities such as Liverpool, Bristol and Nantes flourished on the trade, and the wealth it generated flowed into banks, industries and estates. In this way the profits of the triangular trade helped to finance the very growth of European commerce and capitalism.

The triangular trade thus operated as a self-feeding circuit in which goods, human beings and plantation produce moved between three continents, enriching Europe while draining Africa and enslaving its people.

Question 9

The historian Eric Williams argued that the wealth which built Europe's factories was watered with African blood.

Explain the relationship between the rise of capitalism and the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade.

Model Answer

The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade and the rise of European capitalism were closely and mutually connected. As the historian Eric Williams argued, the trade both sprang from and fed the growth of capitalism.

Mercantilism drove the trade. The early capitalist doctrine of mercantilism taught that a nation's power lay in the accumulation of wealth and bullion through trade. Under this doctrine the plantation colonies and the slave labour that made them profitable became central to the strength of the European states. Slavery was therefore promoted and protected as a matter of national economic policy, and the demand for captives grew with the ambitions of the mercantile powers.

Slave labour produced the raw materials. The enslaved Africans grew the sugar, tobacco, coffee and cotton that fed the commerce of Europe. In particular, the raw cotton they raised on American plantations later supplied the textile mills at the heart of the Industrial Revolution. In this way the labour of the enslaved provided the very materials on which European industry and prosperity came to depend.

The trade accumulated capital. The enormous profits earned from the slave trade and the plantations flowed back across the Atlantic into European hands. This wealth provided capital that helped to found banks, build factories and finance new enterprises. The historian Eric Williams argued that these profits made no small contribution to the pool of capital from which the Industrial Revolution was funded.

It enriched the port cities. The Atlantic ports that handled the trade grew rich and populous on its proceeds. Cities such as Liverpool and Bristol in England, and Nantes and Bordeaux in France, owed much of their prosperity to slaving voyages and the plantation trade. Their wealthy merchants in turn invested their fortunes in the industrial and commercial ventures of the new capitalist age.

Mature capitalism later turned against it. As industrial capitalism developed, the economic logic that had created slavery began to work against it. Free wage labour and new markets in Africa and Asia came to promise greater profit than the old plantation system. According to Eric Williams, it was partly this economic shift, as much as moral feeling, that led the industrial powers finally to abolish the trade they had once cherished.

It developed Europe while underdeveloping Africa. The slave trade concentrated people, wealth and development in Europe and the Americas while draining Africa of all three. The continent lost its labour and its resources and gained only firearms and cheap goods that undermined its own industries. This uneven exchange, which the historian Walter Rodney called the underdevelopment of Africa, is the deepest expression of the link between capitalism and the trade.

The relationship was therefore one of mutual dependence: capitalism gave rise to the slave trade for profit, the trade helped finance the growth of capitalism, and only when capitalism changed did it abandon the very system it had created.

The African-Americans and the growth of black consciousness

Question 10

A resolution passed in Virginia in 1619 condemned a whole people to be slaves not for a season, but forever.

Examine the problems faced by the Africans in the New World.

Model Answer

The Africans shipped to the New World, especially after the Virginia Assembly of 1619 declared that black slaves should be slaves forever, faced severe political, economic and social problems that shaped their long struggle for freedom.

They suffered political exclusion. African slaves were denied the right to vote or to be voted for, and so had no voice in the making of the laws that governed their lives. Even where the vote was formally allowed, devices such as literacy tests, which they were bound to fail because they had been denied schooling, kept them powerless. In this way the independence of 1776, which proclaimed liberty for others, left black people politically silenced and excluded from the nation's affairs.

They lost their basic civil rights. The Virginia resolution of 1619 declared black people slaves forever and thereby stripped them of the ordinary rights of human beings. They could not marry freely, own property, move at will or give evidence against a white person in court. Reduced to the status of possessions to be bought and sold, they were treated in law as things rather than persons, a denial of humanity that lay at the root of all their other sufferings.

They were exploited economically. Africans provided the unpaid labour that worked the plantations and dug the mines of the New World, producing immense wealth for their masters. For this labour they received nothing but the bare means of survival, and they owned neither the land they worked nor the crops they raised. This total exploitation, in which a whole race laboured for the enrichment of another, was the economic foundation of the injustice they endured.

They endured social humiliation and segregation. Black people were treated as inferior beings, denied education, dignity and respect, and taught to despise their own colour and culture. In time this contempt was fixed in segregation laws that separated black from white in schools, transport, housing and every area of daily life. Such humiliation attacked not only their circumstances but their very sense of worth, and it was against this that black consciousness would later rise.

They faced violence and terror. Even after slavery was abolished, black people lived under the constant threat of violence meant to keep them subjected. The Black Codes restricted their freedom, and terrorist groups such as the Ku Klux Klan, which arose during the presidency of Andrew Johnson from 1865 to 1869, used murder and intimidation against them. This reign of terror showed that legal emancipation had not brought real safety or freedom, and it deepened the resolve to resist.

They suffered cultural suppression. Torn from their homeland, Africans were cut off from their languages, religions, histories and customs, and forbidden to practise much of what remained. This deliberate erasure sought to destroy their identity and to leave them with no heritage but that of their masters. Yet the attack on their culture provoked a determined response, for it was in reclaiming their dignity and their history that black people would find the spirit of Pan-Africanism.

These interlocking problems, political, economic, social and cultural, were the common experience that welded African-Americans into a conscious community and drove them toward the solidarity that fed Pan-Africanism.

Question 11

On the first day of 1863, a president's signature turned millions of properties back into people.

Account for the abolition of slavery in the United States.

Model Answer

Slavery in the United States was abolished through a combination of moral, political, economic and military pressures that came to a head in the 1860s under President Abraham Lincoln.

The abolitionist movement stirred the national conscience. Reformers, churches and freed black men such as Frederick Douglass campaigned tirelessly against the injustice and cruelty of slavery. Through books, newspapers, lectures and petitions they kept the wrong of slavery before the public eye and made it a burning moral question. Their persistent agitation slowly turned opinion in the North against the institution and prepared the ground for its abolition.

The enslaved resisted their own bondage. The slaves themselves never accepted their condition, and they resisted through revolts, sabotage, flight and every means available to them. Constant uprisings and escapes made slavery costly, dangerous and difficult to maintain, and they proved to the world that black people

would not remain content in chains. This unyielding resistance from below was a powerful force pushing the whole system toward collapse.

The industrial North relied on free labour. The northern states were industrialising and depended on free wage labour, factories and commerce rather than on slave plantations. Their economic interests clashed directly with those of the slave-holding South, whose wealth rested on cotton and bondage. This deep division between two economic systems set North against South and made the future of slavery the central question of the nation.

The American Civil War gave the opportunity. The war between North and South, fought from 1861 to 1865, turned the question of slavery into a matter of military survival for the Union. Freeing the slaves became a weapon with which to weaken the Confederacy and to strengthen the northern cause. The war thus gave President Lincoln both the reason and the power to strike at slavery in a way that had not been possible in peacetime.

The Emancipation Proclamation made freedom law. Lincoln issued the preliminary proclamation on 22 September 1862 and formally signed the Emancipation Proclamation on 1 January 1863. The proclamation declared slavery and the slave trade illegal in the American states and turned the war into a struggle for freedom. This decisive act of the President gave legal force to abolition and marked the beginning of the end of slavery in the United States.

Moral and international pressure isolated slavery. A growing belief in human equality, spread by the ideas of the age, made the ownership of human beings increasingly indefensible. The earlier abolition of slavery by Britain and other powers set an example and left the United States exposed as a defender of a dying injustice. This combination of moral conviction and international opinion helped to isolate slavery and to make its continuation impossible.

Abolition therefore came from the meeting of moral campaigning, black resistance, economic change and the opportunity of civil war; yet, as the Black Codes and the Klan soon showed, the end of slavery was only the beginning of the struggle for equality.

Question 12

'It is better to die than to live as slaves,' said Douglass, and a people learned to turn suffering into solidarity.

Explain how the experience of the African-Americans strengthened the spirit of Pan-Africanism.

Model Answer

The long experience of the African-Americans, from enslavement through exclusion to the fight for civil rights, did much to deepen and strengthen Pan-Africanism, in the following ways.

It produced the spirit of black solidarity. Generations of shared oppression taught African-Americans that they could survive and resist only by standing together as one people. Out of common suffering grew a spirit of cooperation and togetherness, the conviction that the fate of each was bound to the fate of all. This solidarity, forged in the diaspora, is the very heart of Pan-Africanism and the quality it sought to spread to Africans everywhere.

It created inspiring leaders. The struggle of the African-Americans threw up leaders of courage and vision, from Frederick Douglass to Marcus Mosiah Garvey and Martin Luther King Jr. These men gave the movement direction, voice and hope, and their example inspired black people far beyond America. In supplying such leadership, the African-American experience gave Pan-Africanism many of the figures who would shape and spread it.

It built a culture of resistance. Through songs, sermons, poems and slogans such as 'We shall overcome', African-Americans created and passed down a living culture of struggle. This culture kept hope alive across generations and taught each new generation to resist rather than submit. Carried across the black world, it strengthened the wider consciousness of struggle on which Pan-Africanism depended.

It linked civil rights to African liberation. In fighting their own battle for equality, African-Americans came to see that their dignity was bound up with the freedom of Africa itself. They understood that so long as Africa remained enslaved and colonised, black people everywhere would be despised. This recognition joined the struggle of the diaspora to the struggle of the continent and gave Pan-Africanism its uniting purpose.

It demonstrated the power of organisation. Through churches, associations, newspapers and mass movements, African-Americans showed how a scattered and oppressed people could organise themselves for change. Bodies such as Garvey's Universal Negro Improvement Association proved that black people could build institutions of their own on a great scale. This example of organisation was later carried into the Pan-African congresses and the wider movement.

It asserted black dignity. Against a system that taught black people to despise their colour and their heritage, African-Americans insisted on the worth, beauty and equality of the black race. This proud assertion of identity restored self-respect to a humiliated people and gave the movement a positive vision beyond mere grievance. Pan-Africanism drew from it the moral confidence that made it a movement of pride and not only of protest.

The African-American experience thus gave Pan-Africanism its spirit of solidarity, its leaders and its moral fire, transforming private suffering into a shared demand for the dignity of all Africans.

Question 13

Denied every peaceful door, African-Americans learned to push against the walls in a hundred ways.

Examine the methods used by the African-Americans to resist racial oppression.

Model Answer

The African-Americans, facing enslavement, segregation and violence, resisted their oppression through a wide range of methods over the centuries. The main ones were as follows.

They revolted and escaped under slavery. From the earliest days of bondage the enslaved refused to accept their condition and resisted it by every means open to them. They rose in revolt, destroyed tools and crops, worked slowly and ran away in great numbers toward freedom in the North. Such resistance made slavery costly and dangerous to maintain and proved that black people would never be content in chains.

They built black solidarity. The African-Americans learned that their strength lay in unity, and so they fostered a deep spirit of cooperation and togetherness. They stood by one another in suffering and in struggle, treating the wrong done to one as a wrong done to all. This solidarity, the refusal to be divided, was itself a powerful weapon of resistance and became the very heart of the Pan-African spirit.

They used songs and slogans. Denied schools, newspapers and public platforms, black people expressed and spread their resistance through songs, sermons, poems and slogans. Cries such as 'We shall overcome', associated with Martin Luther King Jr., and 'It is better to die than to live as slaves', linked to Frederick Douglass, gave voice to their determination. Passed from mouth to mouth, this culture of protest kept hope and defiance alive across the generations.

They organised into movements. The African-Americans built organisations through which to press their cause and to act together on a large scale. Bodies such as Marcus Garvey's Universal Negro Improvement Association and the Back-to-Africa Movement gathered millions and gave their protest form and direction. Through such organisation a scattered and oppressed people turned individual anger into a collective force for change.

They waged the civil rights struggle. In the twentieth century black Americans mounted a sustained struggle for equality and the vote. Under leaders such as Martin Luther King Jr., they used mass protest, marches, boycotts and non-violent resistance to challenge segregation and injustice. This disciplined and courageous campaign won important victories and inspired oppressed peoples far beyond the United States.

They asserted black pride and identity. Against a system that taught them to despise their colour and their heritage, African-Americans resisted by proclaiming the worth of the black race. They celebrated

African history and culture and insisted on the dignity and beauty of blackness. This assertion of pride was a form of resistance against cultural humiliation, and it gave the wider movement its confidence and its soul.

The African-Americans thus resisted through revolt, solidarity, culture, organisation and mass protest, and out of this long struggle grew the consciousness and leadership that fed Pan-Africanism.

Black Solidarity and the Back-to-Africa Movement

Question 14

If the New World would never grant them a home, some black leaders answered, then Africa must become one again.

Account for the rise of the Back-to-Africa Movement.

Model Answer

The Back-to-Africa Movement was the collective effort of African-Americans to free themselves from oppression in America by returning to their ancestral homeland. It arose from a cluster of related causes.

Oppression continued after slavery ended. The abolition of slavery had not brought the equality and dignity for which black people had hoped. Discrimination, humiliation and economic exploitation continued, and black people remained despised and shut out in the land of their birth. Many came to believe that they would never find true justice in the New World, and this despair turned their eyes toward Africa as the only place where they might live as free and equal human beings.

Emancipation had failed to bring equality. The years after the Civil War showed that legal freedom was not the same as real freedom. The Black Codes restricted the lives of the freed people, segregation kept them apart and inferior, and the violence of the Ku Klux Klan terrorised them. This bitter experience convinced many that America would never accept them as equals, and it strengthened the case for building a life elsewhere.

The philosophy of Black Solidarity pointed to Africa. The growing belief that all black people were one, sharing a common origin and destiny, led naturally to the idea of a homeland of their own. If black people were truly one nation, then that nation should be gathered and built where it belonged, in Africa. The philosophy of solidarity thus gave the return movement its guiding idea and its emotional power.

The American Colonisation Society provided a destination. The American Colonisation Society, formed in 1816, actively promoted the settlement of free black people in Africa. Its founding of the Republic of Liberia in 1847 gave the movement a real and practical destination rather than a mere dream. The existence of a place to which black people could actually go made the idea of return concrete and encouraged others to consider it.

The leadership of Marcus Garvey gave it force. Marcus Garvey founded the Back-to-Africa Movement in 1920 and, through the Universal Negro Improvement Association, gave it energy, organisation and a mass following. He preached the vision of a free and mighty African nation to which the scattered children of Africa should return. His powerful leadership turned a long-held hope into an organised movement that mobilised thousands and stirred millions.

The desire to preserve African identity inspired it. In America the culture, dignity and beliefs of African people had been despised and suppressed for centuries. The movement sought to rescue and rebuild that identity by returning to African soil, where it could flourish free of contempt. This wish to preserve and honour what was truly their own gave the Back-to-Africa Movement a deep cultural and spiritual motive beyond the escape from oppression.

The Back-to-Africa Movement therefore rose from the failure of American freedom, the philosophy of black solidarity and the leadership of Garvey; though few actually returned, it powerfully advanced the Pan-African idea of a united and self-governing Africa.

Question 15

He never set foot in the Africa he loved, yet millions marched under the red, black and green he gave them.

Assess the contribution of Marcus Garvey to the development of Pan-Africanism.

Model Answer

Marcus Mosiah Garvey was among the greatest of the Pan-African leaders. His contribution was immense, though not without weaknesses, and on balance he transformed Pan-Africanism from an elite idea into a mass movement.

He built a mass movement. Before Garvey, Pan-Africanism had been largely the concern of a small circle of educated men. Through the Universal Negro Improvement Association he reached and organised millions of ordinary black people in America, the Caribbean and beyond. By giving the movement a vast popular following, he transformed it from an elite discussion into a force of the masses, and this was perhaps his greatest single achievement.

He founded the Back-to-Africa Movement. In 1920 Garvey launched the Back-to-Africa Movement and gave the old dream of return a bold and organised form. He called on the scattered children of Africa to go back and build a free and mighty nation of their own. Though few actually made the journey, the movement fixed the vision of a self-governing Africa firmly in the minds of black people everywhere.

He instilled black pride. At a time when black people had been taught for centuries to despise their own colour and heritage, Garvey preached the beauty, dignity and greatness of the black race. He told his followers that black was not a mark of shame but a source of pride, and that Africa had a glorious past and future. This restoration of self-respect to a humiliated people was among his deepest and most lasting gifts.

He promoted economic self-reliance. Garvey believed that black people would never be truly free until they controlled their own economic life. Through ventures such as the Black Star Line shipping company and various businesses, he sought to build black economic independence and to link Africa with its diaspora in trade. Although these enterprises failed, they taught the important lesson that political freedom must rest on economic strength.

He built links with Africa. Garvey worked to connect the diaspora with the continent, establishing contact with African leaders such as Abd el-Karim of Morocco. He created an international convention, a kind of parliament, where black people from different lands could meet and discuss their common cause. In this way he strengthened the bond between Africa and its scattered children that lies at the centre of Pan-Africanism.

His schemes, however, had serious weaknesses. For all his vision, Garvey's practical enterprises were often poorly managed and short-lived. The Black Star Line collapsed in financial ruin, his declaration of himself as provisional president of Africa was resented by other Pan-Africanists, and his imprisonment and deportation to Jamaica cut short his work. These failures showed that his grand designs had outrun his means to achieve them.

Weighing his achievements against his failures, Garvey's contribution was decisive: whatever the collapse of his enterprises, he turned Pan-Africanism into a movement of the masses and left a legacy of black pride that outlived him.

Question 16

The road back to Africa proved longer, and harder, than its dreamers had imagined.

Examine the factors that limited the success of the Back-to-Africa Movement.

Model Answer

Although the Back-to-Africa Movement advanced the Pan-African idea, only a small number of African-Americans ever returned to Africa. Its limited success is explained by the following factors.

The American government opposed it. The government of the United States regarded African-Americans as an essential source of cheap labour for its farms and industries. Unwilling to lose this labour, it viewed

the movement with suspicion and worked to frustrate it at every turn. This powerful official hostility deprived the movement of the freedom and support it needed to grow and to carry out its plans.

The imprisonment of Garvey removed its leader. The Back-to-Africa Movement depended heavily on the energy and vision of Marcus Garvey. When he was imprisoned on charges connected with his business affairs and then deported to Jamaica, the movement lost the leader who had given it life. Without his commanding presence and organising genius, it lost direction and momentum and was never able to recover its former strength.

Tropical diseases discouraged the returnees. Many of the ex-slaves who did return to Africa, such as the early settlers taken to Sierra Leone, died in large numbers from tropical diseases to which they had no resistance. News of these deaths spread fear among those considering the journey and made the prospect of return seem perilous. The heavy toll of disease thus became a serious practical obstacle to the movement's success.

Ignorance of Africa bred reluctance. After generations in the New World, most African-Americans knew little of Africa beyond the distorted images spread by their oppressors. The continent seemed strange, distant and frightening rather than a welcoming home. This ignorance and the fears it produced made many reluctant to abandon the only land they had ever known for an unknown Africa.

Attachment to America held people back. For all the injustice they suffered, African-Americans had lived in the New World for many generations and had built their families, communities and churches there. The majority came to feel that their true struggle was to win their rights in America rather than to leave it. This deep attachment to the land of their birth led most to remain and fight for change at home.

Weak resources and organisation crippled it. Transporting and resettling large numbers of people across the Atlantic required enormous funds and careful organisation. The movement's economic ventures, above all the Black Star Line, collapsed in financial failure and mismanagement. Left without ships, money or a sound organisation, the movement simply lacked the means to carry its followers to Africa on the scale it had promised.

The Back-to-Africa Movement was therefore limited by government hostility, the loss of its leader, the dangers of return and the attachment of black people to America; yet in failing to move bodies to Africa it succeeded in moving minds toward Pan-African unity.

Question 17

The movement asked a simple question with a vast answer: where does a scattered people truly belong?

Examine the objectives of the Back-to-Africa Movement.

Model Answer

The Back-to-Africa Movement, led by Marcus Garvey, sought to free African-Americans from oppression by returning them to their ancestral homeland. Its objectives were as follows.

To promote cooperation among black people. The movement aimed above all to build a spirit of unity and togetherness among black people wherever they lived. It held that all people of African descent, in the New World and on the continent, were one people with one destiny. By fostering this cooperation and solidarity, it sought to make black people a single force capable of winning their freedom and dignity.

To resettle African-Americans in Africa. A central objective was to encourage the emigration of African-Americans back to Africa, the land of their ancestors. The movement presented return as the true solution to the oppression and humiliation that black people suffered in America. Africa was to become the home in which they could at last live as free and equal human beings rather than as a despised minority.

To support African liberation. The movement held that the diaspora had a duty to help free the African continent itself from colonial rule. Those who returned were to work alongside their fellow Africans to build a free and mighty nation. In this way the objective of return was joined to the wider Pan-African aim of the liberation and unity of Africa.

To achieve economic self-reliance. Garvey and his followers believed that black people could not be truly free while they remained economically dependent on others. Through ventures such as the Black Star Line shipping company and other black-owned businesses, the movement sought to build economic independence. It aimed to link Africa with its diaspora in trade and to prove that black people could run great enterprises of their own.

To preserve African culture and dignity. The movement sought to rescue and protect the culture, beliefs and dignity of the African people, which had been despised and suppressed in America. By rebuilding African life on African soil, it hoped to restore what slavery and racism had tried to destroy. The preservation of a proud African identity was thus one of its deepest and most cherished aims.

To end racial segregation. The leaders of the movement worked to eradicate the segregation and discrimination to which black people were subjected in America. They called constantly on African-Americans to unite and to press for social change and equal treatment. The struggle against segregation was thus bound up with the movement's larger vision of a free and dignified black people.

The objectives of the Back-to-Africa Movement were therefore unity, resettlement, liberation, economic self-reliance and the preservation of African dignity; and though few returned, these aims powerfully advanced the Pan-African cause.

Question 18

Long before Garvey, a society of a very different colour dreamed of sending black Americans across the sea.

Explain the role of the American Colonisation Society in the resettlement of freed slaves in Africa.

Model Answer

The American Colonisation Society (ACS), formed in 1816, promoted the settlement of free black people from America in Africa. Its role in the resettlement of freed slaves was as follows.

It organised the earliest resettlement. The American Colonisation Society, founded in 1816 as the American Society for Colonising the Free People of Colour, took the lead in sending free black people from America to Africa. It raised funds, secured ships and arranged the passage and settlement of emigrants. In doing so it became the first organised body to turn the idea of return into a practical undertaking.

It made the first attempt in 1820. The first attempt to carry ex-slaves to Africa was made in 1820, when a group of settlers was taken to the West African coast near Sierra Leone. The venture met with great hardship, for many of the settlers died of tropical diseases to which they had no resistance. This costly beginning revealed both the seriousness of the effort and the dangers that would limit its success.

It founded the Republic of Liberia. In 1847 the settlements established by the Society came together to form the Republic of Liberia on the West African coast. Liberia became the chief destination for African-American ex-slaves seeking a home in Africa. Its founding gave the whole idea of resettlement a concrete and lasting form, a free black republic on African soil.

It settled thousands of ex-slaves. Over the following decades a substantial number of African-Americans migrated to Liberia under the Society's auspices, especially in the 1880s and 1890s. There they sought the freedom, dignity and self-government denied to them in America. Though modest against the size of the black population in America, these settlers gave reality to the dream of return.

It gave the return idea a practical form. Before the Society, the notion of returning to Africa had been little more than a vague and distant hope. By providing organisation, ships and above all a real destination in Liberia, the ACS made return an actual possibility. In this way it prepared the ground for the later and greater Back-to-Africa Movement of Marcus Garvey.

Its motives, however, were mixed. The Society was not a purely black or purely benevolent body, for it included white members with their own purposes. Some of these wished simply to remove free black people

from America, whom they regarded as a problem, rather than to advance black freedom. The work of the ACS therefore served several interests at once, and its mixed motives limited the trust it could command.

The American Colonisation Society thus pioneered the resettlement of freed slaves, founding Liberia and giving the Back-to-Africa idea a practical home, even though its returns were small and its motives mixed.

The Pan-African Congresses, 1900 to 1945

Question 19

For three days in the summer of 1900, a word was coined in London that would one day shake empires: Pan-Africanism.

Explain the significance of the London Conference of 1900.

Model Answer

The London Conference, held from 23 to 25 July 1900 and organised by the Trinidadian lawyer Henry Sylvester Williams, was the first Pan-African conference. Its significance lies in the following points.

It coined the concept of Pan-Africanism. The London Conference gave the movement its very name and its guiding idea, fixing the notion of Pan-Africanism for the first time. What had been a scattered and unnamed feeling of solidarity among black people now became a defined cause with a clear identity. By naming the movement, the conference gave it a banner under which black people everywhere could gather.

It was the first organised Pan-African gathering. For the first time in history, people of African origin from Africa, the Americas and the Caribbean came together deliberately to discuss their common problems. The very act of assembling across oceans proved that the idea of a single African people could be turned into organised action. This first gathering set the pattern of congresses that would carry the movement forward for the next half-century.

It brought forward W. E. B. Du Bois. The conference was attended by the young scholar W. E. B. Du Bois, who would become the movement's greatest early leader. It was here that he began the work of spreading and popularising Pan-Africanism to which he would devote his life. In launching Du Bois upon this path, the London Conference shaped the leadership of the movement for decades to come.

It appealed to the imperial power. The conference addressed itself directly to the British government, calling on it to protect people of African origin from imperialist exploitation. In doing so it set the early method of the movement, which was to petition and appeal to the colonial powers rather than to confront them. This approach of reasoned appeal would guide the congresses until the more radical turn of 1945.

It protested colonial exploitation. The London Conference served as a forum in which the oppression of black people under colonial rule could be openly condemned. Delegates spoke against the injustices suffered by Africans in the colonies and demanded fairer and more humane treatment. By giving a public voice to these grievances, the conference placed the sufferings of colonised Africans before the conscience of the world.

It called for solidarity among Africans. The conference urged unity and cooperation between Africans on the continent and their kinsmen in the diaspora. It insisted that black people everywhere shared one cause and should support one another in the struggle against oppression. This appeal for solidarity planted the seed of the wider Pan-African movement that the later congresses would nourish and grow.

The London Conference of 1900 was therefore the birth of organised Pan-Africanism: it named the movement, gathered its people, produced its greatest early leader and set the method of protest that the next forty-five years would follow.

Question 20

From Paris to Manchester, a series of gatherings slowly sharpened a plea into a demand.

Examine the major resolutions of the Pan-African Congresses held between 1900 and 1945.

Model Answer

Six Pan-African congresses were held between 1900 and 1945, most of them in Europe. Their resolutions grew steadily bolder, moving from appeals for protection to demands for independence.

The London Conference of 1900. The first conference coined the term Pan-Africanism and set the movement in motion. Its central resolution appealed to the British government to protect people of African origin from imperialist exploitation. In doing so it established the early pattern of reasoned appeal to the colonial powers, a moderate approach that the next congresses would follow before the movement grew bolder.

The Paris Conference of 1919. Organised by Du Bois and Ida Gibbs Hunt just after the First World War, this congress petitioned the Versailles Peace Conference to grant a mandate over the former German colonies. Its resolutions demanded the protection of the natives of Africa, the abolition of slavery and the slave trade, universal education for African children and the right of Africans to own their land. It thus set out a clear programme of reform on behalf of colonised Africans.

The Brussels Conference of 1921. Attended by 113 delegates, this congress condemned racial segregation and demanded equal rights and self-determination for all people of African origin. It endorsed the famous 'Declaration to the World', which proclaimed that the equality of all races was the absolute foundation of human advancement. At Brussels the Senegalese Blaise Diagne was condemned for his readiness to serve French colonial interests.

The Lisbon Conference of 1923. Held in the Portuguese capital, this congress expressed its dissatisfaction with Garveyism and its rival vision of the movement. Its resolutions demanded that black people should have a voice in their own governments, should be free to own land and should enjoy a fair trial under the law. Above all it insisted, simply but powerfully, that black people be treated as human beings.

The New York Conference of 1927. Meeting as fascism rose in Europe, this congress was alarmed by the threat that Italy would invade Ethiopia. It responded by forming the International African Friends of Abyssinia, an association to arouse support for the victims of fascist aggression and to defend Ethiopia's independence. In this way the movement began to link the cause of Africa to the wider struggle against fascism and imperialism.

The Manchester Congress of 1945. The last and most decisive of the congresses declared national liberation to be the main goal of Pan-Africanism. It condemned indirect rule, the segregation of South Africa and the Kipande system of Kenya as instruments of oppression. Boldly, it resolved that Africans would resort to force if the imperial powers refused to grant them independence, marking the movement's decisive turn from appeal to demand.

Across these congresses the resolutions hardened from requests for protection into a clear demand for self-government, so that by 1945 Pan-Africanism had become the programme of African independence.

Question 21

In a Manchester hall in 1945 sat the men who would soon rule free nations: Nkrumah, Kenyatta, Azikiwe.

Account for the description of the Manchester Congress of 1945 as a turning point in the history of Pan-Africanism.

Model Answer

The Manchester Congress of 1945 is regarded as the great turning point in the history of Pan-Africanism because it shifted the movement from protest in the diaspora to a programme for African independence. The reasons are as follows.

It was led by Africans of the continent. Unlike the earlier congresses, which had been dominated by black intellectuals of the diaspora, Manchester was attended and increasingly led by Africans of the continent itself. Among them were Kwame Nkrumah, Jomo Kenyatta, Nnamdi Azikiwe, Joseph Danquah and George Padmore, young men who would soon lead their nations to freedom. This passing of leadership to continental Africans changed the whole character and direction of the movement.

It made independence the goal. The Manchester Congress declared that the national liberation of Africa was now the main aim of Pan-Africanism. It thus replaced the earlier appeals for protection and reform with a clear and direct demand for freedom and self-government. This was a decisive change of purpose, for the movement no longer asked the colonial powers to be kinder but demanded that they leave altogether.

It accepted the use of force. In a sharp break from the moderation of the earlier congresses, Manchester resolved that Africans would use violent means if the imperial powers refused to grant independence. This willingness to consider force showed a new determination and militancy in the movement. It signalled that Pan-Africanism had passed from patient petitioning to a resolute struggle prepared to use every means necessary.

It attacked the colonial system directly. The congress condemned the very machinery of colonial rule, including indirect rule, colonial constitutional reforms, the segregation of South Africa and the Kipande system of Kenya. By naming and attacking these instruments of oppression, it addressed the real grievances of ordinary Africans. This direct assault on the colonial system marked a far bolder stance than the general appeals of earlier years.

It linked Africa to a global struggle. The Manchester Congress placed the freedom of Africa within a worldwide movement against imperialism. It expressed support for the liberation struggles of other oppressed peoples in India, China, Indonesia and Vietnam. By joining the African cause to this global anti-colonial front, the congress gave the movement a wider vision and a sense of belonging to a great historical tide.

It shifted the movement onto African soil. After Manchester the centre of Pan-African activity moved decisively from Europe and America to Africa itself. The delegates returned home to build mass parties and to lead the independence struggles of the 1950s and 1960s. In this way the congress marked the moment when Pan-Africanism ceased to be a movement of the scattered and became the driving force of African liberation.

Manchester was thus the hinge on which Pan-Africanism turned: from a movement of the scattered pleading for protection into a movement of Africans demanding, and soon winning, their independence.

Question 22

If Garvey was the voice of the crowd, Du Bois was the pen of the movement.

Assess the contribution of W. E. B. Du Bois to the development of Pan-Africanism.

Model Answer

William Edward Burghardt Du Bois was among the greatest architects of Pan-Africanism. His contribution, chiefly intellectual and organisational, was immense, and he is often called the father of the Pan-African congresses.

He popularised Pan-Africanism. Du Bois attended the London Conference of 1900 and thereafter did more than any other to spread and popularise the idea of Pan-Africanism. Through his writings, his speeches and his tireless organising, he carried the movement to a wide audience on both sides of the Atlantic. In making Pan-Africanism widely known and respected, he transformed it from an obscure idea into a recognised cause.

He organised the congresses. Du Bois was the driving force behind the series of Pan-African congresses that gave the movement its shape. He convened and led the Paris Conference of 1919, which he organised together with Ida Gibbs Hunt, and the congresses that followed. This work of organisation earned him his title as the father of the Pan-African congresses.

He built an international platform. Through the successive congresses of 1919, 1921, 1923 and 1927, Du Bois gave the movement a durable presence on the world stage. These gatherings pressed the demands of black people upon the colonial powers and upon international opinion. In building such a platform, he ensured that the grievances of Africa and its diaspora could be heard far beyond their own communities.

He demanded rights and self-determination. Du Bois used the congresses to advance clear demands for justice and freedom. He championed the 'Declaration to the World', which proclaimed the equality of all races, and called for equal rights, universal education and the right of Africans to own their land. Through these demands he turned the movement's ideals into a concrete programme of reform.

He linked scholarship to struggle. A distinguished scholar and writer, Du Bois brought intellectual weight and prestige to the movement. His learning allowed him to argue the case for black equality with authority and to connect the struggle of the African-Americans to that of Africa itself. In joining scholarship to activism, he gave Pan-Africanism both a mind and a voice.

His approach, however, had limits. For all his achievements, Du Bois's movement remained largely elite, moderate and intellectual in character. It relied on petitions and appeals and never gained the vast popular following that Garvey commanded. Only with the Manchester Congress of 1945, and the entry of continental Africans, did the movement broaden into the mass force that Du Bois's congresses had not by themselves become.

Du Bois's contribution was therefore decisive: he popularised Pan-Africanism, built and led its congresses and gave it intellectual authority, earning his place as the father of the organised movement.

Question 23

The movement changed its accent as it crossed the sea, from the diaspora's plea to the continent's demand.

Compare the diaspora phase and the African phase of Pan-Africanism.

Model Answer

Pan-Africanism passed through two broad phases: an early diaspora phase, from 1900 to 1945, and a later African phase, from 1945 onwards. They may be compared in leadership, aims, methods and location.

Their leadership differed. The diaspora phase was led by black people of the Americas and the Caribbean, such as Blyden, Williams, Du Bois and Garvey, who spoke for a scattered people. The African phase, by contrast, was led by Africans of the continent itself, such as Kwame Nkrumah and Jomo Kenyatta. This shift in leadership from the diaspora to the continent is the clearest difference between the two phases.

Their aims differed. In its first phase the movement sought protection, equal rights and dignity for black people within the existing colonial order. In its second phase it demanded nothing less than the outright national independence of Africa. The aim thus changed from the reform of colonial rule to its complete removal, a far bolder and more revolutionary goal.

Their methods differed. The diaspora phase relied on moderate methods, chiefly petitions, conferences and appeals to the imperial powers and to world opinion. The African phase embraced mass politics, building parties and trade unions and accepting the use of force where independence was refused. The movement therefore passed from reasoned appeal to organised and, if necessary, militant struggle.

Their location shifted. The early congresses were held in the great cities of Europe and America, such as London, Paris, Brussels and New York, far from Africa itself. After 1945 the movement moved onto African soil, where its leaders returned to build parties and lead the independence struggles. The centre of gravity of Pan-Africanism thus travelled from the diaspora to the continent.

Yet the two shared a common core. For all their differences, both phases rested on the same fundamental beliefs. Each held that all people of African descent shared one identity and one destiny, and each opposed racism, colonialism and imperialism. This common foundation shows that the two phases were not separate movements but stages of a single, continuous struggle.

And the later grew from the earlier. The African phase did not spring from nothing but inherited the ideology, the organisation and the trained leaders of the diaspora phase. Nkrumah and Kenyatta themselves were shaped by the congresses and the thought of Du Bois and Garvey. The continent, in other words, took up and completed a movement that the diaspora had raised and nurtured.

The two phases therefore differed in leadership, aims, methods and location but shared one foundation; the diaspora raised the movement, and the continent brought it to fulfilment in independence.

From Pan-Africanism to the Organisation of African Unity

Question 24

On a May morning in Addis Ababa in 1963, the flags of free Africa gathered under one roof for the first time.

Account for the formation of the Organisation of African Unity in 1963.

Model Answer

On 25 May 1963 a summit of African Heads of State met in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, and resolved to create the Organisation of African Unity (OAU). Its formation was the fruit of Pan-Africanism and of several pressing needs.

The achievement of independence demanded a common body. By the early 1960s a great wave of decolonisation had swept the continent, and many African states had won their independence. These new nations, having long dreamed of African unity, now sought a permanent organisation in which to express it. The very success of the independence struggles thus created both the need and the opportunity for a continental body such as the OAU.

The legacy of the Manchester Congress inspired it. The Manchester Congress of 1945 had made the unity and liberation of Africa the goal of Pan-Africanism, and its resolutions were carried home by leaders such as Kwame Nkrumah. As these leaders took power in their own countries, they worked to turn that vision into an institution. The OAU was in this sense the direct heir of Manchester, giving lasting form to the ideals proclaimed there.

The Accra Conference of 1958 prepared the ground. The first Conference of Independent African States, held in Accra in 1958 under Nkrumah, brought the free nations of Africa together for the first time. It allowed them to discuss common problems and to build the habit of cooperation among sovereign African states. This gathering pointed the way toward a formal union and served as an important step on the road to the OAU.

The unfinished task of decolonisation required unity. Although much of Africa was now free, large parts of the continent remained under colonial, settler or racist rule, including the Portuguese colonies and apartheid South Africa. The independent states recognised that only by uniting could they effectively support the liberation of the rest of Africa. The need to complete the freedom of the continent was therefore a powerful reason for creating a common organisation.

The reconciliation of rival blocs made it possible. In the years before 1963 the independent states had divided into rival groups, the radical Casablanca bloc and the more moderate Monrovia bloc, which differed over the form that unity should take. The OAU was the compromise that reconciled these visions and brought the two camps together in a single body. Without this reconciliation, no continent-wide organisation could have been founded.

The prestige of leading statesmen secured it. The creation of the OAU was made possible by the support and authority of Africa's foremost leaders. Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia hosted the founding summit and lent it his great prestige, while Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana was its most passionate champion. The weight of such statesmen helped to overcome hesitation and to bring the organisation into being at Addis Ababa.

The OAU was therefore the institutional harvest of Pan-Africanism: it turned the long dream of unity into a permanent organisation charged with defending African independence and completing the liberation of the continent.

Question 25

The charter signed in Addis Ababa carried the hopes of a continent into a single document.

Examine the aims of the Organisation of African Unity.

Model Answer

The Organisation of African Unity (OAU), founded on 25 May 1963, was created to give institutional form to Pan-Africanism. Its main aims were as follows.

To promote the unity and solidarity of African states. The first and greatest aim of the OAU was to bring the independent states of Africa together in a single organisation. It sought to express and strengthen the unity of a continent long divided by colonialism and to make the African states act as one. This aim was the direct inheritance of the Pan-African dream of a united Africa.

To defend sovereignty and territorial integrity. The OAU set out to protect the hard-won independence of its member states against outside interference. It upheld the sovereignty and the borders of each nation and opposed any attempt by foreign powers to dominate them. In a continent newly freed from colonial rule, the defence of independence was a natural and pressing purpose.

To eradicate colonialism from Africa. Although many states were now free, large parts of Africa remained under colonial, settler or racist rule. The OAU aimed to complete the liberation of the continent by supporting the remaining independence struggles. It established a Liberation Committee to aid the movements fighting against Portuguese colonialism, white settler regimes and apartheid.

To coordinate cooperation for development. The OAU sought to harmonise the policies of its members in order to advance the welfare of African peoples. It aimed to promote cooperation in political, economic, educational, cultural and health matters across the continent. Through such coordination it hoped to overcome the weakness and division that colonialism had left behind.

To promote international cooperation. The organisation aimed to give Africa a common voice and a respected place in world affairs. It undertook to cooperate with the United Nations and other international bodies in the spirit of the sovereign equality of states. By acting together on the world stage, the African states hoped to defend their interests more effectively than they could alone.

To fight apartheid and racial discrimination. The OAU set itself firmly against the apartheid regime of South Africa and against all forms of racial discrimination on the continent. It supported the peoples struggling under white minority rule and worked to isolate the racist regimes internationally. This struggle against racial oppression carried forward one of the oldest concerns of Pan-Africanism.

The aims of the OAU were therefore unity, the defence of sovereignty, the completion of decolonisation, cooperation for development and the struggle against apartheid; in these aims the long dream of Pan-Africanism became a working programme.

Pan-Africanism since the 1960s

Question 26

Half a century after the flags of freedom rose, the question returns: does the old dream still speak to a new Africa?

Evaluate the relevance of Pan-Africanism in the twenty-first century.

Model Answer

Pan-Africanism began as a movement against slavery and colonialism, both of which have passed. Yet, evaluated carefully, it remains largely relevant in the twenty-first century, though its tasks have changed.

It still drives continental unity. The dream of a united Africa did not die with the end of colonialism but lives on in the African Union, which replaced the OAU in 2002. The AU continues the Pan-African goal of political unity and gives Africa a single voice in world affairs. So long as the continent seeks to act together rather than as scattered and weak states, the uniting vision of Pan-Africanism remains fully relevant.

It underpins economic integration. Pan-Africanism inspires the drive to knit Africa's economies together and to reduce their dependence on the former colonial powers. It lies behind regional bodies such as ECOWAS, the East African Community and SADC, and behind the wider push for intra-African trade.

Since economic weakness and fragmentation remain among Africa's greatest problems, this integrating purpose is as important today as ever.

It supplies the ideology against neo-colonialism. Although formal colonial rule has ended, the economies and politics of Africa are still heavily shaped by outside powers and interests. Pan-Africanism provides the language and the spirit with which Africans resist this neo-colonial domination and assert their independence. In an age of globalisation and foreign influence, its call for self-reliance and dignity retains real force.

It promotes a shared identity and dignity. Pan-Africanism continues to foster pride in a common African heritage and a sense of belonging among Africans on the continent and in the diaspora. Through cultural exchanges, festivals and the celebration of shared history, it strengthens the bonds of solidarity between African peoples. This nurturing of identity and dignity remains valuable in a world that has long belittled Africa.

It advances social justice. In its modern form Pan-Africanism concerns itself with human rights, democratic governance and the fight against poverty, inequality and disease. It calls on African states to serve the wellbeing of their peoples and to build a more just order both within Africa and in the world. These aims give the movement a continuing purpose long after the defeat of colonialism.

Its promise, however, remains only partly fulfilled. For all its ideals, Pan-Africanism is still frustrated by narrow nationalism, weak and divided institutions, dependence on foreign aid and a frequent lack of political will. The unity and self-reliance it preaches remain more an aspiration than an achievement. Its relevance therefore lies precisely in the fact that its central task, a truly united and self-reliant Africa, is still unfinished.

Pan-Africanism is therefore still relevant, but as an unfinished task: the enemies of slavery and colonialism are gone, yet the work of uniting, developing and dignifying Africa continues, and it is to that work that Pan-Africanism now calls.

Question 27

By 2002 a new century asked the old organisation to become something more.

Account for the transformation of the Organisation of African Unity into the African Union in 2002.

Model Answer

In 2002 the Organisation of African Unity was replaced by the African Union (AU). This transformation came about for a number of connected reasons.

The OAU had achieved its first task. The OAU had been founded above all to complete the liberation of Africa from colonial and racist rule. By the 1990s this task was largely done, culminating in the fall of apartheid and the freedom of South Africa in 1994. Having accomplished its original purpose, the organisation needed a new mission suited to a continent that was now politically free.

Africa needed to shift to development. With colonialism defeated, the continent's most pressing problems had become poverty, underdevelopment, disease and disunity. A body designed to fight for independence was not well suited to the different work of promoting economic growth and integration. A new organisation was therefore needed to turn Africa's energies toward development and cooperation.

The OAU had proved weak. The OAU had often been criticised as little more than a talking-shop, unable to enforce its decisions. Its strict principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of member states left it powerless to act against tyranny, corruption or conflict within its own borders. This weakness convinced many that a stronger and more effective body was required.

Globalisation demanded a stronger voice. The world was drawing together into a single global economy in which small and divided states counted for little. To protect its interests, Africa needed to integrate its economies and to speak with one stronger and more united voice. The old organisation was poorly equipped for this task, and a new union was needed to meet the challenges of globalisation.

Leaders sought deeper unity. Many African leaders had come to believe that the loose cooperation of the OAU was no longer enough. They wanted a closer union, modelled in part upon the European Union, with real institutions such as a Pan-African Parliament, a Court of Justice and a Peace and Security Council. This desire for a deeper and more effective unity drove the creation of the African Union.

Prominent statesmen drove the change. The transformation was pushed forward by a number of influential African leaders who championed a renewed continental body. Statesmen such as Thabo Mbeki of South Africa promoted the new union and its development programme, the New Partnership for Africa's Development, known as NEPAD. Their vision and energy carried the project through to the launching of the African Union in 2002.

The African Union was therefore born from the OAU's own success and its shortcomings: having freed the continent, Africa needed a stronger body to unite and develop it, and the AU was created to carry that newer, harder task.

Chapter 2

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN THE 18TH AND 19TH CENTURIES

Attempt each question in full on paper before you read the model answer beneath it. The questions follow the chapter topic by topic and rise in demand.

The concept and phases of the Industrial Revolution

Question 1

In the span of a single lifetime, the workshop of the home gave way to the roar of the factory, and the world was never the same.

Explain the concept of the Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The Industrial Revolution refers to the series of technological changes and innovations that transformed industrial production from the cottage to the factory system between the 1750s and the 1840s in Western Europe, notably England. Its meaning can be understood through the following features.

It was a shift from cottage to factory production. Before the revolution, goods were made by hand in small cottage industries in the home, slowly and in small quantities. The revolution moved production into large factories where all the operations were concentrated under one roof and driven by machines. This change from domestic handwork to mechanised factory production is the very core of what the term describes.

It was driven by technological innovation. The period was marked by a wave of inventions such as the spinning jenny and the steam engine that mechanised the making of goods. These machines revolutionised industries such as textiles, mining and transportation, multiplying output far beyond what human hands alone could achieve. Technology, above all, was the engine that drove the whole transformation forward.

It brought massive industrial production. The revolution marked the beginning of production on a scale never seen before in human history. Factories using machines could turn out goods in quantities that the old cottage system could never match. This great increase in output moved economies from small craft manufacture toward mass production for wide markets.

It transformed the structure of the economy. The revolution brought cumulative structural changes that shifted society from an agrarian base to an industrial one. New relations of production emerged, and wealth came increasingly from industry, trade and the factory rather than from land. The whole economic order was reshaped around machine production and the pursuit of profit.

It created new social classes. The rise of the factory produced a new class structure, above all the industrial capitalists who owned the factories and the working class who laboured in them for wages. These new and often opposed classes gave rise to fresh social tensions and struggles between owners and workers. The revolution thus changed not only how goods were made but who made them and who profited.

It caused urbanisation and political change. As people moved from the countryside to work in the factories, small towns swelled into great and crowded industrial cities. This urbanisation, together with the rise of new classes, led in time to the emergence of new political demands and institutions. Society itself was remade in its towns, its classes and its politics.

The Industrial Revolution was therefore far more than a set of new machines; it was a profound and cumulative transformation of technology, economy, society and politics that turned an agrarian world into an industrial one.

Question 2

The age of iron and steam gave way, within a century, to the age of steel and electricity.

Examine the phases of the Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The Industrial Revolution, which unfolded between the mid-eighteenth and the late nineteenth centuries, is generally divided into two main phases, the first and the second industrial revolutions, each with its own technologies and character.

The first phase ran from the 1750s to the 1840s. This first industrial revolution witnessed the beginning of the structural transformation of European industrialisation. It was centred in Britain and rested on the mechanisation of textiles, mining and transport, and on the birth of the factory system. It marked the passage from small-scale handwork to large-scale machine production.

The first phase was dominated by textiles, iron and coal. The leading industries of this period were the textile mills, the iron foundries and the coal mines that powered them. Inventions such as the spinning jenny and the steam engine transformed these industries first and fastest. Britain, richly supplied with coal and iron, naturally led the world in this phase.

The first phase was led by Britain alone. The first industrial revolution was primarily confined to Britain, which guarded its lead with care. Britain protected her technology by prohibiting the export of machinery, of skilled workers and of production techniques. For a generation she was, in effect, the sole workshop of the world.

The second phase ran from the 1840s to 1914. The second industrial revolution spanned from around the 1840s to the outbreak of the First World War in 1914. It marked a significant departure from the first, above all in the prominent role now played by pure science in industrial development. It was, in essence, an age of scientific industry.

The second phase was dominated by steel, chemicals and electricity. Whereas the first phase rested on textiles, iron and coal, the second was driven by the newer industries of steel, chemicals and electricity. Advances in transport, such as railways and steamships, shrank the world and knitted together a global economy. Science and industry were now closely and deliberately joined.

The second phase spread industrial leadership beyond Britain. The second industrial revolution shifted industrial leadership from Britain and France to countries such as Belgium, Germany, Italy and the USA. Through the collaboration of scientists, entrepreneurs and states, these nations caught up with and overtook the early leader. Industry thus became a worldwide and increasingly competitive force.

The two phases were therefore stages of one long transformation: the first, British and based on textiles, iron and coal, gave way to the second, more scientific and international and based on steel, chemicals and electricity, together carrying the world from the age of steam into the modern industrial era.

The causes and inventions of the Industrial Revolution

Question 3

Of all the nations of the world, it was Britain that first crossed the threshold into the industrial age, and not by mere accident.

Account for the factors that gave rise to the Industrial Revolution in Britain.

Model Answer

The Industrial Revolution began in Britain in the mid-eighteenth century, rather than elsewhere, because of a fortunate combination of economic, social and natural conditions. The main factors were as follows.

A growing population increased the demand for goods. Britain's population rose rapidly during the eighteenth century, and this growth created a demand for goods that the old cottage industries could no longer satisfy. Producers, entrepreneurs and inventors were driven to seek faster and cheaper ways of manufacturing to keep pace. This pressure of demand led directly toward machines and the factory system.

The accumulation of capital provided the means. Britain had gathered great wealth from her commerce and empire, including the profits of the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade and the plantation economy. This capital

was available to be invested in machines, factories, mines and canals. Without such funds the costly new industries could never have been built.

Abundant natural resources gave a natural advantage. Britain was richly endowed with the coal and iron on which the new industries depended. Coal fired the steam engines while iron built the machines, the railways and the factories themselves. The ready supply of these resources at home gave Britain a decisive advantage in industrialisation.

Changes in agriculture released a supply of labour. Improvements and enclosures in farming freed many people from the land and created a large pool of workers seeking employment. As rural communities declined, this labour drifted into the towns in search of work in the new industries. The factories thus found the abundant hands that they required.

Colonies and markets encouraged large-scale production. Britain possessed a vast empire and a powerful navy that secured both raw materials and markets across the world. Her colonies supplied cotton and other materials and in turn bought her manufactured goods. This secure and expanding trade encouraged producers to manufacture on an ever-larger scale.

Political stability and a spirit of invention favoured industry. Britain enjoyed relative political stability and a strong, free class of capitalists, unlike France, which was absorbed in revolution and war. This settled order, together with a lively spirit of invention and enterprise, encouraged men to risk their money on new machines. The result was a climate in which industry could take root and flourish.

The Industrial Revolution therefore arose first in Britain because population, capital, resources, labour, markets and a stable, inventive society came together there as nowhere else, making her the workshop of the world.

Question 4

A handful of machines, made of wood and iron, did the work of a thousand hands.

Examine the major inventions of the first Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The first Industrial Revolution was carried forward by a series of great inventions that mechanised production, above all in the textile industry and in the supply of power. The most important were as follows.

The spinning jenny transformed the making of thread. The spinning jenny allowed a single worker to spin many threads at once instead of only one. It broke the old bottleneck in which weaving had outrun the slow spinning of yarn, and it multiplied the output of thread enormously. It was among the first machines to revolutionise the textile industry.

The water frame moved spinning into the factory. Machines such as the water frame harnessed water power to spin strong thread on a large scale. Driven first by water and later by steam, they carried spinning out of the cottage and into the factory. In this way they made possible the mass production of cotton thread.

The power loom mechanised weaving. The power loom mechanised the weaving of cloth so that it could match the vastly increased supply of thread. It replaced the slow handloom of the cottage weaver with a machine that could work tirelessly and swiftly. Together with the spinning machines, it completed the mechanisation of the textile industry.

The steam engine supplied a new and mighty power. The greatest invention of the age was the steam engine, improved by James Watt into a powerful and reliable source of energy. Freed from dependence on wind and water, factories could now be built anywhere and worked at any hour. Steam came to power the mills, the mines and eventually the railways and steamships.

Advances in iron and coal supplied the materials. New methods of smelting iron with coke, together with improved mining, greatly increased the supply of iron and coal. These materials built the machines, the engines, the bridges and the railways of the age. The growth of the iron and coal industries thus underpinned all the others.

Improvements in transport tied the system together. The digging of canals and, later, the coming of the railway and the steamship transformed the movement of goods and people. Raw materials and finished products could now be carried cheaply and swiftly across the country and overseas. Better transport bound the whole industrial system into a single working whole.

These inventions, from the spinning jenny to the steam engine and the railway, were the tools with which the first Industrial Revolution mechanised production, multiplied output and carried Britain into the industrial age.

Question 5

Before the factory could rise, the farm had to change, freeing hands and feeding mouths for the age of industry.

Explain the role of the Agricultural Revolution in bringing about the Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The Agricultural Revolution, the transformation of farming that preceded and accompanied the Industrial Revolution, played a vital part in making industrialisation possible. Its role was as follows.

It increased the supply of food. Improved methods of farming, such as crop rotation, selective breeding and better tools, greatly increased the output of food. This growing surplus could feed the swelling population of the towns. Without more food, the great industrial cities could never have been fed or have grown.

It freed labour for industry. The enclosure of the land and the use of machines in farming reduced the number of workers needed on the land. Many people were driven from the countryside into the towns in search of work. This released the abundant labour that the new factories required.

It supported a growing population. The rising output of the farms sustained a rapidly growing population. This larger population provided both the workers for the factories and the market for their goods. The Agricultural Revolution thus underpinned the whole growth of industry.

It raised capital for investment. Improved and enclosed farms produced greater profits for the landowners who held them. Some of this new wealth was invested in industry, mines and transport. Agriculture therefore helped to supply the capital that industry needed to grow.

It supplied industry with raw materials. The Agricultural Revolution increased the production of raw materials such as wool, and freed labour and capital for the cotton trade. These materials fed the textile industries that led the Industrial Revolution. Farming and industry were thus closely bound together.

It fostered a spirit of improvement. The spirit of experiment and improvement in farming encouraged a similar spirit in industry. Men who sought better ways of farming were ready to invest in better ways of manufacturing. This culture of improvement helped to spark the age of invention.

The Agricultural Revolution therefore prepared the way for the Industrial Revolution by feeding the population, freeing labour, raising capital, supplying raw materials and fostering a spirit of improvement, without which industry could not have risen.

Question 6

One machine, breathing fire and steam, gave the industrial age its heartbeat.

Assess the role of the steam engine in the Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The steam engine, improved above all by James Watt, was among the greatest inventions of the Industrial Revolution. Its role was central and transformative, as the following points show.

It supplied a powerful new source of energy. The steam engine provided a source of power far greater and more reliable than human muscle, water or wind. It could drive many machines at once and never tired. This new and mighty power became the very driving force of industry.

It freed the factory from the river. Before steam, factories had to be built beside rivers in order to use water power. The steam engine could be worked anywhere, so factories could rise in the towns near labour and markets. This freedom allowed industry to spread widely and to grow.

It powered the mines. Steam engines were used to pump water out of the deep mines, allowing far more coal and iron to be won. This increased the supply of the very fuels and materials on which industry depended. Steam thus fed the growth of the mining industries.

It revolutionised transport. The steam engine gave rise to the railway and the steamship, which transformed the movement of goods and people. Raw materials and finished goods could now be carried swiftly and cheaply over great distances. Steam thereby bound the whole industrial system together.

It multiplied productivity. By driving tireless machines, the steam engine multiplied the output of the factories many times over. Goods could be produced faster and more cheaply than had ever been possible. This great rise in productivity lay at the very heart of the revolution.

It became the symbol of the new age. More than any other invention, the steam engine came to stand for the power and progress of the industrial age. It embodied the triumph of the machine over the older and slower ways of working. It was, in truth, the very emblem of the revolution.

The steam engine was therefore of decisive importance: it supplied the power, freed the factory, fed the mines, revolutionised transport and multiplied production, and stands as the very symbol of the Industrial Revolution.

The transition from cottage to factory system

Question 7

For centuries the spinning wheel had turned quietly by the hearth; the machine would silence it forever.

Explain the cottage industry system and account for its decline.

Model Answer

The cottage industry, or domestic system, was the way in which goods were produced before the Industrial Revolution. Its nature, and the reasons for its decline, were as follows.

It was small-scale production in the home. Under the cottage system, goods such as cloth were made by hand in the workers' own homes rather than in factories. Whole families worked together at the spinning wheel and the handloom, often combining this labour with farming. Production was therefore small in scale, personal in character and bound to the household.

It was slow and inefficient. Because the work was done by hand with simple tools, the cottage system produced goods slowly and only in small quantities. Output depended entirely on the strength and time of the individual worker and could not easily be increased. This slowness would prove its fatal weakness once demand began to grow.

Rising population outstripped its capacity. The rapid growth of Britain's population created a demand for goods that the cottage industries could no longer meet. The slow, small-scale domestic system simply could not keep pace with the swelling market. This widening gap between demand and supply created the pressure for a new method of production.

Producers sought faster methods of production. Faced with a demand they could not satisfy, producers, entrepreneurs and inventors began to seek ways of increasing output. Their search led to the invention of new machines and, in the mid-eighteenth century, to the factory system. The cottage system was thus overtaken by the very demand that it had failed to supply.

The new machines could not be used at home. The new spinning and weaving machines were large and powered by water or steam, and could not be housed in a small cottage. They had to be gathered together in factories where power could be supplied to them. As production moved to the factory, the home workshop rapidly lost its place.

Factory goods undersold the work of the cottage. Goods made cheaply and quickly in the factories undersold those made slowly by hand in the home. The cottage worker could not compete with the machine in either price or quantity. One by one the domestic workers were driven out of business and into the factories as wage-labourers.

The cottage system, slow and small in scale, therefore declined because it could not meet the rising demand of a growing population, and it was swept aside by the machines and the factory system that could.

Question 8

Under one roof, and one power, the scattered work of a thousand cottages was gathered into a single engine of production.

Account for the rise of the factory system.

Model Answer

The factory system, in which production was concentrated in large establishments, rose in Britain from the mid-eighteenth century for a set of connected reasons.

The cottage system could no longer meet demand. The old domestic system was too slow and too small to satisfy the demand of a rapidly growing population and expanding markets. A new and faster method of production had become necessary. This pressing need drove the search that ended in the factory.

The new machines required concentration in one place. The new machines of the age were large and powered by water and steam, and could not be worked in the home. They had to be brought together in one building where power could be supplied to them all. This need to house the machines gave birth to the factory.

Steam power made the factory possible. The steam engine provided a powerful and reliable source of energy that could drive many machines at once. Because steam could be generated anywhere, factories could be built in the towns close to labour and to markets. Steam thus freed the factory from dependence on rivers and allowed it to spread.

Concentration greatly increased efficiency. Bringing all the operations of production under one roof allowed the work to be divided, supervised and speeded up. Karl Marx described this as a revolution in the industries that produced consumer goods for immediate use. The factory could therefore produce far more, and far more cheaply, than scattered cottages ever could.

Capital was available to build the factories. Britain's accumulated wealth provided the capital needed to build factories and to buy costly machines. Wealthy entrepreneurs were willing to invest this money in the new industries in search of profit. The gathering of ownership into fewer hands allowed large factories to be established.

Abundant labour was available in the towns. The decline of rural life and the migration of people into the towns supplied the factories with plentiful workers. Men, women and children moved from the countryside in search of employment in the new industries. This ready supply of labour allowed the factory system to grow with great speed.

The factory system therefore rose because the cottage system had failed the market, because the new machines and steam power demanded concentration, and because the capital and labour needed to build and work the factories were both at hand.

Question 9

The factory was a new kind of place, where the clock and the machine, not the sun and the season, ruled the working day.

Examine the main features of the factory system.

Model Answer

The factory system, which replaced the cottage industry from the mid-eighteenth century, had a set of distinctive features that set it apart from all that had gone before.

Production was concentrated under one roof. The defining feature of the factory system was the gathering of all the operations of production into one large establishment. Instead of being scattered among many separate homes, the whole work was brought together in a single building. This concentration of production was the very essence of the factory.

It relied on machines and mechanical power. Production in the factory was carried out by machines driven by water and, above all, by steam power. Human hands increasingly tended and fed the machines rather than doing the work themselves. Mechanisation and power were therefore central and defining features of the system.

It employed a large and disciplined workforce. The factory brought together many workers, including men, women and children, under one roof and one authority. These workers laboured for fixed hours under strict discipline and close supervision, to the relentless rhythm of the machine. Work came to be governed by the clock rather than by the worker's own choice.

Ownership was concentrated in few hands. The factories were owned by wealthy capitalists who supplied the capital and took the profits. As industry grew, the ownership of the means of production became concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. A small class of owners thus came to command the labour of a large class of workers.

It rested on the division of labour. Within the factory the making of a product was broken down into many separate and repeated tasks, each performed by a different worker. This division of labour made production faster, cheaper and more efficient than before. It also reduced the individual worker to a small part of a great productive machine.

It was closely tied to the growing towns. The factory system was associated with industries concentrated in the towns, near labour, markets and transport. Factories drew people into the towns and caused the rapid growth of crowded industrial cities. The system was therefore bound up inseparably with urbanisation.

The factory system was thus marked by the concentration of production under one roof, the use of machines and power, a large and disciplined workforce, concentrated ownership, the division of labour and a close tie to the growing industrial towns.

Question 10

The factory made goods in abundance, but it also made a new and harder world for those who worked in it.

Examine the effects of the factory system on society.

Model Answer

The factory system transformed not only the way in which goods were made but the whole of society. Its effects, both good and ill, were as follows.

It caused rapid urbanisation. As factories were built in the towns, people migrated from the countryside in search of work, and small towns swelled into great industrial cities. Densely populated urban centres grew up around the mills and the mines. In this way society was transformed from a mainly rural into an increasingly urban one.

It led to rural depopulation. As people moved to the towns to labour in the factories, the rural communities they left behind steadily declined. This migration contributed to the decay of the traditional agrarian way of life. The countryside lost much of its population and its former importance.

It created a new working class. The factory gathered together a great class of wage-labourers who owned nothing but their capacity to work. This new working class depended wholly on the factory owners for its

living and its wages. The rise of this class was among the deepest and most lasting social effects of the system.

It brought harsh working conditions. In the factories workers, including many women and children, laboured for long hours at low wages under harsh discipline. The work was often dangerous and the conditions unhealthy and exhausting. This exploitation bred deep grievances that would in time fuel the workers' movements.

It produced overcrowded and unhealthy towns. The rapid growth of the industrial cities far outran the provision of decent housing and sanitation. Workers crowded into slums where filth and disease spread easily among them. The new towns thus brought pollution, squalor and sickness alongside their wealth.

It widened the gulf between the classes. The factory system enriched the capitalist owners while the workers who created that wealth remained poor. This growing inequality sharpened the tension between the two great classes of industrial society. Out of it grew the class conflict that would mark the whole industrial age.

The factory system therefore reshaped society, bringing urbanisation and great wealth on the one hand, but a new working class, harsh conditions and deep class division on the other.

The Industrial Revolution and the rise of working-class movements in Britain

Question 11

Where the machine brought profit to the few, it brought poverty and anger to the many, and the many did not stay silent.

Account for the rise of working-class movements in Britain.

Model Answer

The Industrial Revolution gave rise to movements of workers who resisted the new capitalist industrial system. Their rise is explained by the following grievances born of the factory age.

Workers were paid very low wages. Under the new capitalist system the workers were paid wages far below the value of what they produced. The owners kept the great profits of industry while the workers received barely enough to survive upon. This injustice of low pay was among the chief causes of the workers' anger and their turn to organisation.

Workers laboured for very long hours. The workers were made to labour for exhausting hours, often ranging from fourteen to sixteen a day, and were not paid for the extra time forced upon them. Such hours consumed their health and left them no life beyond the factory. This harsh exploitation of their time drove them to resist their masters.

Working conditions were poor and dangerous. The factories were frequently unsafe, unhealthy and polluted, and the workers laboured under a strict and unfeeling discipline. Accidents and disease were common, and the welfare of the workers was ignored in the pursuit of profit. These wretched conditions bred deep and lasting grievances.

Machines threatened the workers' employment. Many workers believed that the new machines were taking away their jobs and destroying their crafts. Skilled handworkers in particular saw the livelihoods of a lifetime swept away by mechanisation. The fear of unemployment turned the workers against the machines and the owners who introduced them.

The Combination Laws forbade lawful organisation. Combination laws, culminating in the General Combination Acts of 1799 and 1800, made it illegal for workers to join together to demand better wages or conditions. Because lawful and peaceful protest was denied them, the workers turned instead to rioting and to secret organisation. The very laws meant to silence them helped to provoke violent movements.

Workers mourned the loss of their old way of life. The new industrial system destroyed the older and more independent life of the craftsman and the cottage worker. The workers longed for their former

customs, their dignity and their control over their own labour. This resentment at the destruction of a whole way of life fed the movements of protest.

The working-class movements therefore rose from low wages, long hours, harsh conditions, the fear of machines, the denial of lawful organisation and the loss of an older way of life, all of which turned the suffering of the workers into open resistance.

Question 12

By night, armed men moved from village to village, and by morning the great machines lay in pieces.

Examine the Luddite Movement of 1811 to 1817.

Model Answer

Luddism, or the Luddite Movement, was a violent protest movement in England between 1811 and 1817 in which workers destroyed the machines they believed were causing their unemployment. Its main features were as follows.

It was a machine-breaking movement. Luddism was the widespread breaking of manufacturing machines by workers who believed those machines had taken away their jobs. Organised groups of workers attacked and destroyed the new machinery in the mills and workshops. This machine-breaking was the movement's defining method of protest against the industrial system.

It was secret and bound by oaths. The Luddite movement was an underground movement whose members were bound together by solemn oaths of secrecy. Small and disciplined groups moved swiftly and quietly from place to place, usually under cover of night. This secrecy protected them from the harsh laws that forbade the combination of workers.

It was named after the legendary Ned Ludd. The movement took its name from its legendary leader, General Ned Ludd, in whose name threatening letters were sent to employers and to government leaders. In reality there was probably no single Ludd, and many local leaders organised different groups across England. The name gave a common identity to a movement that was never truly unified.

It was a protest against capitalism, not machines alone. Although the Luddites broke machines, their deeper quarrel was with the freedom of the capitalists to destroy the old trade customs. Capitalism had introduced new machinery, lowered wages and undermined the standards of craftsmanship the workers valued. They struck at the machines because these were the visible face of a system that was ruining them.

It was not a blind opposition to progress. It would be very naive to describe the Luddites as mere blind enemies of all machinery and progress. Their protest was in truth a reasoned defence of their livelihoods, their crafts and their customary rights. According to the historian E. P. Thompson, some of the Luddites were among the most articulate workers of their time.

It was crushed by the power of the state. The government treated Luddism as a grave crime and turned the full force of the law and the army against it. Machine-breaking was made a capital offence, and many Luddites were hanged or transported to distant penal colonies. This severe repression had broken the movement by 1817.

The Luddite Movement was therefore a secret, oath-bound and violent protest against the machines and the capitalist system that were destroying the workers' livelihoods; though crushed by the state, it gave powerful early voice to the grievances of the industrial worker.

Question 13

The workers had learned that to change their wages they must first win the vote, and so they turned from the factory to the ballot.

Examine Chartism and its programmes for political reform.

Model Answer

Chartism was a working-class movement in Britain, from the late 1830s, that sought political reform as the means to improve the workers' condition. It was organised by bodies such as the London Working Men's Association, formed in 1836 under William Lovett, and led by radicals such as Feargus O'Connor. Its programme, the People's Charter, contained six main demands.

It demanded universal manhood suffrage. The Chartists demanded that all adult men above the age of twenty-one should have the right to vote and to be voted for in the national assembly. They believed that only by winning the vote could the workers gain a voice in the laws that governed their lives. This demand for the vote was the very heart of the whole movement.

It demanded equal electoral districts. The Chartists campaigned for electoral districts, or constituencies, of equal size across the country. They wished the workers to have equal representation in Parliament rather than being outweighed by the old and unequal districts. Fair and equal representation was to give the workers their proper political weight.

It demanded voting by secret ballot. The Chartists demanded that voting be conducted by secret ballot rather than by the open ballot then in use. The open system allowed employers and landlords to see how men voted and so to intimidate them, limiting real democracy. The secret ballot was intended to secure free and fair elections.

It demanded annual parliamentary elections. The Chartists campaigned for parliaments to be elected every year rather than only every five years. Frequent elections, they argued, would keep Members of Parliament accountable and responsible to those who had chosen them. A five-year term, they held, only encouraged unaccountability and the neglect of the people.

It demanded the payment of Members of Parliament. The Chartists demanded that Members of Parliament be paid a salary for their service in the House. Without payment, only the wealthy could afford to sit, and the workers could never be represented by men of their own kind. Payment was meant to open Parliament to the poor as well as to the rich.

It demanded the abolition of the property qualification. The Chartists demanded the removal of the rule that a man must own property in order to sit in Parliament. This qualification shut ordinary working men out of the House of Commons entirely. Its abolition was meant to allow any man, whatever his wealth, to represent the people.

Chartism was therefore a movement that sought, through its six-point Charter of political reforms, to win for the working class the vote and the representation by which they might at last improve their own condition.

Question 14

The workers marched, petitioned and armed themselves, yet the walls of power did not fall in their day.

Account for the limited success of the early working-class movements.

Model Answer

The early working-class movements, such as Luddism and Chartism, won few of their immediate aims and were largely defeated in their own time. Their limited success is explained by the following factors.

The state met them with repression. The government regarded the workers' movements as a dangerous threat to order and used the law and the army to crush them. Leaders were imprisoned, machine-breakers were hanged or transported, and demonstrations were broken up by force. This severe and repeated repression defeated the movements time and again.

The Combination Laws forbade their organisation. The combination laws, culminating in the Acts of 1799 and 1800, made it illegal for workers to unite in defence of their common interests. Denied the right to organise openly, the movements were driven underground and greatly weakened. The law itself stood squarely in the way of their success.

The workers were divided and uncoordinated. The movements were often disunited, with different groups acting in isolation and without a common plan. Luddism, for example, had no single leader and no unified direction across the country. This lack of unity made the movements far easier for the authorities to defeat one by one.

The capitalist class was powerful and well organised. The factory owners were wealthy, well organised and closely allied with the government that made and enforced the laws. Against such concentrated power the workers, poor and newly gathered from the countryside, were at a grave disadvantage. The sheer strength of their opponents limited what the movements could hope to achieve.

The workers lacked the vote. Because the workers had no vote, they had no lawful voice in Parliament through which to press their demands. Their movements were therefore forced outside the political system into petition, protest and riot. Shut out of power, they could not turn their great numbers into real political strength.

Poverty sapped their endurance. The workers were poor and consumed by the daily struggle simply to survive, which left little time or means for sustained organisation. Hunger and insecurity made it hard to maintain a long and disciplined campaign. This weakness of resources steadily drained the endurance of the movements.

The early working-class movements therefore achieved little in their own day because of state repression, hostile laws, disunity, the power of their opponents, the lack of the vote and their own poverty; yet their struggle prepared the ground for later and greater gains.

Question 15

The battles the workers lost in their own time became the victories of the generations that followed.

Explain the significance of the early working-class movements.

Model Answer

Although the early working-class movements such as Luddism and Chartism were defeated in their own day, their significance for the future was very great. It may be seen in the following ways.

They gave voice to the workers' grievances. The movements brought the sufferings of the industrial workers to public attention for the first time. They forced society to see the low wages, the long hours and the harsh conditions of the factory. In giving a loud voice to these grievances, they made them impossible for the nation to ignore.

They pioneered working-class organisation. The movements taught the workers how to combine, to organise and to act together for a common cause. This early experience of organisation, however imperfect, became a foundation for the future. It proved that a scattered and oppressed class could be forged into a united force.

They prepared the way for trade unions. The struggles of the early movements led in time to the rise of the trade unions that would defend the workers far more effectively. The hard lessons of Luddism and Chartism were carried forward into these later bodies. Modern trade unionism grew directly from the roots that the early movements had planted.

They advanced the cause of political reform. Though Chartism failed in its own day, most of its six demands, such as the secret ballot and the widening of the vote, were granted in the decades that followed. The movement had placed these reforms firmly upon the political agenda of the nation. In time the workers won much of what the Chartists had first demanded.

They spread political consciousness. The movements taught the workers to see their poverty not as an unchangeable fate but as an injustice that could be resisted and changed. This awakening of political consciousness turned mere suffering into an organised demand for rights. It made the working class a real force in the political life of the nation.

They inspired the struggles of later generations. The courage and sacrifice of the early movements inspired the workers' struggles of later times, in Britain and far beyond it. Their example showed that

ordinary people could stand together against injustice and oppression. In this way their influence long outlived their defeats.

The early working-class movements were therefore of lasting significance: though defeated in their own time, they gave voice to the workers, pioneered organisation, prepared the way for trade unions and reform, and awakened a political consciousness whose victories were still to come.

Question 16

When rioting and petitioning had failed, the workers found a more lasting weapon: the union.

Examine the role of trade unions in the industrial age.

Model Answer

The trade unions were associations formed by workers to defend and advance their common interests in the industrial age. Their role was as follows.

They united the workers. The trade unions brought together the workers of a trade or industry into a single organised body. United, the workers could face their employers with far greater strength than as scattered individuals. This unity was the very foundation of the unions' power.

They bargained for better wages and conditions. The unions negotiated with employers, on behalf of their members, for higher wages, shorter hours and safer conditions. By bargaining collectively they could win improvements that no single worker could obtain. This collective bargaining was their chief and most constant method.

They used the strike as a weapon. When bargaining failed, the unions could call their members out on strike, withdrawing their labour to force the employers to yield. The threat of the strike gave the workers real power over production. It became the unions' ultimate weapon in the struggle.

They overcame the Combination Laws. The unions had at first been forbidden by the Combination Laws of 1799 and 1800. After long struggle these laws were repealed in the 1820s, and the unions at last became lawful. This legal recognition allowed them to grow and to organise openly.

They provided mutual support. The unions also acted as friendly societies, supporting their members in times of sickness, injury or unemployment. This mutual aid protected the workers against the harsh insecurity of industrial life. It bound the members together in a spirit of solidarity.

They advanced the workers' cause in politics. In time the unions became a force in politics, pressing for laws to protect the workers and supporting the wider labour movement. They helped to win factory reforms and the widening of the vote. They thus turned the workers into a genuine political power.

The trade unions therefore united the workers, bargained and struck for better conditions, overcame the laws that had forbidden them, provided mutual support and advanced the workers' cause in politics, becoming the workers' most enduring and effective defence.

Question 17

One factory owner dared to dream that industry could be made humane, and that dream outlived his failures.

Explain the contribution of Robert Owen and the cooperative movement to the industrial age.

Model Answer

Robert Owen was a factory owner and reformer who sought to improve the condition of the workers and to build a more cooperative society. His contribution, known as Owenism, was as follows.

He ran his own factory humanely. At his mills at New Lanark, Owen showed that a factory could be run humanely and still prosper. He shortened the hours, improved the housing and provided schooling for the workers' children. He proved that decent treatment and profit could go together.

He opposed the exploitation of children. Owen campaigned against the cruel employment of young children in the factories and mills. He called for laws to protect them and to limit their hours of labour. His efforts helped to advance the cause of factory reform.

He promoted the education of the workers. Owen believed that education could improve the character and the condition of the working people. He founded schools for the children of his workers and argued that society should educate all its members. He placed great faith in education as an instrument of reform.

He founded the cooperative movement. Owen inspired the cooperative movement, in which workers joined together to own shops and enterprises in common. These cooperatives allowed working people to share the profits of their own labour. The movement became a lasting part of the workers' cause.

He advanced the ideas of socialism. Owen argued that competition and private profit bred poverty and misery, and he proposed a more cooperative ordering of society. His ideas made him one of the founders of early, or utopian, socialism. He offered a humane alternative to unrestrained capitalism.

His experiments, however, often failed. Owen's attempts to build ideal cooperative communities, such as New Harmony in America, ended in failure. His grand schemes proved difficult to sustain in practice. Yet his example and his ideas long outlived these disappointments.

Robert Owen's contribution was therefore great: through humane factories, factory reform, education, the cooperative movement and the ideas of socialism, he offered a more humane vision of industry that inspired reformers and workers long after his own experiments had failed.

The second phase and the spread of the Industrial Revolution

Question 18

In the second age of industry, the laboratory stood beside the factory, and science itself became a tool of production.

Examine the features of the second Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The second Industrial Revolution, spanning from around the 1840s to the outbreak of the First World War in 1914, differed markedly from the first. Its main features were as follows.

It gave a prominent role to pure science. The second industrial revolution was marked above all by the leading part now played by pure science in industrial development. There was an unprecedented collaboration among scientists, entrepreneurs and state officials. Knowledge won in the laboratory was applied directly to industry as it had never been before.

It was driven by steel, chemicals and electricity. Whereas the first phase had rested on textiles, iron and coal, the second was driven by the newer industries of steel, chemicals and electricity. These industries depended on scientific knowledge and produced the materials and power of the modern age. They marked a decisive advance beyond the industries of the first phase.

It integrated science into industry through education. Scientific knowledge was now deliberately integrated into industry through institutions sponsored by states and universities. These bodies focused on the practical application of sciences such as electricity and chemistry. Technical education became widespread, joining learning firmly to production.

It advanced transport and communication. The second phase saw great advances in transport, including railroads, steamships, canals and improved roads. These shrank the world, quickened the movement of goods and people, and facilitated global trade and communication. The whole world was drawn closer together by the new means of transport.

It shifted industrial leadership beyond Britain. The second industrial revolution shifted industrial leadership from Britain and France to countries such as Belgium, Germany, Italy and the USA. Through science, capital and the support of the state, these nations caught up with and overtook the early leader. Industry thus became a worldwide and fiercely competitive enterprise.

It was bound up with imperialism. This period also witnessed the expanding influence of the western industrial nations as their political power extended across Africa and Asia. The search for raw materials and for markets drove the industrial powers to seize colonies. The second industrial revolution was thus closely bound up with the growth of modern imperialism.

The second Industrial Revolution was therefore an age of scientific industry, of steel, chemicals and electricity, of global transport and of spreading industrial power, which carried industrialisation beyond Britain and bound it to the imperial expansion of the West.

Question 19

Britain guarded her secrets jealously, yet the fire of industry could not be kept within one island forever.

Account for the spread of the Industrial Revolution from Britain to other countries.

Model Answer

The first Industrial Revolution was at first confined to Britain, but from the early nineteenth century it spread to Belgium, France, Germany, the USA and beyond. This spread came about for the following reasons.

Britain tried, but failed, to guard her monopoly. In order to keep the benefits of industry to herself, Britain prohibited the export of machinery, of skilled workers and of production technologies. Yet such secrets could not be kept forever, and knowledge of British methods gradually leaked abroad. The attempt at monopoly delayed but could not prevent the spread of industry.

British entrepreneurs carried industry overseas. Some British entrepreneurs saw profitable industrial opportunities in other countries and took their skills and capital abroad. The British scientist John Cockerill, for example, built machine shops at Liege and so brought the industrial revolution to Belgium. Such men carried the new industry beyond Britain's own shores.

Other nations were eager to acquire British technology. Other western European countries, attracted by Britain's wealth and power, were determined to industrialise in their turn. They used various strategies to acquire British technology and to copy her methods of production. This eagerness to catch up with the leader drove the spread of industry across the continent.

Belgium led the way on the continent. Belgium became the second country after Britain to undergo the industrial revolution. Like her predecessor, Belgian industrialisation was centred on iron, coal and textiles. Under men such as Cockerill, the city of Liege became the focal point of Belgian industry.

France industrialised more slowly. In France the process of industrialisation was slower than in either Britain or Belgium. The upheaval of the political revolution and the Napoleonic wars created unfavourable conditions, and a weaker bourgeois class had to accommodate the peasants. Yet by 1848 France too had become an industrial power, though she remained behind Britain.

Germany and the USA rose to overtake Britain. Later in the century the industrial revolution spread to Germany and the United States, which drew on science, capital and abundant natural resources. Aided by the support of the state and by technical education, these nations industrialised with great speed. In the second phase they would overtake even Britain herself.

The Industrial Revolution therefore spread from Britain because her monopoly could not hold, because entrepreneurs carried industry abroad, and because eager nations from Belgium to the USA acquired her methods and industrialised in their turn.

Question 20

The first revolution ran on coal and iron; the second on steel and the spark of electricity.

Compare the first and second phases of the Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The Industrial Revolution passed through two phases, the first from the 1750s to the 1840s and the second from the 1840s to 1914. They may be compared in their industries, power, science, leadership and reach.

Their leading industries differed. The first phase rested on textiles, iron and coal, the industries that the early machines first transformed. The second phase was driven instead by the newer industries of steel, chemicals and electricity. The very base of industry thus shifted from the older materials to the new.

Their sources of power differed. The first phase was powered chiefly by water and by the steam engine of James Watt. The second phase added new and greater sources of power, above all electricity, alongside steam. Power itself thus advanced from the age of steam toward the age of electricity.

The place of science differed. In the first phase invention often came from practical craftsmen working by trial and error. In the second phase pure science and the trained scientist played the leading role, working in close partnership with industry. Science and industry became deliberately and systematically joined in the later phase.

Their leadership differed. The first phase was led and dominated by Britain almost alone, the sole workshop of the world. The second phase saw leadership pass to Belgium, Germany, Italy and the USA, which overtook the early leader. Industrial power thus spread from one nation to many rival nations.

Their scale and reach differed. The first phase was largely confined to Britain and her nearest imitators. The second phase was international in scale, bound together by railways and steamships and tied to a global trade. Industry grew from a national into a truly worldwide phenomenon.

Yet the two shared a common character. For all their differences, both phases were driven by machines, by capital and by the pursuit of profit, and both transformed society. Each brought new industries, new classes and new ways of living and working. The two were therefore stages of a single, continuous industrial transformation.

The first and second phases therefore differed in their industries, power, science, leadership and reach, yet both belonged to one great transformation that carried the world from handwork through steam to the modern industrial age.

Question 21

On iron rails, the industrial age went out to conquer distance itself.

Examine the role of the railway in the Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The railway, born of the steam engine and the iron industry, was among the most important developments of the Industrial Revolution. Its role was as follows.

It transformed transport. The railway allowed goods and people to be carried swiftly, cheaply and reliably over long distances by land. It far surpassed the older roads and canals in speed and in capacity. It thus revolutionised the movement of everything the age produced.

It carried raw materials and goods. The railway carried coal, iron and raw materials to the factories, and finished goods to the markets. This quick and cheap transport tied the whole industrial system together. It allowed industry to grow far beyond its earlier limits.

It created a great new industry. The building of railways created a huge demand for iron, steel, coal and labour. Whole industries grew up to make the engines, the rails and the carriages. The railway thus became a powerful engine of industrial growth in its own right.

It widened the market. By linking distant towns and regions, the railway created larger and more unified markets for industrial goods. Producers could now sell far beyond their own localities. This widening of the market encouraged production on an ever-greater scale.

It spread industry and people. The railway carried industry, people and ideas into new regions and quickened the growth of towns along its lines. It helped to spread the industrial revolution across countries and continents. It knitted whole nations together as never before.

It symbolised the power of the age. The railway, with its speed and its iron strength, became a symbol of the progress and power of the industrial age. It captured the imagination of the whole world. It stood, beside the steam engine, as an emblem of the new era.

The railway therefore transformed transport, fed and widened industry, unified markets and spread the industrial revolution across the world, standing among the greatest achievements and symbols of the industrial age.

The impacts of the Industrial Revolution

Question 22

The revolution poured out wealth as never before, but it did not pour it out evenly.

Assess the economic impacts of the Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The Industrial Revolution transformed the economies of Britain and later of the world. Its economic impacts were profound, and on balance positive in the long run, though harsh for many at the time.

It brought a massive increase in production. The use of machines and the factory system multiplied the output of goods far beyond anything the cottage system could achieve. Industries such as textiles produced on a scale never before seen in history. This great and continuous increase in production was the most obvious economic result of the revolution.

It created new industries and great wealth. The revolution gave rise to mighty new industries in textiles, iron, coal and, later, steel and chemicals. These industries generated enormous wealth and made the industrial nations rich and powerful. Britain in particular became the workshop and the banker of the world.

It transformed agriculture and trade. Industry spurred improvements in agriculture to feed the growing towns and vastly expanded trade to supply raw materials and sell finished goods. A worldwide network of commerce grew up around the industrial economies. The whole pattern of economic life was reshaped around industry and trade.

It concentrated wealth in few hands. The wealth created by industry flowed chiefly to the capitalist class who owned the factories and the machines. Ownership became concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, while the workers who produced the wealth remained poor. The revolution therefore widened the economic gulf between owners and workers.

It brought unemployment and insecurity. The machines displaced skilled handworkers and threw many out of work, while the factory worker's livelihood hung on the swings of the market. Periods of boom were followed by depressions, such as that of 1873, which brought widespread hardship. Economic insecurity thus became a permanent feature of industrial life.

It tied the world into a single economy. Through trade, transport and the endless search for raw materials and markets, the industrial nations drew the whole world into one economy. Colonies in Africa and Asia were made to supply materials and to buy manufactured goods. This global economy enriched the industrial powers while binding the rest of the world to their needs.

Assessed as a whole, the Industrial Revolution vastly increased production and wealth and remade the world economy, but it also concentrated that wealth, brought insecurity, and tied the wider world to the service of the industrial nations.

Question 23

The revolution built great cities, and filled them with both fortunes and slums.

Examine the social impacts of the Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The Industrial Revolution changed not only how goods were made but the whole fabric of society. Its social impacts were as follows.

It caused rapid urbanisation. The building of factories in the towns drew people from the countryside and swelled small towns into great cities. Densely populated industrial centres grew up quickly around the mills and the mines. Society was transformed within a few generations from a rural into an urban one.

It created new social classes. The revolution produced a new class structure, above all the industrial capitalists and the working class. These two classes, the one owning the factories and the other labouring in them for wages, stood in growing opposition. The rise of these classes reshaped the whole of society.

It brought poor living and working conditions. The workers laboured long hours for low wages in dangerous factories and lived crowded into unhealthy slums. Pollution, filth and disease marked the new industrial towns. For the great mass of workers the revolution brought hardship and suffering rather than ease.

It drew women and children into wage labour. The factory employed women and children as well as men, changing the life of the family. Children laboured long hours in the mills and mines, and family life was strained by the harsh demands of the factory. The old household economy of the cottage was broken up.

It gave rise to workers' movements. The suffering of the workers bred resistance in the form of movements such as Luddism and Chartism and, later, the trade unions. Workers organised themselves to demand better wages, conditions and political rights. Class struggle thus became a permanent feature of industrial society.

It spread education and new ideas. In time the needs of industry and the demands of the workers led to the spread of education and technical training. New ideas about society, including socialism, arose in response to the conditions of the age. The revolution thus stirred the mind and conscience as well as changing the conditions of life.

The Industrial Revolution therefore transformed society, bringing urbanisation, new classes and in time education, but also harsh conditions, the exploitation of women and children and the rise of bitter class struggle.

Question 24

A new economy demanded, in the end, a new politics to match it.

Examine the political impacts of the Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The Industrial Revolution, by transforming the economy and society, also brought profound changes in politics. Its political impacts were as follows.

It gave rise to new political classes. The revolution created a wealthy industrial middle class that demanded a share of political power. It also created a working class that in time demanded the vote and its own representation. The great political struggles of the age arose largely from the ambitions of these new classes.

It led to demands for reform. The new classes pressed for political reform to match the changed society, as in the widening of the vote and the reform of Parliament. Movements such as Chartism demanded universal manhood suffrage and other far-reaching reforms. The revolution thus placed the reform of the political system firmly on the agenda.

It gave birth to new ideologies. The conditions of industrial society gave rise to powerful new ideologies, above all socialism and, later, Marxism. Thinkers sought to explain the exploitation of the workers and to change the order that produced it. These ideas would go on to shape the politics of the whole modern world.

It strengthened the industrial states. The wealth and technology of industry made the industrial nations mighty and able to dominate others. Their strength enabled them to build great empires, navies and armies. Industrial power thus became the very foundation of political and military power.

It drove imperialism. The search for raw materials and for markets drove the industrial powers to seize colonies across Africa and Asia. The political power of the western nations extended across the globe on the strength of their industry. The revolution was therefore a chief cause of the new imperialism of the nineteenth century.

It enlarged the role of the state. In time the problems of industrial society, such as poor conditions and social unrest, forced governments to act. The state began to regulate the factories, to provide education and to attend to the welfare of the workers. Industry thus steadily enlarged the role and the duties of government.

The Industrial Revolution therefore reshaped politics, giving rise to new classes, reforms and ideologies, strengthening the industrial states, driving imperialism and enlarging the role of the state in the life of society.

Question 25

Was the age of the machine the dawn of a better world, or the twilight of an older and gentler one?

'The Industrial Revolution brought as much suffering as progress.' Assess this statement.

Model Answer

The statement claims that the Industrial Revolution brought suffering equal to its progress. There is much truth in it, for the revolution was at once a great advance and a great affliction, and a fair judgement must weigh the two together.

It brought great material progress. The revolution vastly increased the production of goods and the wealth of nations. It gave the world new industries, new machines and, in the long run, a rising standard of living. In this respect it was a mighty engine of human progress and plenty.

It advanced science and technology. The revolution drove forward the sciences and the useful arts as never before in history. Inventions from the steam engine to electricity transformed human life and opened the door to the modern age. This advance of knowledge was among its greatest and most lasting gifts.

Yet it brought harsh exploitation. Against these gains stood the suffering of the workers, who laboured long hours for low wages in dangerous factories. Women and children were exploited, and the mass of workers lived in poverty amid the very wealth they created. For them the revolution brought misery rather than progress.

It created squalor and disease. The rapid and unplanned growth of the industrial towns brought overcrowding, pollution, filth and disease. Workers were crowded into slums where life was short, hard and unhealthy. The new prosperity was thus shadowed everywhere by great human suffering.

It deepened inequality and class conflict. The revolution concentrated wealth in the hands of the few while the many remained poor, widening the gulf between the classes. This growing inequality bred bitterness, resentment and class struggle. The progress of the age was in part bought at the price of division and conflict.

Its benefits reached the many only slowly. Although the revolution eventually raised the standard of living, the workers of the first generations reaped little of the reward. The gains were long delayed and very unevenly shared among the people. The suffering came first, and the progress, for the mass of workers, came late.

The statement is therefore largely just: the Industrial Revolution was both blessing and curse, an engine of progress and science on the one hand, and a source of exploitation, squalor and inequality on the other, so that its progress and its suffering must be weighed together.

Question 26

In the mills and the mines, the burden of the new age fell heaviest on the smallest shoulders.

Assess the impact of the Industrial Revolution on women and children.

Model Answer

The Industrial Revolution drew women and children into the factories and mines in great numbers, with profound and largely harmful effects upon their lives. Its impact upon them may be assessed as follows.

It employed them in great numbers. The factory system employed women and children as well as men, for their labour was cheap and their hands were nimble. Women and children came to form a large part of the industrial workforce. They were drawn out of the home and into the mill and the mine.

It exploited them with low wages. Women and children were paid far lower wages than men for their long hours of toil. Employers used them precisely because they were so cheap. This exploitation kept whole families in poverty in spite of their labour.

It subjected them to harsh conditions. Women and children laboured for long hours in dangerous and unhealthy factories and mines. Young children in particular suffered accidents, disease and stunted growth. The conditions they endured were often cruel and lasting in their harm.

It disrupted family life. With women and children working long hours in the factories, the life of the family was strained and broken. The old household economy of the cottage, in which the family had worked together at home, was destroyed. Family bonds suffered under the demands of the factory.

It robbed children of education and childhood. Children set to work in the mills had no time for schooling or for the ordinary life of childhood. Their labour deprived them of learning and of health alike. A whole generation of poor children was consumed by the factory.

Yet it provoked reform in time. In time the suffering of women and children stirred the conscience of society and led to reform. Factory Acts were passed to limit their hours and to protect the youngest workers. Thus the very cruelty of their exploitation helped, in the end, to bring change.

The Industrial Revolution therefore fell with great harshness upon women and children, exploiting them with low wages and cruel conditions and disrupting family life, though their suffering at last provoked the reforms that began to protect them.

Question 27

Where fields had lain, forests of chimneys rose, and the city became the home of the industrial age.

Account for the rapid growth of towns during the Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The Industrial Revolution brought the rapid growth of towns and the transformation of Britain into an urban society. This rapid urbanisation is explained by the following factors.

The factories were built in the towns. The factory system concentrated industry in specialised establishments in the towns. Work was now to be found in the town rather than in the countryside. People therefore gathered in great numbers where the factories were.

Work drew people from the land. The decline of cottage industry and the changes in farming drove people off the land in search of work. They migrated to the towns to find employment in the new industries. This steady migration swelled the population of the towns.

Steam power freed industry from the rivers. Because the steam engine could be worked anywhere, factories were built in the towns near labour and markets rather than beside distant rivers. This concentrated industry, and the people who worked in it, in the towns. The towns therefore grew up around the factories.

The towns offered wages and opportunity. The industrial towns offered wages and opportunities that the impoverished countryside could not match. Men, women and children flocked to them in the hope of a living. The promise of work drew the population steadily inward.

Transport fed the growing towns. Canals and railways carried food, fuel and materials into the towns and goods out of them. This transport made it possible to feed and supply a large urban population. Better transport thus allowed the towns to grow ever larger.

The towns grew faster than they could cope. The growth of the industrial towns was so rapid that housing and sanitation could not keep pace with it. Workers crowded into overcrowded and unhealthy slums. The towns therefore grew in squalor as well as in size.

The towns therefore grew rapidly during the Industrial Revolution because the factories, the steam engine and the promise of work drew people from the land, while transport fed the swelling cities, even as they grew faster than they could be made fit to live in.

Chapter 3

INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTIONS IN THE 20TH AND 21ST CENTURIES

Attempt each question in full on paper before you read the model answer beneath it. The questions follow the chapter topic by topic and rise in demand.

The Third Industrial Revolution

Question 1

As the twentieth century wore on, a quieter revolution began, powered not by steam or steel but by the silent flow of information.

Explain the concept and background of the Third Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The Third Industrial Revolution, also called the digital or information revolution, was the transformation of production and society through information technology and electronics in the later twentieth century. Its concept and background may be explained as follows.

It was the revolution of information technology. The Third Industrial Revolution was marked above all by the introduction of information technology as the major means of processing information in industries and businesses. Computers and electronic systems replaced the older methods of handling information. It thus moved the world from the industry of machines into the industry of information.

It was led by the advanced industrial nations. The revolution was led by the most advanced industrial countries, namely the United States, Japan, Germany and the United Kingdom. These nations possessed the science, the capital and the industry needed to develop the new technologies. From them the revolution spread outward to the wider world.

It changed the organisation of production. In this period multinational corporations fused the tasks of administration, production and marketing into large corporations. The development of technology raised productivity through process automation and the use of information technology in business structures. The very way in which industry was organised was transformed.

It rested on new areas of science. The revolution was associated with advancement in four main areas of science: information technology, biotechnology, telecommunications and energy engineering. These fields supplied the innovations that drove the new industries of the age. Science and technology were joined even more closely than before.

It reshaped the relationship of economy and state. The changes it brought altered the relationship between capital and labour and between the economy and the state. During the 1970s countries such as Britain and the United States gradually began to replace the welfare state with the liberal state. Politics and economics alike were reshaped by the new technology.

It gave birth to the information society. Historians named this period the information and knowledge society, because the transformations it brought laid the foundations of a new kind of society. Information and knowledge became the central resources of the economy. The world thus moved into a new age defined by information.

The Third Industrial Revolution was therefore the digital and information revolution, led by the advanced nations, which transformed production, science, politics and society and gave birth to the information age.

Question 2

The Third Industrial Revolution wore many faces, but all of them were lit by the glow of the screen.

Examine the features of the Third Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The Third Industrial Revolution, the digital revolution of the later twentieth century, had a number of distinctive features that set it apart from the industrial revolutions that had gone before.

It introduced information technology into industry. Its first feature was the introduction of information technology as the major means of processing information in industries and businesses. Computers and electronic systems handled information on a scale and at a speed never possible before. Information technology thus became the very heart of the new economy.

It raised productivity through integration. The revolution brought a rise in productivity through the integration of information technology with telecommunications in the processes of production. The joining of computers and communications made industry far more efficient. Output rose sharply as information and production were linked together.

It developed multinational corporations. It was characterised by the development of multinational corporations that concentrated the activities of management, production and trade across the various economic sectors. These giant companies operated across national boundaries. They became the dominant form of business enterprise in the new age.

It advanced four main areas of science. The revolution was marked by technological advancement in four main areas: information technology, biotechnology, telecommunications and energy engineering. These fields supplied the innovations that drove the whole revolution forward. Together they defined its distinctly scientific character.

It developed new materials and sources of energy. The revolution used new materials for industrial production and searched for new sources of energy, such as nuclear energy from uranium and gas to replace oil and to generate electricity. This search for new energy reshaped both industry and power. It reflected the growing needs and anxieties of the age.

It consolidated the information and consumer society. The revolution was associated with the consolidation of the consumer society and the development of the information society. It also brought the geographical redistribution of industrial and agricultural production through improved communication and transport. Society itself was remade around information and consumption.

The Third Industrial Revolution was thus marked by information technology, integrated production, multinational corporations, new sciences, new energy and the rise of the information society, which together made it the digital revolution of the modern age.

Question 3

Four young sciences, of the computer, the signal, the gene and the atom, remade the world between them.

Examine the major technological innovations of the Third Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The Third Industrial Revolution was associated with the development of four major areas of science and technology, which together drove its transformation of industry and society. These were as follows.

Information technology transformed the handling of information. Information technology, above all the computer, transformed the processing, storage and use of information. It automated many tasks in industry and business and vastly increased productivity. It became the central innovation of the whole revolution.

Telecommunications shrank distance. Advances in telecommunications allowed information to be sent instantly across great distances. The integration of telecommunications with information technology tied together production and trade across the world. Communication became faster, cheaper and more reliable than ever before.

Biotechnology opened new industries. The revolution brought great advances in biotechnology, the application of biological science to industry, agriculture and medicine. These innovations improved the

production of food, medicines and new materials. They opened whole new industries based upon the science of life.

Energy engineering sought new sources of power. The revolution developed new sources and uses of energy, including nuclear energy from uranium and the use of gas to replace oil and to generate electricity. This energy engineering sought to meet the growing power needs of modern industry. It reflected both the ambition and the anxieties of the age.

Automation transformed production. The new technologies made possible the automation of production, in which machines and computers controlled the industrial processes. Automation raised productivity and reduced the need for human labour in many tasks. It changed the very nature of work within industry.

New materials made possible new products. The revolution developed and used new materials for industrial production, such as plastics, synthetics and advanced alloys. These materials made possible new products and new industries. They too formed part of the transformation the revolution brought.

The technological innovations of the Third Industrial Revolution, in information technology, telecommunications, biotechnology and energy engineering, together with automation and new materials, were the tools with which it built the information age.

Question 4

The information revolution touched every corner of life, for good and for ill.

Assess the impacts of the Third Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The Third Industrial Revolution transformed the economy, society and politics of the modern world. Its impacts were far-reaching and, on balance, brought great progress, though not without serious cost.

It raised productivity and generated wealth. The use of information technology and automation greatly raised productivity in industry and business. This increased the output of goods and services and generated enormous wealth. The economies that led the revolution grew rich and powerful upon it.

It created the information society. The revolution laid the foundations of a new information and knowledge society. Information and knowledge became central resources, and whole industries grew up around them. Society itself was reshaped around the flow and the value of information.

It gave rise to multinational corporations. The revolution brought the rise of great multinational corporations operating across national boundaries. These companies concentrated management, production and trade on a global scale. They became immensely powerful actors in the world economy.

It changed the nature of work. Automation and information technology changed the kind of work that people did, reducing some jobs while creating others. Many manual and routine tasks were taken over by machines and computers. Workers were forced to adapt to a new and more technical world of work.

It transformed politics and the state. The revolution altered the relationship between the economy and the state, and in the 1970s countries such as Britain and the United States moved from the welfare state toward the liberal state. The role of government in the economy was rethought. Politics was reshaped by the new economic order.

It deepened global inequality. The benefits of the revolution flowed chiefly to the advanced nations that led it, widening the gap between them and the poorer countries. Nations that lacked the new technology fell further behind. The revolution thus deepened the divide between the rich and the poor of the world.

The Third Industrial Revolution therefore brought great gains in productivity, wealth and knowledge and created the information society, but it also transformed work, reshaped politics and widened the gulf between the rich and poor nations of the world.

Question 5

The information age did not fall from the sky; it was built on the science and the wars of the century before.

Account for the rise of the Third Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The Third Industrial Revolution, the digital and information revolution, arose in the later twentieth century for a number of connected reasons.

The advance of science and electronics. The rapid advance of science, especially in electronics and physics, made possible the invention of the computer and the transistor. These breakthroughs gave birth to the new information technology. Scientific progress was the foundation on which the revolution was built.

The invention of the computer. The development of the electronic computer transformed the processing and storage of information. Computers could handle information at a speed and on a scale never possible before. This single invention lay at the very heart of the revolution.

The demands of war and rivalry. The Second World War and the Cold War that followed drove great investment in science and technology. Governments funded research into computing, telecommunications and nuclear energy. This investment greatly hastened the coming of the digital age.

The strength of the advanced economies. The most advanced industrial nations, the United States, Japan, Germany and Britain, possessed the wealth, science and industry to develop the new technologies. They naturally led the way into the information age. Their strength made the revolution possible.

The power of the multinational corporations. Great multinational corporations invested in and spread the new technologies across the world. They fused management, production and marketing and drove the adoption of information technology. Their power carried the revolution outward and forward.

The growing demand for information. As economies and societies grew more complex, the demand to gather, process and share information grew ever greater. Information technology arose to meet this demand. The needs of a complex modern world thus called the revolution into being.

The Third Industrial Revolution therefore arose from the advance of science and the computer, the investment of war and rivalry, the strength of the advanced economies and the growing demand for information, which together gave birth to the digital age.

Question 6

The revolutions of steam and steel gave way to a revolution that could not be seen, only felt.

Compare the Third Industrial Revolution with the first and second industrial revolutions.

Model Answer

The Third Industrial Revolution both continued and departed from the first and second industrial revolutions that preceded it. It may be compared with them as follows.

Its technology was of a different kind. The first and second revolutions rested on machines of iron and steel, driven by steam and electricity. The third rested on the computer, on electronics and on information technology. Its technology was of information rather than of heavy machinery.

Its basis was information, not materials. The earlier revolutions transformed the making of physical goods such as cloth, iron and steel. The third transformed the handling of information and knowledge. It shifted the centre of the economy from matter to information.

It relied even more upon science. The earlier revolutions had drawn increasingly on science, especially the second. The third depended almost wholly on advanced science and organised research. Knowledge itself became the very foundation of the new industries.

It was more global in its reach. The earlier revolutions had spread outward from particular nations over many decades. The third was global in reach, tying the world together through telecommunications and multinational corporations. It bound distant nations into a single information economy.

Its effect on work was distinctive. The earlier revolutions had gathered workers into factories. The third automated production and moved much work into offices and services. It changed the nature of work toward information and away from heavy manual labour.

Yet it followed the same logic. Like the revolutions before it, the third was driven by technology, capital and the pursuit of productivity and profit. It too transformed society and concentrated wealth and power. It was therefore another stage of one long transformation.

The Third Industrial Revolution was therefore both continuous with and distinct from its predecessors: it followed the same logic of technology and profit, yet rested on information rather than materials, relied wholly on science, and reached across the whole world.

The Fourth Industrial Revolution and its impacts

Question 7

In the fourth revolution, the machine began to think, and the boundary between the digital and the physical began to dissolve.

Explain the concept and features of the Fourth Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The Fourth Industrial Revolution is the current transformation of industry and society through advanced technologies such as artificial intelligence, robotics and the Internet of Things. Its concept and main features are as follows.

It rests on rapid technological advancement. The Fourth Industrial Revolution is characterised by rapid technological advancement in areas such as artificial intelligence, automation and robotics. It carries forward and deepens the digital transformation begun by the third revolution. It represents the newest stage of the long industrial age.

It is marked by artificial intelligence. A central feature is the substantial progress in artificial intelligence and machine learning technologies. These innovations automate processes, enhance decision-making and drive efficiency across the economy. Intelligent machines increasingly perform tasks once reserved for the human mind.

It fuses the virtual and physical worlds. The revolution is characterised by the fusion of virtual and physical systems, as seen in the Internet of Things. Everyday objects, embedded with sensors and internet connectivity, exchange data and act automatically. The digital and the real world are woven together as never before.

It rests on advanced sensor technology. Smaller yet more powerful sensors play a central role in collecting data and linking the virtual and physical worlds. These sensors enable the integration of digital and real-world environments. They foretell a new era of sensor-driven insight and interaction.

It spreads at an unprecedented, exponential pace. Unlike the previous revolutions, the fourth spreads at an extraordinary speed, growing exponentially rather than gradually. It disrupts established orders across whole industries and nations. This rapid and accelerating advance is among its most striking features.

It transforms production, management and governance. The revolution brings profound changes in the systems of production, management and governance. It reshapes how goods are made, how organisations are run and how societies are governed. Its reach extends far beyond the factory into every part of life.

The Fourth Industrial Revolution is therefore the age of artificial intelligence, robotics, the Internet of Things and advanced sensors, spreading with unprecedented speed and transforming production, management and governance across the world.

Question 8

The tools of the fourth revolution, the thinking machine, the connected object and the tireless robot, are remaking the world before our eyes.

Examine the major technological innovations of the Fourth Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The Fourth Industrial Revolution is driven by a set of powerful new technologies that together are transforming industry and society. The most important of them are as follows.

Artificial intelligence and machine learning. Artificial intelligence and machine learning enable machines to learn, reason and make decisions for themselves. They automate complex processes and enhance efficiency across every sector of the economy. They are the central innovation of the fourth revolution.

The Internet of Things. The Internet of Things is a network of everyday objects embedded with sensors and internet connectivity. These connected objects exchange data and act automatically, reshaping industries and optimising the use of resources. They join the digital and physical worlds into a single system.

Robotics and automation. Advanced robots and automated systems now perform tasks once done by human hands. Robotics increases the productivity and precision of manufacturing and of many other activities. It is transforming the very nature of work in industry.

Advanced sensor technology. Small but powerful sensors collect vast quantities of data and link the virtual and physical worlds. They enable machines to perceive and respond to their environment. They are essential to the connected systems of the age.

Big data and computing power. The revolution rests on the gathering and analysis of vast quantities of data through powerful computing. This allows businesses and governments to draw insights and make decisions on an unprecedented scale. Data has become one of the most valuable resources of the modern age.

Digital connectivity. The revolution depends on high-speed digital networks that connect people, machines and objects across the whole world. This connectivity fosters unprecedented levels of interaction and interconnectedness. It binds the entire world into a single digital web.

The innovations of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, from artificial intelligence and the Internet of Things to robotics, sensors and big data, are the tools with which it is remaking industry, society and the world itself.

Question 9

The fourth revolution promises abundance, yet it also threatens the very jobs by which people live.

Assess the impacts of the Fourth Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The impacts of the Fourth Industrial Revolution are far-reaching, encompassing the economy, government and society. They bring both great promise and serious dangers, which must be weighed against one another.

It transforms production and productivity. By automating processes and connecting systems, the revolution greatly raises productivity and efficiency. Goods and services can be produced faster, more cheaply and in greater variety. The economy is transformed by intelligent and connected production.

It displaces jobs through automation. The revolution has impacted employment, with automation gradually replacing traditional manufacturing and blue-collar jobs. Even highly skilled work is now threatened by artificial intelligence. Many workers face the loss of their livelihoods to the machine.

It creates new kinds of work. Alongside these losses, the rapid advance of technology has the potential to generate new jobs and industries. Yet the jobs it creates are often fewer than those it displaces. The revolution therefore reshapes, as well as reduces, the world of work.

It reshapes the economy and business. The revolution disrupts established industries and creates new ones, changing the very way business is done. New companies and new markets rise on the strength of the new technologies. The economic order is remade by continual and rapid disruption.

It challenges government and governance. The revolution brings profound changes in the systems of management and governance. Governments must grapple with new problems of regulation, privacy and security. The very art of ruling is challenged by the pace of technological change.

It deepens inequality and disruption. Because the revolution spreads unevenly, it threatens to widen the gap between those who command the new technology and those who do not. It disrupts established orders across industries and nations. Its benefits and its dangers are far from equally shared.

The Fourth Industrial Revolution therefore brings great gains in production and new opportunities, but also the displacement of jobs, the disruption of the economy and government, and the deepening of inequality, so that its promise and its peril must be weighed together.

Question 10

Each industrial revolution ran faster than the last; the fourth runs faster than any before it.

Compare the Fourth Industrial Revolution with the earlier industrial revolutions.

Model Answer

The Fourth Industrial Revolution both continues and departs from the industrial revolutions that came before it. It may be compared with them in its technologies, its pace, its reach and its effects.

Its technologies are more advanced. The earlier revolutions rested in turn on steam, on electricity and on information technology. The fourth rests on artificial intelligence, robotics and the Internet of Things. Its technologies are more powerful and more intelligent than any that came before.

It blurs the digital and the physical. The earlier revolutions kept the machine and the worker distinct from one another. The fourth fuses the virtual and physical worlds, so that objects, machines and systems act together automatically. This fusion is something genuinely new in the history of industry.

It spreads far more rapidly. The earlier revolutions spread gradually, in a linear fashion, over many decades. The fourth spreads at an unprecedented and exponential pace across industries and nations. Its sheer speed sets it apart from all its predecessors.

Its reach is more global. The earlier revolutions began in particular nations and spread outward only slowly. The fourth is global from the very outset, connecting the whole world through digital networks. Its reach is wider and more immediate than that of any earlier revolution.

Its effect on work is deeper. The earlier revolutions changed the kind of work people did but still needed their labour. The fourth threatens to replace human labour itself, even skilled labour, through artificial intelligence. Its challenge to employment runs deeper than any before it.

Yet it follows the same logic. For all these differences, the fourth revolution, like those before it, is driven by technology, capital and the pursuit of greater productivity and profit. It too transforms production, society and power. It is therefore the latest stage of one long industrial transformation.

The Fourth Industrial Revolution is therefore both a continuation and a departure: it follows the same logic of technology and profit as the earlier revolutions, yet surpasses them all in the power of its technologies, the speed of its spread and the depth of its challenge to human work.

Question 11

On the foundations of the digital age, a fourth revolution rose, faster and stranger than any before.

Account for the emergence of the Fourth Industrial Revolution.

Model Answer

The Fourth Industrial Revolution has emerged in the twenty-first century, building upon the digital revolution that preceded it. Its emergence is explained by the following factors.

It built upon the Third Industrial Revolution. The Fourth Industrial Revolution grew directly out of the digital and information revolution before it. The computer and the internet provided the foundation on which it was raised. It carried the digital transformation to a new and deeper level.

The advance of artificial intelligence. Great advances in artificial intelligence and machine learning gave machines the power to learn and to decide. These technologies made possible a new kind of intelligent automation. They lay at the very heart of the new revolution.

The spread of the internet and connectivity. The spread of the internet and of high-speed networks connected people, machines and objects across the world. This connectivity made possible the Internet of Things and the fusion of the digital and physical worlds. It provided the nervous system of the revolution.

The growth of computing power and data. The growth of vast computing power and of enormous quantities of data allowed machines to process and to learn on an unprecedented scale. Big data became a resource that fed artificial intelligence. This power made the new technologies possible.

Advances in sensors and robotics. The development of small, powerful sensors and of advanced robotics allowed machines to perceive and to act in the physical world. These innovations linked the digital and the real. They enabled the automation of ever more tasks.

The demands of a competitive global economy. The pressures of global competition drove businesses and nations to seek ever greater efficiency and innovation. This demand pushed forward the development and the spread of the new technologies. The needs of the modern economy thus called the revolution into being.

The Fourth Industrial Revolution therefore emerged from the digital foundation of the third revolution, the advance of artificial intelligence, connectivity, computing, sensors and robotics, and the demands of a competitive global economy, which together gave rise to the newest age of industry.

Question 12

The machine that can think may lighten our labour, or take it away altogether.

'The Fourth Industrial Revolution threatens more jobs than it creates.' Assess this statement.

Model Answer

The statement claims that the Fourth Industrial Revolution destroys more employment than it provides. There is much truth in it, though the matter must be weighed on both sides before a judgement is reached.

Automation displaces many jobs. The revolution's automation gradually replaces traditional manufacturing and blue-collar jobs with machines. Whole categories of work are taken over by robots and automated systems. Many workers thus lose their livelihoods to the machine.

Artificial intelligence threatens even skilled work. Unlike the machines of earlier ages, artificial intelligence threatens to replace people in positions that require highly skilled human labour. Not only manual but also mental and professional work is now at risk. The threat reaches far up the ladder of employment.

The new jobs are fewer than those destroyed. Although the revolution generates new jobs through the advance of technology, the jobs created are often fewer than those it displaces. The balance appears to fall on the side of loss. In this respect the statement holds much truth.

Yet new industries and roles do arise. On the other side, the revolution creates wholly new industries, roles and opportunities that did not exist before. Fields such as data science, robotics and digital services now employ many. The revolution reshapes, as well as reduces, the world of work.

The outcome depends on adaptation. The impact on employment depends greatly on whether workers can be retrained for the new economy. Where education and skills keep pace, new jobs can replace the old. The outcome is therefore not fixed but shaped by human response.

The gains and losses are unevenly shared. The revolution tends to reward those who command the new technology and to harm those who do not. Its job losses fall heaviest upon the less skilled and the poorer nations. Its effect on employment is therefore deeply unequal.

The statement is therefore largely valid: the Fourth Industrial Revolution does appear to threaten more jobs than it creates, especially for the less skilled, though its ultimate impact will depend on how far societies can educate and adapt their workers for the new age.

Changes and continuities of the industrial revolutions

Question 13

From the loom to the computer to the thinking machine, each age of industry left the last behind.

Examine the changes in the industrial revolutions up to the twenty-first century.

Model Answer

Across the industrial revolutions, from the eighteenth century to the twenty-first, much has changed in technology, organisation and society. The main changes were as follows.

The sources of power changed. The first revolution ran on water and steam, the second added electricity, and the later revolutions ran on electronics and digital power. Each age harnessed a new and greater source of energy than the last. Power thus advanced from the steam engine to the microchip.

The leading technologies changed. The first revolution rested on textiles, iron and coal; the second on steel, chemicals and electricity; the third on information technology; and the fourth on artificial intelligence and robotics. The very tools of industry were transformed from one age to the next. Technology grew ever more advanced and intelligent.

The organisation of production changed. Production moved from the factory of the first revolutions to the automated and connected systems of the later ones. Multinational corporations and global networks replaced the single factory. The scale and organisation of industry were utterly transformed.

The place of science changed. In the first revolution invention came largely from practical craftsmen working by trial and error; in the later revolutions it came from trained scientists and great research institutions. Science and industry became ever more closely joined. Knowledge itself became the driving force of production.

The speed and reach changed. The early revolutions spread slowly and were confined to a few nations; the later ones spread faster and reached across the whole world. The fourth revolution spreads at an exponential pace and is global from the very start. Industry became a worldwide and accelerating phenomenon.

The nature of work changed. Work moved from the handloom to the factory machine, then to the office and the computer, and now to the automated system. Machines took over ever more of what human hands and minds had once done. The very meaning of work was transformed across the ages.

The industrial revolutions therefore brought profound changes in power, technology, organisation, science, speed and work, carrying the world from the handloom of the eighteenth century to the thinking machine of the twenty-first.

Question 14

For all that changed, one thread ran unbroken through every age of industry: the drive to produce more.

Examine the continuities in the industrial revolutions up to the twenty-first century.

Model Answer

Although each industrial revolution differed from the last, certain features ran unbroken through them all. These continuities were as follows.

The driving force of technology. Every industrial revolution was driven forward by new technology and invention. From the spinning jenny to artificial intelligence, the machine remained the engine of change. The restless advance of technology was constant through every age.

The pursuit of productivity. Each revolution sought to produce more goods, faster and more cheaply than before. The raising of productivity was the goal of every stage of industry. This drive to produce ever more was a permanent and unbroken thread.

The rule of capital and profit. Throughout the revolutions, industry was owned by those with capital and driven by the pursuit of profit. The capitalist and the search for gain remained at the very centre of the system. This economic logic endured from the first revolution to the fourth.

The transformation of society. Every revolution reshaped society, its classes, its work and its whole way of life. Each brought new tensions between those who owned the means of production and those who worked them. The power of industry to remake society was constant across the ages.

The concentration of ownership. In every age the ownership of industry tended to gather into fewer and larger hands, from the early factory owners to the modern multinational corporation. Great concentrations of economic power recurred in each revolution. This tendency ran through them all.

The widening of inequality. Each revolution brought great wealth but also widened the gap between the rich and the poor, within nations and between them. The benefits of industry were never shared equally among the people. This inequality was a persistent shadow across every age of industry.

The industrial revolutions were therefore bound together by lasting continuities, the drive of technology, the pursuit of productivity and profit, the transformation of society and the persistence of inequality, which ran unbroken from the first revolution to the fourth.

Question 15

Four revolutions have remade the world; whether they have bettered it is a harder question.

Assess the extent to which the industrial revolutions have improved human life.

Model Answer

The industrial revolutions, from the first to the fourth, have transformed human life across the world. Whether, and how far, they have improved it must be weighed on both sides.

They have raised the standard of living. The revolutions have vastly increased the production of goods and, over time, raised living standards for many. Ordinary people now enjoy comforts and goods once beyond the reach of kings. In this the revolutions have plainly improved human life.

They have advanced science, medicine and knowledge. The revolutions have driven great advances in science, medicine and technology. These have lengthened life, cured diseases and spread knowledge widely. Human welfare has been greatly served by this progress.

They have improved communication and connection. The revolutions, above all the digital ones, have connected the world through transport and communication. People can now share knowledge and reach one another across the globe. Human life has been enriched by this new connection.

Yet they have brought exploitation and hardship. Against these gains stand the exploitation of workers, the poverty and squalor of the industrial towns and the hardship of those displaced by machines. For very many people, the revolutions have brought suffering. The progress has carried a heavy human cost.

They have deepened inequality. The revolutions have concentrated wealth and widened the gap between rich and poor, within nations and between them. Their benefits have been unevenly shared among the peoples of the world. Great inequality has shadowed all their progress.

They have harmed the natural environment. The revolutions have brought pollution, the exhaustion of resources and the growing threat of climate change. The progress of industry has done deep damage to the natural world. This is among the gravest of all the costs of the industrial age.

The industrial revolutions have therefore improved human life to a great extent, in wealth, health, knowledge and connection, but this improvement has been bought at the price of exploitation, inequality and harm to the environment, so that their benefits and their costs must be weighed together.

Impacts of industrialisation in Asia and Latin America

Question 16

The old workshops of Europe found, in the twentieth century, that the world had learned to make things for itself.

Examine the impacts of industrialisation in Asia and Latin America.

Model Answer

The spread of industrialisation to Asia and Latin America in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries had profound effects on the world economy and politics. Its main impacts were as follows.

It raised new economic and political powers. Industrialisation led to the emergence of new powers in economy and political influence, including India, China, Brazil and South Africa. These emerging powers challenged the traditional dominance of Europe and the USA. The balance of world power began to shift toward the East and the South.

It gave birth to the BRICS bloc. The new powers formed the BRICS bloc on 16 June 2009, comprising Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa. In 2023 other countries such as Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined it. This bloc gave the emerging economies a common voice against Western dominance.

It reduced Western industrial dominance. Industrialisation in the Asian-Tiger countries and Latin America reduced the dominance of the USA, Germany, Britain and France in consumer goods and metallurgy. Products made from metals and alloys, such as steel, aluminium, copper and titanium, began to be made by other nations. The old industrial monopoly of the West was broken.

It deepened globalisation. Industrialisation, quickened by the fourth industrial revolution, accelerated communication and drew the world closer together. Contacts of unprecedented scale now transcended national boundaries. Industry became a truly global phenomenon.

It brought the exploitation of workers. Industrialisation also brought the exploitation of workers in the new industrial centres, with harsh conditions, long hours, low wages and widespread child labour. This exploitation sparked social unrest and labour movements demanding rights. The suffering of the workers accompanied the new prosperity.

It caused the migration of labour. Industrialisation led to the migration of labour from less-developed to highly industrialised nations, as in the influx of immigrant workers into Japan. Many migrants took lower-paying jobs, and their remittances supported the economies they had left. Labour thus became a globalised element alongside technology and business.

Industrialisation in Asia and Latin America therefore raised new powers, broke the industrial dominance of the West, deepened globalisation, and brought both the exploitation of workers and the migration of labour, making industry a defining force in contemporary world history.

Question 17

Five nations, and then more, gathered to declare that the age of Western monopoly was ending.

Assess the significance of the rise of new industrial powers such as the BRICS nations.

Model Answer

The rise of new industrial powers in Asia, Latin America and beyond, above all the BRICS nations, has been one of the most significant developments of the contemporary world. Its significance may be assessed as follows.

It challenged Western dominance. The emerging powers, including India, China, Brazil and South Africa, challenged the traditional dominance of Europe and the USA. Their industrial rise ended the long monopoly of the West over manufacturing and wealth. The balance of economic power began to shift toward the East and the South.

It created a new bloc in world affairs. The formation of the BRICS bloc on 16 June 2009, comprising Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa, gave the emerging economies a common platform. Its expansion in 2023 to include Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran, Saudi Arabia and the UAE widened its influence. The bloc became a significant force in global politics and economics.

It broke the West's industrial monopoly. The new powers reduced the dominance of the USA, Germany, Britain and France in consumer goods and in metallurgy. Goods once made only in the West were now produced across Asia and Latin America. The industrial map of the world was thereby redrawn.

It deepened globalisation. The rise of the new powers, joined to the fourth industrial revolution, quickened the integration of the world economy. Trade, investment and communication now bound distant nations closely together. The world grew more interconnected than ever before.

It gave the developing world a stronger voice. The new powers gave the nations of the global South a stronger voice against the old dominance of the West. They pressed for a fairer international order that served their own interests. The poorer and formerly colonised nations gained new confidence and weight.

Yet its benefits remained uneven. The benefits of the new industrial power were unevenly shared, both between nations and within them. Great inequalities and the exploitation of workers persisted amid the new wealth. The rise of the new powers therefore remained an unfinished and unequal transformation.

The rise of the new industrial powers was therefore of great significance: it challenged Western dominance, created a new bloc, redrew the industrial map and gave the developing world a stronger voice, even if its benefits remained unevenly shared.

Question 18

The nations that had once bought the world's goods learned, in a generation, to make them.

Account for the emergence of new industrial powers in Asia and Latin America.

Model Answer

In the later twentieth and the twenty-first centuries, new industrial powers emerged in Asia and Latin America, challenging the old dominance of the West. Their rise is explained by the following factors.

They possessed abundant and cheap labour. The nations of Asia and Latin America had large populations that provided abundant and cheap labour. This made their industries competitive and attractive to investment. Cheap labour was a foundation of their industrial rise.

The state actively promoted industry. The governments of the emerging nations promoted industrialisation through planning, investment and protection. States such as those of the Asian Tigers guided and funded industrial growth. Strong state support drove their development forward.

They drew in foreign investment and technology. The emerging economies attracted foreign investment and acquired advanced technology from the industrial West. Multinational corporations built factories there to use the cheap labour. This capital and technology hastened their industrialisation.

They pursued export-led growth. Many of the new powers produced goods for the markets of the world rather than only for home. Their exports earned wealth and drove rapid growth. This outward, export-led strategy powered their rise.

They invested in education and skills. The emerging nations invested in education and technical training to build a skilled workforce. This gave them the human resources that modern industry required. An educated workforce underpinned their industrial success.

Globalisation opened the way. The globalisation of the world economy allowed the new powers to join the global market and to draw in investment and trade. The fourth industrial revolution quickened these connections. Globalisation thus opened the door to their rise.

The new industrial powers of Asia and Latin America therefore emerged through cheap labour, state support, foreign investment and technology, export-led growth, investment in education and the pull of globalisation, which together broke the old industrial monopoly of the West.

Question 19

Four small economies of the East roared so loudly that the whole world called them tigers.

Explain the rise of the Asian Tiger economies.

Model Answer

The Asian Tiger economies were the newly industrialised countries of East Asia, such as South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore and Hong Kong, which industrialised with remarkable speed in the later twentieth century. Their rise is explained as follows.

They were guided by a strong state. The governments of the Asian Tigers played a leading part in directing and promoting industrial growth. They planned, funded and protected their key industries. This strong state direction was central to their success.

They pursued export-oriented industrialisation. The Tigers produced manufactured goods for the world market rather than only for home. Their exports earned great wealth and drove their rapid growth. This export-oriented strategy powered their industrial rise.

They possessed a disciplined, educated workforce. The Tigers invested heavily in education and had disciplined, hard-working populations. This gave them a skilled and productive workforce at relatively low cost. Their human resources were a foundation of their rise.

They attracted foreign investment and technology. The Tiger economies drew in foreign investment and acquired advanced technology from the industrial nations. This capital and know-how allowed them to build modern industries quickly. Outside investment hastened their industrialisation.

They saved and invested heavily. The Tiger societies saved and invested a large share of their wealth in industry and infrastructure. This provided the capital needed for sustained growth. Their thrift and investment fuelled their development.

They pointed the way for the developing world. The rise of the Tigers showed that the nations of the developing world could industrialise and prosper. They reduced the dominance of the West in consumer goods and manufacturing. Their success inspired and encouraged other developing nations.

The Asian Tiger economies therefore rose through strong state direction, export-oriented industrialisation, an educated workforce, foreign investment and high rates of saving, showing the world that the developing nations too could industrialise and challenge the dominance of the West.

Industrial development in Africa, 1945 to 1960

Question 20

The colonial powers came to Africa not to build factories, but to feed their own.

Account for the limited industrial development in colonial Africa between 1945 and 1960.

Model Answer

During the colonial period, and particularly between 1945 and 1960, Africa saw very little industrial development. This backwardness is explained by the following factors of colonial policy.

The colonial period was one of exploitation. The colonial period was above all a time of economic exploitation rather than of industrial development. The colonial powers sought to draw wealth out of Africa, not to build industry within it. Their whole purpose therefore worked against African industrialisation.

Africa was made a supplier of raw materials. The colonies were turned into suppliers of raw materials for the industries of the metropolitan countries. Africa's minerals and crops were exported unprocessed to feed the factories of Europe. This role as a mere supplier left no room for local industry to grow.

Africa was made a market for manufactured goods. The colonies were also turned into markets for the manufactured goods of the colonial powers. African states were made to buy finished goods from Europe rather than to produce their own. This dependence on imports stunted the growth of local industries.

The colonies were tied to mono-crop economies. Colonial powers focused the colonies on producing one or two cash crops, such as cocoa, groundnuts, cotton, coffee and sisal. They made no attempt to diversify the agricultural economies of the colonies. This mono-cropping left African states dependent on a narrow range of exports and hindered industrialisation.

Africans were denied skills and training. The colonial system gave Africans no proper industrial training, employing them only in unskilled and semi-skilled work. Europeans reserved the skilled, supervisory and administrative posts for themselves. Africa was thus deliberately denied the skills that industry required.

Colonial policy fostered lasting dependence. The colonial economic model prioritised the interests of the colonial powers and fostered the continued economic dependence of the African countries. Africa was kept dependent on foreign goods and foreign markets. This deliberate dependence left the continent economically underdeveloped.

The limited industrial development of colonial Africa was therefore the result of a colonial policy of exploitation that made Africa a supplier of raw materials and a market for manufactures, tied it to mono-crops, denied Africans skills and fostered a lasting dependence.

Question 21

It took a world war, and the loss of European ships, to plant the first factories in colonial Africa.

Explain the rise of Import-Substitution Industries in colonial Africa during the Second World War.

Model Answer

During the Second World War the colonial states were forced to establish Import-Substitution Industries in Africa. Their rise is explained by the following circumstances.

The war cut off European imports. During the Second World War the fighting prevented European commercial ships from transporting consumer goods to the colonies. Goods such as soap, sugar, textiles, shoes and cigarettes could no longer be brought from Europe. This sudden shortage created the need to produce such goods within the colonies themselves.

The European residents still needed supplies. The imported goods had been largely consumed by the European officials and settlers who lived in the colonies. When the ships stopped coming, these residents still had to be supplied with their necessities. Local industries were therefore established to meet their needs.

Import substitution offered a solution. The colonial states set up Import-Substitution Industries to replace the goods that could no longer be imported. These industries produced simple consumer goods within the colonies. In this way local production was substituted for the lost imports.

They produced only simple consumer goods. The new industries dealt mainly with the production of simple consumer goods such as juice, biscuits, sweets and cigarettes. There were no textile industries, and true manufacturing hardly existed. Only light industries were established to meet the most immediate needs.

Light industries appeared across the colonies. Light industries such as soap manufacturing were established in the 1940s in Nigeria, Kenya, Southern Rhodesia, the Gold Coast and Ivory Coast. In the

1950s brick-making and copper-smelting appeared in the Belgian Congo, and oven-making in Southern Rhodesia. These modest industries were the first of their kind on the continent.

They rested on cheap African labour. The new industries depended on African labourers, including migrant workers drawn from the interior colonies such as Niger, Upper Volta and French Sudan. Africans did the unskilled and semi-skilled work while Europeans supervised. The industries thus rested on the cheap labour of Africans.

The Import-Substitution Industries therefore rose in colonial Africa because the Second World War cut off European imports, forcing the colonial states to produce simple consumer goods locally through the light industries that were the first small beginnings of African manufacturing.

Question 22

The first factories of colonial Africa were small, simple and made to serve others, not the Africans who worked in them.

Examine the features of the colonial industries established in Africa between 1945 and 1960.

Model Answer

The industries established in colonial Africa in the years around and after the Second World War had a set of distinctive features that reflected their colonial purpose. These were as follows.

They were light industries. The colonial industries were light industries producing simple consumer goods rather than heavy manufacturing. Manufacturing proper hardly existed, and there were no textile industries. Only modest, small-scale industries were ever established.

They produced only simple goods. These industries dealt mainly with the production of simple goods such as soap, juice, biscuits, sweets and cigarettes. They did not make machines, tools or other producer goods. Their output was limited to the simplest of necessities.

They used simple technologies. The colonial industries used simple technologies, such as the basic machine and raw materials needed for soap-making. They did not employ advanced or heavy machinery. Their methods were as modest as their products.

They relied on cheap African labour. The industries depended on African labourers, often migrant workers from the interior colonies. These workers did the unskilled and semi-skilled tasks for very low wages. The industries rested entirely upon the cheap labour of Africans.

They gave Africans no training. No formal training was given to the African workers, who learned only enough to operate the machines. Skilled, supervisory and administrative posts were reserved for Europeans. Africans were deliberately kept from acquiring real industrial skills.

They served colonial, not African, interests. The industries were established to serve the needs of the colonial system and its European residents, not the development of Africa. They were designed to meet immediate shortages rather than to industrialise the continent. Their purpose was colonial through and through.

The colonial industries of 1945 to 1960 were therefore light industries producing simple goods with simple technologies and cheap African labour, giving Africans no skills and serving colonial rather than African interests.

Question 23

Long before the rest of the continent, the mines of the south had drawn Africa into the industrial age.

Account for the early industrial development of South Africa before 1945.

Model Answer

Before 1945 the most industrialised country in Africa was South Africa. Its early industrial development is explained by the following factors.

Settler industries began at the Cape. South Africa's industrial development began with light industries established by the Boer and British settlers at the Cape in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. These settlers brought European skills, capital and enterprise. They laid the earliest foundations of industry on the continent.

The discovery of diamonds transformed the economy. The discovery of diamonds in 1871 brought a mineral revolution to South Africa. The diamond fields drew capital, labour and enterprise on a great scale. This mineral wealth gave a powerful impulse to industrialisation.

The discovery of gold deepened the revolution. The discovery of gold in 1886 deepened and accelerated the mineral revolution. The gold mines of the Witwatersrand became a great centre of industry and wealth. Gold made South Africa the industrial heart of the continent.

Foreign capital flowed in. The mineral discoveries attracted great inflows of foreign capital into South Africa. This capital financed the mines, the railways and new industries. The wealth of the minerals thus funded a wider industrial growth.

Supporting industries grew up. The mining industry gave rise to supporting industries in engineering, transport and manufacturing. Railways, workshops and factories grew up around the mines. Industry spread outward from the mineral fields into the wider economy.

Cheap African labour sustained it. The mines and industries drew on a vast supply of cheap African labour, much of it migrant. This cheap labour made the industries highly profitable for their owners. It became, and long remained, a foundation of South African industry.

South Africa's early industrial development therefore rested on its settler industries and, above all, on the mineral revolution of diamonds in 1871 and gold in 1886, which drew in capital and cheap labour and made it the most industrialised country in Africa before 1945.

Question 24

'Industrialise or perish,' declared Nkrumah, and the new nations set out to build what colonialism had denied them.

Examine the industrial strategies adopted by African states after independence.

Model Answer

From the 1960s the newly independent African states saw industrialisation as the means to assert their economic independence, and they adopted various strategies to achieve it. These were as follows.

They adopted import-substitution industrialisation. Many independent states adopted an import-substitution industrialisation strategy in order to avoid dependence on foreign goods. They built domestic industries to produce goods that had formerly been imported. The aim was to diversify their economies beyond agriculture.

The state invested in and owned industry. Governments invested heavily in building domestic industries and established state-owned enterprises. In Ghana in 1961, for example, the Ministry of Industries nationalised firms producing furniture, nails and timber. The state thus took the lead in driving industrialisation.

Nkrumah pursued 'Industrialise or Perish'. In Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah pursued an industrialisation agenda known as 'Industrialise or Perish'. The government invested heavily in infrastructure and state enterprises and adopted import substitution. Industrialisation was made a matter of national survival.

They built great infrastructure projects. Some states undertook great projects to power their industries, such as the Kainji Dam near Jebba in Nigeria. The dam served irrigation and generated hydroelectric power. Around it grew industries such as petroleum refining, cement production and food processing.

They sought to attract foreign investment. Some states sought to attract foreign investment to build their industries. Kenya, for example, introduced the Foreign Investment Protection Act in 1964 and established

the Industrial and Commercial Development Corporation. These measures encouraged investment and supported indigenous entrepreneurs.

They met serious challenges. These strategies met serious challenges, including the overvaluation of currencies, shortages of hard currency and mismanagement. Such problems constrained industrial output and hindered success. The dream of industrialisation proved harder to achieve than to declare.

The independent African states therefore pursued industrialisation through import substitution, state investment, great infrastructure projects and foreign investment, in agendas such as Nkrumah's 'Industrialise or Perish', though currency problems and mismanagement often frustrated their efforts.

Question 25

The diamonds and gold of the south brought both great wealth and a long shadow of exploitation.

Assess the effects of the mineral revolution on the development of South Africa.

Model Answer

The mineral revolution, brought about by the discovery of diamonds in 1871 and gold in 1886, had profound and lasting effects on South Africa. These effects, both positive and negative, may be assessed as follows.

It made South Africa the industrial heart of Africa. The mineral wealth drew capital, labour and enterprise and made South Africa the most industrialised country on the continent. Mining became the engine of a wider industrial economy. The country was transformed by the wealth of its minerals.

It attracted capital and immigrants. The diamond and gold fields drew great inflows of foreign capital and of immigrants seeking their fortune. This wealth and population fed rapid economic growth. The mineral revolution made South Africa a magnet for investment and settlement.

It stimulated railways and industry. The mines created a great demand for railways, engineering and supporting industries. Transport and manufacturing grew up around the mineral fields. Industry thus spread outward from the mines into the wider economy.

It rested on the exploitation of African labour. The mines depended on a vast supply of cheap African migrant labour, drawn from across the region. Africans did the hard and dangerous work for low wages, while whites took the skilled posts. The wealth of the minerals was built upon their exploitation.

It entrenched racial division. The mineral economy fixed a system in which whites owned and managed while blacks laboured cheaply, deepening racial inequality. It laid economic foundations for the later system of segregation and apartheid. The mineral revolution thus had a dark and lasting social legacy.

It tied South Africa to the world economy. The export of diamonds and gold bound South Africa closely to the markets and powers of the wider world. Its prosperity came to depend on the demand for its minerals. The country became a supplier of precious minerals to the global economy.

The mineral revolution therefore transformed South Africa into the industrial power of the continent and drew in capital and industry, but it did so upon a foundation of cheap African labour and racial division whose harmful legacy would long endure.

Question 26

Independence gave Africa the will to industrialise, but not, at once, the means.

Examine the challenges facing industrialisation in post-colonial Africa.

Model Answer

After independence the African states sought to industrialise, but they faced serious obstacles that slowed their progress. The main challenges were as follows.

They suffered a shortage of capital. The newly independent states lacked the capital needed to build industries, infrastructure and machinery. Poor and newly freed, they could not easily fund large industrial projects. This shortage of capital was a fundamental obstacle.

They faced currency and foreign-exchange problems. Many states suffered from the overvaluation of their currencies and from shortages of the hard currency needed to buy raw materials and spare parts. These problems severely constrained industrial output and operations. They were a recurring and serious difficulty.

They depended on foreign technology and skills. The African states depended on foreign technology, machinery and skilled personnel, for the colonial period had denied Africans training. This dependence made industrialisation costly and difficult. It left the new states reliant on others for their industry.

Their markets were narrow. The individual African economies were often small and their peoples poor, so the home market for manufactured goods was narrow. Without large markets, industries could not easily grow. This limited the scale on which industry could develop.

They laboured under the colonial legacy. The colonial economy had left Africa a supplier of raw materials and a market for imports, with little industry and few skills. This inheritance was very hard to overcome. The very structure of the economy worked against rapid industrialisation.

They were hindered by mismanagement and instability. Some industrial projects suffered from mismanagement, corruption and political instability. State enterprises were often poorly run and unprofitable. These weaknesses further constrained the growth of industry.

Post-colonial industrialisation in Africa was therefore hindered by shortages of capital and hard currency, dependence on foreign technology, narrow markets, the colonial legacy and problems of mismanagement, which together slowed the continent's advance toward industry.

Chapter 4

ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS IN THE ANCIENT WORLD

Attempt each question in full on paper before you read the model answer beneath it. The questions follow the chapter topic by topic and rise in demand.

The concept and features of ancient administrative systems

Question 1

Long before the modern state, men and women learned that to live together in great numbers they must first agree on who should rule, and how.

Explain the concept of an administrative system as used in the study of the ancient world.

Model Answer

An administrative system is the organised structure of offices, rules and institutions through which a society is governed and its affairs are managed. It is the means by which the bare authority of a ruler is turned into the ordered daily life of a whole people. In studying the ancient world, historians use the concept to compare how far-apart civilisations each solved the common problem of governing large numbers. Its meaning may be explained as follows.

It is the machinery through which power is exercised. An administrative system is the whole set of institutions and offices by which the authority of a ruler or state is put into practice over a territory and its people. It links the ruler at the centre to the humblest subject in the village through a chain of officials and commands. Without this machinery the power of a king would remain a mere claim rather than a working reality. It is therefore the practical instrument that turns authority into government.

It governs a defined territory and people. Every administrative system operates over a bounded territory and a particular population who owe it obedience and tribute. The Egyptian system governed the Nile valley, the Inca the Andes and the Roman the lands about the Mediterranean. Fixing the limits of rule allowed taxes to be gathered, order kept and defence organised within known borders. A system was thus always tied to a land and a people that it claimed to rule.

It rests upon a recognised source of authority. Each ancient system drew its legitimacy from an accepted source, most often religion, royal descent or successful conquest. In many societies the ruler was held to be divine or the chosen agent of the gods, as with the Egyptian Pharaoh and the Chinese Son of Heaven. This sacred sanction turned obedience into a duty rather than mere submission to force. Legitimacy was therefore the invisible foundation on which the whole structure stood.

It is organised as a hierarchy of offices. Administration in the ancient world was arranged in graded ranks descending from the ruler through governors and officials to local headmen. Orders and laws passed downward through this chain, while tribute, taxes and information flowed upward to the centre. Such a pyramid of office allowed a single capital to govern lands far beyond the ruler's own sight. Hierarchy was thus the device that made rule at a distance possible.

It performs the essential functions of the state. The system existed to keep internal order, defend the territory, gather tribute and taxes, settle disputes and organise labour for public works. These functions turned a mere gathering of people into a governed society with common purposes and protection. The range of tasks a system could perform was the true measure of the reach of the state. Government was defined less by its throne than by the work it actually did.

It depends on records and communication. To govern at a distance, ancient administrations developed writing, records and messengers, from the clay tablets of Sumer to the knotted quipu of the Inca. Roads, relays and couriers carried commands, tribute and news across the realm, as along the Persian Royal Road. The capacity to record and to communicate set the very limit of how large a state could grow. Information was, in effect, the nervous system of ancient government.

It combines authority with the means of coercion. Beyond legitimacy and persuasion, every system possessed the force needed to compel the disobedient, whether an army, a guard or a scheme of punishment.

The law-code of Hammurabi and the network of spies in the Mauryan Arthashastra alike show this concern to enforce as well as to command. Authority unsupported by the power to coerce could not long survive rebellion or crime. Government therefore rested on both the willing obedience of subjects and the capacity to punish.

It varied with the society that produced it. No single form was universal, for some peoples built highly centralised empires while others governed themselves through clans, elders and age-grades without any king. The shape of each system reflected the economy, beliefs, geography and history of its people. The concept therefore embraces both the mighty empire and the small stateless community alike. To study administrative systems is thus to study the whole variety of human government.

An administrative system is therefore the entire apparatus of authority, territory, hierarchy, function, record and coercion through which an ancient society governed itself, resting always upon a recognised source of legitimacy. Its study reveals how the different civilisations of the ancient world, from Egypt to Peru, each solved in their own way the universal problem of living together under ordered rule.

Question 2

From the Nile to the Andes the great civilisations never met, yet they built their governments upon strikingly similar foundations.

Describe the main features common to administrative systems in the ancient world.

Model Answer

Although they arose in separate continents and separate ages, the administrative systems of the ancient world shared a remarkable number of common features. This recurrence suggests that all complex societies faced the same basic problems of order, revenue and defence. Comparing them therefore reveals a common pattern beneath the local variety. The principal features may be described as follows.

Divine or sacred kingship. Most ancient states were headed by a ruler believed to be a god, the son of a god or the chosen agent of the gods. The Egyptian Pharaoh, the Inca Sapa Inca and the Chinese Son of Heaven all governed by sacred right and sat at the summit of religion as well as of the state. This clothed political power in an authority that ordinary men dared not question. Sacred kingship was thus the commonest crown of ancient government.

A centralised and hierarchical structure. Authority typically descended from the ruler through a graded order of governors, officials and local chiefs to the ordinary subject. Provinces and districts were placed under appointed men who answered upward to the centre for order and tribute. This pyramid of office allowed vast territories to be ruled from a single capital city. Centralised hierarchy was therefore the skeleton of most ancient states.

A bureaucracy of appointed officials. The great empires employed a class of scribes, ministers and administrators to carry out the daily work of government. The Chinese mandarins, the Egyptian viziers and scribes and the Persian satraps were all such trained servants of the state. Through them taxes were assessed, records kept, justice done and orders enforced. Government thus became a profession as well as a privilege of birth.

Taxation, tribute and forced labour. Every system drew wealth from its subjects as tax, tribute or compulsory service to support the ruler, the army and public works. The Inca exacted the mita labour service, Persia and Mali taxed trade, and Egypt claimed a share of the harvest. This surplus, taken from the many, sustained the few who governed and defended the state. Revenue was the lifeblood without which no administration could stand.

A standing army and organised force. Ancient states maintained armed force to defend their borders, expand their frontiers and compel obedience within. The Persian Immortals, the Roman legions and the war-canoe fleets of Songhai were all instruments of this kind. The army both protected the state from enemies and upheld the ruler against rebellion. Organised force was therefore a universal feature of ancient rule.

A system of law and justice. Every developed system possessed rules, courts or codes to settle disputes and punish wrongdoing, whether the written Code of Hammurabi or the royal justice of the Pharaoh. Law brought order and predictability to daily life and bound subjects to a common standard. It also displayed the ruler as the protector of the weak against the strong. Law and justice were thus a shared pillar of ancient administration.

Great public works and a redistributive economy. Ancient administrations organised communal projects such as irrigation, roads, temples, granaries and city walls, and often stored and redistributed produce. The Nile dykes, the Roman roads, the Inca highways and storehouses were all works of the state. Such undertakings both displayed and extended the power of government over its people. Public works were therefore among the proudest marks of ancient rule.

A rigid social hierarchy. Ancient societies were sharply divided into classes, with a ruler and nobility above, then priests, officials and free commoners, and slaves or serfs below. The Indian caste system, the Roman patricians and plebeians and the helots of Sparta all show this ordered inequality. Administration both rested upon and preserved these social ranks. A layered society was thus the common ground on which government was built.

Religion woven into government. In almost every case priesthoods, temples and worship reinforced the authority of the ruler and the stability of the state. The Egyptian temples, the Babylonian ziggurats and the Inca Sun cult all served political as well as sacred ends. Religion supplied legitimacy, ceremony and often the earliest machinery of administration. Sacred and political power were therefore closely intertwined throughout the ancient world.

The administrative systems of the ancient world therefore shared the common features of sacred kingship, centralised hierarchy, a professional bureaucracy, taxation and forced labour, armed force, law, great public works, a layered society and pervasive religion. That such distant civilisations built upon the same foundations shows that these were the natural answers to the universal challenge of governing complex societies.

Question 3

Government was not born of design but of necessity, as scattered families grew into crowded cities that could no longer govern themselves by custom alone.

Examine the factors that gave rise to organised administrative systems in the ancient world.

Model Answer

Organised administrative systems did not appear by accident but grew out of deep changes in the way people lived and worked. As simple farming communities became complex societies, they were forced to invent the machinery of government. Several economic, social and religious factors worked together to bring this about. These may be examined as follows.

The development of agriculture and surplus. The mastery of settled farming, above all in the fertile river valleys, produced a surplus of food that could feed people not engaged in production. This surplus supported rulers, priests, soldiers and officials, and it had to be stored, guarded and fairly distributed. The management of this wealth called into being the first organisers and record-keepers. Agricultural surplus was therefore the economic root from which administration grew.

Favourable geography of the river valleys. The earliest systems arose in great river valleys such as the Nile, the Tigris and Euphrates, the Indus and the Yellow River. These waters gave rich soil and easy transport but also demanded control through flood-defence and irrigation. Their fertility drew dense populations together into the world's first states and cities. Geography thus set the stage on which organised government first appeared.

The growth of population and towns. As farming fed larger numbers, villages swelled into cities such as Ur, Memphis and Cuzco, crowding together people who were often strangers to one another. Such populations could no longer be governed by kinship and custom as a small clan had been. Their very size

demanded a formal authority to keep order, settle disputes and organise common life. Urban growth therefore made organised administration a necessity.

The need for irrigation and public works. In the river-valley civilisations, farming depended on canals, dykes and dams that no single family could build or maintain alone. Only a central authority could command the labour of thousands to control the waters of the Nile or the Euphrates. This organising of great common works fostered strong and lasting states. The demands of public works thus drove the growth of government.

The influence of religion. Priesthoods and temples were among the earliest organisers of society, collecting offerings, keeping calendars and interpreting the will of the gods. Rulers who claimed divine sanction bound religion and government tightly together, as in Sumer and Egypt. Religion supplied both the legitimacy of rule and much of the early machinery of administration. Belief was therefore a powerful spur to organised government.

Trade and the wealth it created. The exchange of goods over long distances, such as the trans-Saharan and Indian Ocean trades, created wealth that rulers sought to tax and protect. Markets, routes, weights and merchants all required regulation, security and record-keeping. The management of this commerce enriched and strengthened the state that controlled it. Trade thus both demanded and rewarded organised administration.

War and the need for defence. The threat of raids and the ambition of conquest compelled communities to organise for war under a single command. Successful war-leaders became kings, and their armies became permanent instruments of the state, as in Sumer and among the Zulu. The need to defend land and people, and to hold conquests, hastened the growth of strong government. War was therefore a great maker of states.

The rise of social classes and the invention of writing. Surplus wealth allowed some to grow rich and powerful while others laboured, producing classes of nobles, priests, commoners and slaves who had to be governed. At the same time the invention of writing, from Sumerian cuneiform to Egyptian hieroglyphs, gave rulers the means to record taxes, laws and land. Class division created the need for government, and writing supplied its essential tool. Together they completed the foundations of organised administration.

Organised administrative systems in the ancient world therefore arose from the combined pressures of agricultural surplus, favourable geography, growing cities, public works, religion, trade, war, and the emergence of classes and writing. These factors, working together, transformed simple farming communities into governed states, and explain why the earliest administrations appeared where they did.

Administrative systems in Ancient Asia

Question 4

From his capital at Pataliputra the Mauryan emperor governed almost the whole of India through a web of officials and spies that reached into every province.

Describe the administrative system of the Mauryan Empire of ancient India.

Model Answer

The Mauryan Empire (c. 321 to 185 BCE), founded by Chandragupta Maurya, built the first great centralised administration in Indian history. Its principles were set out in the Arthashastra, the manual of statecraft attributed to Chandragupta's minister Kautilya. From the capital, Pataliputra, the emperors governed almost the whole subcontinent through a graded body of officials. The system may be described as follows.

The emperor stood at the head of the state. Supreme authority rested with the emperor, who was at once the source of law, the commander of the army and the final judge. Chandragupta and later Ashoka governed as absolute monarchs, though the Arthashastra held that a king should labour for the welfare of his subjects. The whole administration radiated outward from the person of the king. His will, carried by his officials, reached from the capital to the frontier.

A council of ministers advised the ruler. The emperor was assisted by a council of ministers, the mantriparishad, and by high officials who headed the great departments of state. Kautilya, Chandragupta's chief minister and the reputed author of the Arthashastra, embodied this advisory power. The council debated policy, war and finance and helped supervise the vast machinery of government. It gave the monarchy the steadying counsel of experienced men.

The empire was divided into provinces. The realm was organised into several great provinces, the chief of them ruled by princes of the royal blood acting as viceroys. Below the provinces lay districts and villages, each with its own graded officers responsible upward to the centre. This structure carried the emperor's authority from Pataliputra to the distant borders of the empire. Provincial government thus made so vast a state governable.

A trained bureaucracy governed the districts. A large body of salaried officials managed revenue, justice and order at every level, from district officers down to the village headman, or gramika. Their duties, ranks and salaries were carefully defined in the Arthashastra. Superintendents oversaw trade, mines, forests, markets and the mint on behalf of the state. Government thus reached down into the smallest community of the empire.

Revenue and the economy were closely controlled. The state drew its income chiefly from a tax on land, usually a share of the produce, together with duties on trade, irrigation and craft. Officials measured land, assessed crops and supervised markets, weights and prices to prevent fraud. The state also owned mines, forests and workshops, adding their wealth to the treasury. Careful management of revenue sustained the army and the administration.

Cities were governed by boards of officials. Great cities such as Pataliputra were administered by committees or boards responsible for crafts, trade, foreigners, births and deaths, and the care of goods. This urban government kept order, collected city taxes and regulated the life of the capital. It shows the detailed reach of Mauryan administration into daily affairs. City management was thus a distinctive feature of the system.

Spies and a standing army upheld the state. The Arthashastra prescribed an elaborate network of spies and informers to watch officials and subjects alike and to report disloyalty to the king. A large standing army, one of the greatest of the ancient world, defended the empire and enforced its authority. Surveillance and force together guarded the throne against both rebellion and corruption. Control was thus built into the very design of the state.

Ashoka softened the system with dhamma. After the bloody Kalinga war of c. 261 BCE, the emperor Ashoka tempered the harsher machinery of empire with his policy of dhamma, or moral law. He appointed welfare officials and proclaimed his principles on rocks and pillars throughout the land. Government came to be presented as the care of the ruler for his people's happiness. This ethical turn gave Mauryan administration its distinctive character.

The Mauryan Empire was therefore governed through a centralised monarchy guided by the Arthashastra, a council of ministers, provinces under royal viceroys, a salaried bureaucracy reaching to the villages, a controlled economy, city boards, and an army supported by spies. Softened under Ashoka by the ideal of dhamma, it stands as the model of organised administration in ancient India.

Question 5

A single war so sickened a conqueror that he turned the whole machinery of empire from conquest to the welfare of his people.

Assess the contribution of Ashoka to the administration of the Mauryan Empire.

Model Answer

Ashoka (r. c. 268 to 232 BCE), the greatest of the Mauryan emperors, transformed the very purpose of Indian administration after his conversion to Buddhism. Where his grandfather Chandragupta had built the machinery of empire, Ashoka bent it towards the welfare of his subjects. His reign is therefore a landmark in the history of government. His contribution may be assessed as follows.

He introduced government by dhamma. After the bloodshed of the Kalinga war of c. 261 BCE, Ashoka renounced further conquest and made moral law, or dhamma, the guiding principle of his rule. He proclaimed that a true king should govern for the happiness and welfare of his people rather than for glory. This gave the ancient state a new ethical purpose rarely seen before. Government by dhamma was his most original contribution.

He created officers to promote welfare. Ashoka appointed special officials, the dhamma-mahamattas, to spread righteousness, protect the weak and oversee acts of charity across the empire. They watched over prisoners, the aged, the sick and the poor, and checked the conduct of local officers. Through them the state took on duties of social welfare unusual in the ancient world. This widened the very idea of what government was for.

He communicated with his subjects through edicts. Ashoka had his principles carved on rocks and polished pillars throughout the empire, written in the local languages so that ordinary people could understand them. These edicts announced his policies, his moral teaching and his care for his subjects. They are among the earliest direct royal proclamations to the people in world history. They bound the distant provinces to the mind and voice of the king.

He strengthened public works and communication. His government built roads, planted shade-trees, dug wells and set up rest-houses and hospitals for both people and animals. Such works eased travel and trade and displayed the benevolence of the state to all who used them. They also improved the movement of officials, armies and news across the empire. Public works thus served both welfare and administration together.

He practised religious tolerance. Though himself a Buddhist, Ashoka respected and supported the other faiths of his subjects and urged concord between them in his edicts. This tolerance reduced religious conflict and bound a diverse empire more closely to the throne. It showed a wise understanding that a great state must embrace many beliefs. Toleration was therefore a real instrument of his government.

He preserved the unity of a vast empire. By tempering force with moral authority, Ashoka held together an empire spanning almost the whole subcontinent without the ceaseless warfare of earlier kings. His tours of inspection, the dhamma-yatras, replaced the royal hunts and let him see his people's condition for himself. Persuasion and paternal care became instruments of rule alongside the army. Unity through moral leadership was among his chief achievements.

He gave the state a lasting moral example. Ashoka's ideal of the righteous ruler who serves his people left a deep mark on later Indian and Buddhist ideas of kingship. His reign became a model against which good government could be measured for centuries afterwards. Even today his lion capital stands as the emblem of the Indian state. His moral legacy long outlived his empire.

Yet his system revealed the limits of personal rule. Because the new order rested so heavily on Ashoka's own character and faith, it weakened once his firm hand was gone. Within about fifty years of his death the Mauryan Empire had broken apart. This exposed the fragility of a system that depended on the virtue of one man rather than on lasting institutions. His reign therefore teaches both the strength and the danger of personal government.

Ashoka therefore gave Mauryan administration a moral foundation, welfare officials, public works, religious tolerance and a unifying royal voice, transforming the purpose of the ancient state. Although his system did not long survive him, he remains a rare example of a ruler who turned the machinery of empire towards the good of his people, and his ideal of righteous kingship endured for centuries.

Question 6

The Chinese emperor ruled as the Son of Heaven, yet his commands were carried out by an army not of soldiers but of scholars.

Examine the main features of the administrative system of ancient China.

Model Answer

Ancient China, first unified under the Qin in 221 BCE and consolidated by the Han (206 BCE to 220 CE), developed one of the most enduring administrative systems in all history. It combined a sacred monarchy with a disciplined, professional bureaucracy that outlasted every dynasty. Its structure would shape Chinese government for two thousand years. Its main features may be examined as follows.

The emperor ruled as the Son of Heaven. At the summit stood the emperor, regarded as the Son of Heaven who governed by the Mandate of Heaven. He was at once the supreme lawgiver, the high priest and the commander of the armies. His sacred person was the source of all authority in the state. From him the whole administration descended in an unbroken chain.

Government was highly centralised. The first emperor, Qin Shi Huang, abolished the old feudal lords and divided the empire into commanderies and counties governed by appointed officials. He standardised weights, measures, coinage and even the written script across the land. This broke the scattered power of the hereditary nobles and gathered it at the centre. Centralisation became the enduring principle of Chinese rule.

A professional bureaucracy administered the empire. The empire was run by a vast body of appointed, salaried officials, later known in the West as mandarins, arranged in graded ranks. They collected the taxes, kept the records, judged the cases and maintained order in the provinces. Each was posted away from his home district and regularly inspected to check corruption. Government thus became the disciplined work of trained servants of the state.

Officials were increasingly chosen by merit. Under the Han the state began to recruit officials by recommendation and examination in the Confucian classics, seeking talent rather than mere birth. An imperial academy was founded in 124 BCE to train scholars for the service of the state. This practice grew over the centuries into the famous imperial examination system. The ideal of merit gave Chinese administration a distinctive strength.

Confucianism supplied the ethic of government. From the Han onward, Confucian teaching provided the moral code of the official class, stressing loyalty, virtue and the ruler's duty to care for the people. The earlier Legalism of the Qin had by contrast stressed strict law, reward and harsh punishment. The two traditions together gave Chinese government both its discipline and its conscience. Ideas as much as institutions shaped the state.

The empire was governed through provinces and districts. Below the throne the land was divided into provinces, commanderies and counties, each under officials responsible upward to the capital. Civil governors were commonly balanced by separate military commanders to prevent any one man growing too strong. Careful records of population and land underpinned taxation and conscription. This orderly structure carried the emperor's rule to every corner of the realm.

Law, census and taxation bound the subjects to the state. The state kept detailed registers of households and land, on which it based its taxes and its levies of labour and soldiers. A body of law, sterner under the Qin and milder under the Han, defined crimes and punishments for all. Through these the government reached directly into the lives of its people. Record and law were thus essential tools of Chinese administration.

Roads, canals and defensive works held the empire together. The administration built roads and canals to move armies, tribute and grain, and maintained great defensive works, above all the Great Wall, against the northern nomads. A relay system of posts carried messages swiftly between the capital and the provinces. These works of state knit the huge and varied empire into one. Communication and defence were therefore pillars of the system.

Ancient Chinese administration was therefore marked by a sacred emperor, a centralised structure of provinces, a professional and increasingly merit-based bureaucracy, the ethic of Confucianism, detailed law and census, and great works of communication and defence. This combination gave China a system of government so sound that it endured, in recognisable form, for two thousand years.

Question 7

Heaven, the Chinese believed, chose the emperor, and Heaven could also cast him down.

Explain the significance of the Mandate of Heaven in the administration of ancient China.

Model Answer

The Mandate of Heaven was the doctrine that the emperor ruled by the will of Heaven only for so long as he governed justly. First used to justify the rise of the Zhou, it became the guiding principle of Chinese political thought. It shaped how emperors ruled, how dynasties fell and how officials judged the throne. Its significance for administration may be explained as follows.

It gave the emperor his legitimacy. The doctrine held that Heaven granted the right to rule to a virtuous emperor, making him the Son of Heaven and sole link between Heaven and earth. This sacred sanction placed his authority above challenge by ordinary men. It was the very foundation on which the imperial order rested. Legitimacy flowed from Heaven through the person of the emperor.

It bound the ruler to just government. The Mandate was conditional, for Heaven favoured only a ruler who governed for the welfare of the people. A king who grew cruel, idle or corrupt was held to forfeit Heaven's approval. The doctrine therefore laid a heavy moral duty upon the emperor himself. It made good government not merely wise but a sacred obligation.

It explained the rise and fall of dynasties. Natural disasters, famines, rebellions and defeats were read as signs that a dynasty had lost the Mandate and was ripe for replacement. In this way the doctrine gave China its famous theory of the dynastic cycle. The fall of kings was thus woven into a moral order rather than seen as mere accident. It offered a way of understanding the whole course of history.

It justified rebellion against a bad ruler. Because a tyrant was thought to have lost Heaven's favour, those who overthrew him could claim to be restoring the Mandate rather than committing treason. Successful rebels used this to win legitimacy for a new dynasty. The doctrine thus both upheld good rulers and sanctioned the removal of bad ones. It gave revolution a place within the moral scheme of government.

It reinforced the moral character of the bureaucracy. Since Heaven judged the ruler by his care for the people, officials were expected to govern virtuously and to warn the throne when it strayed. Confucian scholars used the doctrine to counsel, restrain and even reprove the emperor. It thus strengthened the ethical ideal of the whole official class. Good conduct became a duty owed to Heaven as well as to the throne.

It made ritual and omens matters of state. Because Heaven's favour had to be maintained, the emperor performed great ceremonies and sacrifices as high priest of the realm. Unusual events in nature were watched and interpreted as signs of Heaven's pleasure or displeasure. The care of ritual thus became an important function of government. Religion and administration were joined in the person of the emperor.

It gave the empire continuity and unity. By making the emperor the sole holder of Heaven's Mandate, the doctrine upheld the unity of the state under one sacred head. Successive dynasties, whatever their origin, inherited the same heavenly office and its duties. This lent Chinese administration a remarkable continuity across many centuries. The Mandate was thus a thread binding the whole imperial tradition together.

The Mandate of Heaven was therefore significant as the source of imperial legitimacy, a check upon tyranny, an explanation of dynastic change, a justification of rebellion, a spur to virtuous officials and a support for the unity of the state. It gave ancient Chinese administration both its sacred authority and its moral discipline, uniquely blending religion, ethics and government in the person of the emperor.

Question 8

Two of Asia's oldest civilisations each built a mighty empire, yet one bound its people by caste and the other by the brush of the scholar-official.

Compare the administrative systems of ancient India and ancient China.

Model Answer

The Mauryan Empire of ancient India and the Qin and Han Empire of ancient China were the two great administrative achievements of ancient Asia. Both governed enormous populations, yet they rested on very different social and moral foundations. A comparison reveals both their shared methods and their deep contrasts. Their systems may be compared as follows.

Both were centralised monarchies. In each empire supreme authority rested with a single sovereign, the Mauryan emperor and the Chinese Son of Heaven, who commanded the army and stood as the source of law. Both governed vast territories from a great capital, Pataliputra and the Qin and Han capitals respectively. In this concentration of power at the top the two systems were closely alike. The monarch was the keystone of each state.

Both governed through appointed officials. India was administered by a salaried bureaucracy and provincial viceroys, and China by its graded body of officials, or mandarins. In both, the emperor's authority reached the provinces through servants of the crown rather than through independent nobles. Both also kept records and taxed land and trade through these officials. Government by bureaucracy was thus common to both.

Both relied on surveillance and strong law. The Indian Arthashastra prescribed an elaborate network of spies to watch officials and subjects, while the Qin enforced a harsh Legalist code of rewards and punishments. Each empire watched and disciplined its people closely to guard the throne. Control was written into the design of both states. In this concern for order they resembled one another.

They differed in the basis of office. In China office came increasingly to be won by merit through recommendation and, later, examination in the Confucian classics. In India, by contrast, status was powerfully shaped by the hereditary caste system, which fixed men in their station from birth. Chinese administration thus opened, in principle, a path for talent that Indian society restrained. Here the two diverged most sharply of all.

They rested on different ideologies. Mauryan government drew on the practical statecraft of Kautilya's Arthashastra and, under Ashoka, on the moral ideal of Buddhist dhamma. Chinese government was shaped first by Legalism and then, lastingly, by Confucianism. Each empire was thus guided by a distinct philosophy of rule. Ideas as much as institutions set them apart.

They differed in the place of religion. In China the emperor himself was the Son of Heaven and chief priest, so that religion and rule were united in one person. In India kingship was upheld by Brahmin priests and by faiths such as Hinduism and Buddhism that stood somewhat apart from the throne. Sacred authority was thus organised differently in the two lands. Religion legitimised both, but in contrasting ways.

They differed in endurance. The Mauryan Empire fragmented within about fifty years of Ashoka's death, its unity resting too much on great individuals. The Chinese imperial system, with its bureaucratic and Confucian tradition, survived in recognisable form for two millennia. The Chinese model thus proved by far the more durable. This contrast in longevity is perhaps the most striking difference of all.

The administrative systems of ancient India and China were therefore alike in their centralised monarchy, official government, and reliance on surveillance and strong law, but differed in the place of merit and caste, in their guiding ideologies and religions, and in their endurance. The Chinese system, resting on institutions rather than on individuals, proved the more lasting of the two.

Administrative systems in the Ancient Middle East

Question 9

In the mud-brick cities between the Tigris and Euphrates, government first took shape around the temple of the city god.

Describe the administrative system of the Sumerian city-states of Mesopotamia.

Model Answer

The Sumerians of southern Mesopotamia, from about 3000 BCE, built the world's earliest cities and the earliest known systems of government. Their land was a patchwork of independent city-states such as Ur, Uruk and Lagash, each centred on the temple of its god. In these cities writing, law and bureaucracy were first invented. Their administrative system may be described as follows.

Society was organised in independent city-states. Sumer was not a single kingdom but a collection of separate city-states, each governing its own city and the fields and villages around it. Every city was politically independent, ordered its own affairs and often warred with its neighbours over land and water. The city, not any wider nation, was the true unit of government. This fragmentation shaped the whole of Sumerian political life.

The temple was the centre of administration. Each city was dedicated to a patron god whose great temple, the ziggurat, was the hub of economic and administrative life. Priests managed the god's broad estates, stored the grain, and organised labour, craft and trade in his name. In the earliest period religion and government were almost one and the same. The temple was thus the first great institution of the Sumerian state.

Authority passed from priests to kings. In time leadership passed from the priesthood to a king, the lugal, often a successful war-leader who ruled as the god's earthly steward. The king led the army, built and repaired temples, dug canals and enforced justice among his people. Kingship became the crown of the city-state's government, though it never wholly displaced the temple. Sacred and royal authority came to stand side by side.

A class of scribes kept the records. The Sumerians invented cuneiform writing, and a trained class of scribes recorded taxes, contracts, land, wages and trade on clay tablets. Scribal schools taught this difficult art, and literacy brought power and employment in the service of temple and palace. This written record made complex and lasting administration possible for the first time. Record-keeping became the foundation of the state's power.

The economy was centrally managed. The temple and the palace controlled irrigation, stored the harvest, and redistributed food, wool and goods to officials, soldiers, craftsmen and workers. They organised the digging and cleaning of the canals on which all farming depended. Much of the economy was thus planned and directed from the centre rather than left to free markets alone. Economic management was a central task of Sumerian government.

Society was divided into ordered classes. Sumerian society was layered into an upper class of rulers, priests and nobles, a body of free commoners such as farmers and craftsmen, and a class of slaves. Each rank had its own rights, duties and place in the working of the state. Administration both rested upon and preserved this social order. Government and social hierarchy were thus closely bound together.

Law and justice ordered the community. The city rulers issued early law codes, such as that of Ur-Nammu of Ur (c. 2100 BCE), the oldest surviving code known. These laws set penalties for wrongs and rules for trade, property and family, and were enforced through the ruler's courts. Justice in the god's name upheld order and the ruler's authority together. Written law was among Sumer's great gifts to government.

Warfare and defence shaped the state. The rivalry of the city-states, such as the long struggle between Lagash and Umma, made war and defence constant concerns. Cities were ringed with great walls, and kings raised armies and celebrated their victories on monuments like the Stele of the Vultures. The demands of defence strengthened kingship and the organisation of the state. War was thus a powerful force in Sumerian government.

The Sumerian city-states were therefore governed through independent, temple-centred communities that evolved from priestly to royal rule, sustained by scribes, central economic control, an ordered society, early written law, and the constant demands of war. In these small cities between the rivers the very foundations of organised administration in the ancient world were first laid.

Question 10

On a great pillar of black stone a Babylonian king set down the laws by which his people were to live, that the strong might not oppress the weak.

Examine the importance of the Code of Hammurabi in the administration of ancient Babylon.

Model Answer

The Code of Hammurabi, issued by King Hammurabi of Babylon (r. c. 1792 to 1750 BCE), is one of the earliest and most complete written law codes of the ancient world. Carved on a great stone pillar and set up for all to see, its some 282 laws governed the life of his empire. It reveals much about how Babylon was administered. Its importance may be examined as follows.

It provided a single written law for the empire. Hammurabi's code gave his kingdom one uniform body of law, publicly displayed and applied throughout his lands. It replaced the varied and uncertain customs of many separate cities with a common standard. This unity of law helped to bind a diverse empire into a single state. A shared law thus strengthened the unity of Babylon.

It presented the king as the source of justice. The code portrayed Hammurabi as the shepherd chosen by the gods to bring justice to his people and to protect the weak from the strong. It thus bound the authority of the king to the duty of just rule. Kingship was presented not as mere power but as a sacred trust. This ideal of the just king was central to Babylonian government.

It regulated economic and social life in detail. The laws fixed wages, prices, rents and rates of interest, and set out the duties of trade, craft and hire. They also governed marriage, property, inheritance and the family. In this way the state brought order and predictability to the whole of daily life. Administration reached into the ordinary dealings of every subject.

It reflected and upheld the class structure. The code recognised distinct social ranks, the free man (awilum), the dependent commoner (mushkenum), and the slave (wardum), and its penalties varied according to rank. A crime against a nobleman was punished more heavily than the same crime against a commoner. The law thus mirrored and preserved the ordered inequality of Babylonian society. Justice was measured according to one's place in the social order.

It established a fixed and public standard of punishment. Many penalties followed the principle of retribution, an eye for an eye and a life for a life, at least among equals. Because the law was written and displayed, subjects could know in advance the consequences of their acts. This gave justice a certainty and openness it had often lacked before. Public, fixed punishment was a real advance in government.

It protected property, contract and commerce. The code carefully governed loans, deposits, sales, partnerships and the hire of labour and animals. By securing property and enforcing agreements, it gave confidence to the trade on which Babylon's wealth depended. Merchants and farmers alike could rely on the protection of the law. Sound commercial order was thus one of its chief services to the state.

It supported a system of courts and officials. The code implies a network of judges and royal officials who applied the law throughout the realm and recorded their verdicts. Government thereby extended the king's justice from the capital to the provinces. Law and administration were joined together in a single structure of authority. The courts were the arm through which royal justice reached the people.

It displayed the power and legitimacy of the state. By publishing his laws in the name of the sun-god Shamash, the god of justice, Hammurabi advertised both the righteousness and the reach of his rule. The towering stone monument itself proclaimed the authority of the king to all who saw it. It remains a lasting witness to the sophistication of Babylonian government. Law thus served the prestige of the state as well as its order.

The Code of Hammurabi was therefore important as a uniform written law, an expression of royal justice, a detailed regulation of economic and social life, a mirror of the class order, and a support for courts and commerce alike. Publicly displayed in the name of the gods, it stands as one of the great administrative achievements of the ancient Middle East.

Question 11

To hold together the largest empire the world had yet seen, a Persian king divided it into provinces and set upon each a governor, a general and a spy.

Explain how the Persian (Achaemenid) Empire was administered under Darius I.

Model Answer

Darius I (r. 522 to 486 BCE) reorganised the vast Achaemenid Persian Empire, which stretched from the Indus to the Aegean and from Egypt to Central Asia. Faced with the problem of ruling many peoples across great distances, he built one of the most efficient administrations of the ancient world. His reforms held the empire together for nearly two centuries. Its workings may be explained as follows.

The empire was divided into satrapies. Darius organised the empire into about twenty provinces called satrapies, each governed by a satrap who was usually a Persian noble. The satrap collected the tribute, administered justice and kept order within his province. This division broke an unmanageable whole into governable parts. It was the foundation of the entire Persian system.

Power in each province was deliberately balanced. Alongside the civil satrap, each province had a military commander and a royal secretary who reported separately to the king. In this way no single official in a province held all the strands of power. The arrangement guarded against rebellion by over-mighty governors. Balance of office was thus a safeguard built into the system.

Royal inspectors watched the provinces. Darius employed travelling inspectors known as the eyes and ears of the king, who toured the satrapies with armed escorts to check on officials. Their reports kept the king informed of the loyalty and conduct of his governors. This surveillance held the distant provinces firmly to their duty. It reinforced the balance of power within each satrapy.

Tribute and coinage sustained the state. Each satrapy paid a fixed annual tribute in silver or in kind, assessed according to its wealth and resources. Darius introduced a reliable gold coin, the daric, which eased trade and the payment of taxes and troops. Regular revenue supported the army, the court and the administration. Sound finance was thus a pillar of Persian power.

A great road system linked the empire. Darius built the Royal Road, running some two thousand seven hundred kilometres from Sardis to Susa, with over a hundred posting-stations. Mounted couriers using relays of fresh horses could carry a message its whole length in about a week. This bound the far provinces swiftly to the centre. Rapid communication was essential to so vast a state.

A standing army secured the empire. The king maintained a professional army, including the elite royal guard of ten thousand Immortals, kept always at full strength. Garrisons held key fortresses and frontiers throughout the provinces. This force defended the empire and stood ready to crush revolt. Military power underpinned the whole administrative structure.

A common language of government aided rule. Aramaic was used as the shared administrative language of the empire, allowing orders and records to pass among its many peoples. A body of trained scribes carried on the correspondence of the state. This eased the governing of so many different nations and tongues. A common written language was thus a quiet but vital tool of empire.

Local customs and religions were tolerated. The Persians allowed subject peoples to keep their own laws, languages, gods and local rulers, provided they paid tribute and kept the peace. This wise leniency reduced resentment and the temptation to rebel. It made Persian rule lighter and more acceptable than that of earlier conquerors. Toleration proved as useful as force in holding the empire together.

Darius I therefore governed the Persian Empire through balanced satrapies, royal inspectors, fixed tribute and reliable coinage, a great road system, a standing army, a common administrative language and a wise tolerance of local custom. Together these created one of the most efficient and enduring administrations of the ancient world.

Question 12

A single province, if misgoverned, could set a continent ablaze; the satrapy was Persia's answer to that danger.

Assess the effectiveness of the satrapy system in holding the Persian Empire together.

Model Answer

The satrapy system devised by Darius I was the central instrument by which Persia governed its immense and varied empire. By dividing the whole into provinces under governors, it made the seemingly ungovernable governable. Yet the same system carried within it the seeds of weakness. Its effectiveness may be assessed as follows.

It made a vast empire governable. By dividing the empire into about twenty provinces, each under a satrap, the system broke an unmanageable whole into manageable parts. Local government could then respond to local needs and conditions. So great an empire could not have been ruled from one point without such division. In this the satrapy was a great practical success.

It secured a regular flow of tribute. Each satrap was responsible for gathering and forwarding a fixed tribute to the king, assessed by the wealth of his province. This gave the empire a dependable income year by year. That wealth sustained the army, the court, the roads and the public works. The system thus underpinned the whole strength of the state.

The balance of officials curbed rebellion. By separating civil, military and secretarial authority within each province, Darius prevented most satraps from gathering all power into their own hands. The king's roving inspectors reinforced this check by watching the governors. For long periods the arrangement preserved internal peace. Control was thus woven into the very design of the province.

It allowed swift response to trouble. Because the satrapies were linked by the Royal Road and its couriers, news of unrest could reach the king quickly. Armies and orders could then be sent to the troubled province without long delay. This mobility helped the centre to master revolts before they spread. Good communication made the system more effective still.

It respected the diversity of the empire. Because satraps generally governed through existing local customs, laws and elites, subject peoples kept much of their own way of life. This tolerance reduced the friction of ruling so many nations. It made Persian rule more acceptable and therefore more stable. The flexibility of the system was among its greatest strengths.

Yet powerful satraps could still rebel. Over time some satraps grew wealthy, ambitious and semi-independent in their distant provinces. The empire saw serious revolts, such as the great satraps' revolt of the fourth century BCE. Distance from the centre could embolden a determined governor. The system's chief weakness lay in the very power it had to delegate.

It could foster corruption and over-taxation. Because satraps handled great sums and wide powers far from the king's eye, some grew corrupt or squeezed their provinces too hard. Heavy or unjust tribute could breed discontent among subject peoples. Such abuses slowly weakened the loyalty on which the empire rested. The system's efficiency thus depended on the honesty of its governors.

It depended on the strength of the king. The satrapies held firm under vigorous rulers like Darius but grew unruly under weak or distracted ones. This creeping disorder helped to ease Alexander's conquest of the empire in 330 BCE. The system could not by itself supply the energy of good kingship. Its success therefore rose and fell with the men who sat on the throne.

The satrapy system was therefore highly effective in making a vast and diverse empire governable, in securing tribute and internal peace, and in respecting local custom, and it long held Persia together. Yet it carried the constant dangers of over-mighty and corrupt governors and depended on strong kingship, so that its success, though real and lasting, was never wholly secure.

Question 13

In the lands between the rivers, the king held a sceptre in one hand and a law-code in the other, and both were held to be gifts of the gods.

"Law and religion were the twin pillars of administration in the ancient Middle East." Discuss.

Model Answer

The statement holds that the administrations of the ancient Middle East rested above all upon law and upon religion. There is much truth in this, for both were central to the states of Sumer, Babylon and Persia. Yet government also leaned on other supports that the statement passes over. Its validity may be discussed as follows.

Religion legitimised the ruler. Throughout the region kings claimed to rule as the chosen servants or representatives of the gods, as Hammurabi did in Babylon. This sacred sanction made obedience to the ruler a religious duty as well as a political one. Rebellion became not merely a crime but an offence against Heaven. Religion was therefore a genuine pillar of government, as the statement asserts.

Temples were centres of administration. In Sumer the temple managed land, grain, labour and trade, and the priesthood was among the first organisers of society. Economic and religious authority were closely joined in the great temple estates. In this sense religion actually carried out much of the early work of the state. The temple was thus an instrument of government as well as of worship.

Written law ordered society. Codes such as those of Ur-Nammu and Hammurabi gave these societies uniform, public rules for property, trade, family and crime. Law brought predictability and a measure of justice to daily life across the realm. It bound diverse subjects to a single, knowable standard. It was, as the statement claims, a true foundation of administration.

Law and religion reinforced one another. Law codes were presented as the gift of the gods to the king, so that to break the law was also to offend Heaven. Hammurabi received his laws from the sun-god Shamash, the god of justice. The two pillars therefore stood together and strengthened each other rather than competing. Their union gave the state a double and formidable authority.

Yet a bureaucracy also upheld the state. Government rested besides on a trained body of scribes and officials who kept records, gathered taxes and applied the law. The Persian satraps, secretaries and inspectors show how far administration relied on such servants. Without this machinery neither law nor religion could have been made effective. The statement, taken strictly, therefore overlooks a vital third support.

Tribute, coinage and the army were equally essential. States were also held together by the revenue of tribute and taxes and by the armed force that defended and enforced them. Darius's fixed tribute, his daric coinage and his standing army were as important as any temple or code. Power and money underpinned the whole structure of rule. Force and finance were thus further pillars the statement omits.

The balance varied from state to state. In Sumer religion predominated, in Babylon written law was especially prominent, and in Persia efficient bureaucracy and tolerance mattered most. No single formula fits every case across so long a span. Law and religion were central everywhere, but never the whole story. The mix of pillars differed from one state to another.

It is therefore largely valid that law and religion were central pillars of administration in the ancient Middle East, for they legitimised rulers, ordered society and reinforced one another. Yet a full account must add the bureaucracy, the revenue system and the army, so that the statement, though true as far as it goes, is incomplete rather than wrong.

Administrative systems in Ancient Europe

Question 14

The Greeks could imagine no civilised life outside the polis, the small city-state where every citizen had his share in the common affairs.

Describe the administrative system of the city-state (polis) in ancient Greece.

Model Answer

Ancient Greece was not a single state but a land of many independent city-states, or poleis, such as Athens, Sparta and Corinth. Each governed itself completely, yet all shared a common idea of the citizen and the city. The polis was the framework of Greek political life and the birthplace of Western political thought. Its administrative system may be described as follows.

The polis was a small, self-governing community. Each city-state consisted of an urban centre and the countryside around it, governing itself in complete independence. It made its own laws, coined its own money, worshipped its own gods and fought its own wars. The polis, not any wider Greek nation, was the true political unit. This independence shaped the whole of Greek political life.

Citizenship defined political rights. Government belonged to the citizens, a body limited to free-born men of the city, while women, resident foreigners and slaves were excluded. Citizenship carried both the right to share in ruling and the duty to fight and serve. The narrowness of this circle gave the polis its character. Political life was the privilege of the citizen alone.

Assemblies gave citizens a direct voice. Most poleis had an assembly of citizens that met to decide the great questions of law, war and peace. In this gathering the citizen body debated and voted directly on public affairs. There was often no elected parliament standing between the citizen and the decision. Public debate was thus central to Greek government.

Councils and magistrates conducted daily business. A smaller council prepared matters for the assembly, while elected or chosen magistrates carried out the daily work of government and led the army. Offices were commonly held for short terms and by several men together to prevent the growth of personal power. In this way administration was shared and rotated among the citizens. No single official was allowed to dominate.

Law and the courts bound the community. Each polis had its own body of law, often first written down to end the arbitrary rule of nobles, as by Draco and Solon at Athens. Citizen courts judged disputes and crimes, sometimes with large juries of ordinary men. Law gave the city stability and protected the citizen against oppression. Justice was thus a public affair of the whole community.

Constitutions took several forms. The poleis experimented with monarchy, aristocracy, oligarchy, tyranny and democracy, and a single city might pass through several in turn. Athens moved towards democracy, while Sparta kept a mixed and military constitution. Greek political life was thus a workshop of forms of government. This variety gave later ages a rich store of political experience.

A citizen army defended the state. The polis was defended not by a paid professional army but by its own citizens, above all the heavily armed hoplites who fought shoulder to shoulder. Military service was a duty and an honour of citizenship, binding the soldier to the state he defended. The link between fighting and citizenship shaped Greek politics deeply. The citizen-soldier was the backbone of the polis.

Slavery and civic religion underpinned the system. The leisure that citizens needed for politics rested on the labour of a large class of slaves and resident foreigners. At the same time the worship of the city's patron deity, with its festivals and temples, bound the citizens together. Religion and unfree labour alike supported the working of the polis. Both were essential foundations of Greek civic life.

The Greek polis was therefore a small, independent, citizen-governed community, administered through assemblies, councils, magistrates and courts under a variety of constitutions, and defended by its own citizen soldiers. Resting on slavery and civic religion, it gave to the world the enduring idea of the self-governing city and the participating citizen.

Question 15

In a single century the citizens of Athens wrested government from the nobles and placed it, for the first time in history, in the hands of the people.

Examine the development of democracy in the administration of ancient Athens.

Model Answer

Ancient Athens is remembered above all for developing the world's first democracy, in which the citizens themselves governed the state. This did not appear at once but grew through a long series of reforms over more than a century. Each reformer widened the share of the ordinary citizen in government. The stages of that development may be examined as follows.

Aristocratic rule provoked deep discontent. Early Athens was governed by noble families who monopolised office, land and law, while debt drove many poorer citizens into slavery. This injustice bred bitter unrest and the threat of open revolt. The demand for reform grew until the nobles were forced to give ground. This crisis opened the long road towards democracy.

Draco gave Athens its first written laws. About 621 BCE the lawgiver Draco set down the laws of Athens in writing for the first time. Though famously harsh, these laws took the definition of justice out of the hands of the nobles alone. A written law that all could know was a first step away from arbitrary aristocratic rule. It prepared the way for deeper reform.

Solon's reforms eased the crisis. In 594 BCE the lawgiver Solon cancelled debts, forbade the enslavement of citizens for debt, and graded political rights by wealth rather than by birth alone. He gave poorer citizens a place in the assembly and the courts, however modest. His measures relieved the immediate crisis and laid the foundations of popular government. Solon is therefore counted among the fathers of the democracy.

Cleisthenes founded the democracy. In 508 BCE Cleisthenes reorganised the citizens into ten tribes based on where they lived rather than on birth. He created a Council of Five Hundred to prepare public business and strengthened the assembly. These reforms placed real power in the hands of the whole citizen body. Cleisthenes is rightly called the father of Athenian democracy.

The assembly became sovereign. The Assembly, or ekklesia, open to all adult male citizens, decided laws, war, peace and public policy by direct vote. Any citizen might speak and any might propose a measure to his fellows. There was no elected parliament standing above the people. The citizens themselves were, quite literally, the government.

Office by lot and pay opened government to all. Most officials were chosen by lot for short terms, so that ordinary citizens took their turn in ruling. Under Pericles in the fifth century BCE citizens were paid for public service and jury duty, so that even the poor could take part. Large citizen juries decided the cases in the courts. These devices made the democracy genuinely popular in practice.

Ostracism and later reforms guarded the democracy. To protect itself against would-be tyrants, the assembly could vote to banish a dangerous man for ten years, a practice known as ostracism. The reforms of Ephialtes in 462 BCE stripped the old aristocratic council of the Areopagus of most of its powers. Such measures defended and deepened popular rule. The democracy thus armed itself against its enemies.

Yet the democracy had real limits. Political rights were confined to free-born adult male citizens, perhaps only a minority of those who lived in Athens. Women, resident foreigners and a large class of slaves were wholly excluded from power. Athenian democracy was therefore narrow by modern standards. Even so, within that circle the principle of popular self-government was fully realised.

Athenian democracy therefore developed by stages, from the written laws of Draco and the reforms of Solon, through the decisive work of Cleisthenes, to the full popular government of Pericles' age, defended by ostracism and the reforms of Ephialtes. Although it excluded most of the population, it created the enduring ideal of rule by the citizens themselves.

Question 16

Two Greek cities, neighbours and rivals, answered the question of how to govern in almost opposite ways: one trusted the debating citizen, the other the disciplined soldier.

Compare the administrative systems of Athens and Sparta.

Model Answer

Athens and Sparta were the two greatest city-states of ancient Greece and its most famous rivals. Both were independent poleis, yet they organised their governments in strikingly different ways. The one became the home of democracy, the other of militarised oligarchy. Their administrative systems may be compared as follows.

Both were independent city-states. Each was a self-governing polis with its own laws, army and citizen body, ruling itself and its territory without any higher authority. In this basic framework the two were alike. Both also rested upon the labour of a large subject or slave population. The polis was thus the common foundation of both.

Athens was a democracy, Sparta an oligarchy. Athens placed supreme power in an assembly of all its citizens, who debated and voted on public affairs. Sparta reserved real power to a small ruling elite and its councils, allowing its assembly little genuine initiative. The one trusted the many, the other the few. This was the deepest difference between them.

Sparta kept a dual monarchy while Athens abolished kingship. Sparta was headed by two hereditary kings who led the armies and shared in religious duties, though they were checked by other magistrates. Athens, by contrast, had long abolished kingship and rotated its offices among ordinary citizens. Thus Sparta preserved an ancient royal element that Athens had swept away. Their treatment of monarchy sharply divided them.

Their councils and magistrates differed. Sparta was governed through a Council of Elders, the gerousia, and five powerful annual magistrates called ephors who oversaw the kings and the state. Athens relied on its Council of Five Hundred and on officials mostly chosen by lot for short terms. Spartan government concentrated authority in a few hands; Athenian government dispersed it widely. Each structure expressed a different idea of rule.

Their aims of government differed. Sparta organised its whole society for war, subjecting its citizens to lifelong military discipline in order to hold down its subject helots. Athens, though warlike, also fostered trade, debate, art and philosophy. The Spartan state demanded obedience; the Athenian state invited participation. Their institutions served these contrasting purposes.

Their systems of education differed. Sparta took its boys from home at seven for the agoge, a harsh public training that produced disciplined soldiers loyal to the state. Athens left education largely to families, encouraging a broader learning in letters, music and rhetoric. Each city shaped its citizens to fit its form of government. Education thus reflected the deeper aims of each state.

Both excluded most of the population. In each city political rights belonged only to a minority of free adult males, while women, foreigners and a large unfree class had no share in government. Neither was a democracy in the full modern sense. In this basic limitation the two rivals were, after all, alike. The gulf between them lay within a narrow ruling class.

The administrative systems of Athens and Sparta were therefore alike as independent, slave-holding city-states, but sharply opposed in form, Athens a participatory democracy of assembly and lot and Sparta a militarised oligarchy of kings, elders and ephors. Together they illustrate the whole range of ancient Greek government, from the rule of the many to the rule of the few.

Question 17

Having driven out their kings, the Romans built a government so balanced that no single man, they hoped, could ever again master the state.

Explain the administrative system of the Roman Republic.

Model Answer

The Roman Republic (509 to 27 BCE) governed the city and its growing dominions through a carefully balanced constitution. Having expelled their kings, the Romans distributed power so that no one man could seize the whole. The result was a mixed system of magistrates, senate and assemblies that endured for centuries. Its administrative system may be explained as follows.

Power was shared to prevent tyranny. After expelling their kings in 509 BCE, the Romans deliberately divided authority so that no single man could again rule alone. Power was balanced between the magistrates, the senate and the popular assemblies. This mixed constitution, admired by later writers, was the very heart of the Republic. Its aim was to guard liberty against tyranny.

Two consuls headed the state. At the summit stood two consuls, elected annually, who governed jointly, led the armies and could each veto the other. Their shared and short-term power guarded against the return of one-man rule. On leaving office they had to answer for their conduct. Colleagueship and annual election were thus the great safeguards of the office.

A ladder of magistrates administered affairs. Below the consuls served praetors as judges, quaestors over finance, aediles over the city, and censors who conducted the census and supervised public morals. Each office had defined duties, a fixed term and a place on the ladder of honours, the cursus honorum. Men rose through these offices in order over their careers. This graded structure organised the whole work of government.

The Senate guided the Republic. The Senate, a council of experienced men mostly drawn from the nobility, controlled finance and foreign policy and advised the magistrates. Though formally only advisory, it was in practice the steady, directing force of the state. Its members served for life, giving it continuity that the annual magistrates lacked. The Senate's prestige made it the anchor of the Republic.

Assemblies gave the citizens a voice. Popular assemblies of the citizens elected the magistrates, passed laws and declared war and peace. Through them the Roman people shared directly in the government of the Republic. The assemblies balanced the aristocratic power of the Senate. Rome thus mixed aristocratic and popular elements in one constitution.

The tribunes protected the common people. To defend the plebeians against the patrician nobility, the office of tribune of the plebs was created, famously about 494 BCE. Tribunes could veto unjust acts of magistrates and propose laws in the people's interest. They arose from the long struggle of the orders between patricians and plebeians. Their power was a vital check within the system.

Written law bound magistrates and citizens alike. About 451 to 450 BCE the Romans set down their law in the Twelve Tables, publicly displayed for all to see. This written law limited the arbitrary power of the magistrates and gave citizens a known standard of justice. Respect for law became a central Roman value. Public law was thus a foundation of republican government.

Emergencies were met by a temporary dictator. In times of grave danger the Republic could appoint a single dictator with supreme power for a strictly limited term of six months. This allowed swift and decisive action when the divided normal government was too slow. Once the crisis passed, the dictator was expected to lay down his office. The device showed the Republic's blend of flexibility and caution.

The Roman Republic was therefore administered through a balanced system of paired consuls, a ladder of magistrates, a guiding senate, popular assemblies, protective tribunes and public written law, with a temporary dictatorship for emergencies. Its checks and balances long preserved Rome from tyranny and profoundly shaped later ideas of constitutional government.

Question 18

The forms of the Republic survived, but power had quietly passed from the senate house to the palace of one man.

Assess the changes in Roman administration from the Republic to the Empire.

Model Answer

The transformation of Rome from a republic into an empire, completed by Augustus in 27 BCE, brought profound changes to its government. The old balanced constitution gave way to the rule of a single emperor, though its outward forms were preserved. This shift reshaped the administration of the whole Roman world. The changes may be assessed as follows.

Supreme power passed to a single ruler. Where the Republic had divided authority among many annual magistrates, the Empire concentrated it in one man, the emperor, or princeps. Augustus gathered into his own person the chief republican offices and their powers. Government by the many thus gave way to government by one. This was the fundamental change from Republic to Empire.

The forms of the Republic were preserved in appearance. Augustus kept the Senate, the consuls and the assemblies, and styled himself merely the first citizen rather than a king. This careful disguise made one-man rule easier for Romans to accept after generations of republican liberty. The outward shell of the old constitution remained standing. Reality had changed while appearances were preserved.

Real power shifted to the emperor and his servants. In practice the emperor controlled the army, the treasury and the appointment of officials, while the Senate slowly lost its directing role. A new imperial bureaucracy, staffed increasingly by equestrians and imperial freedmen, grew up to serve him. Administration came to centre on the ruler's own household and appointees. The machinery of the state now answered to one man.

The provinces were more firmly and fairly governed. Augustus reorganised the provinces, taking the frontier provinces and their armies under his own control and leaving the peaceful ones to the Senate. Governors were better supervised and paid, and provincial abuses were reduced. The extension of Roman citizenship gradually bound the provincials more closely to the state. Imperial rule thus brought steadier government to the empire's vast territories.

A standing professional army served the emperor. The citizen levies of the Republic gave way to a permanent professional army loyal to the emperor who paid and rewarded it. Augustus also created the Praetorian Guard as a standing force at the capital. This secured the frontiers and the ruler's own position. Yet it also made the army a decisive, and sometimes dangerous, force in politics.

The imperial cult bound the empire to the ruler. The emperor came to be honoured with religious ceremonies, and after death was often declared a god. This imperial cult gave subjects across many lands a common focus of loyalty to Rome. Religion was thus enlisted in the service of the new monarchy. Worship of the emperor helped to unite a diverse empire.

The changes brought stability but ended liberty. The new system opened the long peace and prosperity of the Pax Romana, giving the empire order, security and good administration. But it extinguished the political liberty and shared government of the Republic. Efficiency and peace were purchased at the price of freedom. This was the true and lasting cost of empire.

The passage from Republic to Empire therefore replaced Rome's balanced, shared government with the concentrated rule of the emperor, preserving republican forms while transferring real power to the throne, its bureaucracy and its army. It brought firmer provincial rule and the long peace of the Pax Romana, but at the price of the political liberty that the Republic had prized.

Administrative systems in Ancient South America

Question 19

Without writing, without money and without the wheel, the Inca governed a mountain empire of millions with astonishing order.

Describe the administrative system of the Inca Empire.

Model Answer

The Inca Empire, or Tawantinsuyu, flourished in the Andes from about 1438 to 1533, with its capital at Cuzco. It was the largest and most tightly organised state of ancient America, stretching thousands of kilometres along the mountains. Remarkably, it governed millions without writing, money or the wheel. Its administrative system may be described as follows.

The Sapa Inca ruled as a divine emperor. At the head of the state stood the Sapa Inca, regarded as the son of the Sun god Inti and worshipped as divine. His word was law, and he owned, in principle, all the land and people of the empire. He was at once emperor, high priest and commander. All government descended from his sacred person.

The empire was divided into four great quarters. The name Tawantinsuyu meant the land of the four quarters, for the empire was divided into four vast provinces meeting at Cuzco. Each quarter was placed under a governor of the highest rank, often a close kinsman of the emperor. Below these lay smaller provinces and districts under their own officials. This orderly division carried the emperor's rule to the frontiers.

Administration followed a decimal system. The population was organised into units of ten, one hundred, one thousand and ten thousand households, each under an official responsible to the level above. This graded pyramid made even so vast a population manageable and easy to count. Orders, tribute and information passed smoothly up and down its ranks. The decimal structure was the ingenious core of Inca administration.

The ayllu was the basic community. At the foundation of society lay the ayllu, a kinship group whose families held and worked land in common. Through the ayllu the state reached and organised every household in the empire. Its local headmen, the curacas, passed the demands of the state to the people. The ayllu was thus the cell from which the whole empire was built.

Labour was owed to the state through the mita. Instead of taxes in money, which the Inca did not use, subjects paid the state in labour through the mita, a rotational service. By turns they worked on state farms, roads, bridges, mines and public buildings. In return the state fed them at their labour and supported them in need. This labour tribute sustained the whole imperial economy.

A state religion supported the government. The worship of the Sun god Inti, with the emperor as his son, bound the empire together in a common faith. A powerful priesthood served the great Sun temple at Cuzco and the shrines throughout the land. Religion sanctified the emperor's rule and demanded the loyalty of his subjects. Sacred and political authority were thus closely joined.

Records and roads bound the empire together. Having no writing, the Inca kept detailed accounts on the quipu, a system of knotted and coloured cords read by trained officials. They linked the realm by a great network of roads, with waystations and relay runners who carried messages swiftly across the mountains. These means made central government possible without the tools other civilisations relied upon. Communication and record held the empire together.

A redistributive economy stored and shared the surplus. The produce of the state lands and the mita was gathered into great storehouses, the qollqa, set along the roads and at the provincial centres. From these the state fed its officials, armies and workers, and relieved the people in times of famine or war. There were no free markets or money; the state itself organised production and distribution. This planned economy was a defining feature of Inca rule.

The Inca Empire was therefore governed through a divine emperor, a fourfold provincial division, a decimal hierarchy of officials, the kinship ayllu, the mita labour service, a supporting state religion, and a system of quipu records, royal roads and storehouses. Without writing or money, it formed one of the most remarkable and orderly administrations of the entire ancient world.

Question 20

Conquest was the easy part; the Inca genius lay in binding a hundred conquered peoples into a single obedient realm.

Examine the methods used by the Inca to control their vast empire.

Model Answer

The Inca ruled an empire stretching thousands of kilometres along the Andes and embracing many different conquered peoples. Holding so vast and varied a realm together was a formidable task of government. The Inca met it with a battery of ingenious methods of control. These may be examined as follows.

They centralised power in the divine emperor. All authority was concentrated in the Sapa Inca, whose sacred status as son of the Sun commanded the obedience of every subject. Loyalty to the emperor was made a religious as well as a political duty. This gave the sprawling empire a single, unquestioned centre. Sacred kingship was the keystone of Inca control.

They built a great network of roads and relays. The Inca constructed tens of thousands of kilometres of roads across mountain and desert, with waystations and running messengers, the chasqui. Along these, armies, officials and news could move with remarkable speed. This mobility let the centre respond swiftly to any trouble in the provinces. Good communication was thus a powerful instrument of control.

They imposed a common language and religion. The Inca spread their language, Quechua, and the worship of the Sun god throughout the empire. Conquered peoples' gods were absorbed into the imperial cult rather than destroyed. Shared speech and belief slowly knit diverse peoples into one culture. Language and religion were thus tools for uniting the empire.

They resettled whole populations. To weaken resistance, the Inca moved loyal communities, the mitmaq, into newly conquered regions, and shifted rebellious groups into secure ones. This policy broke up centres of revolt and scattered loyal settlers across the land. It mixed the peoples of the empire and bound them to the state. Controlled migration became a deliberate method of government.

They took hostages and educated conquered elites. The sons of conquered chiefs were often brought to Cuzco to be educated in Inca ways and to serve as hostages for their peoples' good behaviour. Local lords who submitted, the curacas, were confirmed in office under Inca oversight. By winning over the elites, the Inca secured obedience without constant force. Rule was thus shared with those already trusted by the people.

They organised labour and stored the surplus. Through the mita the state commanded the labour of its subjects for its farms, roads and armies. The resulting surplus was stored in great warehouses and redistributed to relieve famine or reward service. This gave the government both a firm hold on the people and the means to keep them fed. Economic control thus reinforced political control.

They kept a census and records by quipu. Officials counted the population and its resources and recorded them on the knotted quipu cords. This knowledge allowed the state to assess labour, plan tribute and move people where they were needed. Careful record-keeping made close control possible across a vast realm. Information was thus turned into a tool of government.

They maintained an army and fortresses. The Inca kept a well-organised army and built strongholds and garrisons at key points throughout the empire. This force overawed the conquered, guarded the frontiers and crushed revolts before they could spread. Behind all the softer methods of control stood the certainty of armed power. Force remained the final guarantee of obedience.

The Inca therefore controlled their vast empire through sacred kingship, a great road network, a common language and religion, the resettlement of peoples, the co-opting of local elites, the command of labour and surplus, careful record-keeping and a standing army. This combination of persuasion and force held together one of the most extensive states of the entire ancient world.

Question 21

The Inca state asked its subjects not for coins, which they did not use, but for their hands and their days.

Explain the role of the mita and the ayllu in the Inca administrative system.

Model Answer

Two institutions, the ayllu and the mita, lay at the very foundation of the Inca economy and administration. The one organised the people upon the land, and the other drew from them the labour that built the empire. Together they allowed the Inca to govern a great realm without money or markets. Their roles may be explained as follows.

The ayllu was the basic unit of society. The ayllu was a community of related families that held and worked an area of land in common under a local headman. It was the smallest building-block of the whole empire and the natural home of every subject. Through it the labour and produce of the people were organised. The ayllu was thus the cell on which Inca government was built.

The land was divided to feed people, gods and state. Within each ayllu the land was divided into three parts, one for the community, one for the gods and priesthood, and one for the Inca and the state. The people worked all three, so that the community fed both the temple and the government. In this way the state drew its support directly from the land. The division of the fields bound every family into the imperial system.

The mita was a duty of rotational labour. The mita was the obligation of every ayllu to supply a number of workers by turns for the service of the state. Since there was no money, subjects paid their dues in labour rather than in coin or produce alone. Each community sent its share of men for a fixed period and was then relieved. This rotating service was the chief form of taxation in the empire.

The mita built and maintained the empire. Mita workers laboured on the roads, bridges, terraces, temples, mines and state farms that were the glory of the empire. Without their organised labour the great Inca works would have been impossible to build or keep up. The army too was raised in part through this same service. The mita was thus the very muscle of the imperial economy.

The curacas organised the labour locally. The local lords, or curacas, at the head of the ayllus were responsible for calling up the mita workers and seeing the duties done. They formed the link between the imperial officials above and the ordinary families below. Through them the demands of the distant state reached each household. Local leaders were thus woven into the machinery of empire.

The state gave protection and relief in return. In exchange for labour the government stored surplus food in its warehouses and distributed it in times of famine, war or old age. It also fed and supplied the workers while they served on its projects. The relationship was therefore one of duty answered by care, a bond of reciprocity. This exchange gave the demanding system a measure of justice and security.

Together they made a moneyless economy work. By resting the economy on communal land through the ayllu and communal labour through the mita, the Inca governed a vast empire without markets, money or private wealth. Production and distribution were planned and directed by the state itself. These twin institutions solved the problem of taxing a people who used no coin. They were, in truth, the secret of Inca administration.

The ayllu and the mita therefore formed the foundation of the Inca system, the one organising the people upon the land and the other drawing from them the labour that built and fed the empire. Bound together by reciprocity between ruler and ruled, they enabled the Inca to govern a great realm without money, and stand among the most original institutions of the ancient world.

Question 22

The Aztecs ruled central Mexico not by absorbing their neighbours but by making them pay, a system as profitable as it was fragile.

Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the Aztec administrative system.

Model Answer

The Aztec Empire, centred on the island-city of Tenochtitlan, dominated central Mexico from 1428 until the Spanish conquest of 1521. Its government combined a strong centre with a loose hold over its many subject cities. This gave the system both real strengths and dangerous weaknesses. These may be assessed as follows.

It was headed by a powerful emperor. At the summit stood the Huey Tlatoani, or Great Speaker, an emperor of sacred standing who led the state in war and religion. His authority gave the empire a strong and respected centre. He was chosen from the royal family by a council of leading men. Firm leadership at the top was thus a clear source of strength.

It was organised through wards and local officials. The capital and its people were divided into calpulli, or wards, each with its own local leaders, land and duties. These managed everyday affairs, schooling and the calling-up of workers and soldiers. This local organisation gave the Aztec heartland an orderly base. Sound local government was a real strength of the system.

It rested on a rich tribute system. The Aztecs and their allies in the Triple Alliance dominated subject city-states and exacted heavy tribute in goods, food and captives. This wealth in cloth, maize, gold and cacao flowed constantly into the capital. It supported the emperor, the nobility, the priests and the army. The flow of tribute was the economic foundation of the empire.

Conquered rulers were left in place. Conquered cities generally kept their own rulers and customs so long as they paid their tribute and kept the peace. This made conquest cheap and quick, since the Aztecs did not need to govern each city directly. It allowed a small ruling people to dominate a wide region. Indirect rule was thus an efficient method of expansion.

Religion and the priesthood upheld the state. A powerful priesthood served the great temples and the many gods of the Aztec faith. Religion sanctified the emperor's rule and the wars of the empire, and shaped the calendar and daily life. It gave the state ceremony, unity and awe. Sacred authority was thus a strong support of Aztec government.

Yet subject peoples remained resentful. Because the empire took tribute and captives without offering unity or benefit, the conquered peoples felt little loyalty to it. Many remained hostile and awaited only a chance to throw off Aztec rule. This deep resentment was a grave and lasting weakness. The empire's own method of rule bred its enemies.

Religion demanded a costly flow of captives. The Aztec religion required human sacrifice on a large scale, which drove constant warfare to capture victims from neighbouring peoples. This ceaseless raiding deepened the hatred of the subject cities still further. A system that fed on war could never be at peace with its neighbours. Its very faith thus multiplied its foes.

The empire was therefore brittle. Because it was a loose network of resentful tributaries rather than a united state, the empire could shatter quickly once seriously challenged. When the Spanish arrived in 1519, thousands of subject peoples joined them against Tenochtitlan. The whole structure collapsed within two years. The fragility of the system proved, in the end, fatal.

The Aztec administrative system was therefore strong in its powerful emperor, its orderly wards, its rich tribute, its cheap indirect rule and its supporting religion. Yet it was fatally weak in the resentment of its subject peoples and its dependence on war for sacrifice, so that its very method of rule prepared the way for its sudden and complete fall.

Administrative systems in pre-colonial Africa

Question 23

To the Egyptians the Pharaoh was no mere king but a living god, upon whose rule the very order of the world was thought to depend.

Describe the administrative system of ancient Egypt.

Model Answer

Ancient Egypt, unified from about 3100 BCE along the valley of the Nile, developed one of the earliest and most enduring centralised administrations in the world. Its government rested upon the divine kingship of the Pharaoh and the yearly bounty of the Nile. A skilled bureaucracy carried the royal will the length of the land. Its system may be described as follows.

The Pharaoh ruled as a god-king. At the head of the state stood the Pharaoh, regarded as a living god and the earthly guarantor of maat, the divine order of the world. He was at once supreme ruler, high priest, lawgiver and commander of the army. On his just rule the prosperity and very order of Egypt were believed to depend. All authority flowed from his sacred person.

The vizier directed the whole administration. Beneath the Pharaoh the vizier, or tjaty, served as chief minister and head of the government. He oversaw justice, taxation, public works, the granaries and the reports of the provinces. He was the vital link between the god-king and the mass of officials below. Through him the daily business of the state was carried on.

The land was divided into provinces. Egypt was organised into administrative districts called nomes, each governed by a provincial official, the nomarch, responsible to the central government. This division carried royal authority the whole length of the Nile valley. Local officials collected taxes and kept order in the king's name. Provincial government allowed a single crown to rule a long and narrow land.

A literate bureaucracy of scribes ran the state. A trained class of scribes kept the records, assessed and collected the taxes, and administered the law and the granaries. Their command of writing gave them power and prestige in the service of the crown. From the census to the harvest, the work of government passed through their hands. The state rested upon their skill in writing and reckoning.

The economy was centrally controlled. The state managed the irrigation of the Nile, measured its yearly flood, and stored grain in royal granaries against times of scarcity. It organised the labour of the people for great works such as the pyramids and temples. Taxes were paid in produce and in labour rather than in coin. Central control of the economy was a defining feature of Egyptian rule.

Taxation rested on the census and the Nile. Officials regularly counted the people, the cattle and the land, and assessed taxes according to the height of the annual flood. A good flood promised a rich harvest and heavier dues; a poor one, relief. This careful reckoning gave the state a dependable and fair revenue. The census and the river together underpinned the whole system of taxation.

Justice was done in the name of maat. Egypt had no great written code like Hammurabi's, but justice was administered by officials and courts according to maat, the principle of truth and right order. The vizier was the chief judge, and the Pharaoh the ultimate source of law. Disputes were settled and wrongs punished to preserve the balance of the world. Justice was thus both a legal and a sacred duty of government.

Religion and the priesthood upheld the state. The temples, the priesthood and the worship of the gods reinforced the Pharaoh's authority and the stability of the realm. Great temple estates held land and people and shared in the work of administration. To maintain maat through ritual was among the first duties of the king. Religion and government were thus bound inseparably together.

Ancient Egypt was therefore governed through a divine Pharaoh, a directing vizier, provincial nomes, a literate scribal bureaucracy, central control of the economy, taxation based on the census and the Nile, and justice in the name of maat, all upheld by religion. It stands as one of the oldest and most stable administrative systems in African and world history.

Question 24

So great was the wealth of Mali that when its emperor crossed the desert to Mecca, the price of gold in Egypt is said to have fallen for years.

Examine the administrative system of the Mali Empire under Mansa Musa.

Model Answer

The Mali Empire of the Western Sudan reached its height under Mansa Musa (r. c. 1312 to 1337). His government held together a vast and wealthy realm built upon the gold and salt of the trans-Saharan trade. Its order and riches made Mali famous across Africa and beyond. Its administrative system may be examined as follows.

The Mansa ruled as supreme sovereign. At the head of the empire stood the Mansa, or emperor, who was the source of justice, the commander of the army and the guardian of trade. Mansa Musa governed as an absolute but responsible monarch, holding great state at his court. His authority bound the whole empire together under one head. The Mansa was the keystone of the Malian state.

A court and officials assisted the ruler. The Mansa governed with the help of a body of court officials and ministers who oversaw the treasury, the army and the affairs of the capital. Learned men and secretaries kept records and conducted correspondence. This central administration carried the emperor's will to the provinces. It gave the empire an orderly government at its heart.

The empire was organised into provinces. Mali was divided into provinces, some ruled directly by appointed governors and others left to submissive local kings who paid tribute. This mixture of direct and indirect rule suited a large and varied realm. It carried the emperor's authority across the wide lands of the Sudan. Provincial government made so great an empire governable.

Trade and wealth sustained the state. The empire grew rich by controlling the trans-Saharan trade in gold and salt and by taxing the goods that passed through its territory. This wealth supported the court, the army and the whole administration. Command of the great trade routes was the foundation of Mali's power. Its riches were the envy of the medieval world.

A standing army secured the empire. The Mansa maintained a large army, including cavalry, which defended the trade routes, kept the provinces in order and extended the frontiers. Security along the routes encouraged the commerce on which the state depended. The army was both the shield of the empire and the arm of the emperor's will. Force thus underpinned the prosperity of the realm.

Islam strengthened the administration. Mansa Musa promoted Islam and employed literate Muslim officials, judges and advisers in his government. He made Timbuktu a famous centre of learning and Islamic law. Islam gave the state trained administrators, a written culture and a common legal framework for its towns. Religion thus reinforced the machinery of the state.

Justice upheld order and trade. The Mansa was the supreme judge, and beneath him Islamic judges and local custom settled disputes across the empire. Later travellers praised the security and justice that made Mali safe for merchants and travellers. This good order encouraged the trade that enriched the state. Justice was thus both a duty of the ruler and a support of prosperity.

The empire won wide fame and standing. Mansa Musa's famous pilgrimage to Mecca in 1324, with its lavish display of gold, spread Mali's fame across North Africa and even into Europe. It advertised the wealth, order and stability of his government to the wider world. Such prestige abroad reflected strong administration at home. Mali took its place among the great states of its age.

The Mali Empire under Mansa Musa was therefore governed through a supreme Mansa, a court of officials, provinces under governors and vassal kings, the wealth of the gold and salt trade, a strong army, the support of Islam and a respected system of justice. Famous for its order and riches, it stands as one of the greatest and best-organised states of pre-colonial Africa.

Question 25

Seizing a throne he had not been born to, Askia Muhammad set about turning a kingdom of conquest into a well-ordered empire of officials.

Explain how Askia Muhammad reorganised the administration of the Songhai Empire.

Model Answer

Askia Muhammad (r. 1493 to 1528) transformed the Songhai Empire of the Western Sudan into the most elaborately organised state of its age. Coming to power by overthrowing the heirs of Sunni Ali, he set about building firm and lasting institutions. His reforms gave Songhai an administration admired far beyond its borders. The ways in which he reorganised it may be explained as follows.

He strengthened central royal authority. Askia Muhammad concentrated power in the person of the emperor, building a strong central government over the sprawling lands he had won. He made the throne the undisputed centre of the state, holding a splendid court. This firm centre gave Songhai an unusual stability. Strong central authority was the foundation of all his reforms.

He governed through a central council of ministers. The emperor ruled with the help of a body of ministers and a council of advisers at his court. These great officers assisted him in directing the affairs of the empire. Around him too gathered scholars, judges and secretaries. This central government gave orderly direction to the whole state.

He created specialised ministries. Askia appointed ministers to oversee particular departments, such as finance, justice, agriculture, the army, and waters and forests. Government was thus divided among expert officials rather than left to the ruler alone. Each minister was responsible for his own branch of affairs. This division of labour marked an unusually advanced administration.

He divided the empire into provinces. He organised the realm into large provinces or vice-royalties, each under a governor appointed by and answerable to the emperor. These governors were often kinsmen or trusted men of the ruler. This replaced looser arrangements with a clear and reliable provincial structure. It carried royal authority firmly to the edges of the empire.

He built professional armed forces. Askia replaced the part-time levies of earlier days with a full-time professional army and a fleet of war-canoes on the River Niger. These were commanded by a general and an admiral answerable to the emperor. A standing force freed farmers for their fields and gave the ruler a reliable instrument of power. Military reform thus underpinned the whole system.

He used Islam as a bond of government. A devout Muslim, Askia employed learned Muslim judges, the qadis, and officials, and applied Islamic law in the towns. He supported the scholars and schools of Timbuktu and Jenne, making Sankore a famous seat of learning. Islam supplied literate administrators and a common legal and moral framework. Religion thus strengthened and refined his government.

He standardised trade and taxation. Askia introduced standard weights and measures and appointed inspectors for the markets to ensure fair dealing. He protected the trans-Saharan trade routes and taxed the commerce that passed along them. The resulting order and prosperity filled the treasury and supported the administration. Sound economic management was a fruit of his reforms.

He promoted learning and justice. Under Askia the universities and scholars of Timbuktu flourished, giving the empire trained men of law and letters. Justice was administered by qadis according to Islamic law alongside local custom. This learning and order won Songhai fame throughout the Muslim world. A cultured administration was among his lasting achievements.

Askia Muhammad therefore reorganised Songhai through a strengthened monarchy, a central council of ministers, specialised ministries, provinces under appointed governors, a professional army and navy, the administrative use of Islam, standardised trade and a flourishing of learning and justice. Together these created the most sophisticated administrative system in the history of the Western Sudan.

Question 26

Not every African people bowed to a king; many governed themselves through elders and age-mates, and prospered without a throne.

Distinguish between centralised and decentralised administrative systems in pre-colonial Africa.

Model Answer

The societies of pre-colonial Africa governed themselves in two broad ways, through centralised states with kings and through decentralised societies without them. Both kept order and organised their peoples, but by very different means. Understanding this distinction is essential to the study of African government. The two may be distinguished as follows.

Centralised systems had a central ruler. In centralised states authority was concentrated in a king or emperor who stood at the head of the whole society, as in Egypt, Mali, Songhai, Buganda and the Zulu kingdom. Power descended from this single ruler through appointed chiefs and officials. Such societies had a clear and unified government with a recognised head. The king was the focus of the whole state.

Decentralised systems had no central ruler. In decentralised, or stateless, societies, such as the Igbo of Nigeria and many pastoral peoples of East Africa, there was no king at all. Authority was instead dispersed among clans, lineages, elders and councils. Government was diffused through the community rather than gathered at a single centre. These are often called segmentary societies.

They differed in the basis of authority. In centralised states authority rested on kingship, frequently sanctified by religion and upheld by an army. In decentralised societies it rested rather on kinship, on age and on the consensus of elders and the community. The one obeyed a ruler, the other obeyed custom and council. This was the deepest difference between the two forms.

They differed in the machinery of government. Centralised states possessed standing armies, systems of tax and tribute, royal courts and provincial officials. Decentralised societies managed their affairs through family heads, village assemblies and age-grade organisations. The former had a formal state apparatus; the latter did not. The scale and complexity of their institutions set them apart.

They differed in how disputes were settled. In centralised states justice flowed from the king and his appointed judges and chiefs. In decentralised societies disputes were settled by the elders, by councils, or by the pressure of kin and custom. Order was maintained in the one by authority from above and in the other by agreement among equals. Their ways of keeping the peace were thus quite distinct.

They differed in their capacity for large-scale action. Centralised states could raise great armies, undertake public works and control long-distance trade, as Mali and Songhai did. Decentralised societies excelled instead at local self-government, social balance and the avoidance of tyranny. Each form had its own strengths and its own limits. The choice reflected the needs and history of each people.

Age-set systems often organised stateless peoples. Many decentralised societies were held together by age-sets, which grouped men of similar age for defence, work and government. These age-grades performed the tasks that a king and his officials did elsewhere, such as war and the keeping of order. They show how a society could be well governed without any central ruler. Such systems were a distinctive African solution to the problem of order.

Both maintained order effectively. Despite their differences, both systems kept the peace, settled disputes and organised production within their communities. A society without a king was not a society without government. Africa thus produced ordered and successful life under both forms of rule. The variety of its administration was one of its great strengths.

Centralised and decentralised systems therefore differed in whether authority was gathered in a king or dispersed among elders, clans and age-sets, and in the machinery, justice and scale of their government. Yet both maintained ordered and effective self-rule, showing the rich variety and sophistication of administrative systems in pre-colonial Africa.

Question 27

The Pharaoh on the Nile, the Sapa Inca in the Andes and the emperor of China never met, yet a visitor from one might have recognised much in the government of another.

"The administrative systems of the ancient world, though varied, rested on common foundations." Assess the validity of this statement.

Model Answer

This statement claims that beneath their many differences the administrative systems of the ancient world shared common foundations. The civilisations of Egypt, Asia, Europe, the Americas and Africa arose apart, yet their governments show striking similarities. Whether these common features outweigh the real differences is the question to be judged. Its validity may be assessed as follows.

Most rested on sacred or divine authority. Across the ancient world rulers commonly governed as gods or as the chosen of the gods, from the Egyptian Pharaoh and the Inca Sapa Inca to the Chinese Son of Heaven. Religion supplied a common source of legitimacy for the state. Everywhere sacred sanction turned obedience into a duty. In this the statement is strongly supported.

Most were centralised and hierarchical. Whether in Persia, Mali or Peru, authority typically descended from a supreme ruler through provincial governors and local officials to the ordinary subject. This pyramid of office was a widely shared design for government. It allowed vast lands to be ruled from a single centre. The similarity of structure gives the statement real force.

All rested on tribute, tax or labour. Every great system drew wealth from its subjects, whether as the Inca mita, the tax on Mali's trade or the fixed tribute of the Persian satrapies. This surplus, taken from the many, sustained the ruler, the army and the officials everywhere. No administration could stand without such revenue. This common economic foundation supports the claim.

Most depended on records and communication. From Egyptian scribes and Sumerian tablets to the Inca quipu and the Persian Royal Road, ancient states developed means to record and to communicate across distance. These tools were essential to government wherever it grew large. Their near-universal presence points to a shared necessity. This too strengthens the statement.

Law and armed force were common instruments. Almost all these states possessed some system of law or justice and some organised force to uphold it, from Hammurabi's Code to the Roman legions. Both order within and defence without were universal concerns of government. These shared instruments appear again and again across the ancient world. They further support the statement's claim of common foundations.

Yet the systems also differed greatly. Against these common features stand real differences: democratic Athens against imperial China, the moneyless Inca economy against trading Mali, centralised Egypt against the stateless societies of Africa. Not every ancient people even had a king or a written script. Such variety cannot be ignored. These differences genuinely qualify the statement.

The common foundations outweigh the differences. Despite such variety, the recurring pattern of sacred kingship, hierarchy, tribute, record, law and force appears too widely to be mere coincidence. It reflects the common problems that all complex societies had to solve. The differences were largely variations upon these shared themes. On balance, therefore, the statement is largely valid.

It is therefore largely valid that the administrative systems of the ancient world rested on common foundations, for most shared sacred authority, centralised hierarchy, tribute, record-keeping, law and armed force. Although they varied from democracy to empire and from money to moneylessness, these differences were variations upon a common response to the shared challenge of governing complex societies.

Chapter 5

WORLD RELIGIONS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS

Attempt each question in full on paper before you read the model answer beneath it. The questions follow the chapter topic by topic and rise in demand.

The concept of religion and administrative systems

Question 1

Before there were parliaments and constitutions, it was the temple, the priest and the sacred law that told men how they must be ruled.

Explain the concept of religion and its relationship to administrative systems.

Model Answer

Religion is a system of beliefs, practices and values centred on the sacred, through which people understand the world and order their lives together. An administrative system is the machinery of offices, laws and institutions through which a society is governed. Throughout history the two have been closely linked, religion shaping the authority, law and purpose of the state. The concept of their relationship may be explained as follows.

Religion is an organised system of belief and practice. Religion consists of beliefs about the sacred or the divine, together with the practices, values, symbols and worldview that flow from them. It gives its followers a shared understanding of right and wrong and of their place in the world. Because it commands the deepest loyalty of the human heart, it has always been a powerful force in society. This makes it a natural partner, and sometimes a rival, of the state.

An administrative system is the machinery of government. An administrative system is the structure of offices, laws and institutions through which a society is ruled and its affairs are managed. Its task is to keep order, collect revenue, defend the community and settle disputes among the people. To do these things it must command both obedience and legitimacy. Religion has, throughout history, been a chief source of exactly this authority.

Religion has legitimised political authority. In most ancient and medieval societies rulers claimed to govern by the will or the appointment of the gods. The Egyptian Pharaoh, the Chinese Son of Heaven and the divine-right kings of Europe all ruled by sacred sanction. This made obedience a religious duty and rebellion a kind of sin against Heaven. Religion thus gave government an authority that force alone could never supply.

Religion has supplied the law of the state. In many societies the law of the land was simply the law of the faith, as with Islamic sharia, Hindu dharma and the Mosaic law of ancient Israel. Sacred law governed property, marriage, crime and trade alike, reaching into every corner of life. Priests, judges and scholars of the faith were therefore also officers of government. Law and religion were, for long ages, one and the same.

Religion has provided officials and institutions. Priesthoods, temples, churches and monasteries were among the earliest organised institutions, keeping records, running schools and managing great estates. Their literate men often staffed the offices of the state, as the clergy did throughout medieval Europe. In this way religion supplied both the trained personnel and the very model of administration. The organisation of the faith became the organisation of government.

Religion has shaped the ethics of government. The faiths taught rulers and officials to govern with justice, mercy and honesty, and to care for the poor and the weak. Christian charity, Islamic zakat and Buddhist compassion all pressed the state towards the welfare of its people. Religion thus gave government a moral purpose beyond the mere holding of power. It set a standard by which even kings could be judged.

Religion has unified diverse peoples. A common faith could bind together peoples of different tribes and tongues into a single political community. Islam united the Arabs and the lands beyond, while Christianity

gave medieval Europe a shared identity as Christendom. Shared belief made subjects easier to govern and empires easier to hold together. Religion was therefore a powerful instrument of political unity.

Yet religion could also divide and restrain the state. Where faiths clashed, or where church and ruler competed for supremacy, religion became a source of bitter conflict, as in the medieval struggles of popes and kings. Sacred law could also limit what a ruler might lawfully do, setting bounds even upon the throne. Thus religion both empowered and constrained government. Its relationship with the state was one of partnership shadowed by tension.

Religion and administrative systems have therefore been bound together throughout history, religion supplying the legitimacy, law, institutions, ethics and unity on which government rested, while at times also dividing and restraining it. To study the one is thus in large measure to study the other, for through most of the human past sacred and political authority were deeply intertwined.

Question 2

Wherever the state has reached, it has often walked in step with the priest, borrowing his law, his learning and his authority.

Examine the ways in which religion has contributed to the development of administrative systems.

Model Answer

Across the world and the centuries, religion has done far more than teach men how to worship; it has helped to build the very machinery of government. From legitimacy and law to welfare and learning, its contributions to administration have been many and deep. The chief ways in which religion has contributed to administrative systems may be examined as follows.

It provided organisation and structure. The hierarchies of the great religions, from the pope and his bishops to the caliph and his governors, offered a ready model of ordered authority. Rulers copied this graded structure in the organisation of their own states. Religious institutions were often the first bodies able to govern great numbers in an orderly way. They thus taught the state how to organise itself.

It supplied ethics and morality. Religions gave government a code of right conduct, teaching that rulers and officials should be just, honest and merciful. This moral standard shaped laws against theft, murder and oppression, and gave subjects grounds to judge misrule. It set before the state an ideal higher than mere power. Ethics in government owed much to religious teaching.

It legitimised authority. By presenting the ruler as divine, or as the chosen servant of God, religion gave government an authority beyond human challenge. Obedience thereby became a sacred duty and the ruler a sacred person. This made states more stable and far easier to govern. Legitimacy was perhaps religion's single greatest gift to administration.

It furnished law and justice. Sacred codes such as sharia, dharma and the Mosaic law provided the state with ready systems of law. Religious courts and judges settled disputes and punished crime in the name of Heaven. In many lands the law of the faith simply became the law of the land. Religion thus underpinned the whole administration of justice.

It advanced education and record-keeping. Temples, monasteries, mosques and academies were centres of learning that trained the literate men whom government required. Christian scriptoria, Islamic madrasas and Confucian schools alike produced scholars and officials. Religion thus supplied the skills of writing and reckoning on which all administration depends. Learning and government grew up together under its care.

It organised social welfare. The faiths taught the care of the poor, the sick and the stranger, and built the first hospitals, orphanages and systems of relief. Islamic waqf endowments and Christian monastic charity funded such works on a wide scale. Through them the state slowly learned to see welfare as a public duty. Religion pioneered the social services later taken over by government.

It fostered accountability and service. By teaching that rulers must answer to God for their conduct, religion pressed them towards honest and dutiful government. Officials were reminded that power was a

trust to be discharged, not a possession to be enjoyed. This ideal of service and answerability shaped the conscience of good administration. Religion thus set a watchman within the state.

It promoted unity and civic loyalty. A shared faith bound subjects together and tied them to the ruler who defended it. Common worship, festivals and pilgrimage strengthened the sense of belonging to one community. This unity made great and lasting empires possible. Religion was therefore a powerful cement of political order.

It provided means of conflict resolution. Religious teaching and religious leaders often mediated quarrels and urged peace between rival parties. Ideas such as the just war, the sanctuary and the truce limited and softened conflict. Faith thus gave the state tools for keeping and for restoring order. Reconciliation, too, was among religion's gifts to government.

Religion has therefore contributed to administrative systems in many ways, giving them structure, ethics, legitimacy, law, learning, welfare, accountability, unity and the means of peace. So deeply did it shape the machinery of government that the modern state, even where it has become secular, still bears the marks of its religious inheritance.

Question 3

Some rulers claimed to speak for God; others claimed to be gods themselves; both bound the crown fast to the altar.

Explain the concepts of theocracy and divine kingship.

Model Answer

Two of the oldest ways of joining religion to government are theocracy and divine kingship. In the one, God or his priests are held to rule directly; in the other, the king himself is regarded as sacred. Both made political authority a matter of religion rather than of human choice. These concepts may be explained as follows.

Theocracy is rule in the name of God. A theocracy is a state in which God is held to be the supreme ruler and his law the law of the land. Government is carried on by priests or religious leaders who claim to act as the agents of God. Ancient Israel under its judges and priests, and modern states governed by religious law, are examples of this. In a theocracy religion and government are one and the same.

Divine kingship makes the ruler sacred. Under divine kingship the king himself is regarded as a god, the son of a god, or the chosen of God. The Egyptian Pharaoh and the Japanese emperor were held to be divine, while the kings of Europe claimed to rule by divine right. The person of the king was therefore sacred and his commands holy. To obey him was to obey Heaven itself.

Both rest authority upon the sacred. In each case the right to rule comes not from the people but from the divine. This placed the ruler above all human challenge and made his authority absolute. Power flowed downward from Heaven rather than upward from the governed. Sacred sanction was the common foundation of both systems.

Both make obedience a religious duty. Because the ruler governed by the will of God, to disobey him was not merely a crime but a sin. This gave government a hold upon the conscience that no mere force could ever match. Rebellion became rebellion against Heaven and its order. Religion thus bound subjects to their rulers with unusual strength.

Both unite religious and political office. In theocracy and divine kingship the ruler is often the chief priest as well as the chief magistrate. The Pharaoh, the caliph and the Roman emperor all held sacred and political office in one person. Worship and government were conducted by the same hand. The temple and the throne were thus joined together.

Both provided stability and continuity. By clothing the ruler in sacred authority, these systems made government firm and enduring. Dynasties lasted because their right to rule was held to be given by God himself. Sacred kingship gave many ancient states their remarkable stability. Religion thus served the permanence of government.

Yet both could be challenged in religion's name. Because authority rested on the sacred, a ruler judged to have offended God could lose his right to rule. Priests, prophets and reformers could therefore check or condemn kings, as the Chinese Mandate of Heaven allowed. Sacred authority thus cut both ways, raising the ruler yet holding him to account. The same religion that made the king could also unmake him.

Theocracy and divine kingship therefore both founded political authority upon the sacred, making the ruler either the agent or the very embodiment of the divine and binding obedience to religion. They gave government great stability and strength, yet left it answerable, in the last resort, to the God from whom it claimed to derive its power.

Question 4

The same faith that crowned a king could also excommunicate him; religion was at once the throne's greatest ally and its most dangerous rival.

Assess the view that religion has been both a support and a challenge to the state.

Model Answer

Religion has stood in a double relationship to the state, at once supporting and challenging it. It has legitimised and served government, yet also limited and opposed it. Whether it has been more a support or a challenge to political authority may be assessed as follows.

Religion supported the state by legitimising rulers. Faith taught that kings ruled by the will of God, making their authority sacred and their subjects dutiful. This gave government a stability that force by itself could never provide. From the Pharaohs to the divine-right monarchs of Europe, religion crowned the state. In this it was the throne's greatest support.

It served the state by supplying law and officials. Religious law, religious courts and literate clergy furnished the state with ready systems of justice and administration. In medieval Europe churchmen ran the royal chancery, and in Islam the qadis judged in the caliph's name. Religion thus performed much of the actual work of government. Its service to the state was practical as well as spiritual.

It strengthened the state by uniting its subjects. A common faith bound peoples together and tied them to the ruler who upheld it. Islam united the scattered Arabs, and Christianity gave the many kingdoms of Europe a shared identity. This unity made subjects easier to govern and empires easier to hold. Religion was therefore a powerful cement of political order.

It disciplined the state by setting a moral standard. By teaching that rulers must govern justly and answer to God, religion pressed government towards good conduct. Prophets and preachers reproved unjust kings in the name of a higher law. This moral check improved government wherever it was heeded. Religion thus gave the state a conscience it could not easily silence.

Yet religion challenged the state by rivalling its power. Where church and ruler both claimed supreme authority, bitter conflict could follow, as in the Investiture Controversy between pope and emperor from 1076 to 1122. The Church claimed a power above kings, and kings deeply resented it. Religion thus became a rival centre of authority within the state. This tension ran through much of medieval history.

It limited the state by binding it to sacred law. Because the ruler was himself bound by the law of the faith, there were things he could not lawfully do. Religious law and religious courts stood partly beyond his control. This restrained the power of government, whether for good or for ill. Faith set limits that even kings dared not lightly cross.

It could overthrow the state by sanctioning resistance. Since authority rested on the sacred, a ruler held to have offended God might be resisted or deposed. The Chinese Mandate of Heaven and the excommunications of medieval popes both licensed rebellion. Religion could thus unmake rulers as surely as it made them. It was a dangerous power for any king to defy.

On balance it was both indispensable and untameable. For most of history religion was so woven into government that the state could not do without it, yet could never wholly control it. It gave far more support

than challenge, but the challenge was real and at times decisive. The relationship was therefore one of deep partnership shadowed by rivalry. Religion was by turns the state's ally and its master.

Religion has therefore been both a support and a challenge to the state, legitimising, serving, uniting and disciplining government, yet also rivalling, limiting and even overthrowing it. On balance its support was the greater and more constant force, but the challenge was ever present, so that the two powers lived together in a lasting partnership of mutual need and mutual suspicion.

Christianity and administrative systems

Question 5

For a thousand years the Church was the one institution that outlasted every kingdom, and its shadow fell across every throne in Europe.

Examine the influence of Christianity on administrative systems from the Middle Ages to the eighteenth century.

Model Answer

From the fall of Rome to the age of revolutions, the Christian Church was the most powerful and enduring institution in Europe. Its teachings, its law and its organisation shaped the governments of the medieval and early-modern world. The chief ways in which Christianity influenced administrative systems may be examined as follows.

It provided a model of hierarchical organisation. The Church was governed through a clear hierarchy descending from the pope through archbishops and bishops to the parish priest. This ordered structure of authority became a model for secular government to imitate. Kings arranged their realms in ranks after the pattern of the Church. The hierarchy of the altar thus shaped the hierarchy of the throne.

It supplied the personnel of government. For centuries the clergy were almost the only literate class, and so they filled the offices of kings. Bishops and monks served as royal chancellors, secretaries, judges and ambassadors. The English chancery and much of royal administration were run by churchmen. The Church thus provided the trained servants that the state could not otherwise find.

It developed the canon law. The Church built up its own great body of law, the canon law, governing the clergy, marriage, wills and morals. This was among the most sophisticated legal systems of the age and deeply influenced the growth of secular law. Its study became a major discipline in the universities. Canon law was thus a school of legal administration for all Europe.

It shaped the theory of kingship. Christianity taught that all authority came from God, so that kings were held to rule by divine appointment. This grew into the theory of the divine right of kings, answerable to God alone. The Church both crowned kings and claimed the right to judge them. Christian teaching thus defined the very nature of royal power.

It fostered the idea of two distinct powers. Christianity distinguished the spiritual authority of the Church from the temporal authority of the king, the doctrine of the "two swords." This planted the enduring idea that religious and political power were separate spheres. Their rivalry, seen in the Investiture Controversy of 1076 to 1122, shaped medieval politics. From this seed grew the later separation of church and state.

It advanced education and record-keeping. Monasteries and cathedral schools preserved learning and trained the literate men whom government needed, copying books in their scriptoria. From them grew the first universities, such as Paris and Oxford in the twelfth century. The skills of administration were kept alive by the Church through the darkest centuries. Government depended upon the learning that the Church preserved.

It organised social welfare. Moved by the duty of charity, the Church built hospitals, almshouses and orphanages and relieved the poor through tithes and the monasteries. It thus performed the social services that no medieval state provided. Care of the needy came to be seen as a recognised public duty. The Church pioneered the welfare later assumed by government.

It reshaped criminal justice. Christian teaching brought ideas of penance, redemption and mercy into the punishment of crime, softening the harsher codes of earlier ages. The concepts of conscience, the oath and the right of sanctuary all entered the law from the faith. Justice came to aim at the reform of the sinner as well as his punishment. Christian ethics thus reshaped the administration of justice.

Christianity therefore profoundly shaped the administrative systems of medieval and early-modern Europe, providing a model of hierarchy, the personnel and law of government, the theory of kingship, the distinction of the two powers, education, welfare and a new ideal of justice. So pervasive was its influence that the very foundations of Western government were largely laid within the Church.

Question 6

The Church was itself a kind of empire, with its own monarch, its own provinces, its own law and its own courts, spanning all of Christendom.

Describe the administrative organisation of the medieval Christian Church.

Model Answer

The medieval Church was not only a community of believers but a vast and orderly institution of government, the most highly organised in all Europe. It possessed its own head, its own hierarchy, its own law and its own courts, reaching into every parish. Its administrative organisation may be described as follows.

The pope stood at the head. At the summit of the Church stood the pope, the Bishop of Rome, regarded as the successor of Saint Peter and the supreme head of the Western Church. He claimed authority over all the clergy and, in spiritual matters, over kings themselves. From Rome he issued decrees binding upon the whole of Christendom. The papacy was, in effect, a monarchy of the entire Church.

Archbishops and bishops governed the provinces. Beneath the pope the Church was divided into provinces under archbishops and dioceses under bishops. Each bishop governed the clergy and faithful of his diocese from his cathedral city. This structure closely mirrored the provincial organisation of the old Roman Empire. The bishops carried the pope's authority into every region of Europe.

Parish priests served the people. At the base of the hierarchy stood the parish priests, who ministered to ordinary Christians in every village and town. They baptised, married and buried the people and gathered the Church's dues. Through them the vast institution reached and touched every single life. The parish was thus the basic cell of the Church's government.

The monastic orders formed a second network. Alongside the parish clergy stood the monasteries, communities of monks under their abbots, following rules such as that of Saint Benedict. These houses held great estates and were centres of farming, learning and charity. They were largely self-governing yet bound in obedience to Rome. The monasteries were a powerful and wealthy arm of the Church.

The Church had its own law. The Church was governed by canon law, a developed body of rules drawn from Scripture, the councils and the decrees of the popes. It regulated the clergy, marriage, wills, morals and much of daily life. Its study became a great discipline in the medieval universities. Canon law gave the Church a complete legal system of its own.

The Church ran its own courts. Church courts, presided over by bishops and their officers, judged cases touching the clergy, marriage, morality and the faith. They could impose penances and, in the last resort, the dread penalty of excommunication. These courts operated across Europe alongside the courts of the kings. The Church thus administered a justice of its own.

The Church raised its own revenue. The Church supported itself through the tithe, a tenth of all produce owed by every Christian, and through the income of its vast lands. It also received gifts, fees and the offerings of the faithful across the continent. This wealth funded the clergy, the monasteries and the Church's works of charity. Financially the Church was a state within the state.

Councils and the Curia gave it central government. The pope governed with the help of the Roman Curia, his central administration, while great questions were settled in general councils of the Church.

These bodies made law, judged disputes and directed the whole vast institution. They gave the Church organs of central government like those of a kingdom. The Church was thus administered as a great international monarchy.

The medieval Christian Church was therefore organised as a great international institution of government, with the pope at its head, archbishops and bishops over its provinces, priests in every parish, a network of monasteries, and its own canon law, courts, revenue and councils. In its order, wealth and reach it was the most complete administrative system of the whole age.

Question 7

Two swords, it was said, God had given to the world; but who should wield them, the pope or the king, no one could finally agree.

Explain the relationship between Church and State in medieval Europe.

Model Answer

In medieval Europe the Church and the secular rulers were the two great powers, and their relationship was one of both partnership and rivalry. Each needed the other, yet each claimed a supremacy that the other denied. This complex relationship may be explained as follows.

Both powers claimed a divine origin. Medieval thought held that both the spiritual power of the Church and the temporal power of kings came from God. This was the doctrine of the "two swords," the spiritual wielded by the Church and the temporal by the crown. Each was held supreme in its own sphere, yet the boundary between them was never clear. From this ambiguity sprang centuries of conflict.

The Church legitimised kings. Kings were crowned and anointed by bishops, so that their authority was blessed and confirmed by the Church. Coronation made the king a sacred person ruling by the grace of God. In return the Church gained the protection and favour of the crown. The two powers thus depended upon one another from the very start.

Kings protected and endowed the Church. Rulers defended the Church, enforced its rights and granted it broad lands and privileges. In return the clergy prayed for the king, served in his government and taught his subjects obedience. This exchange of service bound throne and altar closely together. Church and crown were partners in ruling Christian society.

Churchmen served the machinery of the state. Because the clergy were the literate class, bishops and abbots filled the great offices of royal government as chancellors and councillors. The Church thus supplied much of the machinery of the state itself. Yet this also entangled the two powers, for a bishop was the servant of both king and pope. Such divided loyalty was a constant source of dispute.

The two powers clashed over investiture. A great quarrel arose over who should appoint and install bishops, the pope or the king. This Investiture Controversy, between Pope Gregory VII and Emperor Henry IV from 1076, shook the whole of Europe. It was settled only by the compromise of the Concordat of Worms in 1122. The dispute revealed how deeply the two powers were entangled.

The papacy claimed supremacy over kings. At the height of its power the papacy claimed authority even over rulers, asserting the right to judge and to depose them. Popes used excommunication and the interdict to bring disobedient kings to heel. Some monarchs submitted, while others resisted the claim fiercely. Papal supremacy was the sharpest point of the whole conflict.

Kings resisted and limited the Church's power. Monarchs sought to control appointments, to tax the clergy and to keep the Church courts within bounds. Rulers such as the kings of England and France pushed back hard against papal claims. Over time the growing power of the national monarchies began to prevail. The balance slowly shifted from the Church towards the state.

The tension planted the seed of separation. The long rivalry established that spiritual and temporal power were distinct, neither wholly absorbing the other. This idea, peculiar to Christian Europe, prepared the way for the later separation of church and state. Out of medieval conflict there thus grew a lasting principle of government. The quarrel of pope and king shaped the whole Western political tradition.

The relationship between Church and State in medieval Europe was therefore one of partnership and rivalry combined, each power legitimising and serving the other yet each claiming supremacy. Their conflicts, above all over investiture and papal authority, ran through the age, and from their unresolved tension grew the enduring Western idea that religious and political power are distinct.

Question 8

The Church fed the poor and taught the ignorant, yet it also burned the heretic and grew fat on tithes; its record in government was a mingled one.

To what extent did Christianity promote good government in medieval Europe?

Model Answer

Christianity's influence on medieval government was profound, but it was not wholly for the good. The Church advanced law, learning and welfare, yet it also brought corruption, intolerance and conflict. How far it promoted good government may be assessed as follows.

It advanced justice and the rule of law. The Church developed the canon law and taught that even kings were bound by the law of God. This idea of a higher law standing above the ruler restrained arbitrary and tyrannical power. It nourished the belief that government itself must be just. In this the Church clearly served the cause of good government.

It softened the harshness of justice. Christian ideas of mercy, penance and redemption tempered the savage punishments of earlier ages. The right of sanctuary and the care of the condemned reflected this gentler spirit. Justice came increasingly to aim at reform as well as retribution. The faith thus helped to humanise the administration of law.

It pioneered social welfare. The Church built the first hospitals, almshouses and orphanages and organised relief for the poor of every land. Through tithes and monastic charity it fed the hungry and sheltered the traveller. No medieval state offered any such services to its people. In caring for the needy the Church did lasting good.

It preserved and spread learning. Through its monasteries, schools and universities the Church kept literacy and knowledge alive and trained the men who ran the state. Without it the administrative skills of the ancient world might well have perished. Learning survived the dark centuries within the cloister. This preservation was a great and lasting benefit to government.

It gave Europe moral and political unity. A shared faith bound the many kingdoms of Europe into one Christendom with common values. This unity eased diplomacy, softened warfare and fostered a sense of a common order. Ideas such as the Truce of God sought to limit private violence. In this the Church strengthened ordered government across the continent.

Yet the Church grew wealthy and corrupt. Its vast lands and revenues bred greed, and offices were bought and sold in the abuse known as simony. Worldly and idle clergy discredited the moral claims the Church made. Such corruption weakened rather than served the cause of good government. The Church's very wealth became a snare to it.

It could be intolerant and oppressive. The Church persecuted those it condemned as heretics, through the Inquisition and other harsh means. Religious uniformity was enforced by fear and at times by fire. This intolerance darkened its record and bred real injustice. Persecution was a grave fault in the Church's government of souls.

Its rivalry with kings bred conflict. The Church's claims to supremacy over rulers led to long and bitter struggles that disturbed the peace of Europe. Excommunications and interdicts were used as weapons in essentially political quarrels. Such conflict weakened government and divided the loyalties of subjects. The Church's ambition was not always a friend to good order.

Christianity therefore contributed greatly to good government in medieval Europe, advancing law, justice, welfare, learning and unity, so that the foundations of Western administration were largely its work. Yet

its wealth bred corruption, its zeal bred intolerance and its ambition bred conflict, so that its record, though on balance a great and civilising one, was decidedly mixed.

Question 9

When Luther nailed his theses to the church door, he shook not only the Church but every throne that had leaned upon it.

Examine the impact of the Protestant Reformation on administrative systems.

Model Answer

The Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century, begun by Martin Luther in 1517, broke the religious unity of Europe and reshaped the relationship between church and state. Its effects on administrative systems were deep and lasting. The impact of the Reformation on administration may be examined as follows.

It broke the universal authority of the pope. The Reformation rejected the supremacy of the pope over all Christendom, denying Rome's power over kings and churches alike. This shattered the single religious authority that had stood above the states of Europe. Political power was thereby freed from papal control. The Church ceased to be one universal government.

It strengthened the power of kings. Where Protestantism triumphed, rulers took control of the church within their realms and became its supreme head. In England the king became head of the Church by the Act of Supremacy of 1534. This joined religious and political authority in the crown. The Reformation thus greatly increased the power of the state over the church.

It gave rise to national state churches. In many Protestant lands the church became in effect a department of the state, its clergy appointed and paid by the ruler. National churches, such as the Anglican and the Lutheran, replaced the universal Roman Church. Religion was thus brought under the government of the prince. Church and state were joined in a new national form.

It transferred church wealth to the state. Reforming rulers seized the vast lands and wealth of the monasteries and the Church. In England the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII greatly enriched the crown. This shifted enormous resources from church to state. The material power of the Church was broken and passed to government.

It advanced literacy and popular education. Protestantism urged that all believers should read the Bible for themselves, and so encouraged schools and popular literacy. This spread education more widely through society than before. A more literate people made for a more governable and better-administered state. Religion thus fostered the education that modern government would need.

It encouraged ideas of conscience and dissent. By asserting the right of the individual conscience against Rome, the Reformation planted ideas of religious liberty and dissent. In time these grew into wider claims for freedom and toleration. Governments had to learn to deal with divided faiths among their subjects. The seed of religious toleration was thereby sown.

It divided Europe and bred religious wars. The split between Catholic and Protestant plunged Europe into a century of religious wars. These conflicts reshaped states and forced rulers to find new ways to govern divided populations. The Peace of Westphalia in 1648 recognised the right of states over their own religion. War thus reshaped both the map and the government of Europe.

It helped prepare the way for the secular state. By breaking religious unity and dividing Christians, the Reformation weakened the idea of a single religious basis for government. Rulers increasingly governed mixed populations by practical rather than purely religious means. This slowly opened the road towards the secular state. The Reformation was a step from the age of faith towards the age of reason.

The Protestant Reformation therefore transformed administrative systems by breaking the universal authority of the pope, strengthening kings, creating national state churches, transferring church wealth to the state, advancing education, and, through division and war, preparing the way for the secular state. It

marked a turning-point from the united Christendom of the Middle Ages towards the national and secular governments of the modern world.

Islam and administrative systems

Question 10

When Islam spread out of Arabia, it carried not only a faith but a whole system of law and government in its saddlebags.

Examine the influence of Islam on administrative systems.

Model Answer

Islam, from the seventh century onward, was never merely a religion of private belief but a complete way of life that governed the state as well as the soul. As it spread across three continents it built one of the great administrative traditions of history. The chief ways in which Islam influenced administrative systems may be examined as follows.

It united religious and political authority in the caliph. In Islam there was no division between the sacred and the secular, and the caliph was at once the religious and the political head of the community. He was the successor of the Prophet, charged with defending the faith and governing the ummah. Government was thus a religious duty and religion a matter of state. This union of the two powers was the foundation of Islamic administration.

It made sharia the law of the state. The law of Islamic states was the sharia, drawn from the Quran and the example, or Hadith, of the Prophet. It governed worship, family, property, trade, crime and government alike. Rulers were bound to uphold it, and judges applied it in their courts. Sacred law was thus the very framework of the state.

It created the institution of the caliphate. Islam produced the caliphate, a form of government uniting the whole community of believers under one head. The Rashidun (632 to 661), Umayyad (661 to 750) and Abbasid (750 to 1258) caliphates each governed vast empires in turn. This gave the Muslim world a distinctive and long-lived system of rule. The caliphate was Islam's great political creation.

It developed an organised bureaucracy. The caliphs, above all the Abbasids, built an elaborate administration of departments, or diwans, for taxation, the army, correspondence and the post. The empire was divided into provinces under appointed governors. A trained class of secretaries and scholars staffed these offices. Islam thus produced a sophisticated machinery of government.

It provided justice through the qadis. Islamic government appointed judges, the qadis, to apply the sharia and settle disputes in every province. The judiciary was, in principle, independent of the ruler's whim, bound only by the sacred law. This gave subjects a justice founded upon religion. The qadi was among the most respected officers of the state.

It organised taxation on religious principles. Islamic finance rested on religious dues, above all the zakat paid by Muslims and the jizya paid by protected non-Muslims. These, with the land-tax, filled the treasury, the bayt al-mal, established under the caliph Umar. Revenue was thus gathered and spent according to the teaching of the faith. Religion shaped the very finances of the state.

It provided welfare through the waqf. Islam encouraged endowments, or waqf, in which land and property were dedicated to support mosques, schools, hospitals and the poor. These endowments funded much of the public and charitable life of Muslim societies. Welfare was thus organised through a religious institution. Care of the community was woven into the fabric of the state.

It tolerated and taxed the peoples of the Book. Islam extended protection, the dhimma, to Jews and Christians as peoples of the Book, allowing them their faith in return for the jizya. This tolerance eased the government of religiously mixed empires. It reduced revolt and won the service of many non-Muslims. Religious policy was thus also an instrument of administration.

Islam therefore shaped administrative systems by uniting religious and political authority in the caliph, making sharia the law of the state, creating the caliphate and its bureaucracy, providing justice through the qadis, organising taxation and welfare on religious principles, and tolerating the peoples of the Book. In Islam, more than in most traditions, religion and government were inseparably one.

Question 11

From Umar's simple council in Medina to the glittering court of Baghdad, the caliphate grew into one of the mightiest governments on earth.

Describe the administrative system of the Islamic caliphate.

Model Answer

The caliphate was the system of government by which the Muslim community was ruled after the death of the Prophet Muhammad in 632. Through the Rashidun, Umayyad and Abbasid periods it developed from a simple leadership into a great imperial administration. Its system may be described as follows.

The caliph was the supreme head. At the head of the state stood the caliph, the successor of the Prophet and leader of the whole community of believers. He was both the religious and the political ruler, charged with defending the faith, leading the army and upholding the law. His authority extended, in principle, over all Muslims everywhere. The caliph was the keystone of the entire system.

The Rashidun laid the foundations. The first four rightly guided caliphs (632 to 661), beginning with Abu Bakr and Umar, organised the young state. Umar in particular divided the empire into provinces, appointed governors, and established the treasury and the diwan. This early period set the enduring pattern of Islamic government. The Rashidun were long remembered as the model of just rule.

The empire was divided into provinces. The vast realm was divided into provinces, each governed by a governor, a wali or amir, appointed by the caliph. The governor held civil, military and financial authority within his province. He collected the taxes, led the local army and maintained order. Provincial government made so great an empire governable.

Government worked through departments (diwans). The administration was organised into departments, or diwans, each handling a branch of affairs. There were diwans for the land-tax, for the army and its pay, for official correspondence and for the postal service. This division of labour, developed under the Umayyads and Abbasids, made government efficient. The diwan was the engine-room of the caliphate.

Justice was administered by the qadis. The caliph appointed judges, the qadis, to apply the sharia and settle disputes throughout the empire. Under the Abbasids a chief qadi was set over the whole judiciary. The judges ruled by the sacred law, in principle independent of the governor's will. Justice was thus a distinct and honoured branch of government.

The treasury managed the state's wealth. The bayt al-mal, or public treasury, established under Umar, received the taxes and paid the salaries, pensions and expenses of the state. Its income came from the zakat, the jizya, the land-tax and the spoils of war. From it the caliph funded the army, the officials and public works. Sound finance underpinned the whole administration.

A postal and intelligence service linked the empire. The barid, or postal service, carried official letters and kept the caliph informed of events in the provinces. Postmasters reported on the conduct of governors, the decisions of judges and the state of the treasury. This gave the centre eyes and ears across the empire. Communication and surveillance together held the caliphate together.

Councils of notables advised the ruler. The caliph and his governors took counsel with assemblies of leading men, the majlis, and with the religious scholars, the ulama. These gave advice, voiced grievances and lent the ruler the support of the learned and the powerful. Government was thus tempered by consultation. The majlis linked the ruler to the leading men of the community.

The Islamic caliphate was therefore governed through the caliph as supreme religious and political head, provinces under appointed governors, departments or diwans for the business of state, qadis for justice, a

central treasury, a postal and intelligence service, and councils of notables. From the Rashidun to the Abbasids it grew into one of the most sophisticated administrations of the medieval world.

Question 12

In the Islamic state the law came not from the will of the ruler but from the word of God, and even the caliph was its servant.

Explain the role of sharia law in Islamic administration.

Model Answer

At the heart of Islamic government lay the sharia, the sacred law of Islam, which governed the state as fully as it governed the believer. Drawn from the Quran and the Hadith, it shaped every branch of administration. The role of sharia in Islamic administration may be explained as follows.

It was drawn from the Quran and the Hadith. The sharia was founded upon the Quran, held to be the very word of God, and upon the Hadith, the sayings and example of the Prophet. From these sources were derived the rules by which the community was to live. Scholars developed them into a full and detailed system of law. The sacred texts were thus the foundation of the state's law.

It governed the whole of life. The sharia did not divide the religious from the secular but ruled over worship, family, property, trade, crime and government alike. There was no separate secular law standing beside it. To govern by the sharia was to govern the whole of life by religion. This made law and faith inseparable in the Islamic state.

It bound the ruler as well as the subject. Under the sharia even the caliph was not above the law but its servant and guardian. He was expected to rule within its bounds and could be reproved by the scholars if he strayed. The sacred law thus set real limits upon the ruler's power. Government was, in principle, the rule of God's law rather than of men.

It was applied by the qadis. The sharia was administered in the courts by judges, the qadis, appointed by the caliph and expert in the law. They settled disputes, punished crimes and upheld rights according to the sacred rules. Their judgements gave the law its force in daily life. The qadi was the living instrument of the sharia.

It was interpreted by the ulama. The learned scholars of religion, the ulama, studied and interpreted the sharia and trained the judges. They developed the great schools of law that gave Islamic jurisprudence its depth and richness. Their learning guided both rulers and courts. The ulama were the guardians and teachers of the sacred law.

It shaped taxation and finance. The sharia laid down the religious dues of the state, above all the zakat on Muslims and the jizya on protected non-Muslims. These, with the land-tax, formed the lawful income of the treasury. Even the finances of the state were thus governed by religious rule. Law and revenue were bound firmly together.

It regulated the treatment of non-Muslims. The sharia defined the status of the dhimmis, the protected Jews and Christians, granting them their faith and their own law in return for the jizya. This gave religiously mixed empires an ordered and workable arrangement. Even toleration was regulated by the sacred law. The law thus governed the very boundaries of the faith.

It gave the empire a common legal order. Because the sharia was one law across the whole Muslim world, it bound together peoples of many lands and languages. A judgement in Baghdad rested on the same principles as one in distant Córdoba. This common law was a powerful force for unity. The sharia was thus a bond of the whole Islamic civilisation.

Sharia law therefore lay at the very heart of Islamic administration, drawn from the Quran and Hadith, governing the whole of life, binding ruler and subject alike, applied by the qadis and interpreted by the ulama, and shaping taxation, tolerance and the unity of the empire. In the Islamic state, to administer was above all to apply the sacred law of God.

Question 13

Along the caravan routes and the ocean shore, Islam brought to Africa not only a new faith but a new way of governing.

Assess the influence of Islam on administrative systems in Africa.

Model Answer

As Islam spread across the Sahara and along the East African coast from the eighth century onward, it deeply influenced the administrative systems of many African states. Its effects were great, though they mingled with older African traditions. The influence of Islam on African administration may be assessed as follows.

It gave African rulers a new source of legitimacy. Conversion to Islam allowed African kings to claim the prestige and authority of the wider Muslim world. Rulers such as Mansa Musa of Mali and the Askias of Songhai governed as Muslim monarchs. This linked them to a great and respected civilisation beyond their borders. Islam thus strengthened the standing of the African state.

It supplied literate officials and records. Islam brought Arabic writing and a class of literate Muslim scholars who could keep records and conduct correspondence. These men served as secretaries, judges and advisers in African governments. Writing made administration more exact and more lasting. Literacy was among Islam's chief gifts to African government.

It introduced Islamic law and courts. Muslim rulers appointed qadis to apply the sharia, at least in the towns and among the faithful. This gave their states a written system of law alongside the older custom. Justice thereby gained in uniformity and in record. Islamic law strengthened the administration of justice in African states.

It fostered learning and administrative skill. Islam made towns such as Timbuktu and Jenne into famous centres of learning, with schools and the university of Sankore. These trained the scholars, lawyers and officials whom government required. A learned class thus grew up to serve the state. Islamic scholarship raised the quality of African administration.

It strengthened trade and revenue. Islam bound African states into the wide network of Muslim trade across the Sahara and the Indian Ocean. A common faith and Muslim merchants eased commerce and enriched the treasury through taxes and tolls. This trade wealth supported the army and the administration. Religion and commerce together strengthened the state.

It shaped the states of the East African coast. Along the coast, Islam gave rise to the Swahili city-states, such as Kilwa and Mombasa, ruled by Muslim sultans. Their government, law and trade were all framed by the faith. Islam thus created a distinctive urban civilisation of administration. The coast was bound firmly to the wider Muslim world.

It later inspired reforming Islamic states. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, movements of Islamic reform founded new states such as the Sokoto Caliphate and the Tukulor empire in West Africa. These were governed strictly by the sharia under an emir or caliph. Religion thus became the very basis of new administrations. Islam remade the political map of much of West Africa.

Yet its influence was often limited and mixed. In many states Islam was the faith of the court and the towns, while the mass of the people kept their traditional religion and custom. Rulers often blended Islamic and African practices to keep the loyalty of all. Islamic administration was thus partial rather than complete. The older African systems endured beneath the new faith.

Islam therefore profoundly influenced administrative systems in Africa, giving rulers legitimacy, literate officials, written law, learning, trade and, in time, whole new reforming states, from Mali and Songhai to the Swahili coast and the Sokoto Caliphate. Yet its influence was often confined to the court and the towns, blending with enduring African traditions, so that its impact, though deep, was rarely complete.

Question 14

While much of Europe slept, the cities of Islam blazed with libraries, hospitals and schools, all built as acts of faith.

Examine the contribution of Islam to learning, welfare and social services.

Model Answer

Islam taught that the care of the community and the pursuit of knowledge were sacred duties, and Muslim governments made them part of the work of the state. In its golden age Islam built great institutions of learning and welfare. Its contribution in these fields may be examined as follows.

It made charity a duty of the state and the faithful. Islam commanded the giving of alms, the zakat, as one of its five pillars, and made care of the poor a religious obligation. Governments gathered and distributed the zakat for the relief of the needy. Welfare was thus built into the very finances of the state. Charity became a matter of law as well as of conscience.

It funded welfare through the waqf. The waqf was a religious endowment in which land or property was dedicated forever to a good purpose. These endowments funded mosques, schools, hospitals, fountains and the care of the poor. They provided a lasting source of welfare independent of the treasury. The waqf was among Islam's great institutions of public service.

It built hospitals and cared for the sick. Islamic cities such as Baghdad, Cairo and Damascus built advanced hospitals, the bimaristans, open to all and free of charge. These treated the sick, trained physicians and advanced the science of medicine. Care of the body was thus organised by the faith. Islam pioneered public health in the medieval world.

It founded schools and universities. Islam prized knowledge and founded schools, the madrasas, and universities such as al-Azhar in Cairo and al-Qarawiyyin in Fez. These trained the scholars, judges and officials whom government required. Learning was thus organised and funded as a religious duty. Islam gave the state its educated class.

It preserved and advanced knowledge. During its golden age, from the eighth to the thirteenth century, Islam gathered and translated the learning of Greece, Persia and India. Muslim scholars advanced mathematics, medicine, astronomy and philosophy. This learning enriched administration and, in time, Europe itself. Islam was thus a great guardian and giver of knowledge.

It provided public amenities. Muslim rulers and endowments built roads, bridges, fountains, public baths and caravanserais for the benefit of travellers and townsfolk. These works served the welfare and the commerce of society alike. Their upkeep was a recognised duty of good government. Islam thus organised the amenities of urban life.

It bound welfare to good government. Because care of the community was a sacred duty, the just ruler was expected to provide for his people's needs. Welfare and legitimacy were thereby joined together. A ruler who neglected the poor failed in his religious duty. Islam made social service a mark of righteous government.

It set an example for later ages. The Islamic institutions of hospital, school and endowment influenced the later development of such services elsewhere, including in Europe. The idea of organised, funded public welfare owed much to Islam. Its example thus reached beyond its own civilisation. Islam helped to shape the social services of the wider world.

Islam therefore made a great contribution to learning, welfare and social services, making charity a duty of the state, funding welfare through the waqf, building hospitals, schools and universities, preserving and advancing knowledge, and providing public amenities. In binding social service to good government, Islam gave administration a strong tradition of public welfare that influenced the wider world.

Question 15

The Islamic empire ruled over Jews, Christians and many others, and found in its own law a way to govern them without forcing their faith.

Explain the position of non-Muslims in the administration of Islamic states.

Model Answer

As Islam spread over lands full of Jews, Christians and other peoples, its governments had to find a way to rule those who did not share the faith. Islamic law provided an ordered place for them within the state. The position of non-Muslims in Islamic administration may be explained as follows.

Non-Muslims were treated as protected peoples. Islamic law recognised Jews and Christians as peoples of the Book, possessors of earlier scriptures. They were granted protection, the dhimma, and were known as dhimmis. This gave them a recognised legal status within the Muslim state. They were neither forced to convert nor treated as mere enemies.

They kept their faith and worship. Under the dhimma, non-Muslims were allowed to practise their religion and to keep their places of worship. They were not compelled to become Muslims. This measure of tolerance was unusual in the medieval world. It made the government of religiously mixed empires possible.

They paid a special tax, the jizya. In return for protection and exemption from military service, non-Muslims paid a poll-tax, the jizya. This tax was an important source of revenue for the state. It marked their distinct status while securing their place in the community. Finance and toleration were thus joined together.

They governed their own communities. Non-Muslim communities were largely left to manage their own affairs under their own religious leaders and laws. In the Ottoman Empire this developed into the millet system, by which each religious community ran its own courts and schools. This eased the government of a diverse empire. Self-government under the state was granted to each faith.

They served in the administration. Because many non-Muslims were skilled, educated and wealthy, they often served as officials, secretaries, physicians and merchants. Christian and Jewish administrators were valued in many Muslim governments. Their talents thus enriched the state. Toleration brought practical benefit to administration.

They lived under certain restrictions. Dhimmis lived under limits, such as bars on bearing arms, on building new places of worship, and on holding the very highest offices. Their status was protected but subordinate to that of Muslims. These rules marked the boundaries of their place in society. Tolerance was ordered rather than equal.

The system reduced revolt and eased rule. By granting the conquered their faith and a measure of self-government, Islamic administration reduced resentment and rebellion. Peoples who kept their religion and customs had less cause to resist. This made the vast empire easier to hold together. Toleration was thus also an instrument of government.

It gave the empire a workable religious order. The dhimma and, later, the millet system gave Islamic states an ordered way to govern many faiths under one rule. It was more tolerant than most contemporary systems, if not equal by modern standards. This religious policy was a real achievement of administration. It allowed a single state to embrace many peoples.

The position of non-Muslims in Islamic administration was therefore that of protected peoples, the dhimmis, who kept their faith and a measure of self-government in return for the jizya and certain restrictions. Through the dhimma and the Ottoman millet system, Islamic states governed many religions under one rule, an ordered toleration that eased the government of vast and diverse empires.

Hinduism and administrative systems

Question 16

In the Hindu world the duties of a king were written not in a constitution but in the sacred law, and to rule was itself a sacred act.

Examine the influence of Hinduism on administrative systems.

Model Answer

Hinduism, the ancient faith of India, shaped the administrative systems of the subcontinent for thousands of years. Its ideas of sacred duty, law and social order gave Indian government its distinctive character. The chief ways in which Hinduism influenced administrative systems may be examined as follows.

It gave the king a sacred duty through Rajadharma. Hinduism taught the doctrine of Rajadharma, the sacred duty of the ruler to protect his people and uphold justice and righteousness. The king was seen as a divine embodiment of order, charged with maintaining dharma in the world. To govern well was thus a religious obligation, not merely a political task. Rajadharma set the whole purpose of Hindu kingship.

It made dharma the basis of law. The law of the Hindu state was dharma, the sacred moral order, set out in texts such as the Laws of Manu, the Manusmriti. This governed duty, justice, property and the relations of the classes. Kings were bound to rule in accordance with it. Sacred law thus underpinned the whole administration.

It ordered society through the caste system. Hinduism divided society into four great classes, the Chaturvarna: the Brahmins as priests, the Kshatriyas as warriors and rulers, the Vaishyas as merchants and the Shudras as labourers. This religious order shaped the whole structure of administration and office. Each class had its appointed duty in the life of the state. The caste system was the social foundation of Hindu government.

It gave the Brahmins a central place in government. The Brahmin priests, as the highest class, served as the counsellors, judges, ministers and teachers of the king. Their knowledge of the sacred law made them indispensable to administration. No great decision was taken without their guidance. The priesthood was thus woven into the very machinery of the state.

It made kingship divine. Hindu teaching held the king to be an embodiment or agent of the gods, ruling by sacred right. This gave his authority a religious sanction and his commands a holy force. Obedience to the king thereby became a religious duty. Divine kingship strengthened the stability of the Hindu state.

It shaped taxation through religious principle. The king's right to a share of the produce was rooted in the idea of bali, an offering owed in return for his protection. Taxes, often paid in grain or cattle, were thus given a religious sanction. Revenue was seen as the people's due to their protector. Religion clothed even taxation in sacred meaning.

It guided public works and welfare. Hindu teaching held the building of temples, tanks, wells and roads to be acts of religious merit. Kings therefore undertook such works to fulfil their sacred duty and to win favour. Skilled men, the sthapatis, directed this building. Religion thus inspired the public works of the state.

It shaped the conduct and aims of rulers. Hindu ethics required the king to be just, generous and self-controlled, ruling for the welfare of his subjects. The ideal was the righteous monarch who upheld dharma and cared for his people. This moral teaching set a standard for government. Religion thus shaped not only the structure but the very spirit of Hindu administration.

Hinduism therefore deeply influenced Indian administrative systems, giving the king his sacred duty through Rajadharma, making dharma the basis of law, ordering society through caste, placing the Brahmins at the heart of government, and shaping kingship, taxation, public works and the conduct of rulers. In the Hindu state, government and religion were bound together in the sacred order of dharma.

Question 17

Birth, in the Hindu order, was destiny: it fixed a man's work, his rank, and his place in the service of the state.

Explain the role of the caste system and the Laws of Manu in Indian administration.

Model Answer

Two of the deepest marks of Hinduism upon Indian government were the caste system and the sacred law-book known as the Laws of Manu. Together they ordered society and defined the duties of rulers and ruled. Their role in administration may be explained as follows.

The caste system divided society into four classes. Hinduism ordered society into the four varnas: the Brahmins as priests, the Kshatriyas as warriors and rulers, the Vaishyas as merchants and farmers, and the Shudras as labourers. Each person was born to his class and to its appointed duty. This religious division shaped the whole of social and political life. Caste was the framework within which Indian administration worked.

It assigned rule to the Kshatriyas. By the order of caste, the duty of governing and fighting belonged to the Kshatriya class, from which kings and warriors came. Rule was thus the sacred function of a particular order of society. The king drew his very right to govern from his place in this scheme. Caste determined who might hold the highest political power.

It gave the Brahmins authority in government. The Brahmins, as the highest class, served as priests, counsellors, judges and ministers to the king. Their mastery of the sacred law made them the guardians of right rule. Kings depended upon their guidance in law and policy. The caste order thus placed the priesthood at the centre of administration.

It fixed the duties of every class. Each caste had its appointed work, the Vaishyas in trade and farming and the Shudras in labour and service. This gave society a settled division of labour under religious sanction. Administration could rely on each class performing its ordained role. The caste system thus organised the productive life of the state.

The Laws of Manu set down the sacred law. The Manusmriti, or Laws of Manu, was the great law-book that codified dharma, the duties of the classes and the rules of justice. It guided kings, judges and officials in the ordering of society. It was among the most authoritative texts of Hindu law. Manu gave the caste order its written and sacred form.

It defined the duties of the king. The Laws of Manu set out the Rajadharma, the sacred duty of the ruler to protect his people, punish the wicked and uphold dharma. It taught that a king who ruled justly earned merit, and one who ruled ill earned ruin. The ruler was thus bound by a religious code of government. Manu was, in effect, a manual of kingship.

It regulated justice and punishment. The Laws of Manu laid down rules of justice, evidence and punishment, often varying the penalty according to the caste of the parties. This gave the courts a sacred standard to follow in their judgements. Justice was thus administered according to religious law. Manu shaped the whole system of Hindu justice.

Yet the system rested on rigid inequality. Because caste was fixed by birth and could not be changed, it bound men permanently to their station and denied advancement to the low-born. The Shudras and those below them bore heavy disabilities under the law. Administration thus rested upon a deep and religiously sanctioned inequality. This rigidity was the great weakness of the Hindu social order.

The caste system and the Laws of Manu therefore lay at the foundation of Indian administration, dividing society into ordained classes, assigning rule to the Kshatriyas and counsel to the Brahmins, fixing the duties of all, and setting down in Manu the sacred law of kingship and justice. Together they gave Hindu government a stable and sacred order, though one built upon a rigid and lasting inequality.

Question 18

The Hindu king wore a crown, but he also bore a burden: to fail in dharma was to fail before the gods.

Assess the concept of Rajadharma and divine kingship in Hindu governance.

Model Answer

Central to Hindu ideas of government were Rajadharma, the sacred duty of the ruler, and the belief in the divinity of kingship. These gave the Indian state both its authority and its moral purpose. Their place in Hindu governance may be assessed as follows.

Rajadharma made government a sacred duty. Rajadharma was the teaching that the king held his office as a sacred trust to protect his people and to uphold dharma. Government was thus not a mere exercise of power but a religious obligation. This gave the state a high moral purpose beyond conquest and wealth. Rule became a form of sacred service.

It bound the king to justice and welfare. Under Rajadharma the king was required to defend the weak, punish the wicked and care for the welfare of all his subjects. A ruler who neglected these duties was held to sin against the sacred order. The doctrine thus set a clear standard of good government. It pressed the ruler towards justice and mercy.

Divine kingship gave the ruler sacred authority. Hindu teaching held the king to be an embodiment or agent of the gods, ruling by divine sanction. This clothed his authority in religious awe and placed it above ordinary challenge. Obedience to him thereby became a religious duty. Divine kingship greatly strengthened royal power.

It gave the state stability and continuity. Because the king's authority was sacred and commonly hereditary, dynasties endured and government was stable. The sacred aura of kingship discouraged rebellion and rivalry. This helped the Hindu state to last through the ages. Religion thus served the permanence of government.

It tied the king to the Brahmins. Because the king ruled to uphold dharma, he depended on the Brahmin priests who knew and taught the sacred law. The priesthood both consecrated and guided the ruler. This alliance of throne and altar upheld the whole order. Kingship and priesthood were bound together in Rajadharma.

It set a moral check upon the ruler. Because the king was bound by dharma, his power was not wholly unlimited but answerable to the sacred law. A tyrant who broke dharma was held to forfeit his right to rule and to earn ruin. In principle, therefore, the doctrine restrained misrule. Sacred duty was a check as well as a sanction.

Yet in practice the check was often weak. Because the king was also held to be divine and there was no assembly to enforce dharma upon him, a determined ruler could ignore its restraints. The doctrine relied on the king's own conscience and the influence of the Brahmins. Bad kings could and did oppress their people. The moral check was thus more ideal than institutional.

On balance it gave Indian government a lofty ideal. Rajadharma and divine kingship together gave the Hindu state a noble vision of the righteous ruler serving dharma. Even where kings fell short, the ideal endured and shaped what was expected of rulers. It remains among the great political ideals of the ancient world. Its influence outlasted every dynasty that professed it.

Rajadharma and divine kingship therefore gave Hindu governance both its authority and its conscience, making rule a sacred duty bound to justice and welfare, strengthening the king yet binding him to dharma and the Brahmins. Although the moral check on a divine king was often weak in practice, the ideal of the righteous ruler upholding dharma remained one of the noblest legacies of Hindu political thought.

Question 19

The caste system gave Indian society an order that lasted three thousand years, yet it also locked millions into a station they could never leave.

Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the caste system as a basis of administration.

Model Answer

The caste system, rooted in Hindu religion, was the foundation of the social and administrative order of India for thousands of years. As a basis of government it had both real strengths and serious weaknesses. These may be assessed as follows.

It gave society a settled order. The division into four varnas gave every person a fixed place, class and duty within society. This produced a stable and predictable social order that endured for ages. Administration could rely on a society whose structure scarcely changed. Stability was the great strength of the caste system.

It provided a clear division of labour. Each caste had its appointed work, the priests in learning, the warriors in rule, the merchants in trade and the labourers in service. This ensured that the necessary tasks of society were always performed. The economy and the state had a ready supply of each kind of worker. Order in labour was a real administrative benefit.

It supplied trained men for government. The Brahmins provided learned counsellors, judges and officials, while the Kshatriyas provided rulers and soldiers. Each governing task had a class bred and trained to it from birth. Administration thus drew on men prepared for their roles. The system supplied the personnel of the state.

It gave the social order religious sanction. Because caste was ordained by religion, the whole social and political order carried sacred authority. Men accepted their station as a religious duty, which made society easy to govern. Rebellion against the order was rebellion against dharma itself. Religion made the system remarkably durable.

Yet it rested on rigid inequality. Caste was fixed by birth and could never be changed, binding men permanently to their station. The lower castes bore heavy burdens and disabilities under the law. This deep and lasting inequality was the system's gravest fault. Because religion itself sanctioned it, the injustice could not easily be reformed or overthrown. Justice was thus sacrificed to order.

It wasted talent and blocked ability. Because a man's work was fixed by birth rather than by his gifts, much talent was wasted and much ability blocked. A brilliant man born a labourer could never rise to govern. This denied the state the full use of its people's abilities. Unlike the Chinese examinations, which sought talent wherever it was born, caste closed the door to advancement by merit. Ability was thus sacrificed to birth.

It divided society and weakened unity. By separating men into rigid and often hostile castes, the system divided society against itself. The lowest, the untouchables, were despised and excluded altogether. This weakened the common unity on which a strong state depends. Division was a hidden weakness of the caste order.

On balance it gave stability at the price of justice. The caste system gave Indian administration a stability and order unmatched for length, but did so by fixing men in inequality and wasting their talents. Its strength as a basis of order was real, yet bought at a heavy human cost. It was, in the end, an ordered but unjust foundation for government. Its legacy remains deeply contested to this day.

The caste system was therefore a powerful basis of administration, giving Indian society a settled order, a division of labour, trained rulers and a sacred sanction that lasted three thousand years. Yet it rested on rigid inequality, wasted talent and divided society, so that it purchased stability at the price of justice, and stands as an ordered but deeply flawed foundation for government.

Buddhism and administrative systems

Question 20

Where other faiths crowned the conqueror, Buddhism taught the king to conquer himself, and to rule by compassion rather than the sword.

Examine the influence of Buddhism on administrative systems.

Model Answer

Buddhism, founded by Siddhartha Gautama in India in the sixth century BCE, spread across Asia and shaped the governments of many lands. Its teachings of compassion, merit and non-violence gave rulers a distinctive ideal of administration. The chief ways in which Buddhism influenced administrative systems may be examined as follows.

It taught government by moral merit. Buddhism held that a ruler should govern by moral merit, or punya, earned through good and virtuous deeds. Officials, too, were ideally chosen and judged by their moral character rather than their birth. Government thus rested on virtue rather than mere force or descent. Merit became a measure of the right to rule.

It set before rulers the ideal of the righteous king. Buddhism taught the ideal of the dharmaraja, the king who rules by righteousness and for the good of his people. Such a ruler protected his subjects, gave to the poor and upheld the moral law. This gave government a high moral purpose. The righteous king became the Buddhist model of good administration.

It found its great example in Ashoka. The emperor Ashoka of India (c. 268 to 232 BCE), after his conversion to Buddhism, made moral law, or dhamma, the guiding principle of his rule. He appointed welfare officials, built hospitals and proclaimed his principles on rocks and pillars. Ashoka became the enduring model of the Buddhist ruler. His reign showed how the faith could reshape government itself.

It emphasised non-violence in government. Buddhism taught ahimsa, or non-violence, and urged rulers to prefer peace and to avoid needless war and cruelty. This softened both the conduct of government and the punishment of crime. Conquest by righteousness was preferred to conquest by the sword. Non-violence gave Buddhist administration a gentler character.

It stressed compassion and welfare. The faith taught compassion for all living beings, moving rulers to care for the poor, the sick and even the animals. Buddhist kings built hospitals, rest-houses and wells as works of merit. Welfare thus became a recognised duty of the righteous state. Compassion shaped the social policy of Buddhist government.

It offered the sangha as a model of order. The sangha, the community of monks, was governed by rule and by the consensus of its members. This orderly and disciplined community offered a model of organisation and collective decision. Its example influenced ideas of governance in Buddhist lands. The monastic order was, in effect, a school of administration.

It shaped economic life through reciprocity. Buddhism encouraged giving, or dana, and mutual support rather than greed and exploitation. Kings and laity alike earned merit by supporting the monks and relieving the poor. This wove generosity into the economic life of the state. Religion thus shaped the very spirit of the Buddhist economy.

It required ethics of administrators. Buddhism taught that those who governed should act with honesty, integrity and compassion in all their dealings. Officials were to shun corruption and cruelty and to serve the good of the people. This set a moral standard for the whole administration. Ethical conduct was central to the Buddhist ideal of government.

Buddhism therefore influenced administrative systems by teaching government through merit and righteousness, setting before rulers the ideal of the dharmaraja realised in Ashoka, and stressing non-violence, compassion, welfare, orderly community and ethical conduct. Wherever it spread, it gave government a gentler and more moral character, measuring the ruler by his virtue and his care for his people.

Question 21

The Buddhist king was to be a father to his people, and a war he could not avoid was a war he had already half lost.

Explain how Buddhist principles shaped ideals of kingship in ancient Asia.

Model Answer

As Buddhism spread from India across Asia, it gave the kingdoms it touched a distinctive ideal of the ruler. The Buddhist king was to govern by righteousness, compassion and merit rather than by mere force. How Buddhist principles shaped ideals of kingship may be explained as follows.

The king was to be a righteous ruler (dharmaraja). Buddhism taught that the ideal king was the dharmaraja, who ruled in accordance with the moral law and for the welfare of his people. His first duty was to uphold righteousness throughout his realm. This gave kingship a clear and demanding moral standard. The dharmaraja was the model to which Buddhist rulers aspired.

The king ruled to protect and serve his people. Buddhist teaching held that the ruler existed for the good of his subjects, as a father exists for his children. He was to protect them from harm, relieve their poverty and secure their peace. Government was thus a duty of care rather than a right of privilege. Service to the people was the mark of the good king.

The king earned his authority by merit. Buddhism taught that a ruler's right to reign rested on his store of merit, or punya, gained through virtue in this and past lives. A king held his throne because of his goodness, and might lose the people's loyalty by wickedness. Merit thus legitimised kingship. Virtue and authority were bound together.

The king was to govern by non-violence where he could. The teaching of ahimsa urged the king to avoid needless war and cruelty and to prefer peaceful means. Ashoka's renunciation of conquest after the Kalinga war was the great example. Force was to be the last resort of the righteous ruler. Non-violence shaped the Buddhist ideal of rule.

The king was to practise generosity and charity. The Buddhist ruler earned merit and honour by giving to the poor, supporting the monks and building works of public benefit. Generosity, or dana, was among the chief virtues of kingship. Hospitals, wells and rest-houses were the fruits of this ideal. Charity was a royal as well as a religious duty.

The king upheld and protected the faith. Buddhist kingship carried the duty of supporting the sangha and defending the religion. Rulers built monasteries, endowed the monks and spread the teaching, as Ashoka sent missionaries abroad. Throne and sangha thus supported one another. The king was the patron and protector of the faith.

The ideal spread across Buddhist Asia. This model of the righteous, compassionate king shaped rulers in Sri Lanka, Burma, Thailand and beyond. Kings in these lands took Ashoka as their pattern and styled themselves upholders of the dhamma. The Buddhist ideal of kingship thus became an enduring tradition. It shaped Asian government for many centuries.

Yet the ideal was not always matched in practice. Real kings often fell short of the gentle ideal, waging war and taxing heavily like other rulers. The dharmaraja was a standard to aspire to rather than a description of every reign. Even so, the ideal shaped what was expected of a good king. It set a moral measure that outlasted any single ruler.

Buddhist principles therefore shaped the ideal of kingship in ancient Asia as the righteous dharmaraja who ruled by merit, protected and served his people, preferred non-violence, practised charity and upheld the faith. Realised most fully in Ashoka and spread across Buddhist Asia, this gentle and moral ideal of the ruler was among Buddhism's chief gifts to the art of government, however imperfectly it was kept.

Question 22

The community of monks owned little and ruled no one, yet its example of order and virtue shaped kingdoms across Asia.

Explain the role of the sangha in Buddhist society and government.

Model Answer

At the heart of Buddhism stood the sangha, the community of monks and nuns who devoted themselves to the teaching of the Buddha. Though it held no political power, the sangha deeply influenced Buddhist society and government. Its role may be explained as follows.

It was an ordered and self-governing community. The sangha was governed by its own rule, the Vinaya, and by the consensus of its members. It managed its own affairs in an orderly and disciplined way. This made it a model of organised community life. Decisions were reached collectively and disputes settled by agreed procedure, so that the community governed itself without a single ruler. Its order offered an example to the wider society.

It preserved and taught the faith. The monks preserved the teachings of the Buddha and passed them on to each new generation. They were the guardians and the teachers of the religion. Through them the faith that shaped Buddhist government was kept alive. The sangha was the memory and the voice of the faith.

It guided rulers in righteousness. The monks advised kings on the moral law and reminded them of their duty to rule justly. As respected holy men, they could counsel and even reprove the throne. A king who ignored the monks and their teaching risked losing the respect of his people and the merit on which his rule depended. This gave society a moral check upon its rulers. The sangha was a conscience for Buddhist kingship.

It depended on the support of king and people. Because the monks did not work or own wealth, they relied on the gifts of rulers and laity. Kings earned merit by building monasteries and endowing the sangha. This bound throne and monastery together in mutual support. Religion and government sustained one another.

It provided education and learning. The monasteries were centres of learning where monks and often laymen were taught. They preserved books and knowledge and trained literate men. In many Buddhist lands the sangha was the chief source of education. Learning for government was thus nurtured in the monastery.

It set a moral example for society. By their life of poverty, discipline and non-violence, the monks set before society an ideal of virtue. This moral example shaped the values of rulers and ruled alike. The sight of men who renounced wealth and power for the sake of righteousness held up a mirror to those who wielded them. The sangha taught by living as much as by preaching, and its example softened and civilised Buddhist society.

It offered welfare and refuge. Monasteries often gave shelter, food and help to the poor, the sick and the traveller. They served as places of refuge and as centres of charity. In this the monastery did for Buddhist lands much of what the church did in Christian Europe, relieving want where the state did not. Care of the needy was thus among the sangha's quiet works of welfare.

Yet it stood apart from direct rule. The sangha did not itself govern or hold political office, for its calling was spiritual. Its power lay in influence and example rather than in command. This distinguished it from the ruling priesthoods of some other faiths. The sangha shaped government from beside the throne, not upon it.

The sangha therefore played a great role in Buddhist society and government, as an ordered, self-governing community that preserved the faith, guided rulers in righteousness, provided education and welfare, and set a moral example for all. Though it did not itself rule, its influence and example shaped the governments of Buddhist Asia from beside the throne rather than upon it.

Confucianism and administrative systems

Question 23

Confucius dreamed of a state governed not by the strongest but by the wisest and most virtuous, and China spent two thousand years trying to build it.

Examine the influence of Confucianism on administrative systems.

Model Answer

Confucianism, the ethical teaching of the Chinese sage Confucius (551 to 479 BCE), became the guiding philosophy of Chinese government for over two thousand years. Though more a moral and social philosophy than a religion, it shaped administration as deeply as any faith. Its influence on administrative systems may be examined as follows.

It taught government by virtue. Confucianism held that the state should be governed by moral virtue rather than by mere force or law. The ruler was to set an example of goodness, and his virtue would draw the willing obedience of the people. Good government thus began with the good character of those who governed. Virtue was the first principle of Confucian administration.

It founded government on merit. Confucianism taught that offices should be filled by the most able and virtuous men, whatever their birth. This ideal gave rise to the famous system of examinations for the civil service. Talent and learning, rather than noble blood, became the path to office. Meritocracy was among Confucianism's greatest gifts to government.

It built an ordered bureaucratic hierarchy. Confucian teaching stressed a clear hierarchy and division of duties, with each official knowing his rank and his role. This produced a disciplined bureaucracy with defined lines of authority and responsibility. Government became the orderly work of graded officials. Confucianism thus gave China a highly organised administration.

It required ethical conduct of officials. Confucianism demanded that officials be honest, just and devoted to the public good. Corruption and self-seeking were condemned as betrayals of a sacred duty. Officials were to serve the people, not to exploit them for gain. Ethical government was thus written into the Confucian ideal.

It emphasised education and learning. Confucianism prized education as the means of forming virtuous men and able officials. Schools and academies taught the classics that trained the scholar-official class. Learning became the very foundation of a career in government. Confucianism thus bound education and administration together.

It stressed respect for authority and order. Confucianism taught filial piety and respect for elders and superiors, extending obedience from the family to the state. This fostered a stable and orderly society that accepted its rulers. Loyalty to authority became a moral virtue. Confucianism thus underpinned social and political order.

It aimed government at the common good. Confucianism held that the state existed for the welfare of the people, and that a ruler who failed them lost his right to rule. This echoed the Mandate of Heaven, which judged the ruler by his care for his subjects. Government was thus directed towards the good of all. The people's welfare was the test of good rule.

It gave the state lasting stability and continuity. Because Confucian principles outlasted every dynasty, they gave Chinese administration a remarkable continuity across the centuries. The scholar-officials formed a permanent governing class trained in the same ideals. Government endured through changes of ruler and of dynasty alike. Confucianism was the enduring soul of the Chinese state.

Confucianism therefore profoundly shaped administrative systems, teaching government by virtue and merit, building an ordered and ethical bureaucracy, prizing education, stressing respect for authority, and directing the state to the common good. Above all it gave China a trained governing class and a continuity of government unmatched in the ancient and medieval world.

Question 24

For a thousand years the road to power in China ran through the examination hall, where a peasant's son might, in theory, rise to govern an empire.

Assess the role of Confucianism in the administration of imperial China.

Model Answer

In no state was Confucianism more powerful than in imperial China, where it became the official philosophy of government. It shaped the recruitment, the conduct and the very ideals of the ruling class over many centuries. Its role in the administration of imperial China may be assessed as follows.

It provided the ideology of the state. From the Han dynasty onward, Confucianism became the official teaching of the Chinese state. It defined the duties of ruler and subject and the whole purpose of government. Emperors and officials alike were formed by its ideals. Confucianism was, in effect, the framework of imperial rule.

It created the civil service examinations. Confucianism gave rise to the examination system, in which officials were chosen by tests in the Confucian classics. This sought to fill the government with the most learned and able men in the empire. It became the defining institution of Chinese administration. The examinations were Confucianism's great practical achievement.

It produced a trained governing class. The examinations created the scholar-officials, or mandarins, an educated class of men who ran the empire. They shared a common training in Confucian learning and a common ideal of service. This gave the state a professional and disciplined administration. The mandarins were the backbone of Chinese government.

It opened, in principle, a path for talent. Because the examinations were open to men of humble as well as noble birth, they offered a road to advancement through merit. In theory even a poor man's son might rise to high office by his learning. This gave the system a measure of openness rare in the ancient world. Merit, not birth, was the professed key to power.

It bound the empire together in a common culture. Because all officials were trained in the same classics, the vast empire was governed by men who shared one set of values and one written language. This common Confucian culture held China together across great distances. It gave unity to a huge and varied realm. Shared learning was thus a bond of empire.

It set a moral standard for rulers and officials. Confucianism required the emperor to be virtuous and to care for his people, and officials to be honest and just. It gave the scholars the standing to reprove a wayward throne. This moral ideal restrained, at least in principle, the abuse of power. Confucianism thus gave the state a conscience.

Yet the system could grow rigid and conservative. Because it prized the memorising of ancient classics, the examination system could reward rote learning over fresh thought. In time it made government cautious and resistant to change. This rigidity became a weakness in the face of new challenges. The strength of tradition was also its burden.

On balance it gave China unmatched stability. Despite its faults, Confucian administration gave China a continuity and coherence of government unequalled in world history. The scholar-official class survived the fall of dynasties and preserved the state. For two thousand years it made China one of the best-governed of empires. Confucianism's success was written in that long endurance.

Confucianism therefore played the central role in the administration of imperial China, providing the ideology of the state, the examination system, a trained governing class, a path for talent, cultural unity and a moral standard for rulers. Though it could grow rigid and conservative, it gave Chinese government a stability and continuity unmatched anywhere, and stands as the supreme example of a philosophy shaping a state.

Judaism and administrative systems

Question 25

A small people, often without a state of their own, gave the world an idea that would outlast empires: that even the king is bound by the law of God.

Examine the influence of Judaism on administrative systems.

Model Answer

Judaism, one of the oldest of the world's faiths, has influenced administrative systems out of all proportion to the size of the Jewish people. Its ideas of law, covenant and justice shaped ancient Israel and, through it, the wider Western tradition. The chief ways in which Judaism influenced administrative systems may be examined as follows.

It founded government on a covenant. Judaism taught that the people stood in a covenant, or solemn agreement, with God, who was their true king and lawgiver. Government was thus bound by this sacred bond and its terms. Rulers governed under God rather than in their own right. The idea of a covenant gave a moral foundation to the state.

It made sacred law the basis of the state. The law of ancient Israel was the Torah, the law of Moses, held to be given by God himself. It governed worship, justice, property, family and the conduct of rulers alike. The state existed to uphold this sacred law. Law, and not the will of a king, was supreme in Israel.

It subjected even the king to the law. Judaism taught that the king himself was bound by the law of God and was not above it. Prophets such as Nathan and Elijah rebuked kings who did wrong in the name of God. This was a revolutionary idea: that the ruler answered to a higher law. It planted the seed of limited and lawful government.

It established institutions of justice. Ancient Israel developed courts and judges to administer the law, and later the council of elders known as the Sanhedrin. Justice was to be impartial, favouring neither the rich nor the poor. This gave the state an ordered system of justice under the sacred law. Judaism prized justice as a duty owed to God.

It taught the accountability of rulers. Because kings ruled under God's law, they were answerable for their conduct to God and to his prophets. Misrule was condemned as sin, and not merely as folly or weakness. This idea of the accountable ruler shaped later thinking about government. Judaism made answerability a principle of rule.

It distinguished religious from royal authority. In ancient Israel the priest and the prophet stood apart from the king, so that sacred and royal power were not wholly united in one hand. This separation allowed the prophets to reprove the throne freely. It foreshadowed later ideas of a balance of powers. Judaism kept alive a distinction between the altar and the throne.

It taught the protection of the weak. The Torah commanded care for the poor, the widow, the orphan and the stranger, and set limits on the power of the strong. Justice and mercy to the vulnerable were made duties of the community and its rulers. This gave government a clear duty of welfare. Compassion was written into the sacred law.

It influenced the wider Western tradition. Through Christianity and the Bible, Jewish ideas of law, covenant and the accountability of rulers passed into the political thought of Europe. The belief in a higher law above the ruler shaped later constitutional ideas. Judaism's influence thus reached far beyond ancient Israel. Its legacy endured in the Western idea of lawful government.

Judaism therefore influenced administrative systems by founding government on a covenant, making sacred law supreme, subjecting even the king to that law, establishing justice, teaching the accountability of rulers and the protection of the weak, and distinguishing religious from royal power. Through the Bible these ideas passed into the Western tradition, giving the world the enduring principle that even rulers are bound by a higher law.

Question 26

Long before parliaments, the prophets of Israel declared a truth that shook every throne: that the law stands above the king.

Explain the contribution of Judaism to ideas of law and justice in government.

Model Answer

Among the deepest legacies of Judaism to government are its ideas of law and justice. Ancient Israel held that law came from God and bound all men, even kings, and that justice was a sacred duty. The contribution of Judaism to ideas of law and justice may be explained as follows.

Law came from God, not from the ruler. Judaism taught that the law, the Torah, was given by God and not made by any king. The ruler therefore received the law rather than created it at his pleasure. This placed the source of law above the state itself. Law was sacred and enduring, not the plaything of power.

The law bound everyone equally. The sacred law applied to king and commoner, rich and poor alike, for all stood together under God. No one was above the law or beneath its protection. This ideal of equality before the law was a great advance for its age. Justice was to be no respecter of persons. In an age when the powerful commonly did as they pleased, the claim that one law bound all men was truly revolutionary.

The king was subject to the law. Judaism uniquely held that the king himself was bound by God's law and could be judged for breaking it. The prophets openly rebuked kings such as David and Ahab for their sins. This subjected the highest power to a higher law. It was the very root of the idea of limited government.

Justice was a sacred duty. The Torah commanded that judges be impartial and that justice be done without bribery or favour. To pervert justice was to sin against God himself. This made the fair administration of justice a religious obligation. The prophets openly denounced judges who took bribes or oppressed the poor. Righteousness in judgement was thus central to the faith.

The law protected the weak and the poor. Jewish law commanded special care for the widow, the orphan, the poor and the stranger. It set limits on debt, on the power of masters and on the greed of the strong. Government was thus charged with defending the vulnerable. Mercy and justice were joined together in the law.

Institutions upheld the law. Ancient Israel established judges, courts and, later, the Sanhedrin to administer justice under the Torah. These gave the sacred law an ordered machinery of enforcement. Justice was thus not left to chance but built into the life of the state. Judaism gave law its institutions as well as its ideals.

Prophets held rulers accountable. The prophets stood apart from the throne and reproved kings in the name of God's law and justice. This gave society a voice that could check and correct the misrule of the powerful. The accountability of rulers was thus written into Israel's life. The prophet was, in effect, the conscience of the state.

These ideas shaped later law. Through the Bible, the Jewish ideas of a higher law, equality before it and the accountability of rulers passed into Christian and Western thought. They influenced the later growth of constitutional and human-rights ideas. Judaism's contribution thus reached far beyond its own time. Its principles became part of the common heritage of law.

Judaism therefore made a profound contribution to ideas of law and justice, teaching that law comes from God and binds all equally, that even the king is subject to it, that justice is a sacred duty, and that the weak must be protected and rulers held to account. Passing through the Bible into Western thought, these ideas became foundations of the later belief in lawful and limited government.

Shintoism and administrative systems

Question 27

In Japan the emperor was no mere man but the living descendant of the sun goddess, and to serve him was to serve Heaven itself.

Examine the influence of Shintoism on the administrative system of Japan.

Model Answer

Shintoism, the ancient native religion of Japan, centred on the worship of the kami, the spirits of nature and of ancestors. It gave Japanese government a sacred foundation and a distinctive character, above all in the divinity of the emperor. Its influence on the administrative system of Japan may be examined as follows.

It made the emperor divine. Shinto taught that the emperor was descended from the sun goddess Amaterasu and was himself a living god. This gave the imperial line a sacred authority beyond all challenge. The emperor's rule was thus rooted in religion itself. Divine kingship was the foundation of the Japanese state.

It gave the throne sacred legitimacy. Because the emperor was of divine descent, his right to reign needed no other justification. The imperial dynasty was held to be unbroken and eternal, unlike the changing dynasties of China. This gave Japanese government a unique continuity and stability. Shinto sanctified the very permanence of the throne.

It bound religion and government together. In Shinto the worship of the kami and the governing of the land were closely joined, for the emperor was both ruler and high priest. Government and ritual were carried on together as one. Sacred and political duties were united in the same authority. Religion and rule were thus inseparable in Japan.

It made ritual a tool of government. Shinto ceremonies and festivals were used to legitimise authority and to bind the people to their rulers. The Tokugawa shogunate (1603 to 1867) used Shinto rites to sanctify its power and promote peace among its vassals. Ritual thus served the ends of government. Ceremony reinforced obedience and order.

It fostered respect for tradition and continuity. Shinto valued the preservation of established customs and the ways of the ancestors. This gave Japanese administration a deep respect for precedent and a caution towards sudden change. Government held fast to inherited forms and usages. Tradition was thus a strong support of the state.

It strengthened local community government. Shinto was rooted in local shrines and communities, and villages, the mura, often governed much of their own affairs around them. This fostered strong local organisation and self-management. Community life was bound up with local worship. Shinto thus underpinned government at the local level.

It promoted a collectivist ethos. Shinto stressed harmony and the subordination of the individual to the community and the nation. This fostered loyalty, obedience and a strong sense of collective duty. Such an ethos supported an ordered and disciplined state, in which men served willingly. This deep habit of collective loyalty would later help to bind the whole nation to the state. The good of the group was placed above the self.

It later became a support of the nation-state. In modern times the divinity of the emperor and the Shinto tradition were used to strengthen loyalty to the Japanese state. Shinto became a powerful force for national unity and obedience. Its influence thus reached into the modern age. Religion continued to serve the Japanese state.

Shintoism therefore deeply influenced the administrative system of Japan, making the emperor a living god, giving the throne unique sacred legitimacy and continuity, binding religion and government together, and using ritual, tradition, community and a collectivist ethos to uphold the state. In Japan, perhaps more lastingly than anywhere, divine kingship remained the foundation of government.

African and indigenous traditional religions

Question 28

In many an African kingdom the ruler was also a priest, and the health of the land was believed to hang upon his sacred person.

Examine the influence of African Traditional Religion on administrative systems.

Model Answer

African Traditional Religion, with its belief in a supreme God, lesser spirits and the ancestors, deeply shaped the administrative systems of pre-colonial Africa. It gave rulers their authority, bound communities together and sanctified law and land. Its influence on administrative systems may be examined as follows.

It gave rulers divine authority. In many African societies the king or chief was held to be sacred, descended from the ancestors or chosen by the spirits. The Kabaka of Buganda, the Shilluk divine king and many others ruled by such sacred right. This clothed their authority in religious awe. Divine kingship was widespread in African government.

It united spiritual and political leadership. The African ruler was often both a political chief and a religious leader, responsible for the rituals on which the community's welfare was thought to depend. He led both in war and in worship. Sacred and political office were joined in one person. Religion and rule were thus bound together.

It made the ancestors guardians of the community. African religion held that the ancestors watched over the living and upheld the customs and laws of the people. To break the law was to offend the ancestors as well as the living. This gave custom and authority a powerful sacred sanction. The ancestors were, in effect, guardians of the social order.

It sanctified law and custom. The laws and customs of African societies were believed to come from the ancestors and the spirits, and so carried religious force. To obey them was a sacred duty, and to break them invited spiritual punishment. Religion thus upheld the whole legal order of society. Custom and faith were inseparable.

It gave elders and priests authority. In many societies religious elders, priests, diviners and rainmakers held great influence in government. They interpreted the will of the spirits, blessed the rulers and helped to settle disputes. Their spiritual authority made them powerful figures of administration. Religion thus placed such men near the centre of power.

It bound the community together. Shared worship, festivals and rituals united the members of a society and strengthened their common identity. Religion gave the community a sense of belonging and of shared purpose. This unity made government easier and society more stable. Faith was a powerful cement of the African state.

It shaped land and economic life. African religion held the land to be sacred, often entrusted to the chief on behalf of the ancestors and the community. Spiritual leaders regulated its use and the timing of planting and harvest. Trade and wealth too were placed under religious sanction. Religion thus shaped the economic administration of society.

It supported both centralised and decentralised systems. In centralised states religion sanctified the divine king, while in stateless societies it upheld the authority of elders and age-sets. Thus it underpinned very different forms of government across the continent. Religion adapted to each society's way of ruling itself. It was the common foundation of diverse African systems.

African Traditional Religion therefore deeply influenced administrative systems, giving rulers divine authority, uniting spiritual and political leadership, making the ancestors guardians of law and custom, empowering elders and priests, binding communities together, and sanctifying land and economic life. Whether in centralised kingdoms or stateless societies, religion lay at the very foundation of pre-colonial African government.

Question 29

Where there was no king, there was still order, kept by the elders, the age-mates and the unseen watchfulness of the ancestors.

Explain how indigenous and traditional religions shaped decentralised systems of government.

Model Answer

Not all traditional societies, in Africa or elsewhere, were ruled by kings; many governed themselves without any central ruler. In these decentralised or stateless societies, indigenous religion played a special role in maintaining order. How traditional religions shaped such systems of government may be explained as follows.

Religion supplied authority where there was no king. In stateless societies there was no central ruler to command obedience, so authority rested on custom and the sacred. The ancestors and the spirits, rather than a king, were the ultimate source of order. Religion thus filled the place that a monarch held elsewhere. Sacred custom governed where no crown did.

The ancestors upheld law and custom. Traditional religion taught that the ancestors watched over the living and guarded the customs handed down to them. To break custom was to offend the ancestors and to invite misfortune. This gave the unwritten law a powerful sacred force. The dead thus helped to govern the living.

Elders governed with spiritual authority. In decentralised societies the elders, as those closest to the ancestors, led in decision and in ritual. Their age and wisdom gave them a sacred as well as a social authority. They settled disputes and guided the affairs of the community. Religion thus underpinned the rule of the elders.

Age-sets organised the community. Many such societies grouped their people into age-sets, which took on duties of defence, work and government at each stage of life. These age-grades were often bound together by religious rites of passage. Religion thus helped to organise the very structure of society. Sacred ceremony marked and ordered the life of the community.

Religious sanctions enforced order. In the absence of a king's police and courts, order was kept by the fear of spiritual punishment for wrongdoing. Oaths, curses and the judgement of the ancestors deterred crime and helped settle disputes. Religion thus supplied the force that a state elsewhere provided. Sacred sanction took the place of royal power.

Priests and diviners guided decisions. Diviners, priests and rainmakers interpreted the will of the spirits and advised the community in its affairs. They helped to choose the times for planting, for war and for ritual. Their spiritual authority guided the collective decisions of the people. Religion thus shaped the governance of stateless peoples.

Shared worship bound the community. Common festivals, shrines and rituals united the scattered families and lineages of a decentralised society. This shared religious life gave them a sense of belonging to one people. Unity was thus maintained without any central ruler. Religion was the bond that held such societies together.

Religion thus made government possible without a state. Through the ancestors, the elders, the age-sets and sacred sanction, traditional religion kept order in societies that had no king or formal state. It showed that a people could be well governed without a central ruler. Religion was, in effect, the invisible government of the stateless society. Order rested on the sacred rather than on the throne.

Indigenous and traditional religions therefore made ordered government possible even without a king, supplying authority through the ancestors, upholding custom, empowering elders and age-sets, enforcing order by sacred sanction, and binding the community through shared worship. In the stateless societies of Africa and beyond, religion was itself the government, keeping order where no crown or state existed.

Question 30

The Asantehene sat upon a Golden Stool said to hold the soul of the nation, and no man dared even let it touch the ground.

Examine divine kingship in the administrative systems of pre-colonial African states.

Model Answer

In many pre-colonial African states the king was not merely a political ruler but a sacred figure, on whose person the welfare of the whole people was believed to rest. Divine kingship was among the deepest expressions of religion in African government. It may be examined as follows.

The king was regarded as sacred. In divine kingship the ruler was held to be descended from the ancestors, chosen by the spirits, or himself semi-divine. His person was sacred and often surrounded by ritual and taboo. This gave his authority a religious awe beyond ordinary power. The king was thus set apart from all other men.

The king was both ruler and priest. The divine king led his people in worship as well as in war and government. He performed the great rituals on which the fertility of the land and the welfare of the people were thought to depend. Sacred and political office were united in him. He was the link between his people and the unseen powers.

Sacred regalia embodied the state. The authority of the king was often embodied in sacred objects, such as the Golden Stool of the Asante, believed to hold the soul of the nation. Such regalia were treated with the deepest reverence. They made the unity and sacredness of the state visible to all. The very symbols of kingship were themselves holy.

The king's wellbeing was tied to the land. It was widely believed that the strength and health of the king were bound to the prosperity of his people and the fertility of the land. A failing king could therefore endanger the whole community. In some societies an ailing ruler might even be removed. The sacred body of the king was the wellbeing of the state.

Ritual and taboo surrounded the ruler. The divine king lived under many restrictions and ceremonies that marked his sacred status. He might be hidden from common sight, or forbidden certain acts, to preserve his holiness. These taboos both honoured and confined him. Ritual set the king apart and upheld his sacred role.

Ancestors and priests upheld the throne. The king ruled with the support of the ancestors and of the priests and diviners who served the shrines. These interpreted the will of the spirits and legitimised his rule. The throne thus rested on a wide religious foundation. Kingship and priesthood were bound together.

It gave the state unity and legitimacy. By making the king sacred, divine kingship gave the state a powerful centre of unity and an authority hard to challenge. Loyalty to the king became a religious as well as a political duty. This greatly strengthened the cohesion of the kingdom. Religion was the cement of the divine-king state.

Examples abounded across the continent. Divine or sacred kingship was found in Buganda under the Kabaka, in Asante under the Asantehene, among the Shilluk and the Yoruba, and in ancient Egypt. Each gave the ruler a sacred foundation for his rule. The pattern was widespread across Africa. Sacred kingship was a common African answer to the problem of authority.

Divine kingship therefore lay at the heart of many pre-colonial African administrative systems, making the ruler a sacred figure who was both king and priest, whose person and regalia embodied the state and whose wellbeing was tied to the land. Upheld by ancestors, priests and ritual, it gave such states a powerful unity and legitimacy, and was among the deepest marks of religion upon African government.

From religious to secular administrative systems

Question 31

For a thousand years God had reigned over government; then, over four centuries, men slowly learned to rule in their own name.

Examine the factors for the transition from religion-based to secular administrative systems from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century.

Model Answer

From the fifteenth to the nineteenth century, the administrative systems of Europe and the wider world moved slowly from a religious to a secular basis. Government came to rest less on divine sanction and more on human reason and the will of the people. The factors behind this great transition may be examined as follows.

The Renaissance revived secular learning. From the fifteenth century the Renaissance revived the study of the classical, non-religious learning of Greece and Rome. Its humanism placed a new value on man, on reason and on the things of this world. This gradually weakened the hold of purely religious ways of thinking. Learning began to look to man as well as to God.

The Reformation broke the unity of the Church. In the sixteenth century the Protestant Reformation, led by Martin Luther and John Calvin, shattered the unity of Western Christendom. It challenged the authority of the pope and divided Europe into rival faiths. This weakened the Church as a single universal power over the state. Religious division thus opened the way to secular authority.

The rise of strong monarchies centralised power. The growth of powerful national monarchies concentrated authority in the hands of kings and their bureaucracies. These rulers sought to control the Church within their realms and to govern in their own right. Political power thus shifted from the Church towards the state. The sovereign state began to eclipse the sovereign Church.

The Scientific Revolution changed men's view of the world. The discoveries of the Scientific Revolution taught men to explain the world by natural law rather than by divine will alone. This encouraged a new confidence in human reason and observation. Government too came to be seen as a matter of reason rather than of religion. Science undermined the purely sacred view of the world.

The Enlightenment exalted reason and rights. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the Enlightenment, through thinkers such as Voltaire, Locke and Montesquieu, taught that government should rest on reason, liberty and the consent of the governed. It attacked superstition and the union of church and state. These ideas gave the secular state its guiding philosophy. Reason was set up as the guide of government.

The growth of bureaucracy professionalised the state. As states grew larger, they developed trained, salaried bureaucracies that governed by rule and record rather than by religious office. Administration became a professional and worldly craft. Government came to rely on officials rather than on clergy. The machinery of the state grew increasingly secular.

The French Revolution proclaimed the secular state. The French Revolution of 1789, with its cry of liberty, equality and fraternity, attacked the ancient union of throne and altar. It proclaimed that sovereignty lay in the nation and sought to separate church from state. This gave the secular idea a dramatic and lasting triumph. Government was declared to rest on the people, not on God.

Industrialisation and secular education completed the change. The Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century created new classes and needs that the old religious order could not serve. States built secular systems of education, law and administration for the modern age. Religion was increasingly separated from the ordinary business of government. The secular state thus became the model of the modern world.

The transition from religion-based to secular administrative systems was therefore driven by the Renaissance, the Reformation, the rise of strong monarchies, the Scientific Revolution, the Enlightenment, the growth of bureaucracy, the French Revolution and industrialisation. Together, over four centuries, these forces shifted the foundation of government from divine sanction to human reason and the will of the people, and gave birth to the modern secular state.

Question 32

Two faiths born of the same soil each built a civilisation of government, yet one kept the sword of the state apart from the altar, and the other joined them in a single hand.

Compare the influence of Christianity and Islam on administrative systems.

Model Answer

Christianity and Islam, the two great missionary faiths of the medieval world, each profoundly shaped the administrative systems of the lands they won. In some ways their influence was alike, and in others sharply different. Their influence on administrative systems may be compared as follows.

Both legitimised political authority. Each faith taught that rulers held their power by the will of God, giving government a sacred sanction. The Christian king ruled by divine right and the Muslim caliph as successor of the Prophet. In both, obedience to the ruler became a religious duty. Religion crowned the state in each civilisation.

Both provided systems of sacred law. Christianity developed the canon law and Islam the sharia, each a great body of religious law. These shaped the justice and the administration of their societies. In each, a class of learned men, the canon lawyers or the ulama, arose to study and apply the sacred law. Religion thus gave the state much of its law. Sacred law was central to each tradition.

Both built organised religious institutions. Each faith created powerful institutions, the Church with its papacy and clergy, and Islam with its ulama and qadis. These trained officials, kept records and administered justice. Religious organisation thus shaped government in both. The institutions of faith served the needs of the state.

But they differed over the union of religion and state. In Islam religion and government were united in the caliph, with no division between the sacred and the secular. In Christianity the doctrine of the two swords kept spiritual and temporal power distinct, if often in conflict. This was the deepest difference between them. Islam joined what Christianity kept apart.

They differed in the place of a priesthood. Christianity had an ordained priesthood and a hierarchy under the pope, standing as a distinct order between God and man. Islam had no priesthood as such, only scholars and judges of the law, and no single supreme head after the early caliphs. Their religious structures thus differed greatly. This shaped how each faith entered government.

Both fostered learning and welfare. Each faith built schools, universities and charitable institutions, from the Christian monasteries to the Islamic madrasas and waqf endowments. Both preserved learning and cared for the poor and the sick. In this their contributions to administration were much alike. Faith advanced both knowledge and welfare in each.

Both spread their systems across continents. Christianity carried its model of government across Europe, and Islam across Asia, Africa and Spain. Each gave the lands it won a common law, faith and administration. Both were thus great unifiers of diverse peoples. Religion built wide civilisations of government in each case.

Their legacies to modern government differed. From the Christian separation of the two powers grew the later Western separation of church and state. In much of the Muslim world, by contrast, the union of religion and government long remained the ideal. Their different beginnings thus led to different modern paths. Each left a distinct legacy to the government of today.

Christianity and Islam therefore both profoundly shaped administrative systems, legitimising rulers, providing sacred law, building religious institutions and fostering learning and welfare across continents. Yet they differed most deeply in that Islam united religion and government in the caliph while Christianity kept the two powers distinct, a difference whose consequences still mark the government of the modern world.

Question 33

Strip away the temple, the church and the mosque, and much of the government of the pre-modern world would simply fall to the ground.

"Religion was the most powerful single influence on administrative systems before the modern age." Assess the validity of this statement.

Model Answer

This statement claims that, before the modern age, no single force shaped administrative systems more than religion. Across the ancient and medieval world, faith was indeed woven into every part of government. Whether it was truly the most powerful influence of all may be assessed as follows.

Religion legitimised nearly every government. In almost every pre-modern state, rulers governed by divine sanction, as gods, sons of gods or the chosen of God. From the Pharaoh to the caliph and the Christian king, sacred authority upheld the throne. No other force so widely justified political power. In this the statement is strongly supported.

Religion supplied much of the law. The law of many states was simply the law of the faith, whether the sharia, dharma or the Mosaic law. Religious courts and codes governed justice across the world. Even where a secular law existed, as in Rome, it was commonly hedged about with religious ceremony and sanction. Law and religion were, for long ages, inseparable. Faith shaped the very rules by which men were governed.

Religion provided officials and institutions. Priesthoods, churches and mosques trained the literate men and built the institutions that government required. The clergy of Europe and the scholars of Islam ran much of the machinery of state. Religion thus supplied both the personnel and the model of administration. Few other forces did as much for government.

Religion organised welfare, learning and unity. The faiths built the first hospitals, schools and systems of relief and bound diverse peoples into single communities. Government leaned on religion for education, charity and social cohesion. These were among the essential works of the state. Religion carried much of the burden of administration.

Yet other forces also shaped government. Economic needs, war, trade and the ambition of rulers were also powerful moulders of administrative systems. The demands of irrigation, defence and revenue built states as surely as any creed. Religion did not act alone in the world. These material forces genuinely qualify the statement.

Some systems owed much to secular reason. Not all pre-modern government rested on religion, for Roman law, Greek democracy and Chinese Confucian bureaucracy owed much to human reason and practical statecraft. Confucianism in particular was as much an ethical philosophy as a religion. Secular thought thus had its own great influence. The statement must allow for these.

Religion and other forces usually worked together. In practice religion seldom acted apart from economics, war and politics but was interwoven with them. The caliph's armies, the Church's lands and the Pharaoh's granaries joined faith to material power. It is often impossible to separate the sacred from the secular in pre-modern rule. Religion was one strand, though a central one, in a single fabric.

On balance religion was the deepest single influence. Despite the power of other forces, religion touched every part of pre-modern government, giving it legitimacy, law, institutions and purpose as nothing else did. Only with the modern age did secular reason begin to displace it. Before that, faith was woven through the whole of government. On balance, therefore, the statement is largely valid.

It is therefore largely valid that religion was the most powerful single influence on administrative systems before the modern age, for it legitimised rulers and supplied law, officials, welfare and unity, touching every part of government. Yet economic need, war and secular reason also shaped the state, usually interwoven with religion rather than apart from it, so that faith was the deepest strand, though not the only one, in the fabric of pre-modern government.

Question 34

In the one, the law came down from Heaven; in the other, it rose up from the reason and the will of men.

Distinguish between religion-based and secular administrative systems.

Model Answer

The administrative systems of history may broadly be divided into those founded on religion and those founded on secular, human authority. The one governed in the name of God, the other in the name of the people or the state. The distinction between them may be explained as follows.

They differ in the source of authority. In a religion-based system, authority comes from God or the gods, and the ruler governs by divine sanction. In a secular system, authority comes from the people, the nation or the state itself. The one looks to Heaven, the other to human society. This is the deepest difference between them.

They differ in the basis of law. In religion-based systems the law is sacred, drawn from scripture and religious teaching, as with sharia or the Mosaic law. In secular systems the law is made by human legislators and rests on reason and consent. Sacred law is received; secular law is made. The origin of law divides the two.

They differ in the role of religious leaders. In religion-based systems priests, scholars or clergy hold power and office in the state. In secular systems religious leaders are separated from government and hold no political authority as such. The one joins the altar to the throne; the other keeps them apart. The place of the clergy marks the difference.

They differ in the aims of government. Religion-based systems aim to uphold the faith and to order society according to sacred law. Secular systems aim at worldly goods such as security, prosperity and the rights of citizens. The one measures its success by faithfulness to the divine will, the other by the earthly welfare of the people. The one serves God; the other serves man.

They differ in their treatment of belief. Religion-based systems often enforce a single faith and may persecute dissent. Secular systems tend towards toleration and the freedom of religion, treating belief as a private matter. The one demands conformity; the other allows diversity. Their attitude to belief sets them apart.

They differ in the source of legitimacy. In religion-based systems a ruler is legitimate because he is chosen or blessed by God. In secular systems he is legitimate because he is chosen or accepted by the people. Sacred sanction gives way to popular consent. Legitimacy flows from a different source in each.

They differ in their view of change. Religion-based systems, resting on eternal sacred law, tend to resist change and to prize tradition. Secular systems, resting on reason, are more open to reform and progress. Sacred law, believed to be God-given, could not lightly be altered, whereas laws made by men could be freely amended as needs changed. The one looks to the past, the other to the future.

They mark different ages of government. Religion-based systems dominated the ancient and medieval world, while secular systems became the model of the modern age. The shift from one to the other, from the fifteenth century onward, was among the great changes of history. The distinction thus also marks the movement from the old world to the new. It measures the passage to modern government.

Religion-based and secular administrative systems therefore differ in the source of their authority and law, the role of religious leaders, the aims of government, the treatment of belief, the source of legitimacy and their view of change. The one governs in the name of God and the other in the name of man, and the shift from the first to the second marks the passage from the ancient and medieval world to the modern age.

Chapter 6

SLAVERY AND FEUDALISM IN ANCIENT ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS

Attempt each question in full on paper before you read the model answer beneath it. The questions follow the chapter topic by topic and rise in demand.

The concept, rise and role of slavery

Question 1

In the ancient world the line between a person and a piece of property could vanish in a single defeat on the battlefield.

Explain the concept and main features of slavery as a social and political system.

Model Answer

Slavery was the earliest great system of class exploitation, in which some human beings were owned as the property of others and forced to labour for them. As a social and political organisation it shaped the economy, the law and the administration of many ancient societies. Its concept and main features may be explained as follows.

Slavery is the ownership of human beings as property. Under slavery, some people were held as the legal property, or chattel, of others, to be bought, sold and inherited like any goods. The slave was not a person in law but a thing owned by the master. This total ownership of one human being by another was the very essence of the system. It marked slavery off from every milder form of service or labour.

It rested on forced and unpaid labour. The slave worked not for wages but under compulsion, giving his whole labour to his master for nothing but bare keep. Force, and the constant threat of punishment, drove the slave to toil from dawn to dusk. The master took the entire product of that labour as his own. Unpaid, coerced labour was thus the economic heart of slavery.

It created two antagonistic classes. Slave society was divided sharply between the masters, who owned both the means of production and the slaves, and the slaves, who owned nothing, not even themselves. Between these two classes stood a deep and permanent opposition of interest. This division of society into owners and owned was the basic relation of the system. Slavery was therefore the first great system of class exploitation.

The slave had no rights or legal status. In law the slave was a mere possession, unable to own property, make a contract or found a recognised family. He could be punished, sold, or even killed at the will of his master. Deprived of all rights, the slave stood wholly at the mercy of his owner. This absence of rights defined his utterly degraded condition.

Slaves were acquired by many means. Slaves were obtained above all through war, the defeated being enslaved by the victors, and also through piracy, trade, debt, punishment for crime and birth to a slave mother. The great source in the ancient world was conquest, which flooded the markets with captives. Slavery thus fed upon war and upon the misfortune of the weak. Its supply depended on force and on the trade in human beings.

The condition was usually hereditary. The children of slaves were commonly born slaves, so that the condition passed down from one generation to the next. A whole family might remain in bondage for centuries without hope of release. This made slavery a permanent and inherited status rather than a passing misfortune. Bondage was thus fixed not only by capture but by birth itself.

It was upheld by law and by force. Slave societies developed slave codes and laws that defined the slave as property and armed the master with power over him. Behind the law stood the constant force of overseers, chains and savage punishment. The whole apparatus of the state protected the master's ownership of his slaves. Law and violence together held the system firmly in place.

Slavery shaped the whole society and state. Because slave labour produced much of the wealth, slavery moulded the economy, the classes, the law and the government of the societies that practised it. The masters

formed the ruling class and controlled the state and its offices. Society and administration alike were built upon the labour of the enslaved. Slavery was thus not a mere custom but a whole social order.

Slavery was therefore a social and political system founded on the ownership of human beings as property, resting on forced and unpaid labour, dividing society into the antagonistic classes of masters and slaves, and upheld by law and by force. As the first great system of class exploitation, it shaped the economy, the law and the administration of every society that adopted it.

Question 2

Slavery was born where surplus wealth met the spear: once men could be made to produce more than they consumed, it became profitable to own them.

Examine the reasons for the rise of slavery in the ancient world.

Model Answer

Slavery did not exist in the earliest human societies but arose as they grew larger, wealthier and more unequal. Several conditions came together to give birth to the enslavement of man by man. The chief reasons for the rise of slavery in the ancient world may be examined as follows.

The development of a surplus made slavery profitable. Once farming and craft could produce more than the worker needed to live, it became worthwhile to own labourers and take their surplus. A slave who produced more than his keep was a source of profit to his master. This economic surplus made the ownership of men worthwhile for the first time. Slavery arose precisely to seize that surplus.

Wars of conquest supplied captives. The constant wars of the ancient world gave the victors great numbers of prisoners who could be enslaved rather than killed. Conquest was the largest single source of slaves, as in the expansion of Rome. The more a state conquered, the more slaves flowed into its markets. War thus fed and fuelled the growth of slavery.

The rise of private property created classes. As land, cattle and goods came to be owned privately, society divided into the rich and the poor, the powerful and the weak. The wealthy sought labour to work their growing property, and the captive and the poor supplied it. Class division thus opened the way to slavery. The system grew hand in hand with the growth of private wealth.

The demand for labour drove enslavement. Great estates, mines, building projects and households needed supplies of labour that free men would not willingly give. Slavery met this demand by force, compelling the enslaved to do the heaviest and most hated work. The need for cheap and controllable labour was a powerful spur. Slavery answered the economy's constant hunger for hands.

A trade in human beings developed. As slavery grew, a regular trade in slaves arose, with markets, dealers and long-distance routes such as the trans-Saharan trade. Slaves became a valuable commodity, bought and sold like any other. This commerce spread and sustained the system across whole regions. The slave trade made enslavement a business as well as a spoil of war.

Debt and poverty forced men into bondage. In many societies a man who could not pay his debts might be seized, together with his family, and made a slave. Poverty and famine also drove the desperate to sell themselves or their children. Debt bondage thus enslaved even members of one's own people. Want, as much as war, filled the ranks of the slaves.

Law and custom sanctioned enslavement. Punishment for crime, capture in raids and birth to a slave mother were all recognised in law as grounds of slavery. Custom and religion in many lands accepted the ownership of men as natural and just. This sanction removed any check upon the spread of slavery. Society's own rules thus upheld and extended the system.

Weak or absent authority left the vulnerable exposed. Where no strong power protected the weak, the strong were free to seize and enslave them at will. Raiding and kidnapping flourished in times of disorder and where central authority was absent. The lack of protection for the vulnerable thus fostered slavery. It grew wherever force went unchecked by law.

Slavery therefore arose in the ancient world from the growth of an economic surplus and of private property, the wars that supplied captives, the demand for labour, the trade in human beings, the pressure of debt and poverty, and the sanction of law and custom. Together these conditions turned the enslavement of man by man into a widespread and lasting system of exploitation.

Question 3

The slave built the road, kept the accounts and even guarded the palace; empires were administered on the backs of men who owned nothing.

Examine the role of slavery in the administrative systems of the ancient world.

Model Answer

Slavery was not only an economic system but a foundation of government in many ancient states. The labour, and even the skills, of slaves upheld the administration of empires. The role of slavery in ancient administrative systems may be examined as follows.

It produced the wealth that sustained the state. Slave labour worked the fields, mines and workshops whose produce fed the treasury and the ruling class. The surplus taken from slaves supported the army, the officials and the public works of the state. Government thus rested economically upon slavery. The wealth of many empires was the direct fruit of unfree labour.

It formed the base of the social hierarchy. Slavery placed a great class of the unfree at the bottom of society, upon whom the free classes and the rulers stood. This ordered inequality gave society a fixed structure that the state upheld and defended. The masters formed the governing class and the slaves the labouring base. Administration both rested upon and preserved this hierarchy.

Slaves provided the labour for public works. Rulers used gangs of slaves to build the roads, walls, temples, canals and palaces that were the great works of the state. Such projects, as in Egypt and Rome, would have been impossible without forced labour. Slavery thus supplied the muscle for public administration and display. The very monuments of empire were raised by the enslaved.

Educated slaves staffed the bureaucracy. In many states skilled and literate slaves served as clerks, secretaries, accountants and record-keepers in the offices of government. In Rome and in parts of Asia such slaves did much of the daily work of administration. Their skills made them valuable and even indispensable servants of the state. Slavery thus supplied not only labour but administrative talent.

Slaves served in the household of the ruler. The palaces of kings were run by slaves and eunuchs who managed the household and sometimes rose to great influence. Trusted because they had no family or faction of their own, such slaves could be given delicate and confidential duties. They became instruments of the ruler's personal power. Slavery thus reached into the very heart of government.

Slave codes shaped the law. The need to define and control slaves gave rise to bodies of law, the slave codes, that formed an important part of the legal system. These laws fixed the status of the slave and the powers of the master over him. Much of the law of property and of persons grew up around slavery. The system thus shaped the administration of justice itself.

Slavery supported military organisation. Slaves laboured in the armies as carriers, builders and servants, and in some states were even armed and used as soldiers. Their labour freed citizens to fight and sustained the armies in the field. Military power thus leaned in part on unfree labour. Slavery served the defence and the expansion of the state.

It generated revenue for the state. Governments taxed the slave trade, took slaves as tribute, and worked slaves in state-owned mines and estates. The buying, selling and labour of slaves were thus a direct source of public income. Revenue administration came to depend in part on slavery. The state profited directly from the ownership and trade of men.

Slavery therefore played a central role in ancient administrative systems, producing the wealth that sustained the state, forming the base of the social hierarchy, supplying the labour for public works, staffing

the bureaucracy and the palace, shaping the law, supporting the army and yielding revenue. The government of many ancient empires rested, in the last analysis, upon the labour of the enslaved.

Slavery in ancient Europe

Question 4

At the height of the empire, perhaps one in three people in Italy was a slave, and Rome could neither feed nor build itself without them.

Describe the social structure and administration of slavery in the Roman Empire.

Model Answer

The Roman Empire (27 BCE to 476 CE) was the greatest slave society of the ancient world, holding an estimated two to four million slaves at its peak. Slavery shaped its classes, its economy and its government alike. The social structure and administration of Roman slavery may be described as follows.

Society was divided into masters, freemen and slaves. Roman slave society rested on three broad classes: the wealthy masters, the free citizens, and the slaves at the bottom. The masters, drawn from the aristocracy, owned the land and the slaves who worked it. The free men, though often poor, stood above the slaves in law and status. The slaves owned nothing and were themselves owned as property.

The masters formed the ruling class. The great slave-owners, the senators and equestrians, held the land, the wealth and the power of the state. Their fortunes rested on the slave-worked estates, and they filled the offices of government. Slavery thus underpinned the very position of the Roman ruling class. The masters governed Rome much as they governed their own estates.

Slaves were acquired mainly by conquest. Rome's wars of expansion poured captives into slavery, supplemented by piracy, trade and birth to slave mothers. The conquest of Gaul, Greece and the East filled the slave markets to overflowing. So long as Rome conquered, slaves remained cheap and plentiful. War was thus the great engine of Roman slavery.

Slaves laboured on the great estates. Much Roman slavery was concentrated on the latifundia, the vast estates of the rich, where gangs of slaves grew grain, vines and olives. These estates produced the wealth of the aristocracy and much of the food of the empire. Rural slavery was harsh, and the field slaves lived under overseers and often in chains. The latifundia were the beating heart of the slave economy.

Slaves filled many other roles. Beyond the fields, slaves worked in the mines and workshops, in households, and as gladiators for the public shows. Educated slaves served as tutors, doctors, clerks and stewards to the wealthy. Slavery thus reached into every corner of Roman life and labour. The sheer versatility of slave labour made it indispensable.

Educated slaves ran much of the administration. Literate and skilled slaves, together with freed slaves, kept the accounts, managed estates and staffed the offices of the rich and of the state. Under the emperors, imperial slaves and freedmen ran whole departments of government. Their skills made them essential to Roman administration. Slavery thus supplied the empire's clerks as well as its labourers.

Slaves could be freed through manumission. A master might free his slave, by his will or in reward for faithful service, in the act called manumission. The freed slave, or freedman, gained a limited citizenship but remained bound in duty to his former master. Manumission gave the system both a safety-valve and a supply of loyal dependants. It also created the class of freedmen who served in trade and administration.

Law and force upheld the whole system. Roman law defined the slave as property and armed the master with power over his life and his labour. Slave codes, overseers and savage punishments enforced obedience upon the slaves. After great revolts, laws such as those of Augustus tightened the control of slaves and of manumission. Law and violence together held the vast slave population down.

Roman slavery was therefore organised in a society of masters, freemen and slaves, in which the slave-owning aristocracy formed the ruling class, slaves won by conquest laboured on the latifundia and in every

trade, and educated slaves and freedmen ran much of the administration. Upheld by law and by force, slavery was the foundation on which the wealth and government of the Roman Empire were built.

Question 5

From the silver mines that paid for Athens' fleet to the tutors who taught its children, slaves did the work that citizens would not.

Examine the sources of slaves and the uses of slave labour in ancient Greece and Rome.

Model Answer

The slave societies of Greece and Rome drew their slaves from many sources and put them to a great variety of uses. Slave labour touched every part of their economies and their daily life. The sources of slaves and the uses of slave labour may be examined as follows.

War and conquest were the chief source. The greatest supply of slaves came from war, as the defeated were enslaved by their conquerors. Rome's conquests and the wars of Greece poured captives into slavery. A single great victory could enslave tens of thousands at a stroke. Conquest was thus the main fountain of ancient slavery.

Piracy and kidnapping seized many. Pirates and slave-raiders captured people from ships and coasts and sold them in the great markets, such as Delos. Kidnapping fed a brisk and lawless trade in human beings across the Mediterranean. Even free men were not always safe from seizure. Piracy was thus a constant source of slaves.

The slave trade supplied the markets. A regular trade brought slaves from many lands to the markets of Greece and Rome. Dealers bought and sold them like any commodity, and prices rose and fell with the supply. This commerce distributed slaves across the whole ancient world. The trade made slavery a settled and organised business.

Debt, birth and punishment enslaved others. Some fell into slavery through debt, though Rome and Athens limited this for their own citizens; others were born to slave mothers, or condemned to slavery as a punishment for crime. These sources kept up the supply of slaves between the wars. Bondage thus came by birth and misfortune as well as by capture. The system drew on many separate streams.

Slaves worked the land. In both Greece and Rome, slaves laboured on the farms and great estates, growing the grain, vines and olives that fed the cities. Agricultural slavery was the largest single use of slave labour. It produced the food and much of the wealth of the ancient economy. The fields, above all, were worked by the unfree.

Slaves toiled in the mines. The hardest and deadliest labour was in the mines, such as the silver mines of Laurion that enriched Athens. Thousands of slaves dug and hauled in dreadful conditions, often to an early death. Mining slavery was, in effect, a sentence of doom. Yet the wealth it produced was vital to the state.

Slaves served in households and crafts. Great numbers of slaves worked as domestic servants, cooks, craftsmen and shop-hands in the homes and workshops of the cities. Skilled slaves practised trades and crafts of every kind. Household and craft slavery touched daily life at every point. The comfort of the free rested squarely on the labour of slaves.

Educated slaves did skilled and administrative work. Cultured slaves, many of them captured Greeks, served as tutors, doctors, secretaries, accountants and estate managers. Their learning made them valued and sometimes even influential. Such slaves did much of the skilled and clerical work of society. Slavery thus supplied brains as well as brute strength.

The slaves of Greece and Rome were therefore drawn chiefly from war and piracy, from the organised slave trade, and from debt, birth and punishment, and they were put to every use, from the fields and the mines to the household, the workshop and the office. Slave labour, at once brutal and skilled, sustained the whole economy and civilisation of the ancient Mediterranean.

Question 6

Slavery made Rome rich, but it also hollowed out its free peasantry and sowed the seeds of its own decline.

Assess the effects of slavery on the society and administration of ancient Europe.

Model Answer

Slavery brought great wealth and power to the ruling classes of Greece and Rome, but its effects on society and government were deep and double-edged. It shaped the economy, the classes and the very stability of the state. The effects of slavery on ancient Europe may be assessed as follows.

It enriched the ruling class. The labour of slaves produced the wealth that made the Roman aristocracy immensely rich. Great estates worked by slaves poured out grain, wine and oil for sale and profit. This wealth funded the luxury and the political power of the masters. Slavery thus concentrated riches in the hands of the few.

It sustained the state and its works. The surplus taken from slaves supported the army, the officials and the great public works of Rome. Roads, aqueducts and monuments were raised by slave labour. Government thus leaned economically upon the enslaved. The very grandeur of Rome rested on their toil.

It ruined the free peasantry. Because slave-worked estates could undersell the small farmer, the free peasants of Italy were driven from their land. Many drifted into the cities to form an idle and discontented poor. The backbone of the old Roman society was thus broken. Slavery undermined the class of free citizen-farmers.

It degraded free labour. Where slaves did most of the work, labour itself came to be despised as fit only for the unfree. Free men grew reluctant to toil, and the dignity of honest work was lost. This weakened both the economy and the character of society. A people that scorned work grew idle at the top and resentful at the bottom. Slavery thus corrupted the very attitude to labour.

It bred fear and revolt. The great mass of slaves, held down only by force, was a constant danger to their masters. Terrible slave revolts, such as that led by Spartacus in 73 to 71 BCE, shook Rome to its foundations. The state had to maintain a heavy apparatus of control and punishment. Slavery thus filled society with fear and violence.

It shaped the law and administration. The need to control slaves and define their status gave rise to bodies of law and to offices of supervision. Slave codes and the machinery of punishment became part of government. Administration was shaped by the constant demands of keeping slaves in order. The system moulded the very legal order of the state.

It made the economy rigid and dependent. Because cheap slave labour was always at hand, there was little incentive to invent labour-saving tools or improve methods. The economy grew dependent on a steady supply of slaves from conquest. When conquest ceased, this dependence became a fatal weakness. Slavery thus discouraged technical progress.

It contributed to the decline of the empire. When Rome stopped expanding, the supply of cheap slaves dried up and the slave economy faltered. The ruined peasantry, the idle urban poor and the discontented slaves all weakened the state. Slavery, once a source of strength, became a cause of decline. The system helped to undermine the very empire it had built.

Slavery therefore had profound and contradictory effects on ancient Europe, enriching the ruling class and sustaining the state and its works, yet ruining the free peasantry, degrading labour, breeding fear and revolt, and making the economy rigid and dependent. In the end the very system that had built Roman greatness contributed to its decline, showing the deep instability of a society founded on the exploitation of the enslaved.

Question 7

The chains of the ancient world were not struck off by mercy but loosened by the failing profits of the slave estate.

Assess the causes of the decline of slavery in Europe.

Model Answer

The great slave system of the ancient Mediterranean did not last forever but slowly declined in the later Roman Empire, giving way in time to feudal serfdom. Several causes brought about this profound change. The causes of the decline of slavery in Europe may be assessed as follows.

The end of conquest cut off the supply. Roman slavery had depended on a constant stream of captives from war. When the empire stopped expanding after the second century CE, this supply dwindled, and slaves grew scarce and dear. The system was thus starved of its chief source of labour. The end of conquest struck directly at the root of slavery.

Slaves became costly to maintain. As slaves grew scarce, their price rose, and masters had to feed and house them whether they worked or not. Slave labour ceased to be so cheap and profitable as it had once been. It became more economical to use tenants who fed themselves. Rising cost thus steadily undermined the slave estate.

Slave revolts shook the system. Great uprisings, above all that of Spartacus, showed the danger of holding vast numbers of men in bondage. The cost and the fear of controlling rebellious slaves weighed heavily on the masters. Such revolts made slavery seem both perilous and burdensome. Resistance from below helped to weaken the system.

Slave labour was inefficient. The slave, working under compulsion and with no reward, laboured unwillingly and without care for the work. Such labour was wasteful and resistant to any improvement. Masters found that tenants with a stake in the land worked far better. The sheer inefficiency of slave labour told against it.

The rise of the colonate replaced slaves with tenants. Landlords increasingly settled slaves and poor freemen on plots as tenant farmers, the coloni, who paid rent and kept part of their produce. This gave the worker an incentive and relieved the master of his upkeep. The colonate slowly grew into serfdom. This new relation began to replace outright slavery.

Christianity softened attitudes. The spread of Christianity, with its teaching of the brotherhood of all men, gradually softened the harshest features of slavery. Though the Church did not abolish it, it encouraged manumission and better treatment of slaves. Moral attitudes to bondage slowly began to change. Religion thus helped to ease the system towards its end.

Disorder in the later empire disrupted slavery. The crises, invasions and civil wars of the later empire disrupted trade and the slave markets alike. As central authority weakened, the great slave estates broke up. Disorder made the old system increasingly hard to maintain. The decline of the empire and of slavery went hand in hand.

Slavery gave way to feudal serfdom. Out of the colonate and the breakdown of the slave estates grew the feudal manor, worked by serfs bound to the land. The serf, unlike the slave, could not be sold apart from the land and kept a portion of his produce. This new system gradually replaced slavery as the dominant mode of production. Feudalism thus rose upon the ruins of the slave order.

The decline of slavery in Europe was therefore caused by the end of conquest and the drying-up of the supply of slaves, the rising cost and inefficiency of slave labour, the danger of revolt, the rise of the colonate, the softening influence of Christianity, and the disorder of the later empire. Out of its decay grew the feudal system of serfdom that was to dominate the Middle Ages.

Slavery in Asia and Africa

Question 8

In the East the slave might be a captive of war, a debtor, or a clerk keeping the emperor's accounts; bondage wore many faces.

Examine slavery and its administration in ancient Asia.

Model Answer

Slavery existed across the ancient societies of Asia, though often in forms more varied or more limited than in the classical Mediterranean. It shaped the economy and administration of China, India and other lands. Slavery and its administration in ancient Asia may be examined as follows.

Slavery existed from the earliest times. Slavery appeared in the earliest Asian civilisations, from the Shang dynasty of China to ancient India. Captives, criminals and debtors were reduced to bondage. Though it was rarely the sole basis of the economy, slavery was widespread across the continent. It was a long-established institution in ancient Asia.

War and conquest supplied slaves. As elsewhere, war was a chief source of slaves, the conquered being enslaved by the victors. The campaigns of the Mongols and of the Chinese dynasties produced many thousands of captives. Conquest thus fed the slave markets of Asia. War was a great and constant source of bondage.

Debt bondage was common. Many Asians fell into slavery through debt, being seized or selling themselves and their families when they could not pay. In Han China and elsewhere, debt was a frequent road into bondage. Poverty thus swelled the ranks of the enslaved. Debt bondage was a marked feature of Asian slavery.

Caste and social order shaped bondage. In India the caste system fixed the lowest orders in a servile condition close to slavery. The lowest castes did the most menial labour under heavy disabilities and restrictions. Religion and custom sanctioned this deep servitude. Social order and slavery were thus closely linked in Asia.

Slaves did agricultural and domestic labour. Slaves in Asia worked in the fields, the households and the workshops of the wealthy. They served as farmhands, servants, concubines and craftsmen. Their labour supported the estates and homes of the ruling class. Domestic and rural slavery were widespread across the continent.

Educated slaves served in administration. Skilled and literate slaves were used as clerks, record-keepers, accountants and servants in the offices of government and the great households. Their skills made them useful to the ruler and the state. Slavery thus reached into administration as well as labour. Bondsmen helped to run the very machinery of government.

Slavery was often regulated and limited. Some Asian states regulated and even restricted slavery; the Han dynasty, for example, at times limited the slave trade. Slaves sometimes enjoyed certain protections and could be freed. Bondage in Asia was often less absolute than in Rome. Custom and law thus set some bounds to the system.

Slavery shaped the economy and the hierarchy. By supplying labour and forming the base of the social order, slavery shaped the economy and administration of the Asian states. The masters formed part of the ruling class and the slaves the labouring base. Government rested in part upon this unfree labour. Slavery was woven into the social fabric of Asia.

Slavery in ancient Asia was therefore an established institution, drawing its victims from war, debt, caste and trade, and putting them to agricultural, domestic and administrative work. Though often more limited and regulated than the slavery of Rome, it shaped the economy, the social hierarchy and the administration of the great Asian states.

Question 9

In many an African kingdom the slave was not a mere labourer but a soldier, an official, even a royal adviser trusted above free-born men.

Examine the role of slavery in the administrative systems of pre-colonial Africa.

Model Answer

Slavery was widespread in pre-colonial Africa, though it often differed from the chattel slavery of the classical world and the Americas. It played an important part in the economy and the government of many African states. The role of slavery in African administrative systems may be examined as follows.

Slaves formed part of the labour force. Slaves worked the fields, herded cattle, mined gold and carried goods in many African societies. Their labour added to the wealth of the household, the chief and the state. In kingdoms such as Ashanti and Sokoto, slave labour was important to the economy. Bondage thus supplied much of the heavy work of these societies.

Slavery was often domestic and less harsh. In much of Africa slavery was of a household kind, in which slaves lived within the family and might in time be absorbed into it. Such slaves often had recognised rights and could marry and hold some property. This was milder than the chattel slavery of Rome or the American plantations. African bondage was frequently domestic in character.

Slaves served in the armies. Many African rulers formed bodies of slave soldiers, loyal to the king because they had no other faction or family to serve. Such slave armies gave the ruler a reliable and obedient force, as in Sokoto and other states. Military slavery thus strengthened royal power. Slaves upheld the state by force of arms.

Slaves held administrative office. In some kingdoms trusted slaves served as officials, messengers, tax-collectors and advisers to the king. Because they depended wholly on the ruler, they could be trusted with real power. Slave officials thus became instruments of centralised royal authority. Bondsmen rose to serve at the very heart of government.

Slaves were a source of wealth and trade. Slaves were valuable property and a major article of trade, both within Africa and across the Sahara and the ocean. The trade in slaves enriched kings and merchants and helped to finance the state. Control of this trade was itself a source of royal power. Slavery was thus woven into the commerce of Africa.

Slavery supported the ruling class. By providing labour, soldiers and officials, slavery upheld the position of the chiefs and kings. The ruling class drew wealth and power from the ownership of slaves. Society was ordered with the enslaved at its base. Slavery thus underpinned the African state and its rulers.

Slaves were acquired by war, trade and tribute. African slaves came chiefly from war and raiding, from trade, and from the tribute paid by weaker peoples. The wars of expanding kingdoms produced many captives, and weaker communities were raided for slaves. War and trade were the great sources of bondage. The supply of slaves depended on force and commerce.

Slavery contributed to state-building. By supplying armies, officials and revenue, slavery helped some African rulers to build strong and centralised states. The control of slaves and of the slave trade strengthened royal power against rivals. Slavery was thus a tool of political consolidation. It helped both to make and to sustain kingdoms.

Slavery therefore played a significant role in the administrative systems of pre-colonial Africa, supplying labour, soldiers, officials and revenue, and helping rulers to build and sustain centralised states. Though often more domestic and less harsh than the chattel slavery of Rome and the Americas, it was deeply woven into the economy, the government and the very structure of many African societies.

Question 10

The African slave trade grew where the gun met the market: demand from without and warfare within together forged the chains.

Examine the factors for the rise and growth of slavery in pre-colonial Africa.

Model Answer

Slavery grew in pre-colonial Africa for reasons rooted both within African societies and in their contact with the wider world. Several factors combined to spread and deepen it. The factors for the rise and growth of slavery in Africa may be examined as follows.

Warfare and raiding produced captives. The frequent wars and raids between African peoples produced great numbers of captives who were then enslaved. Expanding kingdoms took many prisoners in their conquests. War was the chief internal source of slaves. Conflict thus constantly fed the growth of slavery.

Long-distance trade created demand. The trans-Saharan trade, and later the Atlantic and Indian Ocean trades, created a strong demand for slaves. African rulers and merchants sold captives for cloth, salt, goods and, in time, firearms. This trade drove the capture and sale of slaves on a large scale. Commerce thus spread and deepened bondage.

The demand for labour drove enslavement. Growing states and estates needed labour for farming, mining, herding and carrying. Slavery met this need by force, compelling the enslaved to do the work. The wealthy sought slaves to work their lands and serve their households. The hunger for labour thus fostered the system.

The rise of centralised states encouraged it. As strong kingdoms arose, their rulers used slaves as soldiers, officials and labourers to build and sustain their power. The state itself became a great owner and trader of slaves. Political centralisation thus encouraged slavery. Kingdoms grew, in part, upon the ownership of the enslaved.

Social differentiation created classes. As African societies grew more unequal, dividing into rich and poor, chiefs and commoners, the powerful sought to own and exploit the labour of others. Class division thus opened the way to slavery. The system grew with the growth of inequality. Bondage was a mark of an increasingly divided society.

The introduction of firearms intensified slaving. When European and Arab traders exchanged guns for slaves, the states that gained firearms could raid their neighbours far more effectively. This so-called gun-slave cycle drove ever more warfare and enslavement. Firearms thus multiplied the taking of slaves. The trade both armed and inflamed the slavers.

Debt, famine and punishment enslaved many. As elsewhere, debt, famine and punishment for crime reduced people to slavery. In hard times the poor might sell themselves or their children to survive. Custom sanctioned enslavement for many offences. Misfortune and law thus filled the ranks of the enslaved.

External demand spurred the trade. The great demand for slaves in the Muslim world and, later, in the plantations of the Americas hugely stimulated the African slave trade. This outside pull turned slaving into a vast and profitable commerce. The needs of distant markets thus reshaped African society. External demand was a powerful engine of the whole trade.

Slavery therefore rose and grew in pre-colonial Africa through the working of warfare and raiding, long-distance trade, the demand for labour, the rise of centralised states, social inequality, the spread of firearms, and the pressures of debt and famine, all intensified by the great external demand of the Muslim world and the Americas. Together these forces made slavery a widespread and deepening system across much of the continent.

The concept and rise of feudalism

Question 11

When the empire fell and the roads grew dangerous, men traded their freedom for protection, and feudalism was born of that bargain.

Explain the concept and characteristics of feudalism as a social and political system.

Model Answer

Feudalism was the social, economic and political system that replaced slavery as the dominant order in medieval Europe and in many other lands. It was founded on land, on personal bonds of service, and on the exploitation of a bound peasantry. Its concept and characteristics may be explained as follows.

Feudalism was a system based on land. In feudalism land was the chief form of wealth and the basis of all power and rank. Those who held land held authority, while those without it were dependent on those

who had. The grant and holding of land, rather than the ownership of slaves, was the foundation of the whole system. Land was thus the very hinge of feudal society.

Land was held in return for service. The lord granted land, or a fief, to a vassal in return for service, above all military service and loyalty. The vassal swore an oath of homage and fealty, binding himself to his lord. This exchange of land for service was the central relation of feudalism. Personal loyalty and landholding were thus joined together.

Society was divided into two main classes. Feudal society rested on two antagonistic classes: the landlords, who owned the land, and the peasants or serfs, who worked it. Between them stood a deep opposition of interest, for the one lived upon the labour of the other. This division of owners and workers was the basic relation of the system. Feudalism was thus a system of class exploitation.

The serf was bound to the land. The peasant, or serf, was tied to the land he worked and could not leave it without his lord's permission. Unlike the slave, he could not be sold apart from the land and kept a part of his own produce. Yet he owed labour, rent and dues to his lord. The bound serf was thus the labouring base of feudal society.

Exploitation was carried on through rent. The lord took the surplus of the serf's labour in the form of rent, whether as labour on the lord's land, as a share of the produce, or as money. This feudal rent was the means by which the ruling class lived off the peasantry. Exploitation was thus carried on through rent rather than through outright ownership. Rent was the economic heart of feudalism.

Political authority was decentralised. In feudalism power was scattered among many lords, each ruling his own lands, rather than gathered in a single strong state. The king depended on his great vassals, who governed, judged and taxed their own domains. Government was thus local and fragmented rather than central. Decentralisation was a defining mark of the feudal order.

Production was for local use. The feudal manor produced chiefly for its own consumption rather than for sale in a wide market. Each estate aimed to be largely self-sufficient in food and goods. Trade and towns were at first weak and undeveloped. Production for use, rather than for exchange, characterised the feudal economy.

The Church was part of the state. In feudal Europe the Church held vast lands, its bishops and abbots were themselves feudal lords, and it was closely bound to the political order. Religion sanctified the feudal hierarchy and the authority of kings and lords. Church and state were thus deeply intertwined. The Church was part and parcel of the feudal system.

Feudalism was therefore a social and political system founded on land held in return for service, dividing society into the antagonistic classes of landlords and bound serfs, exploiting the peasantry through rent, and marked by decentralised authority, production for local use, and a Church woven into the state. It was the second great system of class exploitation, succeeding slavery as the dominant order of the Middle Ages.

Question 12

The slave was owned; the serf was bound. It was a small change in words but a great one in the history of human labour.

Distinguish between slavery and feudalism as systems of administration.

Model Answer

Slavery and feudalism were the two great systems of class exploitation of the ancient and medieval world, and feudalism grew out of the decline of slavery. Though both rested on the exploitation of a labouring class, they differed in important ways. The two systems may be distinguished as follows.

They differed in the status of the worker. Under slavery the worker was owned outright as property, a mere chattel of his master. Under feudalism the worker was a serf, bound to the land but not owned as a thing. The serf had a recognised, if lowly, place in society that the slave wholly lacked. This change in the worker's status was the deepest difference between them.

They differed in the basis of wealth. Slavery rested on the ownership of human beings, whose labour produced the master's wealth. Feudalism rested rather on the ownership of land, worked by a bound peasantry. In the one the slave was the chief property, in the other it was the land. Wealth and power were thus founded differently in each system.

They differed in the form of exploitation. The slave-master took the whole of the slave's labour and gave only bare keep in return. The feudal lord took a part of the serf's produce as rent, leaving the serf the rest to live on. Exploitation by rent thus replaced exploitation by outright ownership. The very manner of taking the surplus differed.

They differed in the worker's incentive. The slave, owning nothing and keeping nothing, worked unwillingly and only under the lash. The serf, keeping part of his produce and holding his own plot, had some incentive to work well. Feudalism thus gave the labourer a stake that slavery denied. This made serf labour more productive than slave labour.

They differed in the mobility of the worker. The slave could be bought and sold and moved at his master's will, torn from home and family. The serf was tied to the land and could not be sold apart from it. The serf's bondage was to a place, the slave's to a person. Their very forms of unfreedom thus differed.

They differed in political structure. Slave societies such as Rome tended towards a centralised state that controlled great numbers of slaves. Feudal society, by contrast, was decentralised, with power scattered among many local lords. The one gathered authority, the other dispersed it. Their systems of government were thus opposite in form.

They differed in the character of the economy. The slave economy could produce on a large scale for the market, as on the Roman latifundia. The feudal manor produced chiefly for its own local use. Trade was strong in the one and weak in the other, at least at first. Their economic character was therefore distinct.

Yet both were systems of class exploitation. Despite their differences, both slavery and feudalism rested on the exploitation of a labouring class by an owning class. In each, the few lived on the surplus wrenched from the many. Both divided society into rulers and ruled, exploiters and exploited. In this most fundamental respect the two systems were alike.

Slavery and feudalism therefore differed in the status, mobility and incentive of the worker, in whether wealth rested on the ownership of men or of land, in the form of exploitation, and in whether the state was centralised or decentralised. Yet both were systems of class exploitation in which an owning class lived on the labour of a subject class, and feudalism grew directly out of the decay of slavery.

Question 13

Feudalism was not planned; it grew, plot by plot, as the great slave estates broke apart and lord and peasant struck a new bargain.

Examine the factors for the transition from slavery to feudalism.

Model Answer

The transition from slavery to feudalism was one of the great changes in the history of human society, marking the passage from the ancient to the medieval world. It came about through the working of several linked factors. The factors for this transition may be examined as follows.

The supply of slaves dried up. Slavery had depended on a constant flow of captives from war, but when the Roman conquests ceased, this supply failed. Slaves grew scarce and dear, and the great estates could no longer be cheaply worked. The economic basis of slavery was thus undermined. Its decline opened the way to a new system.

Slave labour proved inefficient. The slave, working under compulsion and with no reward, laboured poorly and without care for the work. Masters found it more profitable to settle labourers on the land as tenants who had an incentive to produce. The search for more productive labour drove the change. Feudal serfdom promised what slavery could not.

The rise of the colonate created serfdom. In the later Roman Empire, landlords settled slaves and poor freemen on plots as coloni, tenants tied to the land who paid rent. This colonate was the seed from which feudal serfdom grew. The tenant of the late empire became the serf of the Middle Ages. A new class of bound labourers thus arose.

The collapse of central authority scattered power. As the Roman Empire fell and strong government disappeared, power passed to local landowners who protected and ruled the people around them. This scattering of authority produced the decentralised structure of feudalism. Local lords replaced the distant state. The fall of the empire thus reshaped the whole of government.

Insecurity drove men to seek protection. The barbarian invasions and the disorder that followed made life dangerous, and the weak sought the protection of the strong. In return for protection, men gave their land and their service to powerful lords. This bargain of protection for service built the feudal bond. Insecurity thus fostered the growth of feudalism.

Trade and towns declined. With the fall of the empire, trade shrank and the towns decayed, and the economy became local and agrarian. Each estate had to produce for its own needs, the very hallmark of the feudal manor. The retreat of commerce fostered a self-sufficient rural order. Economic decline thus shaped the new system.

Land became the basis of power. As money and trade dwindled, land became the chief form of wealth and the reward for service. Kings granted land, rather than pay, to their followers in return for military aid, creating the network of lords and vassals. Landholding thus replaced the older bases of power. The feudal order rose upon the land.

The Church supported the new order. The Christian Church, itself a great landowner, blessed the feudal hierarchy and the bonds of lord and vassal. It softened slavery into serfdom and sanctified the new relations of land and service. Religion thus eased and legitimised the transition. The Church helped to build the feudal world.

The transition from slavery to feudalism therefore came about through the drying-up of the slave supply, the inefficiency of slave labour, the rise of the colonate, the collapse of central authority, the insecurity that drove men to seek protection, the decline of trade and towns, the new primacy of land, and the support of the Church. Out of the ruins of the slave-owning empire there thus grew the feudal order of the Middle Ages.

Feudalism in Europe

Question 14

From the king at the summit to the serf in the furrow, medieval society was a great ladder of land and loyalty.

Describe the structure and hierarchy of feudalism in medieval Europe.

Model Answer

Feudalism in medieval Europe was organised as a great hierarchy of landholding and personal loyalty, descending from the king to the humblest serf. Each rank held land from the one above and owed service in return. The structure and hierarchy of European feudalism may be described as follows.

The king stood at the summit. In theory the king owned all the land of the kingdom and was the source of all authority within it. He granted great estates to his chief followers in return for their loyalty and service. Yet his real power often depended on the support of his great lords. The king was the apex of the feudal pyramid.

The great lords held land from the king. Below the king stood the great nobles, or tenants-in-chief, who held broad lands directly from him. In return they owed him military service, counsel and financial aid. These barons and dukes were powerful men, often ruling their lands almost as kings. They formed the highest rank of the nobility.

Lesser lords and knights held land from the great. The great lords in turn granted portions of their land to lesser lords and knights, who became their vassals. These held their fiefs in return for military service, chiefly the service of armed knights. Thus the granting of land ran downward through many levels. Each lord was both a vassal above and a lord below.

Land was granted as a fief. The land granted by a lord to his vassal was called a fief, and its grant was the basis of the whole system. The vassal enjoyed the use of the land and its peasants in return for his service. The fief bound the vassal to his lord and gave him his living. It was the very unit of feudal landholding.

Vassalage rested on homage and fealty. The vassal knelt before his lord and swore an oath of homage and fealty, binding himself to loyal service. In return the lord promised protection and the enjoyment of the fief. This solemn personal bond joined lord and vassal together. Vassalage was the cement of the whole feudal hierarchy.

The vassal owed military and other services. In return for his fief the vassal owed his lord service, above all the service of fighting as a knight for a fixed number of days each year. He also owed counsel, attendance at the lord's court, and payments in money on certain occasions. These services were the price of the land. The fief was held in exchange for duty.

The serfs formed the base of the pyramid. At the bottom of the hierarchy stood the peasants and serfs, who worked the land for the lords above them. Bound to the soil, they owed labour, rent and dues, and could not leave without permission. Upon their toil the whole structure rested. The serfs were the foundation on which feudal society stood.

Each rank had duties upward and rights downward. The genius of the system was that each man was bound to the one above him and had claims upon the one below. Loyalty and service flowed upward, while protection and land flowed downward. This chain of mutual obligation held society together. The feudal hierarchy was a web of duties and rights.

Feudalism in medieval Europe was therefore a great hierarchy descending from the king through the great lords and the lesser knights to the serfs at the base, held together by the granting of fiefs and the personal bonds of homage and fealty. Each rank held land in return for service, and upon the labour of the bound serfs the whole ordered pyramid of medieval society rested.

Question 15

The manor was a little world unto itself: it grew its own bread, judged its own quarrels, and rarely looked beyond its own fields.

Explain the manorial system in feudal Europe.

Model Answer

If feudalism was the political system of medieval Europe, the manor was its economic foundation. The manorial system organised the land and labour on which the whole feudal order rested. The manorial system may be explained as follows.

The manor was the basic economic unit. The manor was the estate of a lord, together with the village and the peasants who worked it. It was the basic unit of production and of local government in feudal Europe. Each manor aimed to supply its own needs in food and goods. The manor was thus the cell of the feudal economy.

The land was divided into parts. The land of the manor was divided into the lord's own land, the demesne; the holdings of the peasants; and the common land used by all. The demesne was worked for the lord, the holdings fed the peasants, and the common land provided pasture and wood. This division ordered the whole life of the manor. Land was shared out by custom and by rank.

The serfs worked the lord's demesne. The serfs were required to labour for several days each week on the lord's demesne, and that without pay. This labour rent, or corvée, was the chief service that the serf

owed. It produced the food and wealth that supported the lord. The demesne was worked by the forced labour of the peasantry.

The peasants held their own strips. In return for their labour, the peasants held strips of land in the open fields, from which they fed their families. These holdings were scattered in narrow strips across the great fields of the manor. The peasant lived on the produce of his own strips. His holding was his livelihood and his tie to the land.

The serf owed rent and many dues. Besides his labour, the serf owed his lord rent in produce, and many dues and fines: for the use of the lord's mill and oven, for marrying, and upon inheritance. These burdens took much of the fruit of his labour. The lord thus drew a heavy income from his peasants. Rent and dues bound the serf in exploitation.

The serf was bound to the manor. The serf could not leave the manor, marry, or sell his goods without the lord's permission. He was tied to the land and passed with it from one lord to another. Yet he could not be sold apart from the land, and kept his holding by custom. He was thus neither wholly a slave nor a free man, but something in between the two. His bondage was to the manor itself.

The manor had its own court. Justice on the manor was done in the lord's court, which settled disputes, enforced customs and punished offences. The lord or his steward presided, and the custom of the manor was the law. This gave the lord authority over the daily life of his people. The manor court was local government in action.

The manor was largely self-sufficient. The manor produced most of what it needed within its own bounds: its food, its cloth, its tools and its buildings. It bought and sold little, for trade and towns were weak in the early Middle Ages. This self-sufficiency was the mark of the feudal economy. The manor was a small and nearly closed world.

The manorial system was therefore the economic heart of feudal Europe, organising each estate into the lord's demesne, the peasants' holdings and the common land, and binding the serf to labour, rent and dues under the justice of the manor court. Largely self-sufficient and nearly closed, the manor produced the wealth on which the whole feudal order depended.

Question 16

Feudalism rose from the wreck of Rome, as a drowning society clutched at the only plank left afloat: the land and the local lord.

Examine the factors for the rise of feudalism in Western Europe.

Model Answer

Feudalism arose in Western Europe between the fifth and ninth centuries, out of the ruins of the Roman Empire and the disorders that followed. Several factors combined to bring it into being. The factors for the rise of feudalism in Western Europe may be examined as follows.

The fall of the Roman Empire left a vacuum. The collapse of the Western Roman Empire in the fifth century destroyed the strong central government that had kept order. Into the vacuum stepped local landowners and warlords who took power over their own regions. The absence of a strong state was the ground on which feudalism grew. Rome's fall thus cleared the way for the new order.

Barbarian invasions brought insecurity. The invasions of the Germanic peoples, and later of the Vikings, Magyars and Saracens, filled Europe with danger and disorder. Men needed protection against raiders and against rival lords. This deep insecurity drove the weak to seek the shelter of the strong. Feudalism grew as a system of defence.

Men sought protection through service. In such dangerous times, the weak commended themselves to powerful lords, giving their land and service in return for protection. This bargain of protection for loyalty created the bond of lord and vassal. The search for security thus built the feudal relationship. Protection was exchanged for service.

Land replaced money as the reward for service. With the decline of trade and money, land became the chief form of wealth and the means of rewarding followers. Kings and lords granted land, rather than pay, to those who served them. Landholding thus became the very foundation of power and service. The fief replaced the wage.

Trade and towns decayed. The fall of the empire brought a great decline in trade, and the towns shrank and decayed. The economy became local and agrarian, centred on the self-sufficient estate. This retreat into a rural economy fostered the manorial system. With money now scarce, land and its produce became the only sure measure of wealth. Feudalism grew in a world of failing commerce.

Central government could not defend the people. The kings of the early Middle Ages were often too weak to defend or govern their whole realms. They came to rely on their great lords to raise armies and keep order in the localities. Power thus passed from the centre to the local lord. Weak kingship fostered the decentralised feudal order.

The need for cavalry shaped the system. The new warfare relied on armoured knights on horseback, who were costly to equip and to maintain. Lords granted land to knights so that they could support themselves and serve in war. This tied landholding directly to military service. The fief and the knight thus rose together.

The Church supported and shaped feudalism. The Church, itself a great landowner, entered into feudal relations and blessed the bonds of lord and vassal. Its bishops and abbots held fiefs and owed service like other lords. Religion thus sanctified and strengthened the feudal order. The Church was woven into the very rise of feudalism.

Feudalism therefore arose in Western Europe from the fall of the Roman Empire and the vacuum it left, the insecurity of the barbarian invasions, the search for protection through service, the new primacy of land over money, the decay of trade and towns, the weakness of central government, the demands of mounted warfare, and the support of the Church. Out of the ruin of the ancient world there thus grew the feudal order of the Middle Ages.

Question 17

Under feudalism there was no single government but a thousand: every lord was a little king within his own domain.

Examine how feudalism shaped the administrative system of Western Europe.

Model Answer

Feudalism was not only a system of landholding but a whole way of governing medieval Europe. In the absence of a strong central state, it gave society its structure of authority, justice and defence. How feudalism shaped the administrative system of Western Europe may be examined as follows.

It decentralised political authority. Under feudalism, power was scattered among many local lords rather than gathered in a single strong state. Each lord governed his own lands, raised his own men and kept his own order. Government thus became local and fragmented. Decentralisation was the first mark of feudal administration.

Local lords governed and judged their lands. The lord ruled the people of his domain, settling disputes, keeping order and commanding obedience. He held courts, collected dues and led his men in war. In effect each lord was the government of his own territory. What the emperor had once done for a whole continent, the lord now did for a single valley. Local lordship thus replaced the distant state.

Justice was done in feudal and manorial courts. Justice was administered in the courts of the lords, from the manor court for the peasants to the courts of the great barons. The custom of the fief or the manor was the law, and the lord or his steward the judge. This gave the feudal lords firm control of justice. Law was local and personal under feudalism.

The army was raised through feudal service. The king and the great lords raised their armies not by taxation but through the military service owed by their vassals. Each vassal came with his knights to serve

for a fixed term. This tied the whole military system to landholding. Defence rested squarely on the feudal bond.

Government worked through personal bonds. Feudal administration rested not on a bureaucracy of paid officials but on the personal bonds of homage and fealty between lord and vassal. Men served because they were bound by oath and by land. Loyalty, rather than salary, held the system together. Government was thus a web of personal ties.

The king depended on his great vassals. Because the king had little machinery of his own, he depended on his great lords to govern and defend the realm. His power reached the people only through the lords who stood between. This made royal government weak and the great lords strong. The crown ruled through the nobility.

It gave rise, in time, to royal administration. As kings sought to strengthen their power, they slowly built up their own administration: royal courts, a treasury or exchequer, and a chancery to issue documents. These grew alongside, and against, the power of the feudal lords. Out of the feudal order the machinery of the modern state began to emerge. Royal administration thus rose within feudalism.

It shaped taxation and revenue. Feudal government drew its income from the land, from feudal dues and aids, and from the profits of justice, rather than from regular taxes. The lord lived on the rent and services of his peasants and the dues of his vassals. This bound revenue to the land and to the feudal relationship. Finance too was feudal in form.

Feudalism therefore shaped the administrative system of Western Europe by decentralising authority among local lords who governed, judged and defended their own lands through the personal bonds of homage and fealty, while the king ruled only through his great vassals. Yet out of this fragmented order there slowly grew the royal courts, treasuries and chanceries from which the machinery of the modern state would in time emerge.

Question 18

The bishop wore two hats: he was a prince of the Church and a lord of the manor, and he owed service to God and to the king alike.

Examine the role of the Church in the feudal administration of Europe.

Model Answer

In feudal Europe the Christian Church was not set apart from the feudal order but was deeply woven into it. As a great landowner and a spiritual power, the Church shared fully in the government of medieval society. The role of the Church in feudal administration may be examined as follows.

The Church was a great feudal landowner. The Church held vast estates, granted to it by kings and lords over the centuries, until it owned a large part of the land of Europe. Its bishops, abbots and monasteries were among the greatest landholders of all. This made the Church a major power in the feudal economy. Its wealth rested, like that of the lords, on land and peasants.

Churchmen were themselves feudal lords. Bishops and abbots held their lands as fiefs and owed service, like other lords, to the king. They had their own vassals, courts and even armies, and governed their lands as feudal lords. Thus a churchman might be as powerful as a great baron. The Church was part of the feudal hierarchy.

The Church supplied the literate officials. Because the clergy were almost the only widely literate class, they staffed the offices of kings and lords as clerks, secretaries and chancellors. The king's writing office and much of his administration were run by churchmen. The Church thus provided the trained servants of government. The literate clergy were the civil service of the age.

The Church sanctified the feudal order. The Church taught that the hierarchy of society was ordained by God, and it blessed the bonds of lord and vassal. Coronation and oaths were religious acts that gave feudal relations a sacred force. Religion thus upheld the whole feudal order. The Church clothed feudal power in holiness.

The Church ran its own courts and law. The Church had its own courts and its own canon law, which judged the clergy and matters of marriage, wills and morals. This gave it a large share in the administration of justice across Europe. Its courts stood beside those of the lords and the king. The Church was a power in law as well as in land.

The Church provided welfare and learning. The monasteries and the Church cared for the poor and the sick and preserved learning in their schools and scriptoria. They performed the social services that no feudal state provided. Education and charity were thus largely in the Church's hands. It served society even as it ruled over part of it.

The Church tempered feudal warfare. The Church tried to limit the endless private wars of the lords through measures such as the Peace and Truce of God. It sought to protect the weak and to forbid fighting on holy days. In this it worked for order in a violent age. The Church was thus a force for peace within feudalism.

Yet Church and lords could clash. Because bishops were both churchmen and feudal vassals, their double loyalty bred conflict between the Church and lay rulers. The great quarrel over the appointment of bishops, the Investiture Controversy, shook all of Europe. Church and crown thus struggled as well as cooperated. The Church's power was a rival as much as a support.

The Church therefore played a central role in feudal administration, as a great landowner whose bishops and abbots were themselves feudal lords, as the supplier of the literate officials of government, and as the sanctifier of the whole feudal order. It ran its own courts, provided welfare and learning, and tempered the violence of the age, even as its double authority brought it at times into conflict with kings and lords.

Feudalism in Asia

Question 19

In Japan the emperor reigned but did not rule; real power lay with the shogun and the sword-bearing lords who served him.

Examine the feudal system of medieval Japan and its administration.

Model Answer

Medieval Japan developed one of the most complete feudal systems in the world, strikingly like that of medieval Europe. Power rested upon land and upon the loyalty of a warrior class. The feudal system of medieval Japan and its administration may be examined as follows.

The emperor reigned but did not rule. At the head of Japan stood the emperor, revered as sacred but holding little real power. Actual government passed to the military rulers who governed in his name. The emperor thus became a figurehead above the feudal order. Real authority lay elsewhere than the imperial throne.

The shogun held the real power. From 1192 the true ruler of Japan was the shogun, the supreme military commander who governed in the emperor's name. The shogun stood at the head of the feudal hierarchy and commanded its armies. His government, the shogunate, ruled the land. The shogun was the real master of Japan.

Great lords, the daimyo, held the land. Beneath the shogun stood the daimyo, the great feudal lords who held wide domains of land. They governed their own territories and commanded their own warriors. In return they owed loyalty and service to the shogun. The daimyo were, in effect, the barons of feudal Japan.

The samurai were the warrior class. The daimyo were served by the samurai, a class of warriors who held land or received support in return for military service. Like the European knight, the samurai lived to fight for his lord. They formed the armed backbone of the feudal order. The samurai were the knights of Japan.

Bushido bound the warrior to his lord. The samurai followed bushido, the way of the warrior, a strict code of loyalty, honour and courage. It demanded absolute and unconditional loyalty to one's lord, even

unto death. This code held the feudal bonds of Japan even more tightly than the oaths of Europe. Bushido was the very soul of Japanese feudalism.

Land was granted in return for service. As in Europe, land, or its produce, was granted by lords to their followers in return for military service and loyalty. The estates, the shoen, supported the warrior class. This exchange of land for service was the basis of the whole system. Landholding and loyalty were thus joined together.

The peasants worked the land. At the base of society stood the peasants, who worked the land and paid heavy taxes in rice to their lords. Though honoured in theory above merchants, they lived hard lives of ceaseless toil. Upon their labour the whole warrior order rested. The peasants were the foundation of feudal Japan.

Government was decentralised among the lords. Real power was scattered among the daimyo, who governed their domains with much independence. The shogun held them together by loyalty and force, but the local lords ruled the localities. Government was thus decentralised, as in feudal Europe. Authority lay with the local lord and his warriors.

The feudal system of medieval Japan was therefore a hierarchy descending from the sacred but powerless emperor, through the ruling shogun and the great daimyo, to the samurai warriors and the peasants at the base. Bound together by the granting of land for service and by the strict loyalty of bushido, it was one of the most complete feudal orders in history, strikingly parallel to that of medieval Europe.

Question 20

Long before the emperors ruled through mandarins, China was a patchwork of noble domains held from the king in return for tribute and troops.

Examine feudalism in ancient China and its administration.

Model Answer

Feudalism appeared in China above all under the Zhou dynasty (c. 1046 to 256 BCE), when the land was divided among noble lords who held it from the king. This classic Chinese feudalism shaped early Chinese government before the rise of the centralised bureaucratic empire. Feudalism in China and its administration may be examined as follows.

The Zhou king granted land to nobles. Under the Zhou dynasty, the king granted domains of land to members of his family and to loyal nobles. These lords held their lands from the king in return for service. This grant of land for loyalty was the basis of Chinese feudalism. The Zhou was the great feudal age of China.

Land was held in return for service. The noble lords owed the king military service, tribute and attendance at his court in return for their lands. They were bound to send troops and gifts and to obey his summons to war. This exchange of land for service resembled the feudalism of Europe. Landholding and duty were joined together.

Society was divided into classes. Chinese feudal society was divided between the noble lords who held the land and the peasants who worked it. The lords formed the ruling class, and the peasants the labouring base. Between them lay a deep division of wealth and power. Feudalism in China too was a system of class exploitation.

The peasants worked the land and paid tribute. The peasants tilled the fields of the lords and paid them a share of the produce. Upon their labour the nobility lived, as in every feudal system. They were bound to the land and to their lords, giving up their surplus to the nobility. In China as in Europe, the many toiled so that the few might rule. The peasantry was the foundation of the Zhou order.

Authority was at first decentralised. Under early Zhou feudalism, power was scattered among the many noble domains, each ruling its own lands. The king was honoured as the Son of Heaven but had limited direct control over the lords. Government was thus local and fragmented. Decentralisation marked Chinese feudalism as it did the European.

The lords grew powerful and independent. Over time the noble lords grew rich and strong, and many became almost independent of the king. In the later Zhou period they warred among themselves in the age of the Warring States. Feudal decentralisation thus bred disorder and conflict. The very lords who upheld the system came to threaten it.

Feudalism gave way to centralised bureaucracy. In 221 BCE the Qin dynasty ended feudalism, abolished the noble domains, and replaced them with provinces under appointed officials. The Han continued this centralised, bureaucratic government. China thus moved from feudalism to a centralised empire. The bureaucratic state replaced the feudal lords.

Feudal elements lingered in later ages. Though the centralised empire prevailed, feudal features such as great landed estates and powerful landlord families reappeared in later Chinese history. The relation of landlord and tenant continued to shape the countryside. Feudalism thus left a lasting mark. Its influence outlived the Zhou dynasty.

Feudalism in China, above all under the Zhou dynasty, was therefore a system in which the king granted land to noble lords in return for service and tribute, dividing society into lords and peasants and scattering authority among the domains. Though it gave way in 221 BCE to the centralised bureaucratic empire of Qin and Han, its landed classes and its landlord-tenant relations left a lasting mark on Chinese society.

Question 21

The knight and the samurai never met, yet each knelt to his lord, held land for his sword, and lived by a code of honour.

Compare the feudal systems of medieval Europe and Japan.

Model Answer

Medieval Europe and medieval Japan, though far apart and unknown to one another, developed feudal systems of remarkable similarity. Both rested on land, loyalty and a warrior class, yet they differed in important ways. Their feudal systems may be compared as follows.

Both rested on land held for service. In both Europe and Japan, lords granted land, or its produce, to followers in return for military service and loyalty. Land was the reward of the warrior in each. This exchange of land for service was the basis of both systems. In each, a man's power was measured by the land he held and the swords he could summon from it. Landholding and duty were thus joined in both.

Both had a warrior class. Europe had its knights and Japan its samurai, each a class of warriors who lived to fight for their lords. Both were bound to their lords by loyalty and by land. The armed warrior was the backbone of both orders. In both societies the profession of arms was the highest calling of the noble class. Knight and samurai thus played the same role in each.

Both rested on a bound peasantry. In each system the peasants worked the land and supported the warrior class above them by their labour and their dues. The serf of Europe and the peasant of Japan bore the burden of the whole order. Upon their toil both feudal societies rested. The peasantry was the base of each.

Both were governed by codes of loyalty. Europe had its oaths of homage and fealty, and Japan its code of bushido. Each bound the warrior to his lord in solemn loyalty. Personal bonds, rather than a paid bureaucracy, held both systems together. To break faith with one's lord was, in each land, counted the deepest of disgraces. Loyalty was thus the cement of both.

Both were decentralised. In each, power was scattered among many local lords who governed their own domains. The king or shogun held them together but did not rule the localities directly. Real authority lay less in the distant capital than in the castle of the local lord. Government was thus local and fragmented in both, and decentralisation marked each system.

They differed in the loyalty of the warrior. The loyalty of the samurai under bushido was absolute and unconditional, given even unto death. The European vassal's loyalty was more of a contract, with duties on both sides that could be broken. Japanese loyalty was thus stronger and more one-sided. This was a real difference between the two.

They differed in the place of the ruler. In Japan the emperor reigned as a sacred figurehead while the shogun ruled, so that there were, in effect, two heads. In Europe the king was both the sacred and the actual head of the realm. The division of authority was thus sharper in Japan. Their very summits were differently arranged.

They differed in the role of religion. In Europe the Christian Church was a great feudal power, holding land and supplying officials. In Japan religion, whether Shinto or Buddhism, did not form so powerful a landed institution within the feudal state. Religion thus entered the two systems differently. The Church had no exact Japanese counterpart.

The feudal systems of medieval Europe and Japan were therefore strikingly alike in resting on land held for service, a warrior class, a bound peasantry, codes of loyalty and decentralised power. Yet they differed in the absolute loyalty of the samurai, the divided headship of emperor and shogun, and the place of religion, so that the two great feudalisms were parallel but not identical.

Feudalism in Africa

Question 22

In the kingdoms of Africa the king owned the land as the ancestors' trustee, and lord and peasant were bound together by cattle, tribute and toil.

Examine feudalism and its administration in pre-colonial Africa.

Model Answer

Feudal or feudal-like systems developed in many pre-colonial African societies, especially in the centralised kingdoms with settled agriculture and a landed ruling class. These systems shaped the government of much of the continent. Feudalism and its administration in pre-colonial Africa may be examined as follows.

The king owned and granted the land. In many African kingdoms the king was held to own all the land, which he distributed to his nobles and chiefs. These held the land in return for tribute and service to the king. This grant of land for loyalty resembled the feudalism of Europe. The king was thus the fountain of landholding.

A landed nobility held estates. Below the king stood a class of nobles and chiefs who held estates and controlled the peasants who worked them. They owed the king tribute and military service in return for their lands. This landed nobility formed the ruling class of the kingdom. They were the lords of African feudalism.

The peasants worked the land and paid rent. The mass of the people were peasants who worked the land and paid rent in produce, labour or cattle to their lords. Upon their toil the nobility and the king alike lived. Bound to the land and to their lords, they formed the base of society. The peasantry bore the burden of the whole system.

Cattle were a basis of feudal relations. In many African societies, especially in the east, cattle rather than land alone were the basis of feudal ties. A lord lent cattle to a client, who owed him services and loyalty in return. This cattle-clientship bound rich and poor together. Cattle were thus a form of feudal wealth and power.

Tribute sustained the state. The king and his nobles drew their wealth from the tribute paid by the peasants and by weaker subject peoples. This tribute in produce, cattle and labour supported the court, the army and the administration. Government thus rested on the surplus taken from the peasantry. Tribute was the lifeblood of the African feudal state.

Authority was organised in a hierarchy. African feudal kingdoms were organised in a hierarchy descending from the king through the nobles and chiefs to the peasants. Each rank owed duties upward and held authority downward. This ordered hierarchy gave the kingdom its structure. Feudal Africa too was a pyramid of land and loyalty.

Religion sanctified the order. The authority of the king and the order of society were upheld by religion, the king often being sacred and the land held from the ancestors. To rebel against the order was to offend the spirits and the dead. Religion thus strengthened the feudal hierarchy. Sacred sanction bound the whole system together.

The system supported centralised kingdoms. By binding nobles and peasants to the king through land, cattle and tribute, feudalism helped to build and sustain strong African kingdoms. States such as Buganda, Bunyoro, Rwanda and Ethiopia rested on such relations. Feudalism was thus a foundation of African state-building. It gave these kingdoms their strength and order.

Feudalism in pre-colonial Africa was therefore a system in which the king owned and granted the land, a landed nobility held estates and drew tribute from a bound peasantry, and cattle as well as land bound lord and client together, all sanctified by religion. Organised as a hierarchy of land, cattle and loyalty, it supported strong centralised kingdoms across much of the continent.

Question 23

From the cattle-lords of the Great Lakes to the land-chiefs of Kilimanjaro, East Africa wove its own many-stranded cloth of feudal ties.

Describe the main feudal systems of East Africa.

Model Answer

East Africa developed several distinct feudal or feudal-like systems, in which a ruling class controlled land, cattle and labour, and the common people paid rent and service. These systems are an important part of the region's history and are much examined. The main feudal systems of East Africa may be described as follows.

The Nyarubanja system of the interlacustrine region. In Buhaya and Karagwe, in north-western Tanzania, the Nyarubanja system bound peasants to landlords of the ruling class. The lords held estates granted under the king, or omukama, and the tenants worked them and paid rent. This tied the peasant to the land and to the lord. Nyarubanja was a landlord-tenant feudalism of the Great Lakes.

The Busulu and Nvunjo system of Buganda. In Buganda and Bunyoro the peasants owed their landlords two main dues: busulu, a rent for the land, and nvunjo, a tribute in produce or labour. The Kabaka and his chiefs controlled the land, and the peasants worked it under these obligations. This bound the cultivator to his lord by rent and tribute. Busulu and nvunjo were the feudal dues of Buganda.

The Ubugabire system of Rwanda and Burundi. Among the peoples of Rwanda, Burundi and Buha, the Ubugabire system rested on cattle rather than land. A patron, or shebuja, gave cattle to a client, the umugabire, who owed him loyalty, service and gifts in return. This cattle-clientship bound the poor to the rich. Ubugabire was, in essence, a feudalism of cattle.

The Umwinyi system of the coast. Along the East African coast and in Zanzibar, the Umwinyi system gave a landowning class, the wamwinyi, control of the land and its tenants. The tenants and serfs, the watwana, worked the land and served their masters. At the head stood the paramount lord, the mwinyi mkuu. Umwinyi was the feudalism of the coast.

The Ntemi system of the Nyamwezi and Sukuma. Among the Nyamwezi and Sukuma of western Tanzania, the Ntemi system placed authority in a chief, the mtemi, who controlled land, labour and the products of his people. The word kutema, to clear the land, gave the chief his very title. He led his people in settling and defending the land. Ntemi was a chiefly feudal system of the interior.

The Kihamba system of the Chagga. On the slopes of Kilimanjaro, the Chagga held their land in plots called kihamba, allotted by the chief, or mangi. The tenants worked their plots and paid the chief rent in kind or in labour. This bound the cultivator to the chief and to the land. Kihamba was the feudalism of the mountain.

These systems shared common features. In all these systems a ruling class controlled the land or the cattle, and the common people paid rent, tribute or service. Each bound the peasant or client to a lord in a

relation of exploitation. Though they differed in detail, they were feudal in character. They shared the essence of a landed or cattle-based lordship.

They shaped the government of the region. Through these systems the ruling classes governed the peoples of East Africa, drawing wealth and labour from the many. They gave the kingdoms and chiefdoms their structure and their strength. Government rested squarely on these feudal ties. The administration of much of East Africa was built upon them.

The main feudal systems of East Africa were therefore the Nyarubanja of the interlacustrine region, the Busulu and Nvunjo of Buganda, the cattle-based Ubugabire of Rwanda and Burundi, the Umwinyi of the coast, the Ntemi of the Nyamwezi and Sukuma, and the Kihamba of the Chagga. Though differing in detail, all bound a common people to a landed or cattle-owning ruling class through rent, tribute and service, and shaped the government of the region.

Question 24

In the green kingdoms between the great lakes, a man's freedom might be measured in the cattle he was lent or the land he was allowed to till.

Explain the interlacustrine feudal systems of Nyarubanja and Ubugabire.

Model Answer

Among the most developed feudal systems of pre-colonial Africa were those of the interlacustrine region, the land between the great lakes of East Africa. The Nyarubanja and Ubugabire systems bound the common people to a ruling class through land and cattle. These systems may be explained as follows.

Both arose in the interlacustrine kingdoms. The Nyarubanja and Ubugabire systems developed in the settled and centralised kingdoms between the great lakes, such as Buhaya, Karagwe, Rwanda and Burundi. These were among the most organised states of the region. Their wealth in land and cattle gave rise to feudal relations. The Great Lakes were thus a home of African feudalism.

Nyarubanja bound peasants to landlords. In the Nyarubanja system a lord of the ruling class held an estate, granted under the king or omukama, and settled tenants upon it. The tenants worked the land and paid the lord rent and services. This tied the peasant to the land and to his landlord. Nyarubanja was a feudalism of land and rent.

The Nyarubanja lord drew rent and labour. The tenants of a Nyarubanja estate owed their lord a share of their produce and days of labour. Upon this rent the landed ruling class lived. The peasant kept only what remained after the lord's demands were met. Exploitation was thus carried on through rent, as in European feudalism.

Ubugabire rested on cattle. In the Ubugabire system, wealth and power rested on the ownership of cattle rather than on land alone. Cattle were the great measure of riches and the basis of feudal ties. This gave Ubugabire its distinctive, pastoral character. Among these cattle-keeping peoples, a man rich in herds could command the labour and loyalty of many. It was, in essence, a feudalism of the herd.

The patron gave cattle to the client. In Ubugabire a wealthy patron, the shebuja, gave cattle to a poorer man, the umugabire, to hold and use. In return the client owed the patron loyalty, labour, gifts and service. This bond of cattle-clientship bound the poor to the rich. The gift of cattle created a lasting obligation.

The client served the patron in return. The umugabire tended the patron's cattle, served him in peace and war, and gave him produce and honour. In return he enjoyed the use of the cattle and the protection of his patron. This exchange of service for protection was the heart of the system. It bound the two men in mutual, if deeply unequal, obligation.

Both upheld the power of the ruling class. Through Nyarubanja and Ubugabire, the ruling classes of the interlacustrine kingdoms drew wealth, labour and loyalty from the common people. These systems gave the kings and nobles their power and their following. They were thus the foundation of the state. Feudal ties upheld the whole social order.

Both were relations of exploitation. Beneath their bonds of protection and service, both systems rested on the exploitation of the many by the few. The peasant and the client gave far more than they received, and could not easily escape their lords. Inequality was built into the very relationship. They were, in the end, systems of class exploitation.

The interlacustrine feudal systems of Nyarubanja and Ubugabire were therefore the great feudal orders of the land between the lakes, the one binding peasants to landlords through the rent of land under the omukama, the other binding clients to patrons through the gift of cattle. Both upheld the power of the ruling class and rested, beneath their bonds of protection, on the exploitation of the many by the few.

Question 25

Feudalism took root in Africa where the iron hoe turned surplus soil, and surplus, once stored, could be seized by the strong.

Examine the factors for the rise of feudalism in Africa.

Model Answer

Feudalism and feudal-like systems arose in many parts of pre-colonial Africa through the working of several linked factors, rooted in the growth of settled and unequal societies. The factors for the rise of feudalism in Africa may be examined as follows.

The development of iron technology. The mastery of iron gave Africans stronger tools, such as the hoe and the axe, which raised the productivity of farming. This produced a surplus that could be stored and then seized by a ruling class. The growth of surplus opened the way to exploitation. Iron technology thus laid the material basis of feudalism.

The growth of an agricultural surplus. As farming produced more than the cultivators needed to live, a surplus arose that could support those who did not farm. Rulers, nobles and warriors lived on this surplus taken from the peasants. The surplus was the wealth over which feudal classes formed. It made a landed ruling class possible.

The growth of population and land shortage. As population grew, land became scarcer and more valuable, and control of it a source of power. Those who held land could demand rent and service from those who lacked it. Land shortage thus fostered feudal relations. Population growth pressed men into dependence on landlords.

Fertile land and a favourable climate. Feudalism took root above all in regions of fertile soil and good rainfall, such as the interlacustrine kingdoms and the Ethiopian highlands. These lands produced the surplus on which feudal classes lived. Good conditions for farming favoured the growth of the system. Nature helped to shape where feudalism arose.

The rise of centralised states. As strong kingdoms formed, their kings claimed ownership of the land and granted it to nobles in return for tribute and service. This built the feudal hierarchy of king, nobles and peasants. State formation and feudalism thus grew together. Centralised power created feudal relations.

Social differentiation and the rise of classes. As African societies grew unequal, they divided into a ruling class that controlled land and cattle and a labouring class that worked them. This division of society into exploiters and exploited was the very essence of feudalism. Class formation was thus a root of the system. Inequality bred feudal ties.

The wealth of cattle. In the pastoral and mixed societies of eastern Africa, cattle became a great form of wealth and a basis of power. The ownership of cattle allowed the rich to bind the poor through clientship, as in Ubugabire. Cattle thus gave rise to a pastoral feudalism. Herds were a foundation of lordship.

The growth of trade and specialisation. The growth of trade and of specialised crafts, such as ironworking, created wealth and differences of rank. Those who controlled trade and skill rose above the common people. This differentiation fed the growth of a ruling class. Commerce and craft thus contributed to feudalism.

Feudalism therefore arose in Africa through the development of iron technology and the agricultural surplus it produced, the growth of population and land shortage, fertile land and a favourable climate, the rise of centralised states, the differentiation of society into classes, the wealth of cattle, and the growth of trade and specialisation. Together these forces gave rise to a landed and cattle-owning ruling class living upon the labour of a bound peasantry.

Question 26

Feudalism gave the African kingdom its skeleton: a king at the head, chiefs at the joints, and the peasant's labour running through it like blood.

Assess the influence of feudalism on the administrative systems of Africa.

Model Answer

Feudalism deeply shaped the government of many pre-colonial African kingdoms, giving them their structure of authority, their revenue and their means of defence. Its influence was great, though it also had its costs. The influence of feudalism on African administrative systems may be assessed as follows.

It gave the kingdom a hierarchical structure. Feudalism organised the African kingdom as a hierarchy descending from the king through the nobles and chiefs to the peasants. Each rank owed duties upward and held authority downward. This gave the state a clear and ordered structure. Hierarchy was feudalism's chief gift to African government.

It supported centralised royal power. By binding nobles and peasants to the king through land, cattle and tribute, feudalism strengthened the authority of the ruler. The king stood at the head of the whole order as its fountain of land and honour. This helped to build strong, centralised kingdoms. Feudalism thus upheld the power of the crown.

It provided the state with revenue. The tribute, rent and labour drawn from the peasantry gave the king and his nobles the wealth to govern. This surplus supported the court, the officials and the army. Government thus rested on the feudal exploitation of the peasants. Feudal dues were the revenue of the state.

It organised the army and defence. The nobles and chiefs owed the king military service and led their men in war. Feudal ties thus provided the kingdom with its armies and its defence. The warrior class was bound to the ruler by land and loyalty. In return for their estates, the lords brought their followers to fight at the king's command. Feudalism thus supplied the military strength of the state.

It created a class of local administrators. The chiefs and nobles who held land governed the people of their districts on the king's behalf, keeping order and gathering tribute. They were, in effect, the local administrators of the kingdom. Through them the king's authority reached the peasants. Feudal lords were the officials of the African state.

It bound the peasantry to the land and the state. By tying the peasants to the land and to their lords, feudalism gave the kingdom a settled and controllable labouring population. The peasants could not easily escape their obligations. This made society orderly and its labour available to the state. Feudal bondage thus secured the base of the kingdom.

Religion and tradition reinforced the system. The authority of the king and the order of feudal society were upheld by religion and custom, the king often being sacred. To rebel was to offend the ancestors and the spirits. This gave the feudal order a powerful sanction. Sacred authority strengthened feudal administration.

Yet it rested on exploitation and could breed unrest. For all its order, feudalism rested on the exploitation of the peasants and clients by the ruling class. The burden of rent, tribute and service could be heavy and bitterly resented. This exploitation was the hidden weakness of the system. Feudal order was bought at the price of the peasant's toil.

Feudalism therefore profoundly influenced the administrative systems of Africa, giving the kingdom its hierarchical structure, supporting centralised royal power, providing revenue and armies, creating a class

of local administrators, and binding the peasantry to the land, all reinforced by religion. Yet it rested on the exploitation of the many by the few, so that the order and strength it gave to African government were built upon the labour and the burdens of the peasantry.

The significance of slavery and feudalism

Question 27

Feudalism gave a broken world order and defence, yet it also chained the peasant to the soil and the kingdom to a hundred quarrelling lords.

Assess the strengths and weaknesses of feudalism as a system of administration.

Model Answer

Feudalism was the dominant system of government in the medieval world, in Europe, Asia and Africa alike. As a way of administering society it had both real strengths and serious weaknesses. These may be assessed as follows.

It gave order to a lawless world. Feudalism arose in times of disorder and gave society a settled structure of authority. Each man knew his lord, his duties and his place in the order. This brought stability where central government had failed. In a world without a strong state, such settled order was no small achievement. The provision of order was feudalism's first strength.

It provided defence and protection. Through the bond of lord and vassal, feudalism organised society for war and protected the weak against raiders. Every lord could raise and lead armed men for defence. In dangerous times this protection was vital to survival. The castle and the armed knight shielded the peasant who could not defend himself. Feudalism thus met the great need for security.

It supplied local government. In the absence of a strong central state, the local lord governed, judged and kept order among his people. Government reached the localities through the feudal hierarchy of lords and chiefs. This local administration held society together. Feudalism governed where the central state could not.

It bound society together by mutual obligation. The genius of feudalism was that each rank was tied to those above and below by duties and rights. Loyalty flowed upward and protection downward, binding the whole into one. This web of obligation gave society cohesion. Mutual duty was a real strength of the system.

Yet it weakened central authority. Because power was scattered among many lords, the king was often weak and the kingdom divided. Over-mighty lords could defy the crown and make war among themselves. A kingdom of many masters could rarely act as one, and civil war was never far away. This fragmentation was a grave weakness that bred disunity and disorder.

It rested on the exploitation of the peasantry. Feudalism lived on the rent, labour and dues wrung from a bound peasantry. The serf bore heavy burdens and could not escape his lord. The comfort of the lord was drawn directly from the sweat of those beneath him. This exploitation was the injustice at the heart of the system, and order was bought at the peasant's expense.

It hindered trade and progress. Because the manor produced chiefly for its own use and trade was weak, feudalism discouraged commerce and the growth of towns. Its self-sufficient, rural economy was slow to change or to improve. This held back economic progress. Feudalism was in many ways a brake upon development.

It bred private war and disorder. Because each lord commanded his own armed men, feudalism filled society with private wars and feuds. The very warriors who defended the people also plundered them. The sword that guarded the manor could as easily be turned against a neighbour's. This endemic violence was a constant weakness, and feudal decentralisation could collapse into anarchy.

Feudalism was therefore a system of real strengths, giving order, defence, local government and social cohesion to a broken world, and of serious weaknesses, weakening central authority, exploiting the

peasantry, hindering trade and breeding private war. It suited an age of insecurity and weak states, but its very decentralisation and exploitation were the flaws that, in time, would bring about its decline.

Question 28

Whether in chains or bound to the soil, the labourer of the ancient and medieval world worked so that another might not have to.

"Both slavery and feudalism were systems of the exploitation of one class by another." Discuss.

Model Answer

The statement holds that slavery and feudalism, for all their differences, were alike in resting on the exploitation of a labouring class by an owning class. This view lies at the heart of the historical understanding of these systems. Its validity may be discussed as follows.

Both divided society into two main classes. Slavery divided society into masters and slaves, and feudalism into lords and serfs. In each, one class owned the means of production and another did the labour. This division into owners and workers was common to both. The statement is right that both rested on class division.

In both, the few lived on the labour of the many. Under slavery the master lived on the slave's toil, and under feudalism the lord lived on the serf's. In each, a small ruling class enjoyed the surplus produced by a great labouring class. The few consumed what the many produced. Exploitation was thus the basis of both systems.

Both took the surplus of the worker's labour. The slave-master took the whole product of the slave's labour, and the feudal lord took a large part of the serf's as rent. In each, the worker was made to produce more than he received. This taking of the surplus was the essence of the exploitation. Both systems lived off the labourer's surplus.

Both bound the worker and denied him freedom. The slave was owned and the serf was tied to the land, and neither was free to leave or to keep the fruit of his labour. Each was held in his place by force and by law. Whether owned outright or tied to the soil, the labourer could not call his life his own. Unfreedom was thus common to both conditions, and the worker was bound in each system alike.

Both were upheld by force and by law. Slavery and feudalism alike were maintained by the power of the ruling class, through slave codes and manorial custom, overseers and lords' courts. The state and the law protected the exploiter against the exploited. Force stood behind both systems. Coercion upheld the exploitation in each.

Both made the ruling class the governing class. In each system the exploiting class, the masters or the lords, also held political power and governed the state. Exploitation and government were thus joined in the same hands. The class that took the surplus also made the laws. Economic and political power went together in both.

Yet the forms of exploitation differed. Though both exploited, they did so differently: slavery by owning the worker outright, feudalism by binding him to the land and taking rent. The slave kept nothing, while the serf kept a part. The degree and the manner of exploitation thus varied. The statement, though true, must allow for these differences.

Feudal exploitation was somewhat lighter. Because the serf kept part of his produce and held his own plot, his exploitation was less total than the slave's. He had a stake, a family and a customary place that the slave lacked. Feudalism was thus a milder, though still real, form of exploitation. The two were alike in kind but differed in degree.

It is therefore largely valid that both slavery and feudalism were systems of the exploitation of one class by another, for each divided society into owners and workers, made the few live on the labour of the many, took the surplus of the worker, bound him by force and law, and joined economic to political power. Yet they differed in the form and degree of exploitation, slavery owning the worker outright while feudalism bound him to the land, so that the statement is true in essence though it must allow for these real differences.

Question 29

Cruel and unjust though they were, slavery and feudalism each taught humanity something about how to organise labour, land and power.

Assess the contribution of slavery and feudalism to the development of administrative systems.

Model Answer

Slavery and feudalism, though systems of exploitation, were also great stages in the development of human society and government. Each contributed, in its own way, to the growth of administrative systems. Their contribution may be assessed as follows.

Slavery produced the wealth for early states. The labour of slaves produced the surplus that supported the first great states, their armies, officials and public works. Without this forced labour the early empires could not have been built or governed. Slavery thus underwrote the rise of organised government. It laid an economic foundation for the state.

Slavery supplied skills and administration. Educated slaves served as clerks, accountants and officials, doing much of the skilled work of ancient government. They helped to run the bureaucracies of Rome and of Asia. Slavery thus contributed administrative talent as well as labour. It helped to staff the early state.

Slavery shaped law and social order. The need to control slaves gave rise to bodies of law and to a fixed social hierarchy that the state upheld. Much of the law of persons and of property grew up around slavery. It thus contributed to the development of legal administration. Slavery shaped the very ordering of society.

Feudalism gave government to a broken world. When the ancient states collapsed, feudalism provided a new structure of authority, defence and local government. It held society together in an age of disorder and invasion. Feudalism thus preserved organised government through the dark centuries. It carried administration across a great crisis.

Feudalism developed local administration. Through the manor and the lordship, feudalism created a system of local government, justice and defence. The lord's court and the manor court administered the daily life of the people. This local machinery was a real contribution to government. Feudalism taught the administration of the locality.

Feudalism gave rise to the modern state. As kings struggled to master their lords, they built the royal courts, treasuries and chanceries from which the modern centralised state grew. The parliaments and bureaucracies of later Europe had feudal roots. Feudalism thus prepared the way for modern government. The state was, in a sense, born from its womb.

Both advanced the organisation of labour and land. Slavery organised labour on a great scale, and feudalism organised the holding and working of land. Each taught society new ways to mobilise its people and its resources. These were real advances in the management of society. Both thus contributed to the art of administration.

Yet both rested on exploitation and inequality. For all their contributions, both systems were founded on the exploitation of a labouring class and on deep inequality. Their achievements were bought at the cost of the freedom and welfare of the many. This was the dark side of their contribution. Progress and injustice went together in both.

Slavery and feudalism therefore contributed much to the development of administrative systems: slavery produced the wealth, skills and law of the early state, while feudalism preserved government through the fall of the ancient world, developed local administration, and gave rise, in time, to the modern state. Yet both rested on the exploitation of the many by the few, so that their real contributions to government were inseparable from the injustice on which they were built.

Question 30

From the slave estate to the feudal manor, and beyond to the factory, the story of administration has been the story of who controls the labour of others.

"Slavery and feudalism were necessary stages in the development of society and administration." How far do you agree?

Model Answer

The statement presents slavery and feudalism not merely as systems of oppression but as necessary stages in the development of society and government, each preparing the way for the next. This view, drawn from the study of the modes of production, invites careful judgement. How far it is valid may be assessed as follows.

Each arose from the growth of the productive forces. Slavery arose when a surplus first made the ownership of labour profitable, and feudalism when new relations of land and labour replaced it. Each system grew from the level of the economy of its age. They were not accidents but products of development. In this sense each was a stage in a larger process.

Slavery advanced society beyond the communal stage. Before slavery, early societies were poor, broadly equal and without a state. Slavery, for all its cruelty, produced the surplus and the classes from which civilisation and organised government grew. It carried society beyond the primitive commune. It was a step, however harsh, towards civilisation.

Feudalism advanced society beyond slavery. Feudalism replaced the wasteful labour of the slave with the more productive labour of the serf, who had a stake in his work. It preserved and developed government after the fall of the ancient states. Feudalism thus marked an advance upon slavery. It carried society forward to a higher stage.

Each developed the administration of its age. Slavery built the bureaucracies of the ancient empires, and feudalism the local government of the medieval world. Each produced the form of administration suited to its economy. Government grew and changed with the modes of production. Administration thus advanced from stage to stage.

Feudalism prepared the way for capitalism. Out of the towns, the trade and the money that grew within feudalism came the beginnings of capitalism. The decline of feudalism opened the way to the modern commercial and industrial world. Feudalism was thus a bridge to the next stage. It carried society towards the modern age.

Yet the stages were not the same everywhere. In Africa, Asia and Europe these systems took different forms and did not follow one fixed path. Not every society passed through slavery and feudalism in the same way or in the same order. The idea of universal, necessary stages must therefore be applied with care. History was more varied than a single scheme allows.

And progress was bought at a terrible human cost. To call slavery and feudalism necessary must not hide the suffering of the enslaved and the exploited. Millions lived and died in bondage that others might prosper. The advance of society was paid for by the misery of the many. Necessity, if such it was, was cruel.

On balance they were real, if harsh, stages of development. Despite these qualifications, slavery and feudalism did mark real advances in the productive power and the government of society, each growing from the last and preparing the next. They were stages in the long development from the primitive commune towards the modern world. In this broad sense the statement holds. They were necessary, though terrible, steps.

It is therefore largely valid, in the broad view, that slavery and feudalism were necessary stages in the development of society and administration, each arising from the growth of the productive forces, each advancing beyond the last, and feudalism preparing the way for the modern world. Yet the stages were not uniform across all societies, and the progress they brought was bought at a terrible cost in human suffering, so that they must be judged as real but harsh steps in the long history of human development.

Chapter 7

POLITICAL REVOLUTIONS AND MODERN ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS IN EUROPE

Attempt each question in full on paper before you read the model answer beneath it. The questions follow the chapter topic by topic and rise in demand.

Political revolutions and modern administrative systems

Question 1

A revolution is more than a change of ruler; it is the moment a people tears up the old order and writes a new one in its place.

Explain the concept of a political revolution.

Model Answer

A political revolution is a fundamental and often sudden change in the system of government and the distribution of power in a society. The great political revolutions of Europe overturned monarchies and feudal orders and gave rise to modern administrative systems. The concept of a political revolution may be explained as follows.

It is a fundamental change of government. A political revolution is not a mere change of ruler but a deep change in the whole system of government and the way power is held and exercised. It overturns the existing political order and replaces it with a new one. This distinguishes it from an ordinary rebellion or palace coup. Revolution transforms the very foundations of the state.

It transfers power from one class to another. In a political revolution, power passes from the old ruling class to a new one, as from the feudal aristocracy to the rising middle class. The revolution expresses the demand of a rising class for a share in, or control of, the state. It is thus bound up with the struggle of classes. Revolution changes not only who rules but which class rules.

It is often sudden and violent. Revolutions commonly come suddenly and are accompanied by violence, war or the overthrow of rulers. The English and French kings were overthrown, and one of each was executed. Force is often the means by which the old order is broken. Yet not all revolutions are equally violent, as the Glorious Revolution shows.

It is driven by deep grievances. Revolutions arise from long-standing grievances: oppression, injustice, heavy taxation, or the denial of rights and representation. When such grievances grow unbearable and reform is refused, the people rise against their rulers. The revolution is the explosion of accumulated discontent. Deep causes underlie every great upheaval.

It is inspired by new ideas. The great revolutions were fired by new ideas of liberty, equality, rights and the sovereignty of the people, above all the ideas of the Enlightenment. These ideas gave the revolutionaries a vision of a better order to fight for. Revolution is thus a battle of ideas as well as of arms. Thought, as much as grievance, moves the people to act.

It overturns the old political order. A revolution sweeps away the institutions of the old regime, whether the absolute monarchy, feudal privilege or aristocratic rule. In their place it seeks to build wholly new institutions of government. The old order is not merely reformed but replaced. Revolution marks a break, not a gentle adjustment.

It builds a new administrative system. Out of the destruction of the old order, revolutions create new systems of government: constitutions, parliaments, republics, codes of law and declarations of rights. The modern administrative systems of Europe were largely born of revolution. Revolution is thus creative as well as destructive. It lays the foundations of a new state.

It has effects far beyond its own land. A great revolution inspires and influences others far beyond its own borders. The English Revolution stirred the French, and the French stirred the revolutions of 1848. Revolution spreads its ideas across nations and generations. Its influence outlives its own time and place.

A political revolution is therefore a fundamental and often sudden change in the system of government, transferring power from one class to another, driven by deep grievances and inspired by new ideas, which overturns the old political order and builds a new administrative system in its place. The great revolutions of Europe, in this sense, made the modern political world.

Question 2

The same sparks lit fire after fire across Europe: absent rights, empty treasuries, hungry peoples, and the burning new idea that kings were not gods.

Examine the general causes of the political revolutions in Europe.

Model Answer

The great political revolutions of Europe, though each had its own local causes, shared a number of common underlying grievances and forces. Together these drove peoples to rise against their rulers. The general causes of the European political revolutions may be examined as follows.

The absolutism and divine right of kings. The kings of Europe claimed to rule absolutely and by divine right, answerable to God alone and not to their subjects. This unchecked power bred oppression and denied the people any share in government. Resentment of royal despotism was a common cause of revolution. The demand to limit the crown ran through them all.

Heavy taxation and financial oppression. The peoples were burdened with heavy taxes to pay for the luxury and the wars of their rulers, while the privileged classes often paid little or nothing. This financial oppression fell hardest on the poor and the rising middle class. The cry against unjust taxation was heard in every revolution. Money and taxes were a constant spark.

The extravagance and misrule of the monarchs. The courts of Europe were often extravagant and wasteful, spending the wealth of the nation on luxury while the people suffered. Costly wars and lavish courts emptied the treasuries. This misrule discredited the monarchy and stirred deep anger. Royal excess helped to bring on revolution.

The rise of the middle class. The growth of trade and industry created a wealthy middle class, the bourgeoisie, who bitterly resented their exclusion from power. Rich but without political rights, they demanded a share in government. This rising class provided much of the leadership and the money of revolution. The bourgeoisie were the engine of the great upheavals.

The influence of Enlightenment ideas. The philosophers of the Enlightenment, such as Locke, Montesquieu and Rousseau, taught liberty, equality, natural rights and the sovereignty of the people. These ideas gave the revolutionaries both a vision and a justification for their cause. They undermined the old order in men's minds. Enlightenment thought was a powerful cause of revolution.

Religious grievances and intolerance. Religious oppression and the favouring of one church over others bred deep discontent, as in England and France. Men resented being persecuted or excluded for their faith. Religious grievance thus added to the causes of revolution. Faith and politics were closely entangled in the crisis.

The denial of representation and rights. The peoples were denied any voice in government and any secure rights against the power of the state. The demand for representation and for basic liberties was a common thread in every rising. Where rulers refused reform, revolution followed. The cry for rights and a share in power was universal.

The example of earlier revolutions. Each revolution inspired the next, as the English inspired the French and the French inspired the risings of 1848. The success of one people encouraged others to rise against their own rulers. Revolutionary ideas spread across borders like fire. The example of the past was itself a cause of revolution.

The political revolutions of Europe therefore sprang from a common root of grievances and forces: the absolutism and extravagance of kings, heavy taxation, the rise of the middle class, the ideas of the Enlightenment, religious grievance, the denial of rights, and the example of earlier revolutions. These together drove the peoples of Europe to overturn the old order and build modern systems of government.

Question 3

Out of the wreckage of thrones rose a new kind of state: one governed by law and paper, by elected men and salaried clerks, not by the whim of a king.

Examine the features of the modern administrative systems that emerged from the political revolutions.

Model Answer

The political revolutions of Europe swept away the absolute monarchies and feudal orders and gave rise to a new kind of government, the modern administrative system. This new order rested on law, representation and professional administration. Its main features may be examined as follows.

Government by constitution and law. The modern state is governed by a constitution and by laws, not by the arbitrary will of a ruler. The revolutions established that even the government itself is bound by law, the principle of the rule of law. Written constitutions and codes replaced the whim of kings. Law, not the monarch, became supreme.

Limited and accountable government. The powers of the ruler were limited, and government was made answerable to the people or their representatives. The Bill of Rights and later constitutions bound both the crown and the state. No longer could the ruler act above the law. Accountable government replaced absolutism.

Representative and parliamentary government. Power came to rest, wholly or in part, with elected representatives of the people in parliaments and assemblies. The people, or a growing part of them, gained a voice in their own government. Representation replaced the sole rule of the king. Parliament became a centre of power.

The separation of powers. Following the teaching of Montesquieu, the modern state divided its powers among the legislative, executive and judicial branches. This division checked the concentration of power and guarded against tyranny. An independent judiciary protected the citizen. The separation of powers became a pillar of modern government.

A professional bureaucracy. Modern government came to be carried on by a body of trained, salaried officials, a professional civil service, appointed for their ability. This replaced the amateur and often corrupt officials of the old regime. Administration became a profession governed by fixed rules. Bureaucracy became the machinery of the modern state.

Centralised and uniform administration. The modern state, especially after the French Revolution, was centralised and uniformly administered, its territory divided into standard units under appointed officials. Departments and prefects replaced the patchwork of feudal provinces. Uniform law and administration reached every citizen. Centralisation gave the state new strength and reach.

Equality before the law and individual rights. The revolutions proclaimed the equality of all citizens before the law and their possession of certain rights. Feudal privilege was abolished, and the citizen replaced the subject. Declarations and bills of rights protected individual liberties. Equality and rights became foundations of the modern state.

National sovereignty and citizenship. The modern state rested on the idea that sovereignty belonged to the nation and that its members were citizens, not mere subjects. The people, not the king, became the source of authority. This gave rise to nationalism and to the citizen's loyalty to the nation. The nation-state became the modern form of government.

The modern administrative systems that emerged from the political revolutions were therefore marked by government under a constitution and the rule of law, limited and accountable government, representative

parliaments, the separation of powers, a professional bureaucracy, centralised and uniform administration, equality and individual rights, and national sovereignty. Together these features replaced the absolute monarchy with the modern state.

The English Revolution

Question 4

When a king who believed God had made him answerable to no one met a Parliament that held the purse-strings, England's civil war was all but certain.

Explain the causes of the English Revolution of 1640 to 1649.

Model Answer

The English Revolution of 1640 to 1649, which brought civil war and the execution of a king, arose from a long conflict between the Stuart monarchy and Parliament. Several causes combined to bring it about. The causes of the English Revolution may be explained as follows.

The doctrine of the divine right of kings. The Stuart kings, beginning with James I, claimed to rule by divine right, answerable to God alone and not to Parliament. Charles I acted on this belief, ruling as an absolute monarch. This claim to unchecked power clashed with the ancient rights of Parliament. The conflict over royal authority lay at the very root of the revolution.

The struggle between king and Parliament. Charles I quarrelled bitterly with Parliament over money, power and religion. In 1629 he dismissed Parliament and ruled without it for eleven years, the period of his personal rule. This denial of Parliament's role provoked deep resentment among the political nation. The contest for supremacy between crown and Parliament drove the nation towards war.

Heavy and unlawful taxation. To rule without Parliament, Charles raised money by unpopular and often unlawful means, such as the levy of ship money. These taxes, imposed without consent, angered the merchants, gentry and common people alike. The demand that taxation required Parliament's consent was a central grievance. Money was a chief cause of the quarrel.

Religious conflict and intolerance. Charles and Archbishop Laud tried to impose their form of worship on all, angering the Puritans who sought a simpler faith. Many feared a return to Roman Catholicism. Religious grievance thus joined the political and financial ones. Faith divided the king from a large part of his people.

The extravagance of the royal court. The king's court was costly and extravagant, and its spending deepened the crown's endless need for money. This waste discredited the monarchy in the eyes of the thrifty middle class. Royal extravagance thus added to the mounting discontent. The court's excess helped to bring on the crisis.

The rise of the middle class. The growth of trade had created a wealthy middle class of merchants and gentry who dominated Parliament and resented royal absolutism. They sought a government that respected their rights and their interests. This rising class led the opposition to the king. The bourgeoisie were the backbone of the revolution.

The influence of new political ideas. The growing belief that government rested on the consent of the governed, later expressed by thinkers such as John Locke, challenged the divine right of kings. Such ideas gave the opposition a principled cause beyond mere grievance. They undermined the old monarchy in men's minds. New ideas thus prepared the way for revolution.

The determined leadership of Parliament. The leaders of Parliament, and above all Oliver Cromwell, were resolved to resist the king and to defend Parliament's rights. Their determination turned discontent into armed resistance. Cromwell's New Model Army defeated the king in the field. Resolute leadership made the revolution possible.

The English Revolution of 1640 to 1649 therefore arose from the divine-right claims and absolutism of the Stuart kings, the struggle between crown and Parliament, unlawful taxation, religious conflict, royal

extravagance, the rise of the middle class, new political ideas, and the determined leadership of Parliament and Cromwell. These together plunged England into civil war and brought the king to the scaffold.

Question 5

It ended with the unthinkable: a king tried by his own subjects and beheaded before the very palace he had ruled from.

Describe the course of the English Civil War and the Puritan Revolution.

Model Answer

The English Revolution took the form of a civil war between King Charles I and Parliament, followed by the rule of Oliver Cromwell. Its course ran from the outbreak of war to the execution of the king and the establishment of a republic. The course of the English Civil War and the Puritan Revolution may be described as follows.

The breakdown between king and Parliament. After eleven years of personal rule, Charles I was forced by his lack of money to recall Parliament in 1640. Parliament, long resentful, pressed its demands and refused to submit to the king. Neither side would yield, and the quarrel moved steadily towards war. The breakdown of trust made armed conflict all but inevitable.

The outbreak of civil war in 1642. In 1642 the quarrel turned to open war between the supporters of the king, the Royalists or Cavaliers, and the supporters of Parliament, the Roundheads. England was divided, region against region and family against family. The Civil War had begun in earnest. The nation had taken up arms against itself.

The rise of Oliver Cromwell. Among the leaders of Parliament rose Oliver Cromwell, a gifted general and devout Puritan. He organised the New Model Army into a disciplined and formidable fighting force. His leadership turned the war decisively in Parliament's favour. Cromwell became the driving force of the whole revolution.

The defeat of the king. The New Model Army defeated the Royalist forces in a series of hard-fought battles. By 1646 the king was beaten, and he was later taken prisoner by his enemies. The military power of the monarchy was broken. Parliament and its army had triumphed on the field. The king was now a captive in the hands of the very Parliament he had tried to rule without.

The trial and execution of Charles I. Refusing all compromise, the king was put on trial by his opponents for treason against his people. He was condemned and publicly executed on 30 January 1649. For the first time in history a reigning king was tried and beheaded by his own subjects. This was the most dramatic act of the whole revolution.

The establishment of the Commonwealth. With the king dead, the monarchy and the House of Lords were abolished, and England was declared a republic, the Commonwealth. Power passed to Parliament and to the army. England was, for the first time, governed without a king. A republic had replaced the ancient monarchy.

The rule of Cromwell as Lord Protector. Cromwell came to rule as Lord Protector from 1653 until his death in 1658, governing with the support of the army. His rule brought order but also amounted, in effect, to a military dictatorship. He allowed a broad religious toleration for the Protestant sects. Cromwell was the undisputed master of England in these years.

The Restoration of the monarchy. After Cromwell's death the republic could not survive, and in 1660 the monarchy was restored under Charles II. Yet the revolution had shown that a king could be resisted and even removed. The old absolutism could not simply return unchanged. The way was thus prepared for the further changes of 1688.

The English Civil War and the Puritan Revolution therefore ran from the breakdown between king and Parliament and the outbreak of war in 1642, through the rise of Cromwell and the defeat and execution of Charles I in 1649, to the Commonwealth and the rule of Cromwell as Lord Protector, and finally to the

Restoration of 1660. Though the monarchy returned, the revolution had forever shaken the absolute power of the English crown.

Question 6

The axe that fell on Charles I severed more than a head: it cut the root of the belief that a king could rule exactly as he pleased.

Examine the effects of the English Revolution.

Model Answer

The English Revolution of the seventeenth century had profound and lasting effects on the government and society of England, and beyond. It broke the absolute power of the monarchy and advanced the cause of representative government. The effects of the English Revolution may be examined as follows.

It broke the absolutism of the monarchy. The revolution destroyed the claim of the Stuart kings to rule absolutely and by divine right. The execution of Charles I showed that a king could be called to account by his own people. After the revolution no English monarch could safely claim unchecked power. Absolutism had been dealt a mortal blow.

It strengthened the power of Parliament. The revolution greatly increased the power of Parliament against the crown. Parliament had defeated and executed a king and had ruled the country in his place. Henceforth the crown had to reckon with Parliament as a real and permanent power. The way was opened to parliamentary government.

It advanced the idea of government by consent. The revolution advanced the belief that government rested on the consent of the governed and must respect their rights. The people, through Parliament, had asserted their authority over the king. This idea would shape all later constitutional development. Government by consent had gained lasting ground.

It brought the middle class to power. The revolution raised the middle class, the merchants, gentry and men of property, to a leading place in the state. Their interests and their Parliament now counted for a great deal. The old feudal aristocracy lost ground to the rising bourgeoisie. Power had shifted towards the middle class.

It established a period of republican rule. For a time England was governed as a republic, the Commonwealth, without king or House of Lords. Though the monarchy was later restored, England had shown that it could be governed without a king. The experience left a lasting mark on political thought. Republican ideas had been put into actual practice.

It advanced religious toleration. Under Cromwell a broader religious toleration was allowed than before, at least for the Protestant sects. The revolution weakened the power of a single state church to compel all men to one form of worship. Freedom of worship gained ground. Religious liberty had been advanced.

It inspired later revolutions. The English Revolution, and the ideas it expressed, inspired later revolutions, above all the French Revolution of 1789 and the risings of 1848. It showed that kings could be resisted and their power limited. Its example spread across Europe. England had lit a beacon for others to follow.

It prepared the way for the Glorious Revolution. Though the monarchy was restored in 1660, the revolution had permanently weakened royal absolutism. When James II again tried to rule despotically, he was overthrown in 1688. The Glorious Revolution completed what the earlier revolution had begun. The two together secured constitutional government in England.

The English Revolution therefore broke the absolutism of the monarchy, strengthened Parliament, advanced the idea of government by consent, raised the middle class, established a period of republican rule, advanced religious toleration, inspired later revolutions, and prepared the way for the Glorious Revolution. Together these effects set England on the road to modern constitutional government.

Question 7

In 1688 England changed its king without a battle, and in doing so made Parliament, not the crown, the true master of the realm.

Explain the causes of the Glorious Revolution of 1688.

Model Answer

The Glorious Revolution of 1688 was the almost bloodless overthrow of King James II and his replacement by William of Orange and Mary. It completed the work of the earlier revolution in limiting the crown. The causes of the Glorious Revolution may be explained as follows.

The attempt of James II to restore absolute rule. James II sought to rule as an absolute monarch, ignoring both Parliament and the law. His high-handed acts revived the very fear of royal despotism that the earlier revolution had fought. His absolutism deeply alarmed the nation. The threat to liberty was the deepest cause of his overthrow.

His Roman Catholicism and religious policy. James II was a Roman Catholic in a strongly Protestant land, and he tried to promote Catholics and to favour their faith. He suspended the laws against Catholics and dismissed those who opposed him. This raised deep fears of a coming Catholic tyranny. Religion was a central cause of the revolution.

The birth of a Catholic heir. In 1688 a son was born to James, threatening a lasting line of Catholic kings. Until then men had hoped that his Protestant daughter Mary would succeed him. The birth of a Catholic heir turned discontent into decisive action. It made the removal of James seem suddenly urgent.

The dismissal of Parliament and officials. James dismissed Parliament and removed judges and officials who would not do his will. He tried to pack the offices of state with his own supporters. This attack on Parliament and the law angered the whole political nation. His disregard for constitutional government provoked open resistance.

The alienation of the ruling classes. By his acts James alienated almost every class: the Anglican Church, the Tories, the Whigs and the gentry alike. Even his natural supporters turned against him. This broad alienation left him almost without friends, for a king abandoned by every party had little hope of keeping his throne. The whole political nation came to oppose him.

The invitation to William of Orange. Leading Englishmen invited William of Orange, the Protestant husband of Mary, to come to England to defend their liberties and their religion. William landed with an army in November 1688. His coming gave the opposition both a leader and a force. The invitation set the revolution firmly in motion.

The flight of James II. Deserted by his army and his people, James II lost his nerve and fled to France. His flight left the throne vacant without the need for a battle. The revolution was thus almost entirely bloodless. By fleeing rather than fighting, he made the change of ruler seem lawful and complete. James's collapse handed victory to his opponents.

The offer of the crown on conditions. Parliament offered the crown to William and Mary, but only on condition that they accept limits on their power set out in the Bill of Rights. They agreed, and were crowned in 1689. The crown was thus given by Parliament, and on terms. This transformed the very basis of royal authority.

The Glorious Revolution of 1688 was therefore caused by the attempt of James II to restore absolute and Catholic rule, the birth of a Catholic heir, his dismissal of Parliament and alienation of all classes, the invitation to William of Orange, and the flight of James. Its outcome, the offer of the crown on the conditions of the Bill of Rights, made Parliament the master of the monarchy.

Question 8

The Bill of Rights of 1689 did what no battle had: it bound the crown in writing and made the law, not the king, supreme.

Examine the significance of the Glorious Revolution and the Bill of Rights of 1689.

Model Answer

The Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the Bill of Rights that followed in 1689 were a turning-point in the history of government. They established the supremacy of Parliament and the rule of law over the crown. Their significance may be examined as follows.

It established the supremacy of Parliament. The revolution made Parliament, not the crown, the supreme power in the state. The king now reigned by the will of Parliament, which had given him the throne. Never again could an English king rule without Parliament. Parliamentary supremacy was the great result of the revolution.

The Bill of Rights limited the crown. The Bill of Rights of 1689 set clear limits on the power of the monarch. The king could not suspend laws, levy taxes or keep a standing army without the consent of Parliament. The crown was now bound by written law, for what the king might and might not do was, for the first time, set down in black and white. Royal power had been permanently limited.

It secured the rights of Parliament. The Bill of Rights guaranteed the rights of Parliament: frequent parliaments, free elections, and freedom of speech in debate. These protected Parliament from all royal interference. Its independence was assured for the future. Parliament became a secure and permanent power in the state.

It protected the rights of subjects. The Bill of Rights guaranteed certain rights to the people, such as the right to petition the king, trial by jury, and freedom from cruel punishment and arbitrary arrest. These protected the subject against the power of the state. Individual liberties were placed under the shield of law. The citizen gained lasting protections.

It established constitutional monarchy. The revolution replaced the absolute monarchy with a constitutional one, in which the king ruled according to law and together with Parliament. The crown remained, but its power was strictly limited and defined. England became a constitutional state. This provided a model for later ages.

It advanced the rule of law. After the revolution, the king and the government were bound by law like everyone else. No one, not even the monarch, stood above the law. An independent judiciary upheld this great principle. Henceforth power in England was to be exercised through law, not above it. The rule of law became a foundation of English government.

It settled the succession on Protestant terms. The revolution and the later Act of Settlement of 1701 secured the throne for Protestants and excluded Catholics from it. This ended the long religious struggle over the crown. The succession was now fixed by Parliament. Religious peace and political stability followed.

It influenced government far beyond England. The principles of the Glorious Revolution and the Bill of Rights influenced constitutional development across the world. They inspired the American Bill of Rights and later declarations of rights. England's settlement became a model of limited government. Its influence was worldwide and lasting.

The Glorious Revolution and the Bill of Rights of 1689 were therefore of great significance, establishing the supremacy of Parliament, limiting the crown, securing the rights of Parliament and of subjects, creating a constitutional monarchy, advancing the rule of law, and settling the succession. Their principles of limited and lawful government influenced the whole later development of modern administrative systems.

Question 9

England gave the modern world its first great lesson in how to chain a government: with a parliament, a bill of rights, and the rule of law.

Assess the contribution of the English Revolution to the development of modern administrative systems.

Model Answer

The English Revolution of the seventeenth century, in both its phases, made a lasting contribution to the development of modern government. It replaced absolute monarchy with a limited, constitutional and parliamentary system. Its contribution to modern administrative systems may be assessed as follows.

It established constitutional monarchy. The revolution replaced the absolute monarchy with a constitutional one, in which the king ruled according to law and with Parliament. This became a lasting model of limited government. The crown was preserved, but firmly bound by the constitution. Constitutional monarchy was England's gift to modern government.

It made Parliament supreme. The revolution established the supremacy of Parliament over the crown, making the elected assembly the true centre of power. Government came to rest on the representatives of the people. This was the foundation of parliamentary democracy. Parliamentary government spread from England to much of the world.

It advanced the rule of law. The revolution established that the king and the government were bound by law like all others. No one stood above the law, and an independent judiciary upheld it. This principle of the rule of law became central to modern administration. The idea that even the highest power must obey the law became a cornerstone of the modern state. Law, not the ruler's will, became supreme.

It developed cabinet government. Out of the need for ministers responsible to Parliament grew the cabinet, a body of ministers who advised the crown and answered to Parliament. This became the executive of modern British government. Cabinet government was a lasting institutional legacy. It shaped the executive of many later states.

It established the separation of powers. The revolution advanced the separation of the legislative, executive and judicial powers, and secured the independence of the judges. This division guarded against the concentration of power and against tyranny. It became a principle of modern constitutions. England helped to teach the world the separation of powers.

It protected individual rights. Through the Bill of Rights, the revolution enshrined certain rights of the subject against the power of the state. Freedom from arbitrary arrest, trial by jury and freedom of speech in Parliament were all secured. The protection of rights became a mark of modern government. The citizen gained lasting liberties.

It fostered a more professional administration. The revolution and the period of Cromwell's rule advanced the development of a more organised administration, such as the council of state. Government came to be carried on by defined institutions rather than by the royal household. This prepared the way for the modern civil service. Administration grew steadily more professional.

It inspired constitutional government abroad. The English model of limited, parliamentary and constitutional government inspired reformers and revolutionaries across the world. It influenced the American and French revolutions and the constitutions of many nations. England's example helped to shape the modern state. Its contribution reached far beyond its own shores.

The English Revolution therefore contributed greatly to modern administrative systems, establishing constitutional monarchy and the supremacy of Parliament, advancing the rule of law, developing cabinet government and the separation of powers, protecting individual rights, and fostering a more professional administration. Its model of limited, lawful and representative government became a foundation of the modern political world.

The American Revolution

Question 10

"No taxation without representation," three words that turned loyal colonists into rebels and thirteen colonies into a nation.

Examine the causes of the American Revolution of 1776.

Model Answer

The American Revolution, by which the thirteen British colonies in North America won their independence, arose from a growing conflict between the colonies and the mother country. Several causes combined to bring it about. The causes of the American Revolution may be examined as follows.

Taxation without representation. The British government taxed the colonies through measures such as the Stamp Act and the duties on tea, without giving them any representation in Parliament. The colonists insisted that they could not justly be taxed by a body in which they had no voice. "No taxation without representation" became their rallying cry. This grievance was the chief cause of the revolution.

Resentment of British commercial restrictions. Britain restricted the trade and manufactures of the colonies for the benefit of the mother country. The Navigation Acts and other laws forced the colonies to trade largely on British terms. This hampered their growing economy and bred deep resentment. Commercial oppression turned the colonists against British rule.

The desire for self-government. The colonies had long governed much of their own affairs through their own elected assemblies. They resented the tightening control of the British government over their internal matters. The demand to govern themselves grew ever stronger. The wish for self-government drove them towards independence.

The influence of Enlightenment ideas. The colonists were deeply influenced by the ideas of the Enlightenment, above all the teaching of John Locke on natural rights and government by consent. These ideas taught that a government which oppressed its people could rightly be resisted. They gave the revolution its guiding principles. Enlightenment thought armed the colonists with a cause.

The example of the English Revolution. The colonists inherited the English tradition of resistance to royal tyranny and the rights won in the English Revolution. They claimed the ancient liberties of Englishmen and the protection of the law. The example of 1688 encouraged them to resist oppression. English history itself inspired their revolt.

British coercion and political blunders. The British government answered colonial protest with force and punishment, such as the closing of Boston harbour and the quartering of troops. These harsh measures, seen as tyranny, united the colonies against Britain. Coercion turned discontent into open rebellion. British blunders drove the colonies to arms.

The growth of an American identity. Over generations the colonists had come to see themselves as a distinct people, no longer simply Englishmen living abroad. This growing sense of a common American identity fostered the desire for nationhood. Unity among the thirteen colonies made revolution possible. A new nation was being born in men's minds.

The outbreak of armed conflict. Rising tension turned to war when fighting broke out between colonists and British troops in 1775. In 1776 the colonies proclaimed their independence in the famous Declaration of Independence. Armed struggle turned protest into revolution. War made the break with Britain final and complete.

The American Revolution therefore arose from taxation without representation, British commercial restrictions, the desire for self-government, the influence of Enlightenment ideas, the example of the English Revolution, British coercion, the growth of an American identity, and finally the outbreak of war. Together these causes turned loyal colonists into a free and independent nation.

Question 11

The Americans did something new under the sun: they wrote down, in a single document, the whole plan of a government and the rights it could not touch.

Assess the contribution of the American Revolution to modern administrative and constitutional systems.

Model Answer

The American Revolution not only won independence but created a new kind of state, founded on a written constitution and republican principles. Its contribution to modern administrative and constitutional systems was profound. This contribution may be assessed as follows.

It created a republic. The American Revolution founded a republic, a state without a king, governed by the elected representatives of the people. This showed that even a large nation could govern itself without a monarch. The republic became a model for later states. The revolution greatly advanced the cause of republican government.

It produced a written constitution. The Americans set out the whole plan of their government in a single written constitution, adopted in 1787. This defined the powers of government and the rights of citizens in clear and fixed terms. The written constitution became a model for the modern world. It gave government a firm and public foundation.

It established the sovereignty of the people. The American constitution declared that authority came from the people themselves, in whose name it was framed. Government rested on the consent of the governed, not on the right of a king. This principle of popular sovereignty was a landmark in history. The people became the acknowledged source of authority.

It applied the separation of powers. The constitution divided the powers of government among the legislative, executive and judicial branches, following the teaching of Montesquieu. Each branch checked the others, guarding against tyranny. This careful system of checks and balances was deliberately designed. The separation of powers was fully realised in the new state.

It created a federal system. The Americans devised a federal system, dividing power between the central government and the individual states. This allowed a large and varied nation to be governed as one while preserving local self-government. Federalism became a model for other large states. It was a real innovation in the art of government.

It protected individual rights. The Bill of Rights, added to the constitution in 1791, guaranteed the freedoms of the citizen, such as freedom of speech, religion and the press. These rights were placed beyond the ordinary reach of government. The protection of rights became a mark of modern constitutions. The citizen's liberties were firmly secured in law.

It inspired other revolutions. The American Revolution and its Declaration of Independence inspired reformers and revolutionaries across the world, above all in France. Its example showed that colonial and monarchical rule could be overthrown. It advanced the cause of liberty everywhere. The revolution's influence spread far beyond America.

It advanced the idea of constitutional government. By founding government on a written constitution, popular sovereignty and protected rights, the revolution advanced the whole idea of constitutional government. It showed how a modern state could be deliberately and rationally designed. Its example shaped constitutions across the world. Constitutionalism owed much to the American model.

The American Revolution therefore made a great contribution to modern administrative and constitutional systems, creating a republic founded on a written constitution and the sovereignty of the people, applying the separation of powers and federalism, protecting individual rights, and inspiring other revolutions. Its deliberate design of a modern constitutional government became a model for the world.

The French Revolution

Question 12

France in 1789 was a kingdom of contradictions: brilliant in thought yet bankrupt, rich in culture yet bound by feudal privilege, and the pressure had nowhere to go but explosion.

Explain the causes of the French Revolution of 1789.

Model Answer

The French Revolution of 1789, one of the greatest upheavals in history, overthrew the absolute monarchy and the feudal order of France. It arose from deep political, social and economic grievances. The causes of the French Revolution may be explained as follows.

The absolutism of the monarchy. The kings of France ruled as absolute monarchs, by divine right, without any parliament to check them. The people had no share in government and no protection against royal despotism. This unchecked power bred deep and lasting resentment. The demand to limit the crown was a chief cause of the revolution.

The injustice of the feudal social order. French society was divided into three estates: the clergy, the nobility, and the common people, or Third Estate. The first two enjoyed great privileges and paid little tax, while the Third Estate bore the burdens. This unjust inequality angered the common people. The feudal order was a fundamental grievance.

The heavy burden of taxation. The common people were crushed by heavy taxes, while the privileged classes were largely exempt. The peasants paid taxes to the king, dues to their lords and tithes to the Church. This burden fell on those least able to bear it, and that the rich paid least while the poor paid most made the injustice all the harder to endure. Unjust taxation was a powerful cause of revolt.

The financial crisis of the state. By 1789 the French government was bankrupt, ruined by extravagance and by costly wars. The court of Versailles, and above all the queen Marie Antoinette, was notorious for its waste. The king was at last forced to summon the Estates-General to find money. The financial crisis brought the revolution to a head.

The costly wars of the monarchy. France had exhausted itself in expensive wars, including its recent aid to the American Revolution. These wars drained the treasury and deepened the mounting debt. The cost of war thus helped to bankrupt the state, for France had helped to free America only to bankrupt herself in the doing of it. War abroad brought crisis at home.

The influence of the Enlightenment philosophers. The thinkers of the Enlightenment, such as Voltaire, Montesquieu and Rousseau, attacked absolutism and privilege and taught liberty, equality and the sovereignty of the people. Their ideas spread widely among the educated classes. They gave the revolution its vision and its slogans. Enlightenment thought was a great cause of the revolution.

The rise and ambition of the middle class. The bourgeoisie, grown wealthy through trade, bitterly resented their exclusion from power and privilege by the nobility. They demanded a share in government worthy of their wealth and ability. This rising class provided the leadership of the revolution. The ambition of the middle class was a driving force.

The example of the American and English revolutions. The French were inspired by the English Revolution and, more recently, by the American Revolution in which France itself had shared. These showed that absolute and colonial rule could be overthrown. Their example encouraged the French to act. Foreign revolutions helped to light the way.

The immediate crisis of famine and hardship. In the years before 1789, bad harvests brought famine and soaring bread prices, and the people were hungry and desperate. This immediate misery turned long-standing grievance into open revolt. Hunger drove the people into the streets. Famine was the spark that lit the fire.

The French Revolution of 1789 therefore arose from the absolutism of the monarchy, the injustice of the feudal order, heavy taxation, the bankruptcy of the state, costly wars, the ideas of the Enlightenment, the ambition of the middle class, the example of earlier revolutions, and the immediate crisis of famine. Together these causes brought down the old regime and opened one of the greatest revolutions in history.

Question 13

It began with a demand for bread and taxes and ended with an emperor's crown; the French Revolution devoured its own children along the way.

Describe the course and phases of the French Revolution.

Model Answer

The French Revolution passed through several dramatic phases, from the meeting of the Estates-General to the rise of Napoleon. Its course ran from moderate reform through radical terror to military rule. The course and phases of the French Revolution may be described as follows.

The meeting of the Estates-General in 1789. Bankrupt and desperate, King Louis XVI summoned the Estates-General, the old assembly of the three estates, in May 1789. The Third Estate demanded a greater voice and, when refused, declared itself a National Assembly. This bold defiance was the first act of the revolution. The old order had begun to crack.

The storming of the Bastille. On 14 July 1789 the people of Paris stormed the Bastille, the royal fortress and prison, a hated symbol of tyranny. This dramatic act showed the power of the people and gave the revolution its great symbol. The fall of the Bastille echoed across all France. The revolution had seized the initiative.

The abolition of feudalism and the Declaration of Rights. The National Assembly abolished feudal privileges and dues, ending the feudal order in France. In August 1789 it issued the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, proclaiming liberty and equality. These were the great constructive acts of the early revolution. A new order was being built upon the ruins of the old.

The fall of the monarchy and the Republic. As the king resisted and sought foreign help, the revolution grew more radical. In 1792 the monarchy was overthrown and France was declared a republic. The king, Louis XVI, was tried and executed in January 1793. The revolution had swept the monarchy away.

The Reign of Terror. From 1793 to 1794 the radical Jacobins, led by Robespierre, ruled through the Reign of Terror. Thousands suspected of opposing the revolution were sent to the guillotine. The Terror sought to defend the revolution but became a tyranny of its own. The revolution now began to devour its own.

The fall of Robespierre. In 1794 Robespierre himself was overthrown and executed, and the Terror came to an end. The revolution turned away from its most radical and violent phase. A reaction set in against the extremists, and the man who had sent so many to the guillotine at last mounted its steps himself. The revolution had begun to consume its own leaders.

The rule of the Directory. From 1795 France was governed by the Directory, a body of five men, which sought to steer a middle course. But it was weak, corrupt and unpopular, and could not give France stable government. Disorder and discontent continued, and into this weakness and confusion a young and ambitious general would soon step. The revolution had, in a sense, lost its way.

The rise of Napoleon. In 1799 the general Napoleon Bonaparte seized power, ending the Directory and, in time, the revolution itself. He established first the Consulate and then, in 1804, the Empire, crowning himself emperor. Napoleon preserved many of the revolution's reforms while ending its liberty. The revolution had ended in military rule.

The French Revolution therefore ran from the meeting of the Estates-General and the storming of the Bastille in 1789, through the abolition of feudalism, the fall of the monarchy and the Reign of Terror, to the weak rule of the Directory and finally the seizure of power by Napoleon in 1799. In these ten years France passed from absolute monarchy through republic and terror to empire.

Question 14

The philosophers never manned a barricade, yet their pens did more to topple the French throne than any army.

Examine the role of the Enlightenment philosophers in the French Revolution.

Model Answer

The French Revolution was, above all, a revolution of ideas, and those ideas came largely from the philosophers of the Enlightenment. Their teaching prepared the way for the overthrow of the old regime. The role of the Enlightenment philosophers may be examined as follows.

They attacked absolutism and divine right. The philosophers challenged the claim of kings to rule absolutely and by divine right. They argued that government existed for the people, not the people for the king. This undermined the very foundation of the monarchy. Their attack weakened the old order in men's minds.

Montesquieu taught the separation of powers. Montesquieu, in his Spirit of the Laws, argued that the powers of government should be divided among separate branches to guard against tyranny. This idea of the separation of powers deeply influenced the revolution. It shaped the constitutions that followed. Montesquieu gave the revolution a plan of free government.

Rousseau taught popular sovereignty. Rousseau, in his Social Contract, taught that sovereignty belonged to the people and that government rested on their general will. This gave the revolutionaries the principle that the people, not the king, were supreme. Rousseau's ideas inspired the most radical of the revolutionaries. Popular sovereignty became a rallying cry.

Voltaire attacked injustice and intolerance. Voltaire attacked the injustice, superstition and religious intolerance of the old regime with his sharp and famous pen. He championed freedom of thought and of religion. His writings discredited both the Church and the aristocracy. Voltaire spread the spirit of criticism and reform.

They spread the ideals of liberty and equality. The philosophers together spread the ideals of liberty, equality and the rights of man throughout educated France. These ideals became the slogans of the revolution, summed up as liberty, equality and fraternity. They gave the revolution its guiding vision. The ideals of the Enlightenment became the aims of the revolution.

They inspired the Declaration of the Rights of Man. The great Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen of 1789 drew directly on the ideas of the philosophers. It proclaimed the natural rights of men and the sovereignty of the nation. The philosophers' teaching was thus written into the revolution's charter. Their ideas had become law.

They provided the leaders with their principles. The leaders of the revolution had been educated in the ideas of the Enlightenment and used them to justify their acts. The philosophers gave them both a language and a cause. Their writings armed the revolutionaries with principles. Ideas guided the hands of the revolution.

Yet their ideas were sometimes distorted. In the hands of the radicals, the ideas of the philosophers were sometimes carried to extremes, as when Rousseau's general will was used to justify the Terror. The philosophers had not intended such violence. Their ideas could be turned to cruel ends. The revolution both fulfilled and betrayed their teaching.

The Enlightenment philosophers therefore played a central role in the French Revolution, attacking absolutism and injustice, teaching the separation of powers and popular sovereignty, and spreading the ideals of liberty and equality that became the revolution's aims. Their ideas inspired the Declaration of the Rights of Man and guided the revolution, even where they were carried to extremes their authors never intended.

Question 15

The French Revolution did not stay in France: its cry of liberty, equality and fraternity marched across Europe on the bayonets of its armies.

Examine the effects of the French Revolution.

Model Answer

The French Revolution had effects far beyond France, transforming the government and society not only of that country but of Europe and the world. It destroyed the old order and spread new ideas of liberty and nationhood. The effects of the French Revolution may be examined as follows.

It destroyed the absolute monarchy. The revolution overthrew the absolute monarchy of France and, for a time, abolished the monarchy altogether. It executed the king and established a republic in his place. The divine-right monarchy was destroyed, and the oldest and greatest monarchy of Europe had fallen to its own people. France was set upon a wholly new political path.

It abolished feudalism. The revolution swept away the feudal order, ending the privileges of the nobility and clergy and the dues of the peasants. Equality before the law replaced the old feudal privilege. The ancient social order was destroyed, for in a single night of August 1789 the assembly swept away what centuries had built. France was freed from the last remnants of feudalism.

It proclaimed liberty, equality and rights. The revolution proclaimed the rights of man and the equality of all citizens before the law. The Declaration of the Rights of Man became a charter of liberty for the age. These ideals spread across the world, and its ringing words would be quoted by reformers and rebels for centuries to come. The revolution gave humanity a new vision of freedom.

It spread nationalism. The revolution awakened a powerful sense of nationhood, as the French people rallied to defend their revolution and their nation. This spirit of nationalism spread rapidly across Europe. It would inspire the unification of nations and the overthrow of empires. Nationalism was among the revolution's greatest legacies.

It reshaped the government of France. The revolution and Napoleon reshaped French government, creating a centralised, uniform and efficient administration. Departments, prefects and a codified law replaced the old patchwork. Modern French administration was born of the revolution. Government was made rational and uniform.

It spread revolutionary ideas across Europe. The armies of revolutionary and Napoleonic France carried the ideas of liberty, equality and reform across Europe. Feudalism and privilege were attacked wherever they marched. The revolution's ideas outlived its armies. Europe was permanently changed by the French example.

It provoked reaction and long war. The revolution alarmed the kings of Europe, who made war on France to crush it. These wars lasted for over twenty years and reshaped the whole continent. The revolution thus brought both liberty and long conflict, and the armies of the kings and of the revolution would fight across Europe for a generation. It divided Europe between reform and reaction.

It inspired later revolutions. The French Revolution inspired the revolutions of 1830 and 1848 and countless later struggles for liberty. Its ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity became the watchwords of reformers everywhere. Its example never died. The revolution helped to shape the whole modern age.

The French Revolution therefore destroyed the absolute monarchy and feudalism, proclaimed liberty, equality and the rights of man, spread nationalism, reshaped the government of France, carried revolutionary ideas across Europe, provoked reaction and long war, and inspired later revolutions. Few events in history have done more to shape the modern political world.

Question 16

Napoleon boasted that his true glory was not his forty battles but his Code, the law that governs France to this day.

Examine the administrative reforms of the French Revolution and Napoleon.

Model Answer

The French Revolution, and Napoleon after it, transformed the government of France, replacing the confused and privileged system of the old regime with a centralised, uniform and efficient administration.

These reforms shaped modern government far beyond France. The administrative reforms of the Revolution and Napoleon may be examined as follows.

It centralised the government. The revolution and Napoleon created a strongly centralised government, in which power flowed from Paris to every part of France. This replaced the confused and divided authority of the old regime. Central control gave the state a new strength and efficiency. Centralisation became the hallmark of French administration.

It divided France into departments. The revolution divided France into some eighty-three departments of roughly equal size, replacing the old and unequal provinces. Each was administered in the same uniform way. This gave France a rational and orderly system of local government. The department became the basic unit of French administration.

It appointed prefects to govern the departments. Napoleon placed each department under a prefect, an official appointed by and answerable to the central government. The prefect carried the authority of Paris directly into the locality. This gave the state firm control over the whole country. The prefect became the key agent of centralised rule.

It codified the law in the Napoleonic Code. Napoleon gathered the laws of France into a single clear and uniform code, the Napoleonic Code of 1804. This established equality before the law, the security of property and legal certainty. It replaced the old tangle of laws and customs. The Code became a model for legal systems across the world.

It abolished feudal privilege. The revolution abolished the privileges of the nobility and clergy and the dues of feudalism. All citizens became equal before the law and before the tax-collector. This swept away the deep injustice of the old order, so that no longer would a man's rights and burdens be fixed by the rank of his birth. Equality replaced privilege in the new administration.

It opened careers to talent. The revolution and Napoleon opened offices and honours to men of ability, whatever their birth. Advancement came to depend on merit rather than on noble blood. This gave the state abler servants and the people new hope, and it was said that every soldier now carried a marshal's baton in his knapsack. Careers open to talent was a great and popular reform.

It created a professional bureaucracy. The new administration was carried on by trained, salaried officials organised in a clear hierarchy. This professional bureaucracy replaced the amateur and venal office-holders of the old regime. Government became efficient and orderly. A modern civil service was born in France.

It reformed finance and education. Napoleon reformed the finances of the state, establishing sound taxation and the Bank of France, and built a national system of education. These gave the state secure revenue and trained servants. Administration was placed on a firm and lasting footing. The modern French state took shape.

The administrative reforms of the French Revolution and Napoleon therefore centralised the government, divided France into departments under prefects, codified the law in the Napoleonic Code, abolished feudal privilege, opened careers to talent, created a professional bureaucracy, and reformed finance and education. Together they built the modern French state and set a pattern of efficient, centralised administration for the world.

Question 17

If England taught the world to limit the king, France taught it to build the modern state: uniform, centralised, and answerable to the nation.

Assess the contribution of the French Revolution to modern administrative systems.

Model Answer

The French Revolution made one of the greatest contributions in history to the development of modern government. It destroyed the old order and built a new administrative system founded on equality, law and the nation. Its contribution to modern administrative systems may be assessed as follows.

It established the sovereignty of the nation. The revolution proclaimed that sovereignty belonged to the nation and its citizens, not to the king. Government came to rest on the will of the people rather than on divine right. This principle of national sovereignty became a foundation of the modern state. The nation replaced the king as the source of authority.

It proclaimed equality before the law. The revolution abolished feudal privilege and declared all citizens equal before the law. The subject became a citizen with equal rights and duties. This equality became a guiding principle of modern government. The law came to treat all men alike, whatever their birth.

It created a centralised administration. The revolution and Napoleon built a centralised, uniform administration reaching from Paris to every commune. This became a model of the strong and efficient modern state. Many nations copied the French system of centralised government. Centralisation was a great French contribution.

It gave the world the department and prefect. The division of the country into uniform departments under appointed prefects became a model of modern local administration. It gave central government firm control of the whole territory. Many states later adopted this same system. Uniform local administration owed much to France.

It produced the codification of law. The Napoleonic Code gathered the law into a single clear and uniform system, based on equality and legal certainty. This model of codified law spread across Europe, Latin America and beyond. Modern legal systems owe much to it. Codification was among France's greatest gifts to government.

It advanced the professional civil service. The revolution created a bureaucracy of trained, salaried officials chosen for their ability and open to talent. This professional civil service became a feature of the modern state everywhere. Administration became both a career and a science. France helped to professionalise government.

It spread the ideals of rights and citizenship. The Declaration of the Rights of Man proclaimed the rights of the citizen and the equality of all before the law. These ideals became foundations of modern constitutions and declarations of rights. They spread across the whole world. The revolution advanced the rights of the citizen everywhere.

It fostered nationalism and the nation-state. The revolution awakened the modern idea of the nation and of the citizen's loyalty to it. This gave rise to the nation-state, the characteristic form of modern government. Nationalism reshaped the map of Europe and the world. The nation-state was a lasting legacy of the revolution.

The French Revolution therefore contributed profoundly to modern administrative systems, establishing the sovereignty of the nation and equality before the law, creating a centralised administration of departments and prefects, producing the codification of law, advancing the professional civil service, spreading the rights of the citizen, and fostering the nation-state. Together with the English model of limited government, it laid the foundations of the modern state.

The 1848 Revolutions

Question 18

In one year, 1848, thrones trembled from Paris to Vienna to Budapest, as if a single spark had set the whole of Europe alight.

Explain the causes of the 1848 Revolutions in Europe.

Model Answer

The revolutions of 1848 were a wave of uprisings that swept across Europe in a single year, shaking almost every throne on the continent. They arose from a combination of political, economic and national grievances. The causes of the 1848 Revolutions may be explained as follows.

The conservative order of the Congress of Vienna. After Napoleon's fall, the Congress of Vienna of 1814 to 1815 restored the old monarchies and suppressed liberal and national movements. This conservative order, led by Metternich of Austria, denied the peoples liberty and self-government. Resentment of this settlement was a deep cause of 1848. The peoples rose against the whole system of Vienna.

The demand for constitutional government. Across Europe the peoples demanded constitutions, parliaments and basic rights against the absolute monarchies. Where rulers stubbornly refused reform, discontent grew into open revolt. The desire for liberal, constitutional government was a central cause. The revolutions sought above all to limit the power of kings.

The influence of the French Revolution. The ideals of the French Revolution, liberty, equality and fraternity, still inspired the peoples of Europe. These ideas taught them to demand rights and self-government from their rulers. The French example continued to stir revolt across the continent. The revolution of 1789 lived on in 1848.

The rise of nationalism. Many peoples, such as the Italians, Germans and Hungarians, longed to be free of foreign rule and to form nations of their own. This growing nationalism drove them to revolt against the empires that held them down. The demand for national freedom was a powerful cause. Nationalism inflamed the whole of Europe.

The hardships of the Industrial Revolution. The Industrial Revolution had created a new working class that suffered low wages, poor conditions and unemployment. Economic hardship and the misery of the workers fed the general discontent. The new industrial poverty was a cause of revolt. The workers joined the middle class in revolution.

Economic crisis and famine. In the years just before 1848 Europe suffered bad harvests, famine and economic depression. Hunger and unemployment brought the people to desperation. This immediate crisis turned long-standing discontent into revolt, for empty stomachs did more to fill the streets than any pamphlet or speech. Economic misery was the spark of 1848.

The spread of new ideologies. New ideas, above all socialism, spread among the discontented, taught by thinkers such as Marx and Engels, whose Communist Manifesto appeared in 1848. These ideologies gave the workers a vision and a programme. Socialism added a new force to the revolutions. Ideology sharpened the demands of the people.

The weakness of the ruling regimes. Many of the ruling regimes were weak, unpopular and out of touch with their peoples. When the revolts broke out, they often collapsed with surprising speed, as Metternich's did. This weakness emboldened the revolutionaries. The very frailty of the old order invited revolt.

The revolutions of 1848 therefore arose from the conservative order of the Congress of Vienna, the demand for constitutional government, the influence of the French Revolution, the rise of nationalism, the hardships of the Industrial Revolution, economic crisis and famine, the spread of new ideologies such as socialism, and the weakness of the ruling regimes. Together these caused a wave of revolution to sweep across the whole of Europe.

Question 19

It began in Paris in February and, within weeks, the fever had leaped the Rhine and the Alps; even the mighty Metternich fell before it.

Examine the course and spread of the 1848 Revolutions in Europe.

Model Answer

The revolutions of 1848 began in France and spread with remarkable speed across much of Europe, affecting dozens of states in a single year. Though they shared common ideals, they took different forms in different lands. The course and spread of the 1848 Revolutions may be examined as follows.

The revolution began in France. The wave of revolution began in Paris in February 1848, when the people rose and overthrew King Louis Philippe. France was again declared a republic, the Second Republic. This French revolt was the spark that lit the rest of Europe. Paris once more led the way for the continent.

It spread rapidly across Europe. From France the revolution spread with great speed to Germany, Austria, Italy, Hungary and beyond. Within weeks, uprisings shook almost every capital on the continent. The revolutions seemed to spread like a single fire, for never before had revolution leaped so swiftly from one nation to the next. Europe was suddenly ablaze with revolt.

Metternich fell in Austria. In Austria the people of Vienna rose in March 1848, and the great conservative statesman Metternich, the very symbol of the old order, was forced to flee. His fall was a dramatic blow to the system of Vienna. The chief pillar of European reaction had toppled. The old order seemed to be collapsing.

Revolt swept the German states. In the German states the peoples rose to demand constitutions and national unity. A national parliament met at Frankfurt to seek to unite Germany under a liberal constitution. The German revolutions sought both liberty and nationhood. The dream of a united Germany was awakened.

Hungary rose against Austrian rule. In Hungary the patriot Lajos Kossuth led a revolt against Austrian domination and declared Hungarian independence. The Hungarians fought hard for national freedom and self-government. Their revolt was among the most determined of all. Nationalism drove the Hungarian rising.

Italy sought unity and freedom. In Italy the peoples rose against Austrian rule and against the many small states, seeking liberty and national unity. The revolts gave a great impulse to the movement for Italian unification. Italy joined the wave of national revolution. The cause of a united Italy was advanced.

The revolutions were largely crushed. Despite their early successes, most of the revolutions of 1848 were crushed within a year or two. The old rulers recovered their nerve and their armies and put down the revolts. Austria, with Russian help, defeated the Hungarians. The revolutions failed in their immediate aims.

Yet their effects endured. Though defeated, the revolutions left lasting effects behind them. They forced some reforms, abolished serfdom in places, and above all kept alive the ideals of liberty and nationhood. These would triumph later in the unification of Italy and Germany. The revolutions failed but did not die in vain.

The revolutions of 1848 therefore began in France, spread rapidly to Austria, Germany, Hungary and Italy, and toppled even Metternich, before being largely crushed by the recovering forces of reaction within a year or two. Yet they abolished serfdom in places, forced reforms, and kept alive the ideals of liberty and nationhood that would triumph in later years.

Question 20

The revolutions of 1848 were called a failure, yet they planted seeds that grew into constitutions, free peasants, and the nations of Italy and Germany.

Assess the contribution of the 1848 Revolutions to administrative and political change in Europe.

Model Answer

Although the revolutions of 1848 were largely crushed, they were not without lasting results. They advanced the causes of constitutional government, national unity and social reform. Their contribution to administrative and political change may be assessed as follows.

They advanced constitutional government. In several states the revolutions forced rulers to grant constitutions and to allow parliaments and basic rights. Even where these were later withdrawn, the demand for constitutional government had been greatly strengthened. The idea of limited, representative rule gained ground. Constitutionalism was advanced across Europe.

They weakened the conservative order of Vienna. The revolutions shattered the confidence of the conservative order established at the Congress of Vienna. The fall of Metternich showed that even the old system could be shaken. Reaction recovered, but its authority was never quite the same again. The Vienna settlement was fatally weakened.

They abolished serfdom in some states. In parts of central Europe, above all in the Austrian Empire, the revolutions brought the abolition of serfdom and feudal dues. The peasants were freed from their old feudal burdens. This was a great and lasting social reform. Feudalism was rolled back by the revolutions.

They spread liberal and democratic ideals. The revolutions spread the ideals of liberty, equality and representative government across the continent. Even in defeat, these ideals took deeper root among the peoples. They would inspire later reform and revolution. The revolutions advanced the democratic cause.

They advanced the cause of nationalism. The revolutions gave a great impulse to the national movements of Italy, Germany, Hungary and others. Though crushed for the time, these movements did not die. The dream of national unity was kept alive, for the desire of peoples to govern themselves as nations had been powerfully awakened. Nationalism emerged strengthened from 1848.

They prepared the unification of Italy and Germany. By awakening and strengthening national feeling, the revolutions prepared the way for the unification of Italy by 1870 and of Germany in 1871. These new nation-states grew from the seeds sown in 1848. The revolutions bore fruit in the great unifications. Modern Italy and Germany owed much to them.

They advanced civil and religious toleration. In some states the revolutions brought greater freedom of the press, of association and of religion. Old restrictions were loosened, at least for a time. These freedoms advanced the rights of the citizen, and even where reaction returned, men had tasted liberties they would not soon forget. Toleration gained ground amid the upheaval.

Yet their immediate gains were often reversed. Because the revolutions were crushed, many of their immediate gains, such as constitutions and parliaments, were withdrawn by the recovering monarchies. In the short term the old order was largely restored. The revolutions failed in their immediate aims. Their fruits would ripen only in later years.

The revolutions of 1848 therefore contributed to administrative and political change by advancing constitutional government, weakening the conservative order of Vienna, abolishing serfdom in places, spreading liberal and national ideals, and preparing the unification of Italy and Germany. Though their immediate gains were often reversed, they planted seeds of liberty and nationhood that would grow to transform Europe in the following decades.

The Russian Revolution

Question 21

Russia in 1917 was an empire of the Middle Ages ruled by a Tsar who thought himself chosen by God, and the twentieth century was about to catch up with it.

Explain the causes of the Russian Revolution of 1917.

Model Answer

The Russian Revolution of 1917 overthrew the ancient Tsarist autocracy and, in its second phase, brought the Bolsheviks to power and created the world's first socialist state. It arose from deep and long-standing grievances. The causes of the Russian Revolution may be explained as follows.

The autocracy of the Tsar. Russia was ruled by the Tsar as an absolute autocrat, without a real parliament or constitution. Nicholas II clung to this despotic power and resisted all genuine reform. The people had no voice and no protection against oppression. Resentment of the autocracy was a fundamental cause of the revolution.

The poverty and oppression of the peasants. The great mass of Russians were poor peasants, long oppressed and hungry for land. Though serfdom had been abolished in 1861, the peasants remained

burdened and discontented. Their hunger for land and justice was a deep grievance. The suffering of the peasantry drove them towards revolt.

The misery of the industrial workers. Russia's growing industry had created a working class that suffered low wages, long hours and dreadful conditions. Crowded together in the cities, the workers were ready for revolt. Their misery fed the revolutionary movement. The industrial workers became a powerful force for revolution.

The spread of revolutionary ideas. Revolutionary and socialist ideas, above all Marxism, spread among the discontented workers and intellectuals. These ideas gave the revolution a programme and a leadership. Parties such as the Bolsheviks organised the discontent into a movement. Ideology armed the Russian revolution.

The failure of the 1905 revolution. In 1905 a first revolution had shaken the Tsar, who granted a parliament, the Duma, but soon undermined it. The failure of real reform after 1905 deepened the people's anger. The unfulfilled promises of 1905 pointed towards a greater upheaval. Discontent had been building for years.

The disasters of the First World War. Russia's part in the First World War brought terrible defeats, huge losses and immense suffering. The war strained the economy to breaking-point and discredited the Tsar's government. The hardships of war turned discontent into revolution. The war was the immediate cause of the collapse.

Food shortages and economic collapse. The war brought food shortages, inflation and economic breakdown, and the people of the cities went hungry. In February 1917 bread riots in the capital turned into revolution. Hunger drove the people into the streets, and a demand for bread in the capital grew, within days, into the fall of an empire. Economic collapse brought down the Tsar.

The weakness and misrule of Nicholas II. Tsar Nicholas II was a weak and stubborn ruler, out of touch with his people and badly advised. His misrule, and the scandal of figures such as Rasputin, discredited the monarchy. The failings of the Tsar hastened the revolution. Weak leadership sealed the fate of the autocracy.

The Russian Revolution of 1917 therefore arose from the autocracy of the Tsar, the poverty of the peasants, the misery of the industrial workers, the spread of revolutionary ideas, the failure of the 1905 revolution, the disasters of the First World War, food shortages and economic collapse, and the weakness of Nicholas II. Together these brought down the ancient autocracy and opened the way to a wholly new order.

Question 22

The Bolsheviks promised peace, bread and land, and in their name built a state unlike any the world had seen: ruled by one party in the name of the workers.

Examine the course of the Russian Revolution and the administrative system it created.

Model Answer

The Russian Revolution of 1917 passed through two phases, the fall of the Tsar in February and the Bolshevik seizure of power in October, and it created an entirely new kind of state. Its course and the administrative system it created may be examined as follows.

The fall of the Tsar in February 1917. In February 1917 strikes and bread riots in the capital turned into revolution, and the army refused to fire on the people. The Tsar was forced to abdicate, ending three centuries of Romanov rule. The ancient autocracy had fallen at last. A great empire was suddenly without its emperor.

The Provisional Government. Power passed to a Provisional Government of liberals and moderates, which sought to govern until an assembly could be chosen. But it was weak, and above all it continued the deeply unpopular war. Its failure to give peace and land lost it support. The Provisional Government could not hold power.

The rise of the soviets. Alongside the Provisional Government arose the soviets, councils of workers and soldiers, which held the real loyalty of the masses. The country had, in effect, two rival authorities at once. The soviets became the base of Bolshevik power, for real authority lay less with the government than with the councils in the streets and the barracks. This dual power divided the revolution.

The Bolshevik seizure of power in October. In October 1917 the Bolsheviks, led by Lenin, seized power in the name of the soviets. They overthrew the Provisional Government and took control of the state. This was the decisive act of the whole revolution, and a small and disciplined party had seized control of the largest state on earth. The Bolsheviks had come to power.

The Bolsheviks made peace and gave land. The new government took Russia out of the war and gave the land to the peasants. It thus fulfilled the people's deep longing for peace and land. These acts won it wide support among the masses, for peace, bread and land had been the promise, and the promise was now redeemed. The Bolsheviks delivered what the people had demanded.

They established a one-party state. The Bolsheviks established a state ruled by their single party, the Communist Party, which held all real power. Other parties were suppressed, and the party controlled the government at every level. This one-party rule was the heart of the new system. A new form of state had been created.

They created a planned, socialist economy. The new state abolished the private ownership of the great means of production and took control of industry, land and trade. The economy was to be planned and directed by the state for the whole people. This socialist economy was a bold new departure. The state became the master of the economy.

It became the world's first socialist state. Out of the revolution grew the Soviet Union, the world's first socialist state, ruled in the name of the workers and peasants. It offered an alternative to the capitalist and liberal order of the West. Its example inspired revolutionaries across the world. A new model of the state had been born.

The Russian Revolution therefore ran from the fall of the Tsar in February 1917, through the failure of the Provisional Government and the rise of the soviets, to the Bolshevik seizure of power in October, and it created an entirely new administrative system: a one-party socialist state with a planned economy, ruled in the name of the workers. This Soviet state became a model and an inspiration for revolutionaries across the twentieth-century world.

The rise of capitalism and modern administration

Question 23

Capitalism crept in through the counting-house before it ruled the world: where feudalism had valued land, the new age valued money and the man who could multiply it.

Explain the concept and rise of capitalism as a socio-economic system.

Model Answer

Capitalism was the socio-economic system that grew up in Europe out of the decline of feudalism and came to dominate the modern world. It rested on private ownership, wage labour and the pursuit of profit. Its concept and rise may be explained as follows.

Capitalism is based on private ownership. In capitalism the chief means of production, such as land, factories and capital, are privately owned by individuals, the capitalists. These owners control production and take its profits for themselves. This private ownership distinguishes capitalism from earlier and later systems. Ownership of capital is the very heart of the system.

It rests on wage labour. Under capitalism, those who own no means of production, the workers, sell their labour to the owners for wages. The worker is free, unlike the slave or the serf, but must work for another to live. This relation of capitalist and wage-worker is the basic relation of the system. Wage labour is the engine of capitalism.

It is driven by the pursuit of profit. The capitalist produces not chiefly for use but for sale, in order to make a profit. The pursuit of profit drives production, trade and investment throughout the system. This profit-motive is the mainspring of the whole economy. Capitalism is organised around the making of money.

It grew out of the decline of feudalism. Capitalism arose in Europe from about the sixteenth century, as feudalism decayed. The growth of trade, towns and money undermined the old feudal order of land and serfdom. Capitalism thus succeeded feudalism as the dominant system. It was the fourth great mode of production.

It passed through the stage of mercantilism. In its first stage, from about the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, capitalism took the form of mercantilism, based on trade and the gathering of gold and silver. States sought wealth through overseas trade and colonies. Merchant capital led the way in this age. Mercantilism was the dawn of capitalism.

It advanced through industrial capitalism. In its second stage, from the eighteenth century, the Industrial Revolution brought industrial or competitive capitalism, based on factories and machines. Production grew enormously, and a great working class arose. Industrial capital now led the system. This was the age of competitive capitalism.

It reached the stage of monopoly capitalism. In its third stage, from the late nineteenth century, capitalism grew into monopoly capitalism, or imperialism, dominated by great combines and banks. These extended their power over the whole world, seeking markets and colonies. This was called the highest stage of capitalism. Monopoly and empire marked its maturity.

It divided society into two main classes. Capitalism divided society into the capitalists, who owned the means of production, and the workers, or proletariat, who owned only their labour. Between these two classes lay a deep opposition of interest. This class division was central to the system. Capitalism, too, was a system of class.

Capitalism was therefore a socio-economic system based on the private ownership of the means of production, wage labour and the pursuit of profit, which grew out of the decline of feudalism and passed through the stages of mercantile, industrial and monopoly capitalism. Dividing society into capitalists and workers, it became the dominant economic system of the modern world.

Question 24

It took a whole revolution of the mind, the market and the machine to turn a Europe of manors into a Europe of factories and banks.

Examine the factors for the rise of capitalism in Europe.

Model Answer

Capitalism arose in Europe from about the sixteenth century through the working of many linked factors, economic, intellectual and social. Together they undermined feudalism and built the new order. The factors for the rise of capitalism in Europe may be examined as follows.

The growth of trade and commerce. The revival and growth of trade, both within Europe and overseas, created wealth and a class of merchants who lived by buying and selling. This commercial wealth was the seed of capital. Trade broke down the closed, self-sufficient economy of feudalism. Commerce was a chief root of capitalism.

The decline of feudalism. As feudalism decayed, the ties of serf and lord loosened, and both men and money were freed for new uses. The breakdown of the manorial economy made way for the market. Capitalism grew in the space left by feudalism, and as the manor crumbled, the market rose to take its place. The old order gave way to the new.

The Renaissance and the new spirit. The Renaissance brought a new spirit of enquiry, enterprise and worldly ambition. It freed men's minds from the purely religious outlook of the Middle Ages. This

encouraged trade, science and the pursuit of wealth, for men began to look to this world, and its riches, as never before. A new spirit favoured the rise of capitalism.

The Protestant Reformation. The Protestant Reformation, especially in its Calvinist form, encouraged hard work, thrift and worldly success as signs of virtue. This so-called Protestant ethic favoured the accumulation of capital. Religion thus lent unexpected support to the new economy. The Reformation aided the rise of capitalism.

The voyages of discovery and colonial trade. The great voyages of discovery opened new lands, new trade routes and new sources of wealth. The gold, silver and goods of the Americas, Africa and Asia flowed into Europe. This colonial trade hugely enriched the merchant class. Overseas expansion fuelled the growth of capital.

The growth of banking and credit. The development of banks, credit, bills of exchange and joint-stock companies made it possible to gather and invest large sums of money. This financial machinery was essential to capitalism. It allowed great capital to be raised for great ventures. Banking became the lifeblood of the new system.

Technological and agricultural change. New inventions in industry, and improvements in farming such as the enclosure movement, raised production and freed labour from the land. These changes produced both a surplus and a landless class seeking work. Capitalism was thus supplied with labour and goods. Technology and agriculture prepared the way.

The support of government policy. Governments favoured trade and industry through mercantile and, later, laissez-faire policies, protecting merchants and markets. Adam Smith's teaching of free enterprise, set out in 1776, gave capitalism its philosophy. The state thus actively fostered the new economy. Government policy encouraged the rise of capitalism.

Capitalism therefore arose in Europe through the growth of trade, the decline of feudalism, the new spirit of the Renaissance, the Protestant Reformation, the voyages of discovery and colonial trade, the growth of banking and credit, technological and agricultural change, and the support of government policy. Together these factors built the capitalist system that came to dominate the modern world.

Question 25

The men who stormed the Bastille and packed the English Parliament were, above all, men of the new money, and they meant to rule as well as to trade.

Examine the influence of the rise of capitalism on the political revolutions of Europe.

Model Answer

The rise of capitalism was closely bound up with the political revolutions of Europe. The new capitalist class demanded a share in power to match its wealth, and its rise reshaped the politics of the continent. The influence of capitalism on the political revolutions may be examined as follows.

It created a powerful middle class. Capitalism created a wealthy middle class, the bourgeoisie, of merchants, manufacturers and financiers. This class grew rich but was denied a share in power by the feudal aristocracy. Its rise upset the old balance of society. The bourgeoisie became the leaders of revolution.

The middle class demanded political power. Grown wealthy, the bourgeoisie demanded political rights and a share in government worthy of their new position. They resented the privileges of the nobility and the absolutism of kings. This demand for power drove the revolutions forward. The middle class sought to rule as well as to trade.

It clashed with the feudal order. Capitalism clashed with the surviving feudal order of privilege, guild and restriction, which hampered trade and industry. The capitalists sought to sweep away these feudal barriers to enterprise. This conflict between the new economy and the old order fed revolution. Capitalism made war on feudalism.

It gave the revolutions their aims. The capitalist class sought a government that would protect property, free trade and give it a voice, and these became aims of the revolutions. The English and French revolutions served the interests of the rising bourgeoisie. Capitalism thus shaped what the revolutions fought for. Its interests guided the revolutions.

It created new class conflicts. Capitalism divided society into capitalists and workers, and this new class conflict fed later revolutions. The misery of the workers drove the revolts of 1848 and beyond. Class struggle became a permanent force in politics. Capitalism bred the conflicts that fuelled revolution.

It spread the ideas of liberty and enterprise. Capitalism favoured ideas of individual liberty, free enterprise and the rights of property. These liberal ideas became the ideology of the revolutions. The freedom the capitalist sought in trade he sought also in politics. Capitalism and liberalism thus advanced together.

It gave revolutions their leaders and money. The wealth of the capitalist class provided the money and much of the leadership for revolution. Merchants and manufacturers financed and led the movements against the old order. Capital, in effect, paid for revolution, and those who had grown rich under the old order now paid to overthrow it. The new wealth armed the revolutionaries.

It later gave rise to socialism. By creating a great and suffering working class, capitalism gave rise to socialism, which sought to overthrow it in turn. The Russian Revolution was made in the name of the workers against capitalism. Thus capitalism bred its own revolutionary opponent. It sowed the seeds of new upheavals.

The rise of capitalism therefore profoundly influenced the political revolutions of Europe, creating a powerful middle class that demanded political power, clashing with the feudal order, shaping the aims and ideology of the revolutions, providing their leaders and money, and later giving rise to socialism. The revolutions were, in large part, the political expression of the rise of the capitalist class.

Question 26

Capitalism needed a new kind of state to serve it: one with sound money, clear law, honest clerks, and a reach into every pocket and port.

Examine the influence of the rise of capitalism on the development of modern administrative systems.

Model Answer

The rise of capitalism demanded and produced a new kind of government, the modern administrative state. The needs of trade, industry and finance reshaped the very machinery of government. The influence of capitalism on modern administrative systems may be examined as follows.

It fostered the bureaucratic state. Capitalism required an orderly and efficient government to regulate trade, enforce contracts and keep order. This led to the growth of a bureaucratic state, run by officials organised in a clear hierarchy. Administration became rational and rule-bound. Capitalism fostered the modern bureaucracy.

It demanded the rule of law and secure property. Capitalism needed clear laws to protect property and enforce contracts, so that trade and investment could go forward with confidence. This encouraged the development of the rule of law and of codified legal systems. Sound law became a foundation of the capitalist state. Capitalism demanded legal certainty.

It promoted the separation of powers. The capitalist class favoured the separation of powers as a guard against arbitrary government that might threaten property and trade. An independent judiciary protected contracts and rights. This division of powers suited the needs of capitalism. The middle class championed constitutional government.

It developed public finance. Capitalism required sound public finance, and governments developed treasuries, central banks and systems of public debt to manage money. Ministries of finance and government bonds became features of the modern state. Public finance grew hand in hand with capitalism. The state learned to manage money on a great scale.

It reformed taxation and revenue. The growth of trade and industry required new and more efficient systems of taxation, customs and excise. Governments developed complex machinery to gather revenue from the expanding economy. Taxation became more systematic and productive. Capitalism reshaped the revenue of the state.

It professionalised the civil service. The complex tasks of governing a capitalist economy required trained, salaried and expert officials. This led to the growth of a professional civil service, chosen for ability rather than birth. Administration became a career and a science. Capitalism helped to professionalise government.

It centralised and strengthened government. Capitalism favoured strong central governments able to secure a single market, a common currency and uniform laws across the nation. The state grew larger and reached further into economic life. Central, strong government suited the capitalist economy. The modern state grew with capitalism.

It expanded the functions of the state. As capitalism grew, the state took on new functions: regulating industry, building roads and railways, and, in time, providing education and welfare. Government became far more active in economic and social life. The tasks of administration multiplied greatly. Capitalism enlarged the whole work of the state.

The rise of capitalism therefore profoundly shaped modern administrative systems, fostering the bureaucratic state, demanding the rule of law and secure property, promoting the separation of powers, developing public finance and taxation, professionalising the civil service, and centralising and expanding the functions of government. The modern administrative state was, in large measure, built to serve the needs of the capitalist economy.

The significance of the political revolutions

Question 27

England beheaded one king and kept its monarchy; France beheaded another and abolished it. Two revolutions, two very different roads to the modern state.

Compare the English and French Revolutions.

Model Answer

The English Revolution of the seventeenth century and the French Revolution of 1789 were the two greatest political revolutions of early modern Europe. Both overthrew absolute monarchy, yet they differed in their course and their results. They may be compared as follows.

Both overthrew absolute monarchy. Both revolutions rose against the absolute, divine-right monarchy and sought to limit or to destroy it. Each put its king to death, Charles I in England and Louis XVI in France. Both asserted the rights of the people against the crown. In this fundamental aim the two were closely alike.

Both were led by the rising middle class. In both, the wealthy middle class, the bourgeoisie, led the revolution against the old feudal and royal order. They sought a government that respected their rights and their interests. The rising capitalist class drove both upheavals. The bourgeoisie were the leaders in each.

Both were inspired by new ideas. Each revolution was inspired by new political ideas, the English by the growing belief in government by consent, the French by the full philosophy of the Enlightenment. Ideas of liberty and rights guided both movements. Thought armed the revolutionaries in each case. Neither was a mere blind revolt.

But they differed in their treatment of monarchy. England, after a period as a republic, restored its monarchy and settled into a limited, constitutional monarchy. France abolished its monarchy and became a republic, though it later passed to empire. The one kept the crown and limited it; the other destroyed it outright. This was a deep difference between them.

They differed in violence and extremism. The French Revolution was far more violent and radical, passing through the dreadful Reign of Terror. The English Revolution, though it brought civil war, did not reach such extremes, and the Glorious Revolution was almost bloodless. France went further and bled far more. The scale of violence sharply set them apart.

They differed in their effect on society. The French Revolution swept away feudalism and privilege entirely and remade society on the basis of equality. The English Revolution changed the balance of power but left more of the old social order standing. France made the sharper social break. Their social effects differed in depth.

They differed in their international impact. The French Revolution shook the whole of Europe, spread its ideas by conquest, and provoked twenty years of war. The English Revolution, though influential, had a slower and quieter effect abroad. France's impact was more sudden and violent. Their influence differed in force and in speed.

Yet both advanced modern government. Despite their differences, both revolutions advanced the cause of modern, limited and representative government. England gave the world constitutional monarchy and parliamentary rule; France gave it the sovereignty of the nation and equality before the law. Both were founders of the modern state. In their lasting contribution they were alike.

The English and French Revolutions were therefore alike in overthrowing absolute monarchy, in being led by the middle class and inspired by new ideas, and in advancing modern government. Yet they differed in that England limited its monarchy while France abolished it, in the greater violence and social depth of the French Revolution, and in its wider international impact. Together they were the twin founders of the modern political world.

Question 28

Behind every barricade and every new constitution stood the same figure: the merchant, the manufacturer, the man of the middle class, come to claim his share of power.

Assess the role of the middle class (bourgeoisie) in the political revolutions of Europe.

Model Answer

The political revolutions of Europe were, above all, the work of the rising middle class, the bourgeoisie, who sought power to match their growing wealth. Their role in the revolutions was central and decisive. It may be assessed as follows.

Capitalism created the middle class. The rise of trade and industry created a wealthy middle class of merchants, manufacturers and financiers. This class grew rich and confident as capitalism advanced. Its rise was the great social change lying behind the revolutions. Capitalism, in effect, gave birth to the revolutionary class.

The middle class resented feudal privilege. Though wealthy, the bourgeoisie were denied power and privilege by the feudal aristocracy and the absolute monarchy. They resented the barriers of birth and the burdens of an unjust order. This deep resentment turned them against the old regime. Exclusion drove them towards revolution.

The middle class demanded political power. The bourgeoisie demanded a share in government worthy of their wealth and ability. They sought representation, rights and a government that served their interests. This demand became a central aim of the revolutions. The middle class sought to rule as well as to trade.

They led and financed the revolutions. The middle class provided much of the leadership, the ideas and the money of the revolutions. Merchants, lawyers and manufacturers led the assemblies and the movements against the crown. Their wealth, in effect, paid for revolution. The bourgeoisie were the driving force of the upheavals.

They shaped the aims of the revolutions. The revolutions sought the things the middle class wanted: liberty, the rule of law, the security of property, free trade and representative government. These bourgeois

aims became the very programme of the revolutions. The middle class stamped its interests on the new order. The revolutions served the capitalist class.

They benefited most from the revolutions. When the old order fell, it was the middle class that gained most, winning power, rights and a favourable government. Feudal barriers to trade and enterprise were swept away for their benefit. The bourgeoisie rose to become the new ruling class. They were the chief victors of the revolutions.

They allied with the people but feared them. The middle class led the common people against the old regime but feared their more radical demands. In France they turned against the extreme revolutionaries, and elsewhere they made peace with the old order once their own aims were won. Their revolution was moderate at heart. They wanted reform, not social overturn.

They founded the liberal state. The middle class founded the modern liberal state of constitutions, parliaments, rights and free markets. This state served their interests and expressed their vision of society. The bourgeois revolution created the bourgeois state. The modern liberal order was, in large part, their work.

The middle class, or bourgeoisie, therefore played the central role in the political revolutions of Europe, created by the rise of capitalism, resenting feudal privilege, demanding and seizing political power, and leading and financing the revolutions. They shaped the aims of the upheavals, gained most from them, and founded the modern liberal state, so that the great revolutions were, above all, the triumph of the rising capitalist class.

Question 29

In two centuries, Europe travelled from kings who answered to no one to states that answered to the law, the parliament, and the nation.

Examine how the political revolutions transformed government from absolutism to modern administration.

Model Answer

The great achievement of the European political revolutions was to transform government from the absolute monarchy of the old regime into the modern administrative state. This transformation touched every part of government. How the revolutions brought it about may be examined as follows.

They replaced absolutism with limited government. The revolutions overthrew the absolute, divine-right monarchies and replaced them with governments limited by law and constitution. The ruler ceased to be above the law and the state. Power was now bound and defined by rules. Limited government replaced the old absolutism.

They established government by consent. The revolutions established that government rested on the consent of the governed, expressed through parliaments and elections. The people, or their representatives, gained a real share in power. Authority came to rest on the nation, not on the king. Government by consent replaced arbitrary rule.

They founded the rule of law. The revolutions established that the government itself was bound by law, and that all citizens were equal before it. Written constitutions and codes replaced the will of the ruler. No one, not even the government, stood above the law, and government by fixed and public rules replaced the arbitrary word of the king. The rule of law replaced the rule of men.

They introduced the separation of powers. Following Montesquieu, the revolutions divided the powers of government among the legislature, the executive and the judiciary. This guarded against the dangerous concentration of power and against tyranny. An independent judiciary protected the citizen. The separation of powers became a mark of modern government.

They created representative institutions. The revolutions created or strengthened parliaments and assemblies of the people's representatives. These became the centre of government and the makers of law.

Representation replaced the sole rule of the king. Parliamentary government spread from Europe across the world.

They abolished feudal privilege and proclaimed equality. The revolutions swept away feudal privilege and proclaimed the equality of all citizens before the law. The subject became a citizen with rights and duties. Equality replaced the old privilege of birth, so that the accident of birth ceased, in law, to fix a man's place in society. The feudal social order gave way to the modern.

They built a centralised, professional administration. Especially in France, the revolutions built a centralised, uniform and professional administration of departments, prefects and salaried officials. This replaced the confused and venal system of the old regime. Government became efficient and rational. The modern bureaucratic state was born.

They fostered the nation-state and citizenship. The revolutions gave rise to the modern nation-state, in which sovereignty belonged to the nation and its members were citizens. Loyalty to the nation replaced loyalty to the person of the king. The nation-state became the modern form of government. Citizenship replaced mere subjection.

The political revolutions therefore transformed government from absolutism to modern administration, replacing absolute monarchy with limited government by consent, founding the rule of law and the separation of powers, creating representative institutions, abolishing feudal privilege and proclaiming equality, building a centralised and professional administration, and fostering the nation-state. In these great changes the modern state was born.

Question 30

The revolutionaries dreamed of a government where the law, not the monarch, would be the highest power in the land, and largely they achieved it.

"The political revolutions of Europe replaced the rule of kings with the rule of law." Discuss.

Model Answer

The statement holds that the great achievement of the European political revolutions was to replace the arbitrary rule of kings with the rule of law. There is much truth in this, though it must be weighed with care. The validity of the statement may be discussed as follows.

The revolutions overthrew arbitrary royal rule. The revolutions destroyed the absolute, divine-right monarchies that had ruled by the will of the king alone. The king ceased to be the highest and unchecked power in the state. In this the statement is strongly supported. Arbitrary royal rule was indeed overthrown.

They established government under law. The revolutions established that the government itself was bound by law, through documents such as the Bill of Rights and the written constitutions. Even the ruler was made subject to the law. This was the very essence of the rule of law. Law was raised above the ruler.

They created written constitutions and codes. The revolutions produced written constitutions, bills of rights and codes of law that defined and limited the powers of government. These replaced the whim of the king with fixed and public rules. Law became knowable and certain for all. The rule of law was given written and lasting form.

They proclaimed equality before the law. The revolutions abolished feudal privilege and declared all citizens equal before the law. The law came to apply to all alike, whatever their birth or rank. This equality was central to the rule of law, for the same law that bound the peasant now bound the noble and the official too. Justice was made no respecter of persons.

They secured an independent judiciary. The revolutions, especially in England and America, secured the independence of the judges from the crown. This allowed the law to be applied impartially, even against the government itself. An independent judiciary upheld the rule of law. Justice was freed from the ruler's control.

Yet the rule of law was not always achieved. In practice the rule of law was often imperfect or delayed. The French Revolution passed through the lawless Terror, and Napoleon ruled as an autocrat. Revolutions could replace one arbitrary power with another. The ideal was not always matched by the reality.

And new forms of arbitrary power arose. Some revolutions produced new absolutisms, as the Russian Revolution produced the one-party state. Here the rule of law gave way to the rule of the party. Not every revolution ended in lawful government, for the overthrow of a king did not always bring the reign of law in his place. The statement does not hold true for all.

On balance the revolutions advanced the rule of law. Despite these qualifications, the general effect of the revolutions was to advance the rule of law over the rule of kings. They established the principle firmly, even where the practice fell short. The modern ideal of lawful government was their great legacy. On balance the statement is largely valid.

It is therefore largely valid that the political revolutions of Europe replaced the rule of kings with the rule of law, for they overthrew arbitrary royal power, established government under written constitutions and codes, proclaimed equality before the law, and secured an independent judiciary. Yet the rule of law was not always achieved, and some revolutions bred new absolutisms, so that the statement holds as a general truth and an ideal rather than as an unbroken rule.

Question 31

The modern world of constitutions and citizens, of parliaments and nations, of rights and republics, was forged in the fire of Europe's revolutions.

Assess the significance of the European political revolutions in the making of the modern world.

Model Answer

The political revolutions of Europe, from the English to the Russian, were among the most important events in the history of government. Together they made the modern political world. Their significance may be assessed as follows.

They destroyed absolute monarchy and feudalism. The revolutions overthrew the absolute monarchies and the feudal privilege of the old regime across Europe. They cleared away the political order of the Middle Ages. This destruction was the necessary beginning of the modern age. The old world was swept away to make room for the new.

They founded modern constitutional government. The revolutions founded government under constitutions, bound by law and limited in power. Constitutional government became the model of the modern state. The English and American revolutions in particular gave the world this foundation. Modern government rests upon their work.

They established representative democracy. The revolutions created or advanced parliaments, elections and representative institutions. Power came to rest on the people and their chosen representatives. Representative democracy spread from Europe and America across the world. The modern democratic state was their achievement.

They proclaimed the rights of the citizen. The revolutions proclaimed the rights of man and the equality of all citizens before the law. Bills and declarations of rights protected the individual against the state. These rights became foundations of modern government, and the individual now had liberties that even the government was bound to respect. The citizen replaced the subject.

They created the modern nation-state. The revolutions gave rise to the nation-state, founded on national sovereignty and citizenship. Nationalism reshaped the map of Europe and the world, giving birth to new nations. The nation-state became the characteristic modern form of government. It was largely their creation.

They built the modern administrative state. The revolutions, above all the French, built the centralised, professional and bureaucratic administration of the modern state. Departments, codes and civil services

replaced the old confusion of the past. Efficient modern government was their lasting legacy. The very machinery of the modern state was their work.

They offered rival models of the state. The revolutions produced rival models that still shape the world: the liberal, capitalist democracy of the West and the socialist state of the Russian Revolution. These competing visions defined much of modern politics. The great ideological divisions were born of revolution. Their legacy shaped the whole twentieth century.

They inspired liberation across the world. The ideals of the European revolutions, liberty, equality, nationhood and the rights of man, inspired struggles for freedom across the globe, including the later independence movements of Africa and Asia. Their example spread far beyond Europe. The revolutions became a beacon for the oppressed everywhere. Their influence was worldwide and enduring.

The European political revolutions were therefore of the greatest significance in the making of the modern world, destroying absolute monarchy and feudalism, founding constitutional and representative government, proclaiming the rights of the citizen, creating the nation-state and the modern administrative state, and offering the rival models of liberal democracy and socialism. Their ideals of liberty, equality and nationhood inspired struggles for freedom across the world, so that the modern political order is, in large measure, their creation.

Chapter 8

THE CAPITALIST CRISES AND ALTERNATIVE GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS

Attempt each question in full on paper before you read the model answer beneath it. The questions follow the chapter topic by topic and rise in demand.

The concept of capitalist crises

Question 1

A system that produces more than it can sell carries the seed of its own collapse, and capitalism has bloomed and withered on that seed again and again.

Explain the concept of a capitalist crisis.

Model Answer

A capitalist crisis is a periodic breakdown in the capitalist economy in which production outruns the market, trade collapses and mass unemployment follows. Such crises are not accidents but recurring features of the capitalist mode of production. The concept of a capitalist crisis may be explained as follows.

It is a crisis of the capitalist mode of production. Capitalism is a system in which the means of production are privately owned and goods are produced for profit and for sale on the market. A capitalist crisis is a breakdown within this very system and not a blow from outside it. It arises from the way capitalism itself is organised. The crisis is thus rooted in the mode of production.

It is essentially a crisis of overproduction. Under capitalism, factories produce goods in ever greater quantities in search of profit, until the market is glutted with goods that cannot be sold. Warehouses fill, prices collapse and production is cut back. This overproduction, or more exactly underconsumption, lies at the heart of the crisis. Capitalism drowns in its own abundance.

It appears as a sudden collapse of trade and industry. A capitalist crisis strikes as a sharp and sudden fall in trade, prices and production, often beginning with a financial panic or a stock market crash. Banks fail, firms close and commerce is paralysed. The boom turns abruptly into slump. The collapse is swift and severe.

It brings mass unemployment and poverty. When firms cut production or close their doors, they throw millions of workers out of employment, and the jobless can no longer buy goods. Poverty, hunger and homelessness then spread through society. The suffering of the crisis falls hardest on the working class. Human misery is its clearest mark.

It is a recurring feature of capitalism. Capitalist crises are not isolated events but return again and again in cycles of boom and slump. The system swings from prosperity to depression and back with grim regularity. This recurrence shows that crisis is built into capitalism. It is a periodic sickness of the system.

It springs from the anarchy of production. Under capitalism each firm produces blindly for profit, without any overall plan to match production to the needs of society. This unplanned and competitive production leads to gluts, waste and imbalance. The absence of planning is a deep source of crisis. Anarchy in production breeds disorder in the economy.

It reflects the unequal distribution of wealth. Capitalism concentrates wealth in the hands of a few owners while the mass of workers receive only low wages. The people therefore cannot buy back the goods they produce, and markets shrink. This gap between production and purchasing power feeds the crisis. Inequality starves the market.

It exposes the contradictions of capitalism. The crisis lays bare the deep contradiction between the social character of production and the private ownership of wealth. It is in these moments that the weaknesses of capitalism are most clearly seen. Thinkers such as Karl Marx held that such crises were inevitable under capitalism. The crisis reveals the inner flaws of the system.

A capitalist crisis is therefore a recurring and often sudden breakdown of the capitalist economy, springing from overproduction, the anarchy of unplanned production and the unequal distribution of wealth, and

bringing the collapse of trade and mass unemployment. It is not an accident but a contradiction built into the capitalist mode of production itself.

Question 2

Every boom in the capitalist world has carried within it the causes of the slump that was bound to follow.

Examine the causes of the recurring crises of the capitalist system.

Model Answer

The capitalist system is subject to periodic crises that return in cycles of boom and depression. These crises spring from contradictions built into the very nature of capitalism. The causes of the recurring crises of the capitalist system may be examined as follows.

Overproduction of goods. Driven by the pursuit of profit, capitalist firms expand production far beyond what the market can absorb, until goods pile up unsold. This overproduction forces prices down and compels firms to cut output and dismiss workers. It is the most immediate cause of capitalist crisis. Capitalism produces more than it can sell.

Underconsumption and low purchasing power. Because workers are paid low wages while owners take the profits, the mass of the people cannot buy back the goods they produce. Demand therefore falls short of supply, and markets collapse. Underconsumption is the other face of overproduction. The people are too poor to buy what they make.

The anarchy of production. Under capitalism there is no overall plan, and each firm produces blindly and competitively for private profit. This unplanned production leads to gluts in some goods and shortages in others. The lack of coordination breeds imbalance and crisis. Anarchy in production is a standing cause of collapse.

The unequal distribution of wealth. Capitalism concentrates wealth in the hands of a small class of owners while the majority of people remain poor. This inequality narrows the home market and deepens underconsumption. The maldistribution of income is a root cause of crisis. Wealth piled at the top starves demand below.

Reckless speculation and unsound banking. In boom years, speculators gamble on rising share and property prices, and banks lend recklessly without adequate reserves. When confidence breaks, the speculative bubble bursts and the banks collapse. Financial panic then spreads to the whole economy. Speculation turns a downturn into a disaster.

The trade cycle of boom and slump. Capitalist economies move in a natural cycle from prosperity to depression and back again. A boom encourages over investment and overproduction, which end in a slump, until recovery begins the cycle anew. This trade cycle makes crisis periodic. Boom and bust are the rhythm of capitalism.

Competition and the concentration of capital. Fierce competition drives weaker firms out of business and gathers capital into ever fewer hands, forming great monopolies and trusts. This narrows competition and distorts the market. The concentration of capital sharpens the instability of the system. Big capital swallows small and unbalances the whole.

Imperial rivalry and the struggle for markets. As capitalism matured into imperialism, the great powers competed fiercely for colonies, raw materials and markets abroad. Lenin argued in his study of imperialism that this rivalry was a higher stage of capitalism that bred war and crisis. The scramble for markets destabilised the world economy. Imperial competition carried crisis across the globe.

The recurring crises of the capitalist system therefore arise from causes rooted in its very structure: overproduction and underconsumption, the anarchy of unplanned production, the unequal distribution of wealth, reckless speculation, the trade cycle, the concentration of capital and imperial rivalry. These contradictions ensure that capitalism moves from boom to slump in a cycle it cannot escape.

Question 3

Twice in thirty years the capitalist world tore itself apart in war, and in the years between it collapsed into the deepest slump in its history.

Analyse the major manifestations of the crises of capitalism in the twentieth century.

Model Answer

The contradictions of capitalism expressed themselves in a series of great crises during the twentieth century. These manifestations shook the capitalist world and drove peoples to seek alternative systems of governance. The major manifestations of the crises of capitalism may be analysed as follows.

The First World War of 1914 to 1918. The imperial rivalry of the capitalist powers for colonies and markets exploded into the First World War. The war revealed how the competition of capitalist states could plunge the whole world into slaughter. It was the first great crisis of twentieth century capitalism. Imperial greed set the world ablaze.

The rise of monopoly and imperialism. By the early twentieth century, free competition had given way to great monopolies, trusts and cartels that dominated whole industries. Capital was exported abroad in the scramble for colonies. This stage of monopoly capitalism sharpened rivalry and instability. Capitalism had grown into imperialism.

The Russian Revolution of 1917. The strains of war and the failures of capitalism in Russia brought the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, which overthrew the old order and built the first socialist state. For the first time capitalism faced a rival system on a national scale. The revolution was both a symptom and a challenge. A crisis of capitalism gave birth to socialism.

The Great Depression of 1929 to 1933. The most severe manifestation of capitalist crisis was the Great Depression, which began with the Wall Street Crash of October 1929 and spread across the capitalist world. Trade collapsed and unemployment soared to levels never seen before. It was the classic crisis of overproduction. Capitalism reached its deepest slump.

The rise of fascism and Nazism. The despair of the Depression drove Italy and Germany into the arms of fascist and Nazi dictators who promised order and recovery. Mussolini and Hitler built totalitarian states out of the ruins of the crisis. Dictatorship was a political manifestation of economic breakdown. Slump bred tyranny.

The Second World War of 1939 to 1945. The unresolved crises of capitalism, the Depression and the rise of aggressive dictatorships led directly to the Second World War. The world was again torn apart by conflict rooted in capitalist rivalry. It was the most destructive crisis of all. Capitalism ended the era as it had begun, in war.

The intensified exploitation of the colonies. The manifestations of capitalist crisis were never confined to Europe and America but spread to the colonies of Africa and Asia. Falling prices and intensified exploitation carried the crisis to the wider world. The colonial peoples bore the burden of the crises of the powers. No corner of the globe was spared.

The search for alternative systems. Each crisis drove peoples and governments to seek alternatives to unregulated capitalism, whether socialism, the welfare state, fascism or, later, African socialism. The failures of the system discredited pure laissez faire. The crises were therefore also a spur to new ideas. Breakdown forced the world to look for other paths.

The crises of capitalism in the twentieth century therefore manifested themselves in the two World Wars, the rise of monopoly and imperialism, the Russian Revolution, the Great Depression and the rise of fascism and Nazism, all of which spread to the colonies and drove the world to seek alternative systems of governance. These manifestations showed that the contradictions of capitalism could shake the whole world.

The Great Depression of 1929 to 1933

Question 4

It began on a single autumn day on Wall Street, and before it ended it had idled a quarter of America's workers and darkened the whole capitalist world.

Explain the meaning and main features of the Great Depression.

Model Answer

The Great Depression was the most severe economic crisis in the history of capitalism, lasting from 1929 to 1933 and spreading from the United States across the world. It was a classic crisis of overproduction, marked by the collapse of trade and mass unemployment. Its meaning and main features may be explained as follows.

It was a worldwide economic crisis. The Great Depression was a prolonged and severe breakdown of the capitalist economy that began in the United States in 1929 and spread to Europe, Asia and Africa. Only the socialist Soviet Union, standing outside the world market, was largely untouched. It was global in its reach. The whole capitalist world was drawn into the slump.

A sharp fall in prices. The Depression was marked by a steep and general fall in the prices of goods, as glutted markets could find no buyers. Falling prices ruined farmers and manufacturers alike and drove firms into bankruptcy. The collapse of prices was among its clearest features. Goods lay unsold as their value tumbled.

Mass unemployment. Perhaps the cruellest feature was the enormous rise in unemployment, which reached about a quarter of the workforce in the United States by 1933, some fifteen million people. Millions more were thrown out of work across Europe. Whole families were plunged into want. Idleness and hunger stalked the industrial world.

The collapse and closure of banks. Thousands of banks failed as panicked depositors rushed to withdraw their savings and borrowers defaulted on their loans. The banking system, weakened by years of reckless lending, crumbled. The fall of the banks deepened and spread the crisis. Confidence in finance was shattered.

The fall and stagnation of trade. International and domestic trade shrank drastically as demand collapsed and nations raised tariff walls against one another. World commerce fell to a fraction of its former level. Trade stagnation was a defining mark of the Depression. The channels of commerce ran dry.

The decline of industrial production. Factories cut back or ceased production as their goods went unsold, and industrial output in the United States fell by about a half by 1932. Idle plant and silent machines spread across the land. Production shrank far below capacity. Industry ground to a halt.

Business closures and bankruptcies. Countless firms and companies, unable to sell their goods or repay their debts, closed their doors and went bankrupt. The collapse of business swelled the ranks of the unemployed still further. Enterprise withered in the general ruin. The commercial world contracted sharply.

Widespread poverty and misery. The Depression brought hunger, homelessness and despair to millions who lost their jobs, their savings and their homes. Soup kitchens and shanty settlements appeared even in the richest countries. Human suffering was its lasting image. Want spread in the very midst of plenty.

The Great Depression was therefore a severe worldwide crisis of the capitalist economy from 1929 to 1933, marked by falling prices, mass unemployment, the collapse of banks, the stagnation of trade, the decline of industrial production and widespread poverty. It was the classic crisis of overproduction and the deepest slump that capitalism had ever known.

Question 5

A decade of dazzling prosperity had been built on speculation, overproduction and debt, and in 1929 the whole glittering structure came crashing down.

Examine the causes of the Great Depression of 1929 to 1933.

Model Answer

The Great Depression did not arise from a single cause but from a combination of weaknesses in the capitalist economy that had built up during the prosperous 1920s. Together these brought the system crashing down. The causes of the Great Depression may be examined as follows.

Overproduction and underconsumption. After the First World War, American industry and agriculture produced goods in ever greater quantities, while low wages left the mass of people unable to buy them. Goods piled up unsold in the warehouses. This gap between production and consumption was the fundamental cause. Capitalism produced more than the people could purchase.

The effects of the First World War. The war had destroyed European industry and agriculture, leaving Europe dependent on American goods and loans throughout the 1920s. When Europe recovered its own production, the swollen American market suddenly contracted. The post war distortion of trade prepared the ground for collapse. The war left the world economy unbalanced.

The recovery of European industry. As European industry and farming revived in the later 1920s, European nations bought fewer American goods and competed with American exports. American producers lost their markets both abroad and at home. This shrinking of markets brought overproduction to a head. The recovery of Europe undercut American prosperity.

Reckless stock market speculation. During the 1920s, Americans gambled feverishly on the stock market, buying shares on credit in the hope of quick profit as prices rose. Share prices climbed far above their real values in a great speculative bubble. When the bubble burst, ruin followed. Speculation had built the boom on sand.

The Wall Street Crash of October 1929. In October 1929 the New York stock market crashed, most violently on the twenty ninth, remembered as Black Tuesday. Panic selling wiped out fortunes overnight and shattered all confidence. The crash triggered the chain reaction of closures and unemployment. It was the spark that lit the Depression.

The unsound banking system. American banks had multiplied recklessly in the 1920s, lending freely with few reserves and little regulation. Many were insolvent and quite unable to withstand a shock. When depositors panicked, thousands of banks collapsed. A fragile banking system turned crisis into catastrophe.

The unequal distribution of wealth. The prosperity of the 1920s had been very unevenly shared, with great profits flowing to a small class of capitalists while workers and farmers gained little. This maldistribution of income limited the buying power of the masses. A narrow market could not sustain mass production. Inequality undermined the whole boom.

American protectionist tariff policy. The United States raised high tariff walls, such as the Fordney McCumber Tariff of 1922, to keep out foreign goods. Other nations retaliated with tariffs of their own, so that American exports fell and world trade shrank. Protectionism strangled international commerce. Tariff wars deepened the slump.

Overreliance on the American economy. So much of the world's trade, credit and prosperity depended on the United States that when the American economy collapsed, the crisis spread at once across the globe. American loans to Europe suddenly dried up. The world's dependence on one economy magnified the disaster. When America fell, the world fell with it.

The Great Depression therefore sprang from deep weaknesses in the capitalist economy: overproduction and underconsumption, the after effects of the First World War, reckless speculation and the Wall Street Crash, an unsound banking system, the unequal distribution of wealth, protectionist tariffs and the world's overreliance on the American economy. These combined to produce the greatest crisis that capitalism had ever faced.

Question 6

When the American engine of the world economy seized, the machinery of trade and industry across the capitalist world ground to a halt.

Examine the economic effects of the Great Depression on the capitalist world.

Model Answer

The Great Depression struck the capitalist world with devastating economic force between 1929 and 1933. Its economic effects reached every sector, from banking to trade and industry. The economic effects of the Great Depression on the capitalist world may be examined as follows.

Mass unemployment. The collapse of trade and industry threw millions out of work, with unemployment reaching about a quarter of the American workforce by 1933 and rising steeply across Europe. The jobless lost both their income and their hope. Unemployment was the gravest economic wound of the Depression. Work vanished for millions.

The collapse of banks. Thousands of banks failed as depositors rushed to withdraw their money and debtors defaulted on their loans. The banking system, the very heart of the capitalist economy, seized up. Savings were wiped out and credit dried up. The fall of the banks paralysed the economy.

The fall in prices. Prices of goods, and especially of agricultural produce, fell steeply as markets were glutted and buyers disappeared. Farmers and manufacturers were ruined as their goods lost their value. The collapse of prices spread distress through the whole economy. Value drained out of goods and land.

The decline of industrial production. Factories cut their output or closed as their products went unsold, and industrial production in the United States fell by roughly a half by 1932. Idle plant and machinery lay across the industrial nations. Production sank far below capacity. Industry withered in the slump.

The shrinking of world trade. International trade collapsed as demand fell and nations raised protective tariffs against one another. World commerce shrank to a fraction of its former volume. The arteries of international trade were choked. World trade fell to roughly a third of its former value between 1929 and 1933. Nations turned inward as trade dried up.

The drying up of loans and investment. The United States, which had lent heavily to Europe in the 1920s, stopped its loans and called in its debts. Investment collapsed as confidence evaporated. The flow of capital that had sustained recovery ceased. Credit and investment froze across the world.

The ruin of agriculture. Farmers were among the worst hit, as prices for their crops fell below the cost of production and many lost their land to debt. In America the Dust Bowl added natural disaster to economic ruin. Agriculture sank into a deep depression. The countryside shared fully in the towns' distress.

The intensified exploitation of the colonies. To cushion themselves against the crisis, the industrial powers squeezed their colonies harder, buying raw materials cheaply and forcing increased production. The burden of the Depression was shifted onto the colonial peoples. Empire became a shock absorber for the metropole. The colonies paid for the crisis of the powers.

The economic effects of the Great Depression on the capitalist world were therefore severe and far reaching: mass unemployment, the collapse of banks, the fall in prices, the decline of industrial production, the shrinking of world trade, the drying up of loans, the ruin of agriculture and the intensified exploitation of the colonies. The capitalist economy was brought to its knees.

Question 7

Behind the falling graphs of trade and production lay a human tragedy of hunger, broken homes and shattered hope.

Examine the social effects of the Great Depression.

Model Answer

The Great Depression was not only an economic catastrophe but a profound social one, touching the lives of ordinary people across the capitalist world. Its social effects reshaped society and the family. The social effects of the Great Depression may be examined as follows.

Widespread poverty and hunger. The loss of work and income plunged millions into poverty and even hunger, so that soup kitchens and bread queues appeared in the richest nations on earth. Families that had

been comfortable were reduced to want. Poverty spread in the very midst of plenty. Hunger became a common sight.

Homelessness and destitution. Countless families, unable to pay their rent or mortgages, lost their homes and drifted into shanty settlements, mockingly called Hoovervilles in America. The destitute wandered in search of work and shelter. Homelessness became a mark of the age. Whole families were cast into the streets.

Psychological despair and loss of confidence. The Depression bred deep anger, humiliation and despair among those who had lost everything through no fault of their own. Confidence in governments and employers collapsed. The crisis wounded the spirit as much as the purse. Hope itself seemed to fail.

The fall in marriages and birth rates. Young people without work or income postponed marriage and children, so that marriage and birth rates fell during the Depression years. The crisis reached into the most intimate decisions of life. Families shrank under the weight of hardship. Poverty delayed the founding of homes.

The growth of trade unions. As workers suffered wage cuts and unemployment, many turned to trade unions to defend their interests and their livelihoods. Union membership and militancy grew in the struggle against hardship. The Depression strengthened organised labour. Workers combined in the face of distress.

The spread of crime and social unrest. Desperation drove some to crime, and hardship provoked strikes, protests and demonstrations by the hungry and the jobless. Social order was strained by the pressures of the slump. Unrest simmered beneath the surface of society. Want bred anger and disorder.

The disruption of education and health. As incomes and public spending fell together, many could no longer afford schooling or medical care, and services were cut back. The health and education of the poor suffered severely. The human cost reached into the next generation. Hardship robbed children of their prospects.

The loss of faith in capitalism. Above all, the Depression shook the popular faith in the capitalist system and its promise of ever rising prosperity. Many turned to socialism, fascism or state intervention in search of security. The deepest social effect was a search for alternatives. Confidence in the old order was broken.

The social effects of the Great Depression were therefore profound: widespread poverty and hunger, homelessness, psychological despair, falling marriage and birth rates, the growth of trade unions, social unrest, the disruption of education and health, and a deep loss of faith in capitalism. The crisis scarred a whole generation and drove the search for new systems of governance.

Question 8

The slump did not stop at the factory gate, for it reached into parliaments and palaces, toppling governments and raising up dictators.

Examine the political effects of the Great Depression.

Model Answer

The Great Depression had far reaching political consequences that reshaped the governments of the capitalist world and prepared the way for a second world war. Its political effects were as momentous as its economic ones. The political effects of the Great Depression may be examined as follows.

The fall of governments. The Depression discredited the governments that presided over it and swept many of them from power. In the United States, the Republican president Hoover was defeated by the Democrat Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932. Across the world, ruling parties fell. The slump was the graveyard of governments.

The rise of dictatorship. In the countries hit hardest by the crisis, desperate peoples turned to strong armed dictators who promised order and recovery. Hitler rose in Germany, Mussolini tightened his grip in Italy, and militarists gained power in Japan. Democracy gave way to dictatorship. The slump bred tyrants.

The rise of fascism and Nazism. The despair of the Depression drove Italy and Germany into fascism and Nazism, movements that blamed the crisis on democracy and promised a national revival. Hitler came to power in Germany in 1933. Extremism fed upon economic ruin. Fascism was a child of the slump.

The abandonment of laissez faire. The Depression discredited the old belief that governments should leave the economy entirely alone. States everywhere began to intervene to manage the economy and relieve distress. The doctrine of laissez faire was abandoned. Government stepped into the marketplace.

The New Deal in the United States. President Roosevelt responded with the New Deal, a great programme of state intervention to bring relief, recovery and reform. The federal government took new responsibility for the economy and the welfare of its citizens. The New Deal reshaped American government. The state became the guardian of the economy.

The growth of state intervention and planning. Across the capitalist world, governments took new powers over industry, trade and employment, borrowing from the ideas of the economist John Maynard Keynes. Economic planning gained ground everywhere. The role of the state expanded far beyond its old limits. Crisis enlarged the powers of government.

The intensification of colonial exploitation. To recover from the crisis, the imperial powers tightened their grip on their colonies, raising taxes and forcing increased production of cash crops. This intensified exploitation stirred resentment and fed the growth of nationalism. The Depression sharpened the colonial conflict. Empire pressed harder on the colonised.

The road to the Second World War. By breeding aggressive dictatorships and bitter economic rivalry, the Depression led directly towards the Second World War. Fascist expansion and the collapse of international cooperation set the world on the path to conflict. The slump was among the deepest causes of the war. Economic ruin ended in global violence.

The political effects of the Great Depression were therefore momentous: the fall of governments, the rise of dictatorship, fascism and Nazism, the abandonment of laissez faire, the New Deal and the growth of state intervention, the intensification of colonial exploitation, and the road to the Second World War. The crisis remade the political world and drove the search for alternative systems of governance.

Question 9

Some called it a crisis of greed and others a crisis of banking, but at its core lay a simpler paradox, a world buried under goods it could not afford to buy.

"The Great Depression was essentially a crisis of overproduction." How valid is this claim?

Model Answer

The claim that the Great Depression was essentially a crisis of overproduction points to the fundamental contradiction of capitalism, that it produces more than the people can consume. The claim is largely valid, though the crisis also had other important dimensions. Its validity may be assessed as follows.

Overproduction lay at the root of the crisis. The American economy in the 1920s produced goods in ever greater quantities, until factories and farms turned out far more than the market could absorb. Warehouses filled with goods that could not be sold. Overproduction was indeed the fundamental cause of the crisis. The claim rests on solid ground.

Underconsumption matched the overproduction. The other face of overproduction was the low purchasing power of the masses, kept poor by low wages and the unequal distribution of wealth. The people simply could not buy back what they produced. Underconsumption confirms that the crisis was one of overproduction. Supply outran demand.

Agricultural overproduction ruined the farmers. Farmers, producing more than they could sell, saw the prices of their crops collapse below the cost of production. The glut of agricultural goods was a clear case of overproduction. The ruin of the countryside proved the claim. Fields yielded more than markets could take.

Industrial gluts forced closures and unemployment. As unsold goods piled up, factories cut their production and dismissed their workers, spreading unemployment across the land. The chain from glut to closure to joblessness shows overproduction at work. The very mechanism of the crisis supports the claim. Excess goods emptied the workshops.

Yet financial speculation was also to blame. The crisis was triggered by reckless speculation on the stock market and the Wall Street Crash of 1929, and not by overproduction alone. Financial folly played a very large part. The claim must therefore be qualified by the role of speculation. The bubble burst before the warehouses did.

The banking collapse deepened the crisis. The failure of thousands of unsound banks turned a downturn into a catastrophe by destroying savings and freezing credit. This financial weakness was distinct from overproduction. Banking failure widened and prolonged the crisis. The rot in finance made matters far worse.

International factors shared the blame. The after effects of the First World War, protectionist tariffs and the world's overreliance on the American economy all helped to cause the Depression. These were not simply matters of overproduction. The crisis had wide international roots. Many currents fed the flood.

Overproduction remained the fundamental cause. Although speculation, banking failure and international strains all played their part, they worked upon an economy already glutted with goods that could not be sold. Overproduction was the deep cause upon which the others acted. The claim is therefore largely valid. The crisis was, at bottom, one of overproduction.

The claim that the Great Depression was essentially a crisis of overproduction is therefore largely valid, for overproduction and its twin, underconsumption, lay at the root of the collapse. Yet the crisis was deepened by reckless speculation, banking failure and international strains, so that overproduction, while fundamental, was not the sole cause. It was the deep cause upon which all the others worked.

The effects of the Great Depression on Africa

Question 10

The crash on Wall Street was felt in the sisal fields of Tanganyika and the cocoa farms of West Africa, where prices tumbled and wages were slashed.

Examine the effects of the Great Depression on Africa.

Model Answer

Although the Great Depression began in the United States, its effects were carried across the world to the colonies of Africa, whose economies were tied to the capitalist market. Africa was seriously affected by the crisis between 1929 and 1933. The effects of the Great Depression on Africa may be examined as follows.

A great fall in the prices of raw materials. African colonies produced raw materials for export, and their prices collapsed as world demand fell away. The price of sisal exported from East Africa fell from about thirty two pounds a ton in 1929 to 1930 to about twelve pounds in 1931 to 1932. Export earnings collapsed. Africa's produce lost its value almost overnight.

The fall of workers' wages. As export earnings fell, colonial employers slashed the wages of their African workers. In Kenya, for example, wages fell from about thirty five shillings to about ten shillings in 1930. Workers were left far poorer than before. The crisis was passed straight down onto the African labourer.

Increased taxation of Africans. To make up for their falling revenues, colonial governments raised taxes on the African population, demanding more from people who now had less. Hut and poll taxes pressed hard upon the peasantry. The tax burden grew heavier as incomes shrank. Africans were made to pay more as they earned less.

Intensified colonial exploitation. To recover from the crisis, the colonial powers exploited Africa more harshly, through land alienation, forced cropping and forced labour. Africans were compelled to produce

more for even less reward. The Depression sharpened the edge of colonial oppression. Africa was squeezed to cushion the metropole.

The establishment of processing industries. To reduce the bulk and cost of exports, a few processing and import substitution industries were set up in the colonies. Meat canning works were established at Kawe near Dar es Salaam, run by Tanganyika Packers. Such industries were few but significant. The crisis brought a little local industry to Africa.

Poor provision of social services. As colonial governments cut their spending, the social services provided to Africans in education and health were reduced still further. Schools and clinics were starved of funds. Africans received even less than they had before. The crisis deepened the neglect of colonial rule.

Retrenchment and loss of jobs. To cut their costs, colonial employers and governments dismissed many African workers, including teachers, clerks and nurses. The educated few who had found employment were thrown out of work. Job redundancy spread hardship among the emerging African elite. Even the fortunate lost their places.

Famine and food shortages. As more land and labour were forced into export crops, less was left for growing food, and famines followed in several areas. The people went hungry so that the colonies might export. Food security was sacrificed to the cash crop. Hunger followed the crisis into the villages.

The growth of African nationalism. The hardship and injustice of the Depression exposed the exploitation of colonial rule and stirred deep African discontent. Grievances over prices, wages and taxes fed the growth of nationalist feeling. The crisis sowed the seeds of resistance. Suffering awakened the demand for change.

The Great Depression therefore affected Africa seriously between 1929 and 1933, through the fall in raw material prices and wages, increased taxation, intensified exploitation, the growth of a few processing industries, the neglect of social services, retrenchment, famine and the growth of nationalism. Africa, though far from Wall Street, was made to bear a heavy share of the crisis of capitalism.

Question 11

Faced with collapsing prices, the colonial powers did not lighten the load on Africa but shifted more of it onto African shoulders.

Analyse the measures taken by colonial governments to overcome the effects of the Great Depression in Africa.

Model Answer

When the Great Depression struck the colonies, the colonial governments took a range of measures to protect their own revenues and to recover from the crisis. Most of these measures fell heavily upon the African peoples. The measures taken by colonial governments to overcome the effects of the Great Depression in Africa may be analysed as follows.

Increased production of cash crops. To offset the falling prices, colonial governments compelled Africans to grow and export ever larger quantities of cash crops. More sisal, cotton and coffee were forced from the land. Greater volume was meant to make up for the lower prices. Africa was driven to produce more for less.

The imposition of higher taxes. Colonial governments raised hut, poll and other taxes to make up for their falling revenues. Africans were forced to pay more even as their incomes collapsed. Taxation squeezed the peasantry harder than ever before. The burden of recovery was laid on the taxed African.

The reduction of African wages. Employers cut the wages of African workers sharply to reduce their costs, as in Kenya where wages fell from about thirty five to about ten shillings in 1930. Labour was made cheaper to protect profits. Wage cuts passed the crisis to the worker. The African labourer paid for the slump.

The establishment of processing industries. To cut the cost of transporting bulky raw materials, some import substitution and processing industries were set up, such as the meat canning works at Kawe run by

Tanganyika Packers. These reduced the bulk of goods before export. A little local industry emerged from the crisis. Processing lowered the cost of exporting.

Retrenchment and cuts in spending. Colonial governments dismissed workers and cut their expenditure on social services in order to balance their budgets. Teachers, clerks and nurses lost their posts. Public spending on Africans was slashed. Even the small educated class that colonial rule had trained was thrown out of work. Austerity was imposed upon the colonised.

The encouragement of settler agriculture. In the settler colonies, governments protected and subsidised European farmers at the expense of Africans, reserving markets and good land for the settlers. African producers were pushed aside. The settler was shielded while the African was squeezed. Colonial favour ran to the European farmer.

Marketing controls and price fixing. Colonial authorities set up marketing arrangements that bought African produce cheaply and controlled its sale. The prices paid to African growers were kept deliberately low. The state managed trade to its own advantage. The African grower received a pittance for his crop.

Diversification of production. In some colonies, governments encouraged the growing of new crops in order to spread the risk of depending on a single export. Diversification aimed to steady colonial revenues. New crops were introduced to widen the base. The colonies sought a little safety in variety.

The measures taken by colonial governments to overcome the effects of the Great Depression in Africa therefore included increased cash crop production, higher taxes, wage cuts, the establishment of processing industries, retrenchment, the encouragement of settler agriculture, marketing controls and diversification. Almost all of these measures protected the colonial power by pressing harder upon the African peoples.

Question 12

In the hardship of the slump, many Africans saw for the first time the true face of colonial rule, and their discontent hardened into a demand for change.

Explain how the Great Depression contributed to the growth of nationalism in Africa.

Model Answer

The Great Depression brought great hardship to colonial Africa and exposed the exploitation of colonial rule. In doing so, it helped to stir and strengthen the growth of African nationalism. The ways in which the Great Depression contributed to the growth of nationalism in Africa may be explained as follows.

It exposed the exploitation of colonial rule. The crisis revealed how completely African economies were tied to the interests of the colonial powers, who passed their losses straight on to Africa. Africans saw plainly that colonial rule served the metropole and not themselves. This awareness bred deep resentment. The slump unmasked the colonial system.

It brought economic hardship and grievance. Falling prices, wage cuts and rising taxes plunged Africans into hardship and gave them concrete grievances against colonial rule. Discontent grew among peasants and workers alike. Economic suffering fed political anger. Hardship turned steadily into protest.

It hit the educated elite through retrenchment. The dismissal of African teachers, clerks and other educated workers created a body of discontented and articulate men. These were the very people who could lead a nationalist movement. Their grievances gave nationalism its leaders. Retrenchment sharpened the anger of the elite.

It strengthened workers' organisations. The wage cuts and unemployment of the Depression drove African workers to organise in defence of their interests. Trade unions and associations grew in strength and number. These organisations became channels of nationalist feeling. Labour protest fed the national cause.

It stirred protest among the peasants. Forced cropping, low prices and heavy taxes provoked resistance among African farmers, who protested against the demands of the colonial state. Rural discontent spread widely across the land. The peasantry was drawn into the struggle. The countryside joined the growing protest.

It discredited the colonial promise of progress. The colonial powers had justified their rule as a source of prosperity and progress, a claim that the Depression exposed as hollow. Africans lost faith in the supposed benefits of colonial rule. The moral case for empire was weakened. The slump shattered the colonial promise.

It encouraged new political associations. In the wake of the crisis, Africans formed welfare associations, unions and early political bodies to voice their grievances. These associations laid the groundwork for the later nationalist parties. Organisation grew out of hardship. The seeds of the independence movements were sown.

It linked African grievances to global currents. The crisis, and the ideas of socialism and anti imperialism that spread in its wake, connected African discontent to wider movements against capitalism and empire. Africans drew on these ideas in their own struggle. Local grievance met global current. Nationalism drew strength from the wider world.

The Great Depression therefore contributed to the growth of African nationalism by exposing colonial exploitation, inflicting economic hardship, angering the educated elite, strengthening workers' organisations, stirring the peasants, discrediting the colonial promise, encouraging new political associations and linking African grievances to global currents. The crisis of capitalism thus helped to awaken the demand for African freedom.

Question 13

Some see the slump as a passing storm over Africa, but its deeper legacy was to bind the continent still more tightly to a system that drained its wealth.

Assess how far the Great Depression deepened the dependence and underdevelopment of colonial Africa.

Model Answer

The Great Depression not only brought immediate hardship to colonial Africa but also shaped its longer economic development. Historians such as Walter Rodney have argued that colonial rule deepened Africa's dependence and underdevelopment, and the Depression illustrates this process. How far the Great Depression deepened the dependence and underdevelopment of colonial Africa may be assessed as follows.

It exposed Africa's dependence on the world market. The collapse of prices showed how completely African economies depended on exporting raw materials to the capitalist market. When that market failed, Africa had no protection whatever. Dependence was laid bare by the crisis. Africa's fate was tied to distant markets.

It entrenched the export of raw materials. To recover, the colonial powers forced Africa to export still more raw materials at low prices, deepening the one sided colonial economy. Africa remained a producer of primary goods for others. The crisis reinforced the whole pattern of dependence. The continent was bound more tightly to raw export.

It drained wealth from Africa to the metropole. Cheap raw materials and forced production transferred African wealth to the industrial powers, who bought low and sold high. The surplus of African labour flowed abroad. This drain, as Rodney argued, worked to underdevelop Africa. The crisis intensified the outflow of wealth.

It discouraged balanced development. Colonial policy developed only what served export, neglecting industry, food production and the infrastructure that Africans needed. The Depression reinforced this narrow pattern of development. Africa's economy was shaped for the metropole and not for itself. Lopsided growth was firmly entrenched.

It deepened poverty and weakened African producers. Falling prices and wages left African farmers and workers poorer and less able to invest or improve their lot. The productive base of African society was weakened. Poverty was deepened by the crisis. The African producer was left far worse off.

Yet it brought a little local industry. Against this, the crisis did prompt some processing industries, such as the meat canning works at Kawe, that added a small amount of local production. This was a modest step towards development. Not every effect deepened dependence. A little industry took root in the soil.

Yet it stirred the resistance that would end colonial rule. The hardship of the Depression also awakened the nationalism that would eventually challenge and overthrow colonial rule. In this sense the crisis sowed the seeds of change. Dependence bred the resistance to dependence. The slump helped to prepare Africa's liberation.

On balance, dependence was deepened. Weighing these effects together, the Depression on the whole tightened Africa's dependence on the capitalist market and deepened its underdevelopment, even as it planted some seeds of change. The negative effects far outweighed the positive. The crisis left Africa more dependent than before. Underdevelopment was, on balance, deepened.

The Great Depression therefore deepened the dependence and underdevelopment of colonial Africa to a considerable degree, by exposing and entrenching Africa's reliance on the world market, draining its wealth, discouraging balanced development and deepening poverty, even though it also brought a little local industry and stirred the nationalism that would one day end colonial rule. On balance, as Walter Rodney's argument suggests, the crisis bound Africa still more tightly to a system that drained it.

State intervention and the welfare state

Question 14

For a century the state had been told to keep its hands off the economy, until the Great Depression taught the capitalist world that only the state could save it.

Explain the concept of state intervention as an alternative to laissez faire capitalism.

Model Answer

The Great Depression discredited the old doctrine of laissez faire, which held that governments should not interfere in the economy. In its place arose the idea of state intervention, associated above all with the economist John Maynard Keynes. The concept of state intervention as an alternative to laissez faire capitalism may be explained as follows.

The failure of laissez faire. Under laissez faire, the state left the economy to regulate itself through the free market, but the Depression showed that the market could not correct so deep a crisis. Millions remained unemployed while the market failed to recover on its own. The old doctrine had failed the test. Laissez faire could not cure the slump.

The idea of state intervention. State intervention meant that the government would actively manage the economy rather than leave it to the market. The state would spend, invest and regulate in order to restore prosperity. Government took responsibility for the health of the economy. The state became an economic actor.

The teaching of John Maynard Keynes. The British economist John Maynard Keynes argued in the 1930s that in a slump the state must step in to raise demand. His General Theory of 1936 provided the theory behind intervention. Keynes gave the new policy its intellectual foundation. His ideas reshaped economic thinking.

The stimulation of demand. Keynes taught that the cause of the slump was a lack of demand, which the state could restore by spending on public works and creating jobs. Government spending would put money back into people's pockets. Restored demand would revive industry. The state would prime the pump of the economy.

Public works and job creation. Under the new policy, governments undertook great programmes of public works, building roads, dams and bridges to employ the jobless. Public spending created work where the market offered none. Employment was generated directly by the state. Government became the employer of last resort.

Deficit spending. Keynes argued that in a crisis the state should spend more than it collected in taxes, borrowing to fund recovery. This deficit spending broke with the old rule of balanced budgets. Government debt was accepted as a tool of recovery. The state spent its way out of the slump.

The regulation of the economy. State intervention also meant regulating banks, industry and trade to prevent the abuses that had caused the crisis. Government supervised finance and set firm rules for business. Regulation guarded against a repeat of the collapse. The state became the referee of the economy.

A middle path between capitalism and socialism. State intervention preserved private ownership and the market while giving the state a large role in managing them. It was neither pure capitalism nor socialism but a mixture of the two. This middle path reshaped the capitalist world. Intervention saved capitalism by reforming it.

State intervention as an alternative to laissez faire capitalism therefore meant that the government actively managed the economy, following the teaching of John Maynard Keynes, by stimulating demand, undertaking public works, engaging in deficit spending and regulating industry and finance. This middle path between pure capitalism and socialism reshaped the capitalist world and saved the system by reforming it.

Question 15

When Franklin Roosevelt told Americans they had nothing to fear but fear itself, he launched the boldest experiment in state intervention the capitalist world had yet seen.

Examine the New Deal as a response to the Great Depression.

Model Answer

The New Deal was the great programme of state intervention by which President Franklin D. Roosevelt sought to lift the United States out of the Great Depression. Introduced from 1933, it rested on the three aims of relief, recovery and reform. The New Deal as a response to the Great Depression may be examined as follows.

The election of Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1932 the American people, weary of the failure of President Hoover, elected Franklin D. Roosevelt, who promised a new deal for the common man. He took office in 1933 with a mandate for bold action. His election marked a decisive turn to state intervention. A new leader brought a new approach.

The programme of relief. The first aim of the New Deal was relief for the millions of unemployed and destitute. Agencies such as the Civilian Conservation Corps and the Works Progress Administration gave work to the jobless. Direct aid reached the hungry and the homeless. Relief eased the immediate suffering of the crisis.

The programme of recovery. The second aim was the recovery of the economy to its former levels. Measures such as the National Industrial Recovery Act sought to revive industry, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act to raise farm prices. Public spending stimulated demand. Recovery aimed to restart the engine of the economy.

The programme of reform. The third aim was the reform of the financial and economic system to prevent another such crisis. The banking system was overhauled and deposits were insured. New rules were set for the stock market. New laws separated ordinary banking from risky speculation on the stock market. Reform guarded against a repeat of the collapse.

The rescue of the banks. Roosevelt acted at once to save the banks, declaring a bank holiday and passing the Emergency Banking Act of 1933. Deposits were insured to restore public confidence. The banking system was stabilised. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was created to guarantee people's savings. Faith in the banks was slowly restored.

Public works and employment. The New Deal created work through great public works, building roads, schools and dams. The Tennessee Valley Authority developed a whole river basin and brought electricity to the countryside. Millions were given employment. Public works put America back to work.

Social security and labour rights. The New Deal gave America its first system of social security, providing pensions and unemployment insurance through the Social Security Act of 1935. The rights of workers to organise were protected in law. A measure of welfare was established. The state became a guardian of the citizen.

The growth of federal government. Through the New Deal, the federal government took on vast new powers over the economy and the welfare of citizens. The role of the state was permanently enlarged. Washington became the manager of the economy. American government was transformed.

The influence of Keynesian ideas. The New Deal put into practice the idea that the state should spend to revive demand, an idea associated with John Maynard Keynes. Government spending and deficits were used to fight the slump. The New Deal embodied the new economics. Theory was turned into policy.

The New Deal was therefore a bold programme of state intervention through which Roosevelt fought the Great Depression by relief for the unemployed, recovery of the economy and reform of the system, including the rescue of the banks, great public works and the beginnings of social security. It transformed American government and showed that state intervention could save capitalism from its own crises.

Question 16

The New Deal did not by itself end the Depression, yet it changed forever what people expected their government to do.

Assess the achievements and limitations of the New Deal.

Model Answer

The New Deal brought great changes to the United States, but historians have long debated how far it succeeded in ending the Great Depression. It had both notable achievements and real limitations. The achievements and limitations of the New Deal may be assessed as follows.

It provided relief to millions. The New Deal gave work and aid to millions of the unemployed and destitute, easing the worst suffering of the Depression. Public works employed the jobless and direct aid fed the hungry. Human misery was greatly relieved. The New Deal rescued many from utter ruin.

It restored public confidence. Roosevelt's energetic action and reassuring leadership restored the confidence of a frightened people. His fireside talks and bold measures revived hope. The banking panic was calmed. On taking office in 1933 he told the people that the only thing to fear was fear itself. Faith in the future was slowly rebuilt.

It reformed the financial system. The New Deal reformed the banks and the stock market and insured deposits, guarding against another collapse. The abuses that had caused the crisis were curbed. The financial system was made far safer. The Securities and Exchange Commission was set up in 1934 to police the stock market. Reform gave lasting protection.

It established social security. The Social Security Act of 1935 gave America its first system of pensions and unemployment insurance. The state accepted responsibility for the welfare of its citizens. A national safety net was created. For the first time the federal government guaranteed a measure of security in old age. Welfare became a duty of government.

It did not fully end the Depression. Despite all its measures, the New Deal did not restore full employment, and unemployment remained high until the Second World War brought recovery. The Depression was eased but not cured. The deepest problem remained unsolved. It was the war, not the New Deal, that finally ended the slump.

It was criticised as too much government. Opponents attacked the New Deal for giving the federal government too much power over the economy and the citizen. Business resented its regulation and its cost. Some critics feared a drift towards socialism. The growth of the state alarmed many.

It left some groups behind. The benefits of the New Deal did not reach everyone equally, and groups such as black Americans and farm labourers often gained the least. Old injustices persisted beneath the reforms.

Its relief was uneven. Domestic and farm workers, among whom many black Americans laboured, were left out of early social security. Not all Americans shared in the New Deal.

It rested on deficit spending and debt. The New Deal was funded by heavy government borrowing, which greatly increased the national debt. Its critics questioned whether such spending could continue for long. The cost of recovery was very large. Debt was the price of the New Deal.

The New Deal therefore achieved a great deal, providing relief, restoring confidence, reforming finance and establishing social security, yet it had real limitations, for it did not fully end the Depression, alarmed its critics, left some groups behind and rested on heavy debt. It was above all a bold and largely successful attempt to save capitalism through state intervention, even though final recovery awaited the Second World War.

Question 17

Out of the ruins of depression and war came a promise that the state would care for its people from the cradle to the grave.

Examine the welfare state as an alternative governance system.

Model Answer

The welfare state was an alternative governance system in which the state took responsibility for the basic welfare of all its citizens. It arose from the ideas of Keynes and the experience of depression and war, and was built most fully in Britain after 1945. The welfare state as an alternative governance system may be examined as follows.

The concept of the welfare state. The welfare state is a system in which the government provides for the basic needs of its citizens, such as health, education, housing and income security. It rests on the belief that the state has a duty to protect its people from want. It goes far beyond the old limited government. The state becomes the guardian of welfare.

Its roots in the crisis of capitalism. The welfare state grew from the failure of unregulated capitalism, which had left millions in poverty and insecurity during the Depression. It sought to soften the harshness of the market. Its very origins lay in the crisis of the system. Welfare was a response to capitalist failure.

The influence of Keynes. The welfare state rested on the Keynesian idea that the state should manage the economy to maintain full employment. Steady employment and public spending underpinned welfare. Keynesian economics made the welfare state possible. Full employment was its foundation.

The Beveridge Report of 1942. In Britain, the Beveridge Report of 1942 laid the plan for the welfare state, naming five great evils to be defeated: want, disease, ignorance, squalor and idleness. It proposed a comprehensive system of social security. The report became the blueprint of the welfare state. Beveridge charted the way forward.

Social security from the cradle to the grave. The welfare state provided security against poverty at every stage of life, through pensions, unemployment benefit and family allowances. Citizens were protected from the cradle to the grave. Insurance replaced destitution. No one was to be left to fall.

The National Health Service. In Britain the welfare state created the National Health Service in 1948, providing medical care free to all at the point of use. Health care became a right rather than a privilege. Sickness no longer meant ruin. It was founded in 1948 under the Labour government of Clement Attlee and the minister Aneurin Bevan. The state took charge of the nation's health.

Public education and housing. The welfare state expanded free public education and built public housing for those in need. Opportunity and shelter were extended to the poor. Ignorance and squalor were attacked directly. The Education Act of 1944 had already promised free secondary schooling to every child. The state widened the chances of ordinary people.

A reform that preserved capitalism. The welfare state did not abolish capitalism but softened it, providing security within a market economy. It was a middle path between pure capitalism and socialism.

By reforming the system it helped to preserve it. It secured the citizen against want while leaving industry and enterprise in private hands. Welfare made capitalism bearable.

The welfare state was therefore an alternative governance system in which the state, drawing on the ideas of Keynes and Beveridge, took responsibility for the welfare of its citizens through social security, free health care in the National Health Service, public education and housing. Built most fully in Britain after 1945, it softened the harshness of capitalism and, by reforming the system, helped to preserve it.

Socialism and the planned economy

Question 18

Where capitalism promised freedom and delivered crisis, socialism promised equality and a world in which the wealth of all would belong to all.

Explain socialism as an alternative to the capitalist system.

Model Answer

Socialism arose as the great rival and alternative to capitalism, offering a different way of organising production and governing society. It rested on common ownership, planning and equality in place of private profit and the market. Socialism as an alternative to the capitalist system may be explained as follows.

It is based on the common ownership of the means of production. Under socialism, the means of production, such as land, factories and banks, are owned by the community or the state rather than by private individuals. Production is carried on for the common good and not for private profit. This common ownership is the essence of socialism. The wealth belongs to the people as a whole.

It replaces the market with economic planning. Socialism replaces the anarchy of the market with a planned economy, in which the state decides what is to be produced and how. Production is directed to meet the needs of society. Planning replaces the blind competition of capitalism. The economy is guided by design and not by chance.

It aims at a classless society. Socialism seeks to abolish the division of society into rich and poor, owners and workers, and to build a classless society of equals. The exploitation of one class by another is to be ended. Equality is its guiding aim. The wealth created by the labour of all was to be enjoyed by all alike. Socialism seeks a society without masters.

It rests on the ideas of Marx and Engels. Modern socialism drew on the writings of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, in the Communist Manifesto and Das Kapital. They taught that capitalism would in time be overthrown by the working class. Their ideas gave socialism its theory. Marx and Engels were its great prophets.

It arose from the failures of capitalism. Socialism grew from the poverty, inequality and recurring crises that capitalism produced. It offered the workers an alternative to their exploitation. The failures of capitalism were the very soil in which socialism grew. Socialism was born of capitalist injustice.

It distributes wealth according to need or work. Under socialism, wealth is shared according to need or according to labour, rather than according to the ownership of property. The idle rich give way to the working community. Distribution is made just. Reward follows work and not property.

It gives the state a central role. In socialism the state takes control of the economy and directs it for the good of all. The state becomes the owner, the planner and the provider. Government stands at the very centre of economic life. It plans production, sets prices and provides education, health and housing to the people. The state is the guardian of the common wealth.

It was first realised in the Soviet Union. Socialism was first put into practice on a national scale in the Soviet Union after the Russian Revolution of 1917. There the means of production were nationalised and the economy was planned. The Soviet Union became the model of socialism. Theory became a living system.

Socialism as an alternative to the capitalist system therefore rests on the common ownership of the means of production, the planning of the economy, the pursuit of a classless society and the just distribution of wealth, drawing on the ideas of Marx and Engels and arising from the failures of capitalism. First realised in the Soviet Union, it stood as the great rival to the capitalist world.

Question 19

While the capitalist world sank into depression, the Soviet Union was building factories and cities under a plan that owed nothing to the market.

Examine the features of the socialist planned economy in the Soviet Union.

Model Answer

The Soviet Union, born of the Russian Revolution of 1917, built the first socialist planned economy, in which the state owned and directed all production. Its features stood in sharp contrast to those of the capitalist world. The features of the socialist planned economy in the Soviet Union may be examined as follows.

The nationalisation of the means of production. In the Soviet Union all the means of production, including land, banks, factories and mines, were taken into the ownership of the state. Private property in the means of production was abolished. The whole economy belonged to the people through their government. Nationalisation was the foundation of the system.

Central economic planning. The Soviet economy was directed by central planning rather than by the market. The state decided what should be produced, in what quantity and at what price. Planning replaced the free play of supply and demand. The economy moved according to the plan.

The Five Year Plans. From 1928 the Soviet Union developed its economy through a series of Five Year Plans, beginning with the first plan of 1928 to 1932. These plans set targets for industry and agriculture and mobilised the whole nation to meet them. Rapid industrialisation was their aim. The plans drove the Soviet economy forward.

The collectivisation of agriculture. Soviet farming was collectivised, as the small holdings of the peasants were merged into large collective and state farms. Agriculture was brought under state control and direction. Collectivisation aimed to feed the great industrial drive. The land, like the factory, was made collective.

The New Economic Policy as a transition. In an earlier phase, from 1921, Lenin's New Economic Policy had allowed a limited degree of private trade and small enterprise while the state kept the commanding heights. It was a temporary step towards full socialism. The New Economic Policy eased the transition. A little private trade was allowed for a time.

State control of employment and prices. The state was the sole employer and set wages, prices and the direction of labour. There was no private market in labour or goods as there was under capitalism. Employment was provided and controlled by the state. The state governed both work and reward.

The one party socialist state. The planned economy was directed by a one party state under the Communist Party, organised from the grassroots to the national level. Political and economic power were united in the party. The party guided the whole system. One party ruled the socialist state.

Immunity from the capitalist market. Because it stood outside the world capitalist market, the Soviet Union was largely untouched by the Great Depression that ravaged the capitalist world. While others sank into slump, the Soviet economy grew. Planning shielded it from the crisis. The socialist economy escaped the capitalist storm.

The socialist planned economy in the Soviet Union was therefore marked by the nationalisation of the means of production, central planning through the Five Year Plans, the collectivisation of agriculture, state control of employment and prices, and direction by a one party socialist state. Standing outside the capitalist market, it escaped the Great Depression and stood as the great alternative to capitalism.

Question 20

The Soviet plan turned a backward peasant empire into an industrial power in a single generation, but it exacted a terrible price in freedom and in blood.

Assess the achievements and weaknesses of the Soviet planned economy.

Model Answer

The Soviet planned economy transformed a backward country into a great industrial power, yet it did so at a heavy human cost. It had both remarkable achievements and grave weaknesses. The achievements and weaknesses of the Soviet planned economy may be assessed as follows.

It achieved rapid industrialisation. Through the Five Year Plans, the Soviet Union built up heavy industry with astonishing speed, becoming a major industrial power within a generation. New factories, dams and cities rose across the land. Industrial output soared. A peasant country became an industrial giant.

It escaped the Great Depression. Standing outside the world capitalist market, the Soviet economy was untouched by the Depression that ruined the capitalist world. While others sank into slump, Soviet production grew. Planning gave immunity from the crisis. The socialist economy stood firm.

It provided full employment. The planned economy guaranteed work to all, abolishing the mass unemployment that plagued capitalism. There were no idle millions as in the West. Every worker had a place. The Five Year Plans demanded so much labour that every hand was needed for the great projects. Unemployment was banished from the system.

It expanded education and welfare. The Soviet state provided education, health care and social services on a wide scale, raising literacy and skills among the people. The benefits of growth were spread to the population. Welfare was made a duty of the state. Ordinary people gained schooling and care.

It relied on force and coercion. The plan was carried through by harsh compulsion, and collectivisation in particular was imposed by force upon an unwilling peasantry. Millions suffered and many died in the process. The system rested on coercion. Progress was bought with cruelty.

It brought famine and suffering. The upheaval of collectivisation and the seizure of grain brought terrible famine, especially in the early 1930s. The countryside paid a fearful price for industrialisation. Suffering accompanied the plan. The famine of 1932 to 1933 struck Ukraine and other grain lands with terrible force. Hunger stalked the land of the plan.

It denied political and economic freedom. The one party state allowed no political freedom and no free choice in economic life. Citizens could neither dissent nor choose their own path. Liberty was sacrificed to the plan. Under Stalin the secret police and the labour camps crushed all dissent. The people gained security but lost freedom.

It produced bureaucracy and inefficiency. Central planning bred a vast and often rigid bureaucracy, and the absence of a market led to waste, shortages and goods of poor quality. The system was clumsy and inflexible. Planning had its own serious failings. Bureaucracy weighed heavily upon the economy.

The Soviet planned economy therefore achieved rapid industrialisation, escaped the Great Depression, provided full employment and expanded welfare, yet it relied on force, brought famine, denied freedom and bred bureaucracy and inefficiency. It stood as a powerful alternative to capitalism, but one whose achievements were bought at a terrible human cost.

Question 21

As the capitalist world queued at soup kitchens, the Soviet Union's factories hummed, and to many the future seemed to belong to socialism.

Account for the appeal of socialism as an alternative to capitalism after the Great Depression.

Model Answer

The Great Depression discredited capitalism and turned the eyes of many towards socialism as an alternative. In the 1930s, socialism gained a wide appeal among workers, intellectuals and colonial peoples. The reasons for the appeal of socialism as an alternative to capitalism after the Great Depression may be examined as follows.

The failure of capitalism in the Depression. The Great Depression exposed the failures of capitalism, its crises, unemployment and poverty, and drove people to seek an alternative. Socialism offered a wholly different path. The collapse of capitalism made socialism attractive. Capitalist failure was socialism's opportunity.

The apparent success of the Soviet Union. While the capitalist world sank into slump, the Soviet Union appeared to grow steadily under its plans. Its immunity from the Depression impressed many observers abroad. The Soviet example seemed to prove that socialism worked. Soviet growth was socialism's advertisement.

The promise of equality. Socialism promised to end the gross inequalities of capitalism and to create a society of equals. To those who had suffered under capitalist injustice, this promise was deeply attractive. Equality drew people to the cause. Socialism spoke to the poor and the exploited.

The promise of security. Socialism promised full employment and security against poverty, in contrast to the insecurity of the capitalist crises. To the unemployed and the fearful, this security was a powerful appeal. Socialism offered a life without slump. In the Soviet Union there was work for all while millions in the West stood idle. It promised freedom from want.

Its appeal to the working class. Socialism spoke directly to the interests of the workers, promising to end their exploitation and to give them power. Trade unions and labour movements were drawn towards it. The working class was its natural base. Labour found its voice in socialism.

Its appeal to intellectuals. Many intellectuals, disillusioned with capitalism, were attracted by the ideals and the apparent rationality of socialist planning. They saw in socialism a scientific ordering of society. Thinkers lent it their prestige. The educated were drawn to the socialist vision.

Its appeal to colonial peoples. Socialism, with its opposition to imperialism, appealed to the colonised peoples of Africa and Asia struggling against colonial rule. It linked their struggle to a wider cause. Anti imperialism drew the colonies towards socialism. The oppressed saw in it an ally.

The weakness of the alternatives. With capitalism discredited and the only other alternative being fascism, socialism appealed to those who rejected both the old order and the dictators. It seemed the hope of the future. Socialism stood as the progressive choice. It offered a path between ruin and tyranny.

Socialism therefore appealed as an alternative to capitalism after the Great Depression because capitalism had failed, the Soviet Union appeared to succeed, and socialism promised equality and security, drawing to itself the working class, the intellectuals and the colonial peoples, and standing as a progressive alternative to both the old order and fascism. For a time, the future seemed to many to belong to socialism.

Fascism and Nazism

Question 22

Fascism answered the chaos of depression not with equality or freedom but with the iron promise of order, nation and strength.

Explain the concept and features of fascism as an alternative governance system.

Model Answer

Fascism arose in Europe after the First World War and grew strong in the crisis of the Great Depression, offering an alternative to both liberal capitalism and socialism. It was a system of extreme nationalism and total state control under a single leader. The concept and features of fascism may be explained as follows.

It is a system of extreme nationalism. Fascism placed the nation above all else and preached the supremacy and glory of the nation and the state. Loyalty to the nation was demanded above every other tie. Extreme nationalism and chauvinism were its creed. The nation was made into an idol.

It is a totalitarian system. Fascism sought total control over every part of life, political, economic, social and cultural. It abolished free elections, banned opposition and censored the press and radio. The state reached into every corner of society. Nothing was to lie outside the state.

It is a one party dictatorship. Under fascism all parties save the ruling Fascist Party were banned, and power was concentrated in a single party and leader. Mussolini in Italy ruled as such a leader. All opposition was crushed. All rival parties, elections and free assemblies were abolished after 1925. One party and one leader held all power.

It rests on the worship of a leader. Fascism exalted a single all powerful leader, whose word was law and who embodied the will of the nation. Mussolini was hailed as Il Duce, the leader. The people were to follow him without question. Propaganda taught the people that the leader was always right. The leader was made into a god.

It glorifies militarism and violence. Fascism glorified war, force and violence as noble and necessary. Mussolini declared that fascism did not believe in perpetual peace. Force was the means of policy both at home and abroad. The regime prepared its people for war and seized Abyssinia in 1935. Violence was made a virtue.

It directs the economy through the state. Under fascism the state directed the economy towards national strength, though without abolishing private ownership as socialism did. Industry and labour were controlled and organised by the state. The economy served the nation and the leader. The state commanded without owning all.

It is anti-communist and anti-liberal. Fascism was bitterly opposed to communism and socialism, and equally hostile to liberal democracy and its freedoms. It crushed the parties of the left and the liberal order alike. It stood against both of its rivals. Fascism fought the left and the liberals together.

It suppresses opponents by force. Fascism silenced its opponents through imprisonment, violence and the secret police. Free trade unions were banned and dissenters were persecuted. Terror upheld the regime. A secret police, the OVRA, hunted down those who dared to resist. Opposition was beaten into silence.

Fascism as an alternative governance system was therefore marked by extreme nationalism, totalitarian and one party rule, the worship of a single leader, the glorification of militarism and violence, the state direction of the economy, and bitter hostility to both communism and liberal democracy. Rising in the crisis of the age, it offered order and national strength at the cost of all freedom.

Question 23

A nation that had won the war but felt cheated of the peace was ripe for a man who promised to make Italy great and feared again.

Examine the causes of the rise of fascism in Italy.

Model Answer

Fascism first came to power in Italy, where Benito Mussolini and his Fascist Party seized control in 1922. Its rise sprang from the discontents of post war Italy and the fears of the age. The causes of the rise of fascism in Italy may be examined as follows.

Discontent after the First World War. Although Italy had fought on the winning side in the First World War, many Italians felt cheated of the rewards they had been promised. This bitterness bred a deep sense of grievance and humiliation. Disappointment with the peace fed fascism. Italy felt betrayed by its own victory.

Disappointment with the Treaty of Versailles. Italy gained far less territory at the peace settlement than it had hoped, and nationalists spoke bitterly of a mutilated victory. This grievance was skilfully exploited by the fascists. Anger at the settlement drove the nationalist cause. The peace left Italy resentful.

Economic hardship and unemployment. After the war Italy suffered inflation, unemployment and economic distress, which the weak governments could not cure. Hardship spread discontent among all classes. Economic misery prepared the ground for fascism. Distress turned the people against the old order.

The fear of communism. The unrest of the post war years, with its strikes and factory occupations, raised the fear of a communist revolution. Property owners and the middle class looked to fascism to protect them. Fear of the left drove many into Mussolini's arms. Fascism posed as the shield against communism.

The weakness of liberal government. The liberal parliamentary governments of Italy were weak, divided and unable to master the crisis. Their failure discredited democracy in the eyes of many. The vacuum of power invited a strong man. Between 1919 and 1922 a string of weak coalition governments rose and fell. Weak government opened the door to fascism.

The leadership of Mussolini. Benito Mussolini was a bold and ruthless leader who founded the Fascist Party in 1921 and rallied the discontented behind him. His energy and propaganda won him a wide following. Strong leadership gave fascism its force. A former socialist and journalist, he turned his gifts to the nationalist cause. Mussolini seized the moment.

The use of violence and the Blackshirts. The fascists used armed squads, the Blackshirts, to intimidate and crush their opponents, especially the socialists. Violence broke the resistance of the left. Force cleared the path to power. They burned the offices of the socialists and broke up their strikes and meetings. The Blackshirts beat their way to victory.

The March on Rome of 1922. In October 1922 the fascists marched on Rome, and the king, unwilling to resist, invited Mussolini to form a government. Fascism thus came to power without a real fight. The March on Rome was its triumph. King Victor Emmanuel the Third chose to appoint him rather than risk a civil war. Mussolini walked into power.

The rise of fascism in Italy therefore sprang from discontent after the First World War, disappointment with the Treaty of Versailles, economic hardship, the fear of communism, the weakness of liberal government, the leadership of Mussolini, the use of violence, and the March on Rome of 1922. Out of the disorder of post war Italy, fascism rose to power.

Question 24

The Great Depression did for Hitler what years of agitation had failed to do, for as the factories closed, the German people turned to the man who promised them bread and pride.

Examine the causes of the rise of Nazism in Germany.

Model Answer

Nazism rose to power in Germany under Adolf Hitler, who became Chancellor in 1933. Its rise sprang above all from the humiliation of defeat and the ruin of the Great Depression. The causes of the rise of Nazism in Germany may be examined as follows.

The humiliation of the Treaty of Versailles. Germany had been defeated in the First World War and forced to accept the harsh Treaty of Versailles, with its loss of land, its disarmament and its clause of war guilt. Germans burned with resentment at this humiliation. The Nazis promised to overturn the treaty. Versailles was the great grievance.

The burden of reparations and inflation. Germany was saddled with heavy reparations, and in 1923 suffered a catastrophic inflation that wiped out savings. This ruin bred bitterness and deep insecurity. Economic disaster turned Germans against the republic. Hardship prepared the way for Hitler.

The impact of the Great Depression. The Great Depression struck Germany with terrible force, throwing millions out of work and plunging the country into despair. The Nazis promised work and recovery to a desperate people. The slump was the making of Nazism. Depression drove Germans into Hitler's arms.

The weakness of the Weimar Republic. The democratic Weimar Republic, born of defeat in 1919, was weak, divided and blamed for Germany's misfortunes. Its many quarrelling parties could not provide strong government. The failure of democracy discredited it. The weak republic could not withstand the crisis.

The fear of communism. The rise of the communists frightened the middle class, the property owners and the industrialists, who looked to the Nazis to save them from revolution. Fear of the left drove them towards Hitler. Nazism posed as the barrier against communism. The right rallied to Hitler in fear.

The leadership and propaganda of Hitler. Adolf Hitler was a spellbinding orator and a master of propaganda who promised to restore the greatness of Germany. His speeches and the Nazi machine won mass support. Strong leadership gave Nazism its power. Hitler bound the people to himself.

The appeal of Nazi promises. The Nazis promised work, bread, national revival and the undoing of Versailles, offering something to almost every group. These promises drew millions of votes. Nazism offered hope amid despair. In the elections of 1932 the Nazis became the largest party in the Reichstag. Hitler promised to make Germany great once more.

The use of terror and scapegoats. The Nazis used violence against their opponents and blamed Germany's troubles on the Jews and the communists. Terror silenced dissent while scapegoats channelled the people's anger. Hatred and force served the Nazi cause. Nazism rose upon fear and blame.

The rise of Nazism in Germany therefore sprang from the humiliation of Versailles, the burden of reparations and inflation, the impact of the Great Depression, the weakness of the Weimar Republic, the fear of communism, the leadership and propaganda of Hitler, the appeal of Nazi promises, and the use of terror and scapegoats. Out of defeat and depression, Hitler rose to power in 1933.

Question 25

Mussolini and Hitler were brothers in tyranny, alike in their hatred of freedom, yet Hitler carried the creed to a far darker extreme.

Compare fascism and Nazism as alternative governance systems.

Model Answer

Fascism in Italy and Nazism in Germany were the two great authoritarian systems that rose from the crises of the age between the wars. They shared much in common but also differed in important ways. Fascism and Nazism may be compared as follows.

Both were extreme nationalist systems. Both fascism and Nazism preached extreme nationalism and the supremacy of their own nation and state. Both demanded total loyalty to the nation. Chauvinism was common to them both. Each preached that its own people were destined for greatness and dominion. Each made the nation supreme.

Both were totalitarian one party dictatorships. Both abolished democracy and ruled as one party states under a single all powerful leader. Mussolini and Hitler alike held total power. Opposition was banned in both. The state alone was permitted to organise politics, labour and the press. Each was a totalitarian regime.

Both glorified militarism and expansion. Both systems glorified war and force and pursued aggressive expansion abroad in search of empire. Both built up their armies for conquest. Militarism was central to each. Italy seized Abyssinia in 1935, and Germany drove towards war in Europe. Both marched towards war.

Both were anti communist and anti democratic. Both fascism and Nazism were bitterly hostile to communism and to liberal democracy alike. Both crushed the parties of the left and the liberal order. They shared the very same enemies. Both smashed the trade unions and the socialist and communist parties. Each fought the left and the liberals.

Both arose from the crises after the First World War. Both movements grew from the discontent, grievance and instability that followed the First World War and deepened in the Depression. Both fed on national humiliation and economic ruin. Crisis was the parent of both. Each was a child of hard times.

They arose in different countries under different leaders. Fascism arose in Italy under Mussolini, while Nazism arose in Germany under Hitler. Mussolini formulated fascism, and Hitler founded the Nazi

movement. The two were distinct in their origins. Mussolini took power in 1922, and Hitler eleven years later in 1933. Each had its own land and leader.

Nazism was driven more by the Great Depression. Fascism rose chiefly from the grievances of the First World War and Versailles, while Nazism was driven above all by the Great Depression. The slump was the making of Hitler more than of Mussolini. Their timing and triggers differed. Depression was the engine of Nazism.

Nazism was marked by extreme racism. The sharpest difference was that Nazism rested on a savage racial doctrine and anti Jewish hatred, which fascism in Italy did not originally share. Hitler's persecution of the Jews had no true parallel in Mussolini's early Italy. Racism set Nazism apart. Nazism carried hatred to a murderous extreme.

Fascism and Nazism were therefore alike in their extreme nationalism, their totalitarian one party rule, their militarism, and their hostility to communism and democracy, and both arose from the crises that followed the First World War. Yet they differed in their countries and leaders, in that Nazism was driven more by the Great Depression and was marked above all by an extreme racism that set it apart. They were kindred tyrannies, but Nazism was the darker of the two.

African socialism and Ujamaa

Question 26

In a newly free Tanzania, Julius Nyerere looked neither to Wall Street nor to Moscow but to the African family for a model of how a nation might govern itself.

Explain the concept of African socialism or Ujamaa as an alternative governance system.

Model Answer

African socialism, known in Tanzania as Ujamaa, was an alternative governance system rooted in African values and adapted to African conditions. Set out by Julius Nyerere in the Arusha Declaration of 1967, it rejected both Western capitalism and Soviet communism. The concept of African socialism or Ujamaa as an alternative governance system may be explained as follows.

It is an African form of socialism. Ujamaa was a socialism drawn from African traditions rather than borrowed wholly from Europe. Nyerere held that the African extended family already lived in a spirit of sharing and cooperation. This traditional spirit was made the basis of Ujamaa. Socialism was rooted in African life.

The meaning of Ujamaa. The Swahili word ujamaa means familyhood, the spirit of the extended family in which people live and work together and share what they have. Nyerere made this the guiding idea of his socialism. Society was to become one great family. Ujamaa was familyhood written large.

It was set out in the Arusha Declaration. African socialism in Tanzania was proclaimed in the Arusha Declaration of 5 February 1967 by the ruling party, TANU. The declaration set out the policy of socialism and self-reliance. It became the charter of Ujamaa. Arusha gave the policy its foundation.

It rests on equality and human dignity. Ujamaa was founded on the belief in the equality and dignity of all people. It rejected the division of society into rich and poor, exploiter and exploited. All were to share as equals. Nyerere taught that no man should be made to live by the labour of another. Human equality was its cornerstone.

It rests on self-reliance. Ujamaa stressed self-reliance, that the nation should depend on its own efforts and resources rather than on foreign aid. The people were to build the country by their own labour. Self-reliance was central to the policy. Tanzania was to stand on its own feet.

It aims at a classless society. Like other forms of socialism, Ujamaa aimed to build a classless society, free of the exploitation of one person by another. Nyerere sought a nation of equals without masters or servants. A classless society was its goal. It sought to prevent the rise of a wealthy African elite in place of the departed colonisers. Ujamaa sought to banish class.

It places the means of production under public control. Under Ujamaa the major means of production were to be owned and controlled by the people through their government and cooperatives. Private accumulation and exploitation were to be ended. Public ownership was its economic basis. The wealth of the nation was to be shared.

It rejected both capitalism and communism. Ujamaa charted a middle path, rejecting the exploitation of Western capitalism and the class struggle and atheism of Soviet communism alike. It was a distinctly African alternative. Nyerere sought a third way. Ujamaa stood between the two great systems.

African socialism or Ujamaa was therefore an alternative governance system rooted in the African tradition of familyhood, proclaimed in the Arusha Declaration of 1967, resting on equality, human dignity and self reliance, and aiming at a classless society in which the means of production were held in common. Rejecting both capitalism and communism, it offered a distinctly African path of development.

Question 27

Fresh from the struggle against colonialism, Nyerere feared that political freedom without economic justice would leave Tanzania in chains of a different kind.

Examine the reasons why Tanzania adopted socialism after independence.

Model Answer

After gaining independence in 1961, Tanzania under Julius Nyerere chose socialism, proclaimed in the Arusha Declaration of 1967, as its path of development. Several reasons lay behind this choice. The reasons why Tanzania adopted socialism after independence may be examined as follows.

To build national unity. Nyerere adopted socialism to bind the many peoples of Tanzania into one united nation. A one party socialist state was meant to prevent division and tribalism. Unity was to be forged through common effort. Kiswahili was promoted as a common national language to bind the people together. Socialism was to make one people out of many.

To create a classless society. Socialism was chosen to prevent the growth of classes of rich and poor and to correct the inequalities left by colonial rule. Nyerere feared the rise of a new exploiting class. A classless society was the aim. He warned constantly against the growth of a class living off the peasants. Socialism was to keep the nation equal.

To achieve economic self-reliance. Tanzania adopted socialism to build its economy through its own efforts and resources rather than depend on foreign powers. Self-reliance was to guard the nation's freedom. Economic independence was the goal. Socialism was to make Tanzania self-supporting.

To avoid neo colonial dependence. Nyerere feared that a capitalist path would leave Tanzania dependent on and exploited by the former colonial powers. Socialism was chosen to keep foreign capital from dominating the country. It was a defence against neo colonialism. Socialism guarded hard won freedom.

To develop the rural areas. Since most Tanzanians were peasants, socialism through Ujamaa villages was meant to develop the countryside. Communal villages would pool labour and bring services to the people. Rural development was central to the policy. Socialism was to lift the villages.

To draw on African tradition. Nyerere believed that socialism suited the African tradition of the extended family, in which people already shared and cooperated. Ujamaa was presented as a return to African values. Tradition made socialism seem natural. The African past pointed to a socialist future.

To ensure stability under one party. A one party socialist state was chosen to give stable government to a young nation and to avoid the divisions of multiparty rivalry. Nyerere feared that opposition parties might stir conflict among an inexperienced people. Stability was sought through unity. One party was to steady the nation.

The vision of Julius Nyerere. Much owed to the personal vision and conviction of Nyerere himself, who believed deeply in equality, dignity and social justice. His leadership shaped the whole policy. The choice of socialism bore his mark. His essay on the basis of African socialism, written in 1962, set out the philosophy years before Arusha. Nyerere was the architect of Ujamaa.

Tanzania therefore adopted socialism after independence in order to build national unity, create a classless society, achieve self-reliance, avoid neo colonial dependence, develop the rural areas and draw on African tradition, all under the stable rule of one party and the guiding vision of Julius Nyerere. In Ujamaa, Tanzania sought a path of development suited to its own conditions.

Question 28

The Arusha Declaration was more than a speech, for it set out to remake Tanzania from a nation of scattered villages into a socialist society built by its own hands.

Examine the features of Ujamaa and self-reliance under the Arusha Declaration.

Model Answer

The Arusha Declaration of 1967 set out the policy of socialism and self-reliance that shaped Tanzania for a generation. It laid down the principles and features of Ujamaa. The features of Ujamaa and self-reliance under the Arusha Declaration may be examined as follows.

Public ownership of the means of production. The Arusha Declaration placed the major means of production, such as banks, industries and large farms, under public ownership. The commanding heights of the economy were nationalised. Private exploitation was to be ended. The wealth of the nation passed to the people.

The policy of self-reliance. The declaration proclaimed kujitegemea, or self-reliance, that Tanzania should develop through its own resources and labour rather than foreign aid. The people were to build the nation themselves. Self-reliance was the watchword. Tanzania was to depend upon itself.

The building of Ujamaa villages. The people were to be gathered into communal Ujamaa villages, where they would live and farm together and share the fruits of their labour. These villages were the very heart of rural socialism. Communal life was to be built in the countryside. The village was the cell of Ujamaa.

An emphasis on agriculture. The Arusha Declaration stressed that Tanzania, a land of peasants, must build its development on agriculture and the land. Farming, and not industry, was the true basis of the economy. The hoe was to lead the way. Agriculture was made the foundation of development.

Equality and human dignity. Ujamaa rested on the equality and dignity of all people and the rejection of exploitation. No one was to live by the labour of another. Equality was written into the policy. The declaration condemned the exploitation of man by man in every form. All were to be equal in dignity.

The leadership code. The declaration laid down a code of conduct for leaders, forbidding them to own shares, hold directorships or rent out property. Leaders were not to become a new exploiting class. The code guarded the purity of socialism. No leader was to hold shares, take a second salary or live off rents. Leaders were to serve and not to profit.

The goal of a classless society. The policy aimed to build a society without classes, in which there were neither exploiters nor exploited. The growth of a rich elite was to be prevented. A nation of equals was the goal. The state and the cooperatives, not private owners, were to hold the nation's wealth. Class was to have no place in Ujamaa.

The one party democratic state. Ujamaa was carried on through a one party state, which claimed to practise democracy from the grassroots upward. The party led the people in building socialism. Political and economic policy were united. TANU, and later Chama Cha Mapinduzi, was declared the single ruling party. One party guided the socialist nation.

The features of Ujamaa and self-reliance under the Arusha Declaration therefore included the public ownership of the means of production, the policy of self-reliance, the building of Ujamaa villages, an emphasis on agriculture, equality and human dignity, a leadership code, the goal of a classless society, and the one party democratic state. Together these principles were to remake Tanzania as a self-reliant socialist society.

Question 29

Ujamaa gave Tanzania unity, schools and dignity, yet it left the nation poorer than its hopes and dependent still on the very crops it had always sold.

Assess the achievements and failures of Ujamaa in Tanzania.

Model Answer

The policy of Ujamaa, pursued in Tanzania from the Arusha Declaration of 1967, brought both real achievements and serious failures. Its record has been much debated ever since. The achievements and failures of Ujamaa in Tanzania may be assessed as follows.

It built national unity. Ujamaa and the one party state bound the many peoples of Tanzania into one united nation, free from the tribalism and division that troubled other African states. National unity was among its greatest achievements. It escaped the tribal conflicts that tore apart many of its neighbours. Tanzania stood together as one people.

It expanded social services. Under Ujamaa the government greatly expanded education and health services, spreading schools and clinics across the country. Literacy rose sharply through Universal Primary Education. The people gained schooling and care. Social services reached even the villages.

It promoted equality. Ujamaa prevented the growth of a wide gulf between rich and poor and kept Tanzania a relatively equal society. The leadership code checked the greed of leaders. Exploitation was held in check. The leadership code forbade officials from enriching themselves at public expense. Tanzania avoided the extremes of wealth and poverty.

It nationalised the economy for the people. The Arusha Declaration brought banks, industries and estates under public ownership for the benefit of the nation. The commanding heights passed to the people. Foreign domination of the economy was reduced. The nation took charge of its own wealth.

Compulsory villagisation caused hardship. The gathering of peasants into Ujamaa villages became compulsory, and many were moved by force before roads, water and services were ready. The upheaval caused resentment and real hardship. Villagisation was often oppressive. Force soured a noble policy.

Agricultural production fell. Ujamaa did not raise agricultural output as had been hoped, and food production often fell, leading to shortages. The peasants had little wish to farm communally. Farming stagnated under the policy. The country that had once fed itself was forced at times to import grain. The land yielded less than the nation needed.

The economy declined and debts grew. By the 1980s Tanzania remained one of the poorest countries in Africa, burdened with heavy foreign debts. Inefficient state enterprises drained the treasury. The economy weakened rather than grew. The oil crisis of the 1970s and the war against Idi Amin's Uganda in 1978 to 1979 drained the treasury. Prosperity did not follow the plan.

Dependence was not overcome. Despite the goal of self reliance, Tanzania remained dependent on foreign aid and on exporting coffee, cotton and sisal at prices set abroad. The dream of self reliance was not realised. External shocks, such as the oil crisis, struck the country hard. Dependence outlived the policy.

Ujamaa therefore achieved much, building national unity, expanding education and health, promoting equality and bringing the economy under public ownership, yet it also failed in important ways, for compulsory villagisation caused hardship, agricultural production fell, the economy declined into debt, and the goal of self-reliance was not achieved. It remains a noble experiment whose ideals outran its results.

The significance of the capitalist crises and alternative systems

Question 30

The twentieth century was, at bottom, a great contest between two ways of ordering human society, one built on private profit and the other on common ownership.

Compare capitalism and socialism as systems of governance.

Model Answer

The crises of the twentieth century set capitalism and socialism against each other as rival systems of governance. Each rested on a different principle and offered a different vision of society. Capitalism and socialism may be compared as follows.

The ownership of the means of production. Under capitalism the means of production are privately owned, while under socialism they are owned by the community or the state. This is the deepest difference between the two. Private property faces common ownership. Ownership divides the two systems.

The motive of production. Capitalism produces for private profit, while socialism produces to meet the needs of society. Profit drives the one, and need the other. Their very purposes are opposed. Under capitalism goods are made only where a profit can be had, whatever the need. Gain and need are their rival motives.

The market against planning. Capitalism relies on the free market to guide the economy, while socialism relies on central planning by the state. The one trusts competition, the other design. Market and plan stand opposed. In the one, prices are set by supply and demand; in the other, by the state plan. They order the economy in different ways.

Class and equality. Capitalism produces classes of rich and poor, owners and workers, while socialism seeks a classless society of equals. Inequality marks the one, and equality is the aim of the other. Class divides them. The one accepts inequality as natural, while the other strives to abolish it. They differ over the very shape of society.

The role of the state. Under capitalism the state plays a limited role, while under socialism the state controls and directs the whole economy. Small government faces great government. The role of the state sharply divides them. In the one the state stands back, while in the other it owns and directs everything. They differ over the power of government.

Freedom and security. Capitalism offers economic freedom but little security, while socialism offers security but little economic freedom. Each gains the one at the cost of the other. Liberty and security are traded differently. The worker under capitalism is free but insecure, and under socialism secure but not free. They balance the two in opposite ways.

Their characteristic weaknesses. Capitalism is prone to crises, unemployment and inequality, while socialism is prone to bureaucracy, inefficiency and the loss of freedom. Each has its own besetting fault. Both fall short in their own way. The one is shaken by slumps, the other stiffened by shortage and red tape. Neither is without its flaws.

Their historical rivalry. In the twentieth century the two systems became great rivals, dividing the world between the capitalist West and the socialist East. Their contest shaped the whole age. The Cold War grew out of their rivalry. For much of the century the world was divided between their two great camps. The world was split between them.

Capitalism and socialism therefore differ fundamentally in the ownership of the means of production, the motive of production, the reliance on market or plan, the presence or absence of class, the role of the state, and the balance of freedom and security, each with its own characteristic weaknesses. Their rivalry, born of the crises of capitalism, divided and shaped the whole of the twentieth century.

Question 31

Every great alternative of the modern age, from the New Deal to Ujamaa, was born in the shadow of a capitalist crisis.

"The crises of capitalism gave birth to the alternative governance systems of the twentieth century." Discuss.

Model Answer

The claim that the crises of capitalism gave birth to the alternative governance systems of the twentieth century holds that the failures of capitalism drove the world to seek new ways of governing the economy

and society. The claim is largely valid, as may be shown by considering each of the alternatives in turn. This may be discussed as follows.

The crises of capitalism created the demand for alternatives. The recurring crises of capitalism, above all the Great Depression, discredited the system and drove peoples to seek alternatives. The failure of the old order opened the way for the new. Crisis was the parent of change. The search for alternatives began with capitalist failure.

State intervention arose from the Depression. The New Deal and the general turn to state intervention arose directly from the Great Depression, which showed that the market could not heal itself. Governments took new powers to manage the economy. Intervention was a child of the crisis. The slump made the state an economic actor.

The welfare state grew from capitalist failure. The welfare state was built to protect citizens from the poverty and insecurity that capitalism had inflicted during the Depression. It softened the harshness of the market. The crisis gave birth to the welfare state. Capitalist failure made welfare necessary.

Socialism drew strength from the crises. Socialism, first realised in the Soviet Union, gained its widest appeal when capitalism collapsed in the Depression while the Soviet economy grew. The crisis was socialism's opportunity. Capitalist failure fed the socialist alternative. The slump advertised the planned economy.

Fascism and Nazism rose from the crises. Fascism and Nazism rose from the disorder after the First World War and the ruin of the Great Depression, promising order and recovery. The crisis drove desperate peoples towards the dictators. Fascism too was a child of the slump. Crisis bred these dark alternatives as well.

African socialism responded to colonial capitalism. Ujamaa in Tanzania arose as an alternative to the exploitative colonial capitalism that had underdeveloped Africa. Nyerere sought a path free from capitalist dependence. The failures of colonial capitalism shaped African socialism. Africa too sought its own alternative.

Not every alternative sprang only from crisis. Yet the alternatives also owed much to older ideas and to particular leaders, from Marx and Keynes to Nyerere. The crises gave the opportunity, but ideas and leadership gave the form. Crisis alone did not create them. Thought and leadership shaped the alternatives.

On balance the claim is valid. Weighing all this together, the crises of capitalism were indeed the great spur that drove the world to seek and to build its alternative systems of governance. Without the crises, the alternatives would not have taken the form they did. The claim is therefore largely valid. Crisis was the midwife of the modern alternatives.

The crises of capitalism therefore did much to give birth to the alternative governance systems of the twentieth century, for state intervention, the welfare state, socialism, fascism and African socialism all arose in response to the failures of capitalism, above all the Great Depression. Although older ideas and particular leaders gave these systems their form, it was the crises of capitalism that gave them their opportunity, so that the claim is, on balance, largely valid.

Chapter 9

ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS IN POST-COLONIAL AFRICAN STATES

Attempt each question in full on paper before you read the model answer beneath it. The questions follow the chapter topic by topic and rise in demand.

The concept of a post-colonial administrative system

Question 1

When the colonial flags came down and the new ones rose, Africa's leaders inherited not a blank page but a machine of government built to serve others.

Explain the concept of a post-colonial administrative system.

Model Answer

A post-colonial administrative system is the system of government and administration adopted by African states after they won their independence from colonial rule. It was shaped both by the colonial inheritance and by the choices of the new rulers. The concept of a post-colonial administrative system may be explained as follows.

It is the system of rule after independence. A post-colonial administrative system is the machinery of government through which an independent African state rules itself after the end of colonialism. It replaced the colonial administration with a national one, staffed and led by Africans. The colonised at last became the rulers of their own state. Independence brought self-rule after long subjection.

It was inherited from the colonial state. The new administrations did not begin afresh but took over the structures, laws and boundaries left behind by the colonial powers. The colonial state, built to serve the metropole, simply passed into African hands. Much of the old machine of government remained in place. Independence changed the rulers more than it changed the system.

It combined inherited and new features. The post-colonial state kept many colonial institutions while also creating new national ones, such as ruling parties, national armies and development plans. The old and the new were mixed together in the same system. It was part inheritance and part fresh creation. The state was neither wholly old nor wholly new.

It sought to serve the nation and not the colonial power. Unlike the colonial administration, which served the interests of the metropole, the new system was meant to serve the African nation and its development. Its declared purpose was the welfare of the people themselves. Government was now to work for the governed. Service to the nation became its stated aim.

It faced the task of nation-building. The post-colonial system had to weld the many peoples within its artificial borders into a single nation. Unity had to be built where colonialism had deliberately sown division. Nation-building thus became one of its central tasks. The state was charged with making a nation out of many peoples.

It varied from one state to another. African states adopted very different systems, some multi-party, some one-party, some military and some monarchical. There was no single post-colonial model that all followed. Each state chose its own path of government. The systems were as varied as the states themselves.

It often brought political but not economic independence. Many new states won political independence while their economies remained tied to and dependent on the former colonial powers. This incomplete freedom was called flag or ceremonial independence. Real economic freedom often remained out of reach. Independence was frequently more form than substance.

It was shaped by the pressures of its age. The post-colonial system took form amid the Cold War, the debt crisis and the urgent demands of development. These outside pressures shaped the choices of the new rulers. The system was in many ways a child of its turbulent times. Its shape reflected the troubled world around it.

A post-colonial administrative system is therefore the system of government adopted by an African state after independence, inherited in large part from the colonial state yet adapted to serve the nation, charged with the task of nation-building, and varying widely from one country to another. Often it brought political independence without full economic freedom, so that the work of independence remained unfinished.

Question 2

The new African rulers took the keys to a house they had not built, one designed to extract wealth and to keep its occupants apart.

Examine the colonial legacy inherited by post-colonial African administrations.

Model Answer

The administrations of independent Africa did not start with a clean slate but inherited a heavy legacy from the colonial state. This colonial inheritance shaped and often burdened the new governments. The colonial legacy inherited by post-colonial African administrations may be examined as follows.

Artificial national boundaries. The colonial powers had drawn Africa's borders for their own convenience at the Berlin Conference of 1884 to 1885, without regard to its peoples. These artificial boundaries grouped rival peoples together and split single peoples apart. The new states inherited borders that made national unity hard to build. Colonial lines became national problems.

An authoritarian and centralised bureaucracy. The colonial state had been an autocratic machine that ruled by command rather than by consent. The new administrations inherited this centralised and authoritarian style of rule. Power was concentrated at the very top of the state. The habits of colonial command outlived colonial rule.

Ethnic division from divide and rule. Colonial rule, especially through indirect rule, had deepened ethnic and regional divisions in order to keep the colonised weak. The new states inherited societies split along ethnic lines. Tribalism became a lasting danger to the nation. Divide and rule left behind a divided people.

A weak and dependent economy. The colonies had been made to produce a few raw materials for export, leaving their economies narrow, dependent and undeveloped. The new states inherited monoculture economies whose prices were set abroad. Real economic independence was altogether lacking. The colonial economy chained the new nation.

Inherited European forms of government. At independence the departing powers handed over European constitutions and parliamentary systems ill-suited to African conditions. These borrowed forms often failed to take root in African soil. The inherited model soon broke down in many states. Foreign institutions sat uneasily upon the new nations.

A shortage of skilled and educated manpower. Colonial rule had trained very few Africans for high office, leaving the new states short of skilled administrators, doctors and engineers. The sudden departure of colonial officials created a wide gap. Trained personnel were painfully scarce. Independence found the nation short of its own experts.

Repressive colonial laws and instruments. The new rulers inherited the detention laws, the poll tax and the marketing boards through which the colonial state had controlled the people. Many of these repressive tools were simply kept in use. The machinery of coercion passed into new hands. Old laws now served new masters.

Poor and export-oriented infrastructure. The roads and railways built under colonialism ran to the ports to carry out wealth, not to bind the country together. The new states inherited transport designed for extraction rather than development. Internal communication had been badly neglected. The colonial map served export and not the nation.

The colonial legacy inherited by post-colonial African administrations therefore included artificial boundaries, an authoritarian bureaucracy, deep ethnic divisions, a weak and dependent economy, ill-suited European institutions, a shortage of skilled manpower, repressive laws and an export-oriented

infrastructure. This heavy inheritance shaped the difficulties of the new states and set much of the agenda they were forced to face.

Question 3

The lowering of the colonial flag was a moment of triumph, yet for many states the real chains, those of the economy, remained firmly in place.

Distinguish between political and economic independence in post-colonial Africa.

Model Answer

The independence won by African states was often political rather than economic, a distinction that lies at the heart of the post-colonial condition. Where political freedom was not matched by economic freedom, the result was called flag independence or neo-colonialism. The distinction between political and economic independence may be examined as follows.

Political independence means self-government. Political independence is the winning of self-government, when a people rules itself through its own leaders and institutions rather than a foreign power. It is marked by a new flag, a national anthem and a seat at the United Nations. The colonised become citizens of their own sovereign state. Political freedom is the end of foreign rule.

Economic independence means control of the economy. Economic independence is the control by a nation of its own economy, its resources, industries and trade. It means producing for oneself and setting one's own prices in the world. Without it, a nation cannot truly direct its own affairs. Economic freedom is mastery of one's own wealth.

Most states won only political independence. At independence most African states gained self-government while their economies stayed tied to the former colonial powers. They still exported raw materials and imported manufactures on terms set abroad. Political freedom thus came without economic freedom. The victory of independence was only half complete.

This condition is called flag independence. Where a state has its own flag and government but no control of its economy, its independence is called flag or ceremonial independence. The symbols of freedom hide the substance of continued dependence. The flag flew over an economy still owned by others. Independence was more form than reality.

Continued dependence is neo-colonialism. The continued economic control of a politically free state by its former masters is called neo-colonialism. Kwame Nkrumah named it the last stage of imperialism. The former colony remained an economic servant of the metropole. The old domination survived in a new and hidden form.

It works through economic means. Neo-colonialism operates not through direct rule but through trade, investment, loans and aid that keep the new state dependent. Foreign companies and banks come to hold the real power. Control is exercised through the purse rather than the gun. Money and markets replaced the colonial governor.

It limited the freedom of the new states. Because their economies were controlled from outside, the new states could not freely choose their own path of development. Economic dependence sharply narrowed political freedom. The reach of independence was cut short. Dependence bound the hands of the newly free.

It made economic independence the next struggle. Having won political freedom, the new states faced a second struggle for economic independence and true self-reliance. This became the great task of the post-colonial age. The fight for freedom was by no means over. Economic liberation still remained to be won.

Political and economic independence are therefore distinct, the first being self-government and the second the control of one's own economy. Most African states won only political independence, a condition of flag independence in which continued economic control by the former masters, or neo-colonialism, limited their freedom. The winning of economic independence thus remained the unfinished struggle of the post-colonial state.

Systems of governance in post-colonial Africa

Question 4

Free at last to choose how they would be ruled, African states tried every path from the ballot box to the barracks to the throne.

Examine the types of governance systems adopted by independent African states.

Model Answer

On winning independence, African states adopted a variety of systems of governance, each suited to their circumstances and the choices of their leaders. These ranged from multi-party democracy to one-party, military and monarchical rule. The types of governance systems adopted by independent African states may be examined as follows.

Multi-party liberal democracy. Many states began their independence with the multi-party parliamentary systems handed over by the colonial powers, as in Nigeria and Ghana. Several parties competed in elections for power. This inherited system, however, often did not last long. Multi-party democracy was the starting point for many.

The one-party state. A great number of African states soon adopted the one-party system, in which a single legal party held power, as in Tanzania under TANU and Ghana under the Convention People's Party. Political choice was exercised within the one party. This became the most common African system. One party ruled in the name of unity.

Military government. In many states the army seized power by coup and ruled the country directly, as in Nigeria and Uganda. By 1970 about half of Africa's independent states had come under military rule. Soldiers governed by decree from the barracks. The army became a seat of power.

Monarchy. A few African states were governed as monarchies, whether absolute or constitutional, as in Swaziland, Lesotho, Morocco and imperial Ethiopia. Kings and emperors ruled or reigned over their peoples. Traditional rule survived into the modern age. The crown remained a form of African government.

The socialist one-party state. Some states combined the one-party system with socialism, placing the economy under state control, as in Tanzania under Ujamaa and Nkrumah's Ghana. Party and plan were joined together in one system. Socialism shaped their whole governance. The single party set out to build a socialist state.

The capitalist one-party state. Other one-party states followed a capitalist path, keeping private enterprise while banning opposition, as in Kenya and Malawi. The single party served a market economy rather than a socialist one. Not all one-party states were socialist. One-party rule took both left and right forms.

The choice reflected local conditions. The system a state adopted reflected its history, its leaders and its circumstances rather than any single rule. Diversity of condition bred diversity of government across the continent. There was no one African model of rule. Each state fitted its government to its own needs.

Most moved away from the inherited model. Across the continent, the inherited multi-party democracy gave way within a decade to one-party or military rule. The borrowed democratic system rarely survived for long. Africa reshaped its governance in its own way. The colonial model gave way to distinctly African forms.

The types of governance systems adopted by independent African states therefore ranged from the inherited multi-party democracy to the one-party state, military government and monarchy, with one-party rule taking both socialist and capitalist forms. Most states moved away from the borrowed democratic model towards systems that reflected their own conditions, above all the one-party state.

Question 5

In much of Africa, democracy did not mean a choice between parties but a choice within the only party there was.

Examine the features of the one-party system of government in Africa.

Model Answer

The one-party system became the most widespread form of government in independent Africa. Under it, a single legal party monopolised political power in the name of unity and development. The features of the one-party system of government in Africa may be examined as follows.

A single legal party. The defining feature of the one-party state is that only one political party is permitted by law, as TANU was in Tanzania after 1965. All other parties are banned or absorbed into it. Political life runs through the one party alone. The single party holds a monopoly of power.

Democracy within the party. In the one-party state, political choice is exercised inside the ruling party rather than between rival parties. Voters may choose between candidates of the same party, as in Tanzania's elections. Competition is internal rather than external. The party claims to offer democracy within itself.

The fusion of party and state. Under the one-party system the ruling party and the government become closely merged, so that party and state are almost one. Party organs guide and direct the work of government. The line between the two fades away. Party officials and government officers were often the same men. The party in effect becomes the state.

A dominant national leader. The one-party state usually centres on a single powerful leader who embodies the party and the nation, as Nyerere did in Tanzania. Great authority rests in his hands alone. The leader stands above the ordinary workings of the system. Power gathers around one commanding figure.

The claim to guard national unity. The one-party system is justified as the guardian of national unity, holding the many peoples of the state together. Opposition is portrayed as division, tribalism and weakness. Unity is its constant watchword. The one party claims to speak for the whole nation.

Mobilisation for development. The one-party state presents itself as an instrument for mobilising the nation for rapid development. The whole people are to pull together under one leadership and one plan. Party and development plan work as one. Unity of effort is offered as the path to progress.

The absence of legal opposition. In the one-party state there is no lawful opposition party to challenge the government at the polls. Criticism must come from within the party, if it is heard at all. The government faces no legal rival. The ruling party alone could put forward candidates and policies. Opposition has no lawful home in the state.

Strong central control. The one-party system concentrates power at the centre, in the party leadership and the president. Local and regional bodies answer upward to the centre. Authority flows firmly from the top down. The president and the party headquarters directed the regions and districts. Central control is a clear mark of the system.

The features of the one-party system of government in Africa therefore included a single legal party, democracy exercised within the party, the fusion of party and state, a dominant national leader, the claim to guard national unity, mobilisation for development, the absence of legal opposition and strong central control. Together these made the one-party state the characteristic form of government in much of independent Africa.

Question 6

To leaders who had just united their peoples to win freedom, a chorus of rival parties looked less like democracy than a threat to the nation itself.

Examine the reasons why many African states adopted the one-party system after independence.

Model Answer

After independence, a great many African states abandoned the inherited multi-party system in favour of the one-party state. Several reasons lay behind this widespread choice. The reasons why many African states adopted the one-party system after independence may be examined as follows.

To build and preserve national unity. The chief reason was to bind the many ethnic groups within the artificial colonial borders into one nation. Rival parties were feared as a source of division and weakness. The one party was to hold the whole nation together. Unity was the great justification for one-party rule.

To prevent ethnic and regional division. Leaders feared that multi-party politics would divide along ethnic and regional lines, as parties formed around tribes. The one-party state was meant to prevent such dangerous fragmentation. It sought to keep tribalism out of national politics. One party was raised as a guard against division.

To speed up development. The one-party state was presented as a means of mobilising the whole nation for rapid development, without the delays of party quarrels. United effort was thought to serve progress best. Development was said to demand unity. The single party was to drive the nation forward.

The weakness of opposition parties. In many states the nationalist party that won independence was overwhelmingly dominant, while opposition parties were small and weak. The one-party state often merely recognised this existing reality. Strong rivals simply did not exist. The ruling party already stood almost alone.

To consolidate the power of the ruling party. The nationalist parties that had led the independence struggle wished to secure and keep the power they had won. The one-party system firmly entrenched their rule. Consolidation of power was a real and pressing motive. The victors sought to hold on to their victory.

The colonial legacy of intolerance. The colonial state had allowed no real opposition and had governed by command, a habit the new rulers inherited. Intolerance of opposition was part of the colonial inheritance. The colonial past thus shaped the new politics. Old habits of command endured into independence.

The demands of socialist ideology. In states that chose socialism, such as Tanzania, a single party was thought necessary to mobilise the nation for Ujamaa. Socialism and the one-party state went hand in hand. Ideology called for unity of leadership. The socialist path was held to require one party.

The fear of foreign interference. Leaders feared that opposition parties might become channels for foreign or neo-colonial interference in the young state. The one-party system was meant to close this dangerous door. Unity was thought to guard independence. One party was raised as a shield against outside meddling.

The reasons why many African states adopted the one-party system after independence therefore included the wish to build national unity, to prevent ethnic division, to speed development, the weakness of opposition, the desire to consolidate power, the colonial legacy of intolerance, the demands of socialist ideology and the fear of foreign interference. Together these drove much of Africa from multi-party democracy to one-party rule.

Question 7

The one-party state promised unity and progress, but too often it delivered a ruler no one could remove and a government no one could question.

Assess the merits and demerits of the one-party system in Africa.

Model Answer

The one-party system was widely adopted in independent Africa and has been much debated ever since. It brought real advantages but also serious dangers. The merits and demerits of the one-party system in Africa may be assessed as follows.

It promoted national unity. The one-party system helped to bind diverse peoples into a single nation and to hold the state together, as it did in Tanzania. It gave a common political home to all groups. Unity was its greatest merit. In Tanzania it gave Africans of every group a single political home. The one party made one people out of many.

It gave political stability. By removing the contests of rival parties, the one-party state offered a measure of stability to young nations. Government was not disturbed by constant party strife. Stability favoured continuity of policy. Governments were spared the upheavals of shifting coalitions and party wars. The single party steadied the young state.

It reduced ethnic conflict in politics. Where parties might have formed around tribes, the one-party system kept ethnic rivalry out of open politics. It discouraged the politics of the tribe. Division was held in check. Politics was fought within one party rather than between rival tribes. Tribalism found less room to grow in the one-party state.

It allowed united effort for development. The one-party state could mobilise the whole nation behind a single plan of development without the delays of opposition. National effort was concentrated on the task. The energy of the people was pooled together. Unity of purpose was meant to aid progress.

It tended towards dictatorship. With no legal opposition, the one-party state easily slid into the personal dictatorship of its leader. Power went unchecked by any rival. Rulers grew almost impossible to remove. Leaders such as Kwame Nkrumah gathered ever more power into their own hands. Unchecked authority readily bred tyranny.

It bred corruption. Because those in power faced no rival watchdog, the one-party state often bred corruption and the abuse of office. There was no opposition to expose wrongdoing. Accountability was dangerously weak. Officials who could not be voted out grew careless of the public purse. Unchecked power invited corruption.

It denied the people real choice. In the one-party state the people could not vote out the ruling party or choose a different path. Their political choice was narrow and hollow. Real democracy was lost. At the polls the voter could only approve the single party's candidates. The people could not change their rulers.

It suppressed freedom and dissent. The one-party state often silenced its critics through detention without trial and the banning of dissent. Freedom of speech and association suffered badly. Opposition was crushed rather than answered. Critics were often silenced by detention without trial. Liberty was the price paid for unity.

The one-party system in Africa therefore had real merits, promoting national unity, stability, the containment of ethnic conflict and united effort for development, yet it carried grave demerits, for it tended towards dictatorship, bred corruption, denied the people real choice and suppressed freedom. Its record was thus deeply mixed, offering unity and stability at the heavy cost of democracy and liberty.

Question 8

When politicians failed and treasuries emptied, it was often the soldiers who stepped out of the barracks to seize the state at gunpoint.

Explain the rise and features of military rule in Africa.

Model Answer

Military rule became one of the most common forms of government in independent Africa, as armies seized power from civilian governments. By 1970 about half of Africa's states had experienced it. The rise and features of military rule in Africa may be explained as follows.

It comes to power by coup. Military rule begins with a coup, the seizure of power by the armed forces from a civilian government, as in Nigeria and Ghana in 1966. The soldiers overthrow the elected or ruling government by force. The ballot is replaced by the bayonet. Power is taken at gunpoint.

It suspends the constitution. On seizing power, the military commonly suspends the constitution and dissolves the parliament. The normal law of the land is set aside. Government according to the constitution is halted. Parliament was dissolved and the courts were curbed. The rule of law gives way to the rule of the gun.

It rules by decree. The military governs not by debated laws but by decrees issued by the ruling council. Orders simply replace legislation. The soldiers command and the people obey. The people had no voice in the orders that governed them. Rule by decree is a clear mark of military government.

It bans political parties. Military regimes usually ban political parties and all political activity. Opposition and organised politics are forbidden outright. The political arena is closed by force. Meetings, rallies, newspapers and all free assembly are strictly forbidden. Party life is silenced altogether under the soldiers.

It governs through a ruling council. Power is held by a small group of officers, often called a military or revolutionary council. This junta rules in place of cabinet and parliament. A mere handful of soldiers holds the whole state. In Nigeria and Ghana such councils replaced the elected government. The council governs the nation by command.

It became widespread after independence. Military coups spread rapidly across Africa during the 1960s, so that by 1970 about half of the independent states had known military rule. Ghana, Nigeria, Uganda and Sudan all fell to soldiers. The trend was continent-wide. The coup became an African commonplace.

It claims to correct civilian failure. The military usually justifies its seizure of power by pointing to the corruption, division or failure of the civilian government. It presents itself as a rescuer and a reformer. Correction of failure is its standing excuse. It promised to root out corruption and to restore order. The soldiers claim to save the nation.

It often proved no better. In practice military governments frequently proved as corrupt, divided and repressive as the civilians they replaced. Some, such as that of Idi Amin in Uganda, were far worse. The promise of reform was seldom kept. Many regimes clung to power for years without ever returning it. The soldiers rarely healed what they had seized.

The rise and features of military rule in Africa therefore lay in the seizure of power by coup, the suspension of the constitution, rule by decree, the banning of parties and government by a ruling council, spreading so widely that by 1970 about half of Africa's states had known it. Though the soldiers claimed to correct civilian failure, their rule often proved no better and sometimes far worse.

Question 9

The soldier's path to power was paved by the failures of the politicians, the greed of officers, and the meddling of foreign hands.

Examine the causes of military coups in Africa.

Model Answer

Military coups became a recurring feature of politics in independent Africa, toppling civilian and one-party governments alike. Their causes were many and often worked together. The causes of military coups in Africa may be examined as follows.

Weak political institutions. The new states inherited weak parties, parliaments and constitutions that could not hold the government to account or resolve its disputes. Into this vacuum the army readily stepped. Feeble institutions invited intervention. Weakness at the centre tempted the soldiers.

The corruption of civilian leaders. The corruption and embezzlement of public funds by civilian rulers discredited them in the eyes of the people and the army. The soldiers seized upon corruption as their justification. Graft steadily undermined the government. Corruption opened the door to the coup.

Tribalism and ethnic rivalry. Ethnic and regional divisions, often exploited by politicians, bred an instability that the army seized upon. Some coups were made in the name of one group against another. Tribalism weakened the whole state. Officers sometimes struck in the name of their own ethnic group. Division gave the soldiers their chance.

Economic hardship and poverty. The failure of governments to deliver the prosperity promised at independence bred a discontent that the army exploited. Economic crisis discredited civilian rule. Hardship stirred deep unrest. Unemployment and rising prices turned the people against their rulers. Poverty prepared the ground for the coup.

The personal ambition of officers. Many coups sprang from the naked ambition of army officers who coveted power and its rewards. Greed for office drove the plotters forward. Ambition often wore the mask of reform. Power brought officers wealth, rank and the rewards of high office. The lust for power moved the soldiers.

The weakness of national unity. Because the new states were artificial and their peoples not yet truly united, loyalty to the nation was often weak. This fragility made governments easy to overthrow. Disunity

plainly invited the coup. Loyalty to the tribe often ran deeper than loyalty to the state. A divided nation could not resist the barracks.

Cold War and foreign interference. The rival superpowers of the Cold War meddled in African politics, sometimes backing coups against governments they disliked. Foreign hands helped to make and unmake African rulers. Outside interference destabilised the states. Global rivalry reached into Africa's barracks.

The example of earlier coups. Once the first coups had succeeded, they set an example that other armies were quick to follow, especially in West Africa. Each coup encouraged the next in turn. Precedent bred imitation across the continent. West Africa in particular saw coup follow coup through the 1960s. The habit of intervention spread from state to state.

Dictatorship and the abuse of power. The dictatorship, repression and abuse of power by civilian and one-party rulers provoked the army to intervene. Where rulers could not be removed by vote, they were removed by force. Tyranny at the top invited the coup. Abuse of power bred revolt from below.

The causes of military coups in Africa therefore included weak political institutions, the corruption of leaders, tribalism, economic hardship, the personal ambition of officers, weak national unity, Cold War interference, the example of earlier coups and the abuse of power by rulers. Together these made the coup a recurring feature of post-colonial African politics.

Question 10

Between the ballot box of the Westminster model and the ancient thrones of kings, Africa's newest states also kept some of its oldest and most borrowed forms of rule.

Examine multi-party democracy and monarchy as systems of governance in post-colonial Africa.

Model Answer

Besides the one-party and military systems, independent Africa also knew multi-party democracy, inherited at independence, and monarchy, surviving from earlier ages. These systems, though less common, formed part of the post-colonial picture. Multi-party democracy and monarchy as systems of governance may be examined as follows.

Multi-party democracy was inherited at independence. Most British and French colonies were granted multi-party constitutions at independence, with several parties competing for power, as in Nigeria in 1960. The departing powers handed over their own systems of government. Democracy was the starting form for many states. The ballot box came in with independence.

It followed European models. The inherited systems followed European patterns, the British Westminster model of a prime minister and parliament, or the French model of a strong president. These borrowed forms were transplanted onto African soil. The model was European in its origin. Africa began its freedom with foreign institutions.

It largely collapsed within a decade. In most states multi-party democracy did not last, giving way within a few years to one-party or military rule. The inherited system proved strikingly fragile. It rarely struck deep roots in the new states. Democracy soon gave way across the continent.

Its collapse had several causes. Multi-party democracy failed because parties formed around ethnic groups, because leaders sought to entrench their power, and because the borrowed model suited African conditions poorly. Its weaknesses were many and deep. The transplant simply did not thrive. The inherited democracy withered for want of roots.

Monarchy survived in a few states. A small number of African states were ruled as monarchies, where a king or emperor held the highest office, as in Ethiopia, Morocco, Swaziland and Lesotho. Traditional kingship survived into the modern state. The crown remained a genuine form of rule. Kings still reigned in independent Africa.

Some monarchies were absolute. In some states the monarch held real and often unlimited power, as in Swaziland, where King Sobhuza the Second suspended the constitution in 1973 and banned all parties.

There the king ruled as well as reigned. Power rested firmly in the crown. The monarch governed the state directly.

Others were constitutional. In other states the monarch reigned but did not rule, leaving power to an elected government, as in Lesotho. The king was a ceremonial head of state. Real power lay with the ministers. The government was formed by the party that won the elections. The crown reigned quietly above politics.

Monarchy was vulnerable to overthrow. Several African monarchies were swept away by revolution or coup, as the Sultan of Zanzibar was overthrown in 1964 and Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia in 1974. Ancient thrones proved fragile in the modern age. Revolution ended several crowns. The monarchy often fell to the tide of change.

Multi-party democracy and monarchy therefore formed part of the pattern of governance in post-colonial Africa, the first inherited from the colonial powers and soon collapsing into one-party or military rule, the second surviving from earlier ages in absolute and constitutional forms. Both proved vulnerable, so that the enduring African systems became more often the one-party state and military government.

The structure of government in post-colonial African states

Question 11

Whatever flag it flew or party it followed, every modern African state rested on the same three pillars: one to make the laws, one to carry them out, and one to judge them.

Examine the structure of government in post-colonial African states.

Model Answer

Every post-colonial African state, whatever its system, was built upon a structure of government divided into three main organs. These were the executive, the legislature and the judiciary. The structure of government in post-colonial African states may be examined as follows.

The three organs of the state. The government of a modern African state is divided into three organs: the executive, the legislature and the judiciary. Each has its own distinct role in the running of the state. Together these three form the structure of government. The state rests upon these three pillars.

The executive. The executive rules the country and carries out the laws, headed by the president as head of state and head of government. It works through the ministries, the departments and the civil service. It governs the nation from day to day. Its head, the president, appoints the ministers and directs their work. The executive is the ruling arm of the state.

The president as head of state. In most African states the president stands at the head of the executive, as head of state and commander-in-chief of the armed forces. Great power rests in his single office. He leads both the government and the nation. The presidency became the very centre of power.

The legislature. The legislature, or parliament, is the law-making organ, composed of the elected representatives of the people. It makes and debates the laws and approves the national budget. It gives voice to the people it represents. Its members are chosen by the people at elections. Parliament is the law-making arm of the state.

The judiciary. The judiciary is the organ that interprets the law and administers justice through the courts, headed by the chief justice. It settles disputes and punishes crime according to law. It stands as the guardian of the law itself. Its judges apply the law without regard to person or party. The judiciary is the justice-giving arm of the state.

The civil service. Beneath the executive stands the civil service, the body of appointed officials who carry on the daily work of administration. It puts the decisions of government into effect across the land. It is the permanent machinery of the state. The civil service turns policy into action.

The security institutions. The state also rests on its security institutions, the army, the police and the prisons, which uphold order and defend the nation. At independence Tanzania replaced the colonial King's

African Rifles with its own national forces. These bodies enforce the will of the state. Security institutions stand guard over the nation.

The links between the organs. The three organs are meant to work together while checking one another, so that power is not concentrated in a single hand. In practice, however, the executive often overshadowed the others in Africa. Balance between them was the ideal. The organs were meant to hold each other in check.

The structure of government in post-colonial African states therefore rested on three organs, the executive that rules, the legislature that makes the laws and the judiciary that administers justice, supported by the civil service and the security institutions. Though these organs were meant to balance one another, in practice the executive, and above all the president, came to overshadow the rest.

Question 12

A government is known not only by its shape but by its work, and the three organs of the state each carry a labour without which the nation could not stand.

Examine the functions of the three organs of government in an African state.

Model Answer

The government of a post-colonial African state carries out its work through three organs, each with its own functions. The executive, the legislature and the judiciary together perform the tasks of government. The functions of the three organs of government in an African state may be examined as follows.

The executive formulates and carries out policy. The chief function of the executive is to decide the policy of the state and then to carry it into effect. It plans and directs the development and the daily affairs of the nation. It governs through its ministries and departments. The executive both makes and executes the government's decisions.

The executive maintains law and order. The executive keeps peace and order within the state through the police and the machinery of administration. It enforces the laws and protects life and property. It upholds the authority of the government. Order within the nation is the executive's charge.

The executive conducts foreign affairs and defence. The executive represents the state abroad, conducts its foreign relations and provides for its defence through the armed forces. It makes treaties and receives ambassadors. It guards the nation against external danger. Foreign policy and defence rest with the executive.

The legislature makes the laws. The chief function of the legislature is to make, amend and repeal the laws of the land. It debates proposed laws before passing them. Its statutes bind the whole nation. A proposed law is debated and voted upon before it takes effect. Law-making is the central work of parliament.

The legislature represents the people. The legislature gives voice to the people through their elected representatives, who bring the concerns of the nation before the government. It is the forum of the nation's opinion. It links the ruled to their rulers. Parliament speaks for the people it represents.

The legislature controls finance and checks the executive. The legislature approves taxation and the national budget and calls the executive to account for its actions. It holds the purse-strings of the state. It questions and checks the government. Parliament guards the public money and watches the executive.

The judiciary interprets and applies the law. The judiciary interprets the meaning of the laws and applies them to the cases that come before the courts. It tries offenders and settles disputes according to law. It ensures that the law is justly applied. Judges decide the meaning of the law when disputes arise. The courts give the law its living force.

The judiciary protects rights and settles disputes. The judiciary protects the rights of citizens and settles disputes between persons, and between the citizen and the state. It stands as the guardian of justice and of the constitution. It shields the individual against wrong. The courts defend the rights of the people.

The functions of the three organs of government in an African state therefore run as follows: the executive formulates and carries out policy, keeps order and conducts foreign affairs; the legislature makes the laws, represents the people and controls finance; and the judiciary interprets the law, protects rights and settles disputes. Together these functions make up the whole work of government.

Question 13

Where one hand holds the sword, the purse and the scales of justice together, the citizen has no defence, and this is the danger the separation of powers was meant to prevent.

"An independent judiciary and the separation of powers are essential to good governance." Discuss with reference to post-colonial Africa.

Model Answer

The claim that an independent judiciary and the separation of powers are essential to good governance rests on the belief that power divided is power restrained. In post-colonial Africa, where the executive often dominated the state, this claim carries great force. It may be discussed as follows.

The meaning of the separation of powers. The separation of powers is the division of government among the executive, the legislature and the judiciary, so that no single organ holds all power. The doctrine was taught by the philosopher Montesquieu. It aims to prevent tyranny by dividing authority. Power is checked by power.

It guards against dictatorship. By dividing power among three organs, the separation of powers guards against its concentration in one hand. Where power is divided, no ruler can easily become a tyrant. This check is vital to free government. No single organ can gather all the powers of the state into its hands. Division is a barrier against dictatorship.

An independent judiciary upholds the rule of law. An independent judiciary applies the law without fear or favour, even against the government itself. It ensures that all, including the rulers, are bound by the law. This is the essence of the rule of law. An independent court makes the law supreme.

It protects the rights of the citizen. An independent judiciary defends the rights and liberties of the citizen against the power of the state. The individual can seek justice against the government in a free court. Rights without an independent court are empty. The judge is the shield of the citizen.

It checks the abuse of power. Where the three organs check one another, the abuse of power is exposed and restrained. Parliament questions the executive, and the courts judge its acts. Mutual checking limits misgovernment. A wrong done by one organ can be corrected by another. Each organ curbs the others.

In Africa the executive often dominated. In much of post-colonial Africa the separation of powers was weak, as strong presidents overshadowed parliament and the courts. The executive bent the other organs to its will. The doctrine was often ignored in practice. Power gathered in the president's hands.

Its absence bred dictatorship and injustice. Where the judiciary was not independent and powers were not separated, dictatorship, detention without trial and injustice followed. The citizen had no defence against the state. Misgovernment thrived where power was undivided. Its absence proved the doctrine's worth.

Its restoration is central to good governance. The reforms of recent decades have sought to restore the independence of the judiciary and the separation of powers as pillars of good governance. Their return is held essential to just rule. Good governance rests upon them. The doctrine is being revived as a safeguard.

An independent judiciary and the separation of powers are therefore essential to good governance, for they guard against dictatorship, uphold the rule of law, protect the citizen and check the abuse of power. The experience of post-colonial Africa, where the executive so often dominated and injustice followed, proves the claim by showing the harm their absence brought. Their restoration lies at the heart of the search for good governance.

Challenges facing post-colonial African administrations

Question 14

The new states marched out of the colonial era straight into a minefield of poverty, division, debt and the ambitions of their own leaders.

Examine the challenges facing post-colonial African administrations.

Model Answer

The administrations of independent Africa faced a host of daunting challenges as they set about governing their new states. These challenges sprang from the colonial legacy, the world around them and their own weaknesses. The challenges facing post-colonial African administrations may be examined as follows.

Neo-colonialism and economic dependence. Many states won political freedom while their economies remained controlled by the former colonial powers. This neo-colonial dependence kept them poor and unfree. Real independence was cut short by economic bondage. The chains of the economy outlasted colonial rule.

Artificial boundaries and weak national unity. The new states inherited borders that threw together rival peoples and split others apart. Building a single nation within these borders was a heavy task. National unity was fragile and hard-won. Rival peoples were forced together within a single frontier. The colonial map made unity difficult.

Tribalism and ethnic division. Ethnic and regional loyalties, deepened by colonial divide and rule, threatened the unity and stability of the new states. Tribalism divided parties and bred conflict. It stood in the way of nation-building. Loyalty to the tribe often overrode loyalty to the young nation. Ethnic division was a constant danger.

Poverty and weak, dependent economies. The new states inherited poor, narrow economies dependent on the export of a few raw materials. Falling prices and monoculture left them weak. Poverty gripped the mass of the people. Most people lived by farming and remained desperately poor. The economy could not meet the nation's needs.

The international debt crisis. From the 1970s the new states borrowed heavily and fell into a mounting burden of foreign debt, worsened by the oil crisis. Debt tied them to foreign lenders and their conditions. The burden crippled development. Borrowing became a chain of dependence.

Corruption and the abuse of office. Corruption and the embezzlement of public funds drained the resources of the new states and discredited their governments. Unchecked power bred the abuse of office. Graft ate into development. Public funds meant for development were diverted into private hands. Corruption weakened the state from within.

Political instability, coups and civil wars. The new states were shaken by military coups, civil wars and frequent changes of government. Instability destroyed the continuity that development needed. Violence and disorder spread. Coups and wars broke the continuity that progress required. Political turmoil obstructed all progress.

A shortage of skilled manpower and poor services. Colonial rule had trained few Africans, leaving the new states short of skilled people and of good social services. Health, education and other services were poor and thin. The nation lacked its own experts. Want of skill and service held the states back.

Foreign interference in the Cold War. The rival superpowers of the Cold War interfered in African affairs, backing friendly rulers and undermining others. This interference destabilised the young states. Foreign hands meddled in African politics. The Cold War reached deep into the continent.

The challenges facing post-colonial African administrations therefore included neo-colonialism and economic dependence, artificial boundaries and weak unity, tribalism, poverty, the debt crisis, corruption, political instability, a shortage of skilled manpower and foreign interference. Springing from the colonial

legacy and the pressures of the age, these challenges together made the governing of the new states a formidable task.

Question 15

Nkrumah warned that a state could fly its own flag and sing its own anthem while its economy was still run from foreign boardrooms.

Explain neo-colonialism as a challenge to post-colonial African states.

Model Answer

Neo-colonialism, the continued economic domination of politically independent states by their former masters, was among the gravest challenges facing post-colonial Africa. It kept the new states dependent and poor long after independence. Neo-colonialism as a challenge to post-colonial African states may be explained as follows.

The meaning of neo-colonialism. Neo-colonialism is the continued control of a politically independent state's economy by its former colonial masters. Kwame Nkrumah described it as the last stage of imperialism in his book of 1965. The colony is free in name but bound in substance. Old domination survived in a new form.

Continued dependence on raw-material exports. The new states remained tied to exporting a few raw materials whose prices were fixed in the markets of the rich nations. Their monoculture economies stayed narrow and dependent. They produced for others rather than themselves. Dependence on raw exports kept them weak.

Control by foreign companies and capital. The key sectors of many African economies remained owned by foreign companies and banks. These multinationals held the real economic power in the new states. Ownership stayed in foreign hands. Foreign capital ruled where the flag had changed.

Dependence on foreign loans and aid. The new states depended on loans and aid from the rich nations, which came with conditions attached. This dependence gave the lenders influence over African affairs. Aid became a means of control. Lenders attached conditions that shaped the policies of the borrower. The purse-strings ran back to the former masters.

Unequal terms of trade. The new states sold cheap raw materials and bought dear manufactured goods, so that trade ran against them. The terms of trade steadily drained their wealth. They gave much and received little. A tonne of coffee bought ever fewer of the goods Africa needed. Unequal exchange kept Africa poor.

Foreign influence over policy. Through their economic power, the former masters and their companies could influence the policies of the new states. Economic control was turned into political influence. The free state was not truly free to choose. Foreign hands guided African decisions.

The draining of wealth abroad. The profits of foreign companies and the interest on foreign loans drained African wealth to the rich nations. This outflow, as Walter Rodney argued, worked to underdevelop Africa. The continent's surplus flowed away. Wealth was drained from the poor to the rich.

It limited real independence. Because their economies were controlled from outside, the new states could not fully direct their own affairs. Political freedom was hollowed out by economic bondage. True independence remained unwon. The free state could not set its own economic course. Neo-colonialism cut the reach of freedom short.

Neo-colonialism was therefore a grave challenge to post-colonial African states, keeping them dependent through raw-material exports, foreign ownership of capital, loans and aid, unequal terms of trade and the draining of wealth abroad. As Nkrumah warned, it gave the new states the flag of freedom without its substance, so that the winning of true economic independence remained the central struggle of the post-colonial age.

Question 16

The borders drawn in Berlin threw ancient rivals into the same state, and the politics of the tribe became a wound that would not heal.

Examine the effects of tribalism and ethnicity on post-colonial African administration.

Model Answer

Tribalism, the placing of ethnic loyalty above national loyalty, was one of the deepest challenges to post-colonial African administration. Rooted in the artificial colonial borders, it threatened the unity and stability of the new states. The effects of tribalism and ethnicity on post-colonial African administration may be examined as follows.

It weakened national unity. Where people gave their first loyalty to the tribe rather than the nation, national unity was gravely weakened. The state struggled to command a common loyalty. Ethnic feeling pulled against the nation. People looked first to their own group and only then to the nation. Tribalism undermined the very idea of the nation.

It divided political parties along ethnic lines. In many states political parties formed around ethnic groups rather than ideas or policies. Politics became a contest between tribes. This ethnic division poisoned the political life of the nation. Each party drew its support from a particular region or people. Parties of the tribe replaced parties of principle.

It bred favouritism and nepotism. Leaders often favoured their own ethnic group in the sharing of jobs, resources and development. This nepotism bred resentment among the groups left out. Public office served the tribe rather than the nation. Favouritism corrupted the fair work of government.

It fuelled instability and coups. Ethnic rivalry bred the instability that soldiers seized upon to make their coups. Some coups were themselves the work of one group against another. Tribalism thus fed political violence. Ethnic grievance provided the pretext for many a coup. Ethnic conflict opened the way to the barracks.

It led to civil wars. In the gravest cases, ethnic division erupted into civil war, as in the Nigerian civil war over Biafra from 1967 to 1970. Such wars brought terrible bloodshed and ruin. Tribalism could tear a state apart. The Biafran war alone cost around a million lives. Ethnic hatred ended in open war.

It undermined fair development. Because resources were shared along ethnic lines, development was often unequal and unjust between the regions. Favoured groups prospered while others were neglected. Uneven development deepened grievance. Tribalism warped the sharing of the nation's wealth.

It was exploited by politicians. Ambitious politicians deliberately stirred ethnic feeling to win support and power. They set group against group for their own ends. Tribalism was used as a weapon of ambition. They set group against group in order to gather votes and power. Leaders fanned the flames they should have quenched.

It hindered nation-building. Above all, tribalism stood in the way of building one nation out of many peoples. It kept the state divided against itself. The great task of nation-building was made far harder. The task of forging one people out of many was made far harder. Ethnic loyalty blocked the making of the nation.

The effects of tribalism and ethnicity on post-colonial African administration were therefore deeply harmful, for they weakened national unity, divided parties along ethnic lines, bred favouritism, fuelled instability and civil war, undermined fair development and were exploited by politicians. Rooted in the artificial colonial borders, tribalism stood as one of the greatest obstacles to nation-building in independent Africa.

Question 17

Independence gave Africa's leaders control of the treasury, and for too many the temptation to plunder it proved stronger than the duty to serve.

Examine corruption as a challenge to governance in post-colonial Africa.

Model Answer

Corruption, the abuse of public office for private gain, became one of the most damaging challenges to governance in post-colonial Africa. It drained resources, discredited governments and bred instability. Corruption as a challenge to governance in post-colonial Africa may be examined as follows.

The meaning of corruption. Corruption is the abuse of public office for private gain, through bribery, embezzlement and the theft of public funds. It turns the power of the state to the profit of the few. It betrays the trust placed in public servants. Corruption is the misuse of office for private ends.

It was encouraged by unchecked power. Under one-party and military rule, those in power faced no rival or watchdog to expose their wrongdoing. This unchecked power gave wide room for corruption. Without accountability, graft flourished. One-party and military rulers faced no watchdog to expose them. Power without a check bred corruption.

It drained public resources. Corruption diverted into private pockets the funds that were meant for the development of the nation. Money for schools, roads and clinics was stolen. The public treasury was plundered. Funds meant for schools and roads vanished into private accounts. Resources meant for all enriched the few.

It undermined development. Because so much wealth was lost to graft, corruption crippled the development that the new states so badly needed. Projects failed or were never built. Progress was stolen along with the money. Projects collapsed or were never begun once the money was gone. Corruption robbed the nation of its future.

It discredited governments. The corruption of leaders destroyed the trust and respect of the people for their government. A corrupt government lost its legitimacy. The people grew cynical and angry. The people lost all faith in leaders who enriched themselves. Graft ate away the authority of the state.

It bred coups and instability. The corruption of civilian rulers gave the army its favourite justification for seizing power. Coup-makers pointed to graft as they overthrew governments. Corruption thus fed political instability. Soldiers pointed to graft as they seized power. It opened the door to the soldiers.

It deepened poverty and inequality. While a corrupt elite grew rich, the mass of the people remained poor, so that corruption widened the gulf between them. Wealth was concentrated in dishonest hands. Inequality was deepened by graft. A dishonest elite grew rich while the masses stayed poor. The corrupt prospered as the people suffered.

It deterred investment and aid. Corruption frightened away honest investors and made donors reluctant to give aid. Capital and assistance were lost to the reputation for graft. The economy was starved of investment. Honest investors and donors turned away from corrupt states. Corruption cost the nation the trust of others.

Corruption was therefore a grave challenge to governance in post-colonial Africa, for it was encouraged by unchecked power, drained public resources, undermined development, discredited governments, bred coups, deepened poverty and deterred investment. It stood among the deepest wounds of the post-colonial state, and its control became a central aim of the search for good governance.

Question 18

To pay for development and to survive the oil shocks, Africa borrowed heavily, and the bill, when it came due, was paid in the closing of schools and clinics.

Examine the international debt crisis and structural adjustment programmes as challenges to post-colonial Africa.

Model Answer

The international debt crisis and the structural adjustment programmes that followed were among the heaviest challenges facing post-colonial Africa from the 1970s. They deepened dependence and inflicted hardship on the people. The debt crisis and structural adjustment programmes may be examined as follows.

The growth of foreign borrowing. To pay for development after independence, African states borrowed heavily from foreign banks and governments. Their ambitions outran their own resources. Debt was taken on to build the new nation. Borrowing seemed at first the road to progress.

The oil crisis of the 1970s. The sharp rise in oil prices in 1973 and 1974 raised the costs of the oil-importing African states enormously. To pay for fuel and imports they borrowed still more. The oil shock deepened their difficulties. The oil-importing states had to borrow simply to buy their fuel. The price of oil drove them deeper into debt.

The mounting burden of debt. As borrowing grew and prices for their exports fell, the debts of African states mounted beyond their power to repay. Interest alone swallowed much of their income. The burden became crushing. Falling export prices left states unable to repay what they owed. Debt piled upon debt without end.

The role of the IMF and World Bank. As states could no longer pay their debts, they turned to the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank for rescue. These bodies became the lenders of last resort. Their help, however, came with strict conditions. The lenders gained great power over Africa.

The structural adjustment programmes. The IMF and World Bank granted new loans only on condition that states adopted structural adjustment programmes. These programmes forced sweeping changes in economic policy. Loans were tied to the conditions of the lenders. Adjustment was the price of rescue.

The conditions imposed. The programmes demanded cuts in government spending, the removal of subsidies, the devaluation of currencies and the privatisation of state enterprises. States had to shrink their role in the economy. Free-market policies were imposed from outside. The conditions reshaped African economies.

The heavy social cost. The cuts in spending fell hard upon the people, as health, education and other services were reduced. The removal of subsidies raised the price of food and fuel. The poor bore the heaviest burden. Fees were imposed on schooling and health that the poor could not pay. Adjustment was paid for in human suffering.

It deepened dependence. The debt crisis and the programmes bound the African states ever more tightly to foreign lenders and their conditions. Their freedom to choose their own policy was lost. Dependence was deepened rather than eased. The lenders gained a lasting say over African policy. Debt became a new chain of neo-colonialism.

The international debt crisis and structural adjustment programmes were therefore a heavy challenge to post-colonial Africa, arising from foreign borrowing and the oil shocks of the 1970s, deepening into a crushing burden of debt, and drawing in the IMF and World Bank whose conditions forced painful cuts and reforms. The social cost was severe, and the whole crisis bound the new states more tightly than ever to their foreign creditors.

Question 19

For every road built and school opened, a coup or a civil war has undone the work, and the question is whether instability, above all else, has held Africa back.

"Political instability has been the greatest obstacle to development in post-colonial Africa." Discuss.

Model Answer

The claim that political instability has been the greatest obstacle to development in post-colonial Africa points to the coups, civil wars and dictatorships that have plagued the continent. The claim carries much force, though other obstacles have also weighed heavily. Its validity may be discussed as follows.

Coups destroyed the continuity of government. The frequent military coups broke the continuity that steady development requires, as each new regime overturned the plans of the last. Policy was forever begun anew. Nothing could be carried through to its end. Instability made lasting development impossible.

Civil wars devastated economies and peoples. The civil wars that ravaged states such as Nigeria, Angola and Sudan destroyed lives, property and whole economies. War consumed the resources that might have built the nation. Ruin followed the fighting. Angola and Sudan were locked in war for decades. Conflict laid waste to development.

Instability frightened away investment. Investors and donors shunned countries torn by coups and war, so that capital and aid were lost. Without security there could be no investment. The unstable state was starved of funds. Capital and aid flowed instead to more peaceful lands. Disorder drove away the means of growth.

Dictatorship and misrule wasted resources. The unstable politics of the continent threw up dictators who wasted and plundered the wealth of their nations. Misrule squandered what development needed. Tyranny consumed the nation's substance. Instability bred rulers who ruined the state.

Yet neo-colonialism also held Africa back. Against this, the continued economic domination of Africa by foreign powers kept the continent poor and dependent regardless of its politics. Neo-colonialism drained African wealth. Dependence was a deep obstacle in its own right. Not all the fault lay in instability.

Yet poverty was inherited, not only caused. The new states inherited poor, narrow and dependent economies from the colonial era before ever a coup was made. This colonial legacy of poverty was a heavy burden. Underdevelopment had older roots. Some obstacles were inherited, not self-made.

Yet corruption drained development on its own. Corruption robbed the nation of its resources even where governments were stable. Graft was a great obstacle apart from instability. It crippled development directly. Graft crippled development even in states that knew peace. Not every failure sprang from disorder.

On balance, instability was a major but not the sole obstacle. Weighing all this, political instability was indeed among the greatest obstacles to development, yet it worked together with neo-colonialism, inherited poverty and corruption. It was a chief cause but not the only one. The claim is strong but not complete. Instability was one great obstacle among several.

Political instability has therefore been among the greatest obstacles to development in post-colonial Africa, for coups, civil wars, dictatorship and disorder destroyed continuity, ruined economies and drove away investment. Yet it was not the sole obstacle, for neo-colonialism, inherited poverty and corruption also held the continent back. The claim is thus largely valid, provided instability is seen as the chief of several obstacles rather than the only one.

Measures to improve governance in post-colonial Africa

Question 20

Chastened by decades of coups and one-party misrule, Africa turned in search of better government, to the ballot, the constitution and the pledge of accountability.

Examine the measures taken to improve governance in post-colonial African states.

Model Answer

After decades of one-party rule, military coups and misgovernment, African states took a range of measures to improve their governance. These reforms aimed at accountability, participation and the rule of law. The measures taken to improve governance in post-colonial African states may be examined as follows.

The return to multi-party democracy. From the 1990s many states abandoned one-party and military rule and restored multi-party democracy. Opposition parties were legalised and elections held once more. The people regained a real political choice. Multi-party rule returned across the continent.

The adoption of good governance. African states embraced the principles of good governance, above all accountability and transparency in the exercise of power. Rulers were to answer for their actions. Government was to be open to its people. Good governance became the new standard.

Constitutional reform and the rule of law. Many states adopted new constitutions and repealed the repressive laws inherited from colonial and one-party days. Government was to be bound by the constitution. The rule of law was to be restored. The repressive laws of colonial and one-party days were repealed. Reform sought to place law above the ruler.

Decentralisation and local government. States transferred power to local authorities in order to bring government nearer to the people. Local government spread administration across the land. Decisions were made closer to those affected. Decentralisation carried government to the grassroots.

The fight against corruption. States set up anti-corruption bodies and leadership codes to curb the abuse of office. Leaders were to be watched and held to account. Graft was to be exposed and punished. Anti-corruption bureaus and leadership codes were set up to curb graft. The war on corruption became a work of reform.

Free and fair elections. Reform sought to ensure regular, free and fair elections through which the people could choose and change their leaders. Independent bodies were set up to run the polls. The vote was to be made real. Independent electoral commissions were created to run the polls. Free elections became a pillar of the new order.

Regional cooperation and integration. States joined regional bodies such as the East African Community and others to cooperate for peace and development. Union with neighbours strengthened weak states. Cooperation spread good practice. Integration became a means of improvement.

Nation-building and national unity. States worked to build one nation from many peoples, as Tanzania did by promoting Kiswahili as a common language. Unity was fostered to overcome tribalism. A shared identity was encouraged. A common language and identity were fostered to overcome tribalism. Nation-building supported good government.

The measures taken to improve governance in post-colonial African states therefore included the return to multi-party democracy, the adoption of good governance, constitutional reform and the rule of law, decentralisation, the fight against corruption, free and fair elections, regional cooperation and nation-building. Together these reforms sought to replace the misgovernment of earlier decades with accountable, participatory and lawful rule.

Question 21

As the Berlin Wall fell and the Cold War ended, a wind of change blew across Africa, and the one-party states began to open their doors to opposition once more.

Examine the return to multi-party democracy in Africa in the 1990s.

Model Answer

In the 1990s, many African states abandoned one-party and military rule and returned to multi-party democracy. This wave of democratisation reshaped the governance of the continent. The return to multi-party democracy in Africa in the 1990s may be examined as follows.

The failure of one-party and military rule. Decades of one-party and military rule had brought dictatorship, corruption and economic decline. These systems had plainly failed the people. Their failure discredited authoritarian rule. Decades of dictatorship and decline had discredited authoritarian rule. The old order lost its last defenders.

The end of the Cold War. The end of the Cold War between 1989 and 1991 removed the superpower support that had propped up many African dictators. No longer shielded by their patrons, the old regimes were exposed. The world had changed around them. The fall of communism shook Africa's dictatorships.

Popular demand for freedom. The peoples of Africa demanded freedom and a voice in their government, pressing their rulers through protests and strikes. Popular pressure grew too strong to resist. The people

called for democracy. Crowds took to the streets to demand a voice in their government. Demand from below drove the change.

Pressure from Western donors. The Western nations and lenders tied their aid to democratic reform, pressing African states to open up their politics. Donors made democracy a condition of help. Outside pressure reinforced the demand within. Western governments made their aid conditional on reform. Aid was linked to reform.

The example of change elsewhere. The fall of communism in Eastern Europe and the spread of democracy inspired Africans to seek the same. The example of change gave them hope and courage. A democratic wave was sweeping the world. The fall of communism in Europe inspired Africans to seek change. Africa was caught up in the tide.

The legalising of opposition parties. States repealed the laws that banned opposition and once more permitted rival parties, as Tanzania restored multi-party politics in 1992. The one-party clauses were struck out. Opposition became lawful again. Tanzania amended its constitution to this end in 1992. The parties returned to public life.

The holding of multi-party elections. States held multi-party elections in which several parties competed for power before the voters. The people were given a real choice at the polls. Contested elections returned to Africa. Several parties now competed openly for the votes of the people. The ballot regained its meaning.

Its mixed results. Democracy returned, yet in many states it remained shallow, as ruling parties clung to power and elections fell short of being free. The change was real but often incomplete. Old habits died hard. Ruling parties often clung to power despite the new freedoms. Multi-party rule returned unevenly across the continent.

The return to multi-party democracy in Africa in the 1990s therefore sprang from the failure of one-party and military rule, the end of the Cold War, popular demand, donor pressure and the example of change elsewhere, and it brought the legalising of opposition and the holding of multi-party elections. Its results were mixed, for democracy returned in form but often remained shallow, yet the wave marked a decisive turn towards more open government.

Question 22

Good government, Africa learned, is not merely about who rules but about how they rule: openly, accountably and under the law.

Explain the concept and pillars of good governance.

Model Answer

Good governance became the watchword of reform in post-colonial Africa, setting a standard for how states ought to be ruled. It rests upon a number of key principles or pillars. The concept and pillars of good governance may be explained as follows.

The meaning of good governance. Good governance is the just, open and accountable exercise of power for the good of the people. It concerns not only who rules but how they rule. It sets a standard for the conduct of government. It concerns the manner of rule as much as the identity of the ruler. Good governance is the right use of public power.

Accountability. Accountability means that those who hold power must answer for their actions to the people and the law. Leaders are responsible for how they govern. They can be called to account and removed. Rulers who fail the people can be questioned and removed. Accountability binds the ruler to the ruled.

Transparency. Transparency means that the workings of government are open and known to the people, without secrecy. Decisions and accounts are made public. The people can see how they are governed. Decisions and public accounts are open to the eyes of all. Openness is the enemy of corruption.

The rule of law. The rule of law means that all persons, including the rulers, are bound by the law and equal before it. No one, however powerful, stands above the law. Government itself is subject to the law it

makes. Even the president is bound by the very same law as the humblest citizen. Law, not the ruler, is supreme.

Participation. Participation means that the people share in the decisions that affect their lives, through elections and consultation. Government rests on the consent of the governed. The people have a voice in their own rule. The people share in the decisions that shape their lives. Participation makes government their own.

Free and fair elections. Good governance requires regular, free and fair elections through which the people choose and change their leaders. The vote gives the people control over their rulers. Power rests on the will of the people. The vote gives the people the power to choose their rulers. Elections make government answerable.

Respect for human rights. Good governance requires that the rights and freedoms of the citizen be respected and protected. The dignity of the individual is upheld. Government serves the people rather than oppressing them. The freedoms and dignity of the citizen are respected and protected. Rights set limits to the power of the state.

Efficiency and the control of corruption. Good governance requires that public affairs be managed efficiently and that corruption be controlled. Resources are to be used honestly for the public good. Waste and graft are to be curbed. Public resources are used honestly and without waste. Efficient, honest administration serves the nation.

Good governance is therefore the just, open and accountable exercise of power for the good of the people, resting on the pillars of accountability, transparency, the rule of law, participation, free elections, respect for human rights and efficient, honest administration. Adopted as the standard of reform in post-colonial Africa, it sought to replace the misgovernment of earlier decades with rule that served and answered to the people.

Question 23

To bring government closer to the villager and the town, Africa's states pushed power downward, from the distant capital to the district and the ward.

Examine decentralisation and local government as a means of improving administration in Africa.

Model Answer

Decentralisation, the transfer of power from the central government to local authorities, was one of the chief means by which African states sought to improve their administration. It aimed to bring government nearer to the people. Decentralisation and local government as a means of improving administration may be examined as follows.

The meaning of decentralisation. Decentralisation is the transfer of power and functions from the central government to local authorities such as districts and councils. It shares out the work of government across the land. Power is moved from the capital to the localities. Decentralisation spreads authority downward.

It brings government nearer to the people. By placing authority in local hands, decentralisation brings government closer to the people it serves. Decisions are made near to those they affect. The distant capital gives way to the local council. Government is brought within reach of the people.

It encourages popular participation. Local government gives ordinary people a share in running their own affairs. Citizens take part in the decisions of their district. Participation is widened at the grassroots. Citizens help to plan and manage the affairs of their own district. Decentralisation draws the people into governance.

It speeds development at the local level. Local authorities can plan and carry out development suited to the needs of their own areas. Roads, schools and clinics are built where they are needed. Local knowledge guides local development. Roads, schools and clinics are built where they are most needed. Decentralisation quickens progress in the localities.

It eases the burden on the central government. By handing work to local bodies, decentralisation relieves the central government of tasks it could not manage alone. The centre is freed for national affairs. The load of government is shared. Local authorities lighten the burden of the capital.

It suits local needs and conditions. Local government can adapt its work to the particular conditions of each area, which a distant centre cannot know. Rule is fitted to local circumstance. Diversity is respected in administration. What suits one district may not suit another, and local rule can adapt. Decentralisation tailors government to the place.

Its difficulties. Decentralisation is often hindered by a shortage of funds and skilled people in the localities, and by the reluctance of the centre to give up power. Local bodies may be weak and poor. The centre may withhold real authority. Local bodies often lack the money and the skilled staff they need. These difficulties limit its success.

The example of Tanzania. Tanzania pursued decentralisation and built a system of local government to carry administration and development to the districts and villages. Power was devolved to local councils. The policy sought to reach the grassroots. Tanzania made decentralisation a tool of development.

Decentralisation and local government were therefore an important means of improving administration in Africa, for they brought government nearer to the people, encouraged participation, speeded local development, eased the burden on the centre and suited local conditions. Though hindered by shortages of funds and skills and by the reluctance of the centre, decentralisation, as in Tanzania, sought to carry good government down to the grassroots.

The Organisation of African Unity and regional cooperation

Question 24

In Addis Ababa in 1963, thirty-two states, freshly freed, joined hands and vowed to complete the liberation of the continent and to guard the freedom they had won.

Examine the objectives of the Organisation of African Unity.

Model Answer

The Organisation of African Unity was founded in 1963 to promote the unity and independence of the African states. Its objectives, set out in its charter, guided African cooperation for nearly four decades. The objectives of the Organisation of African Unity may be examined as follows.

It was founded in 1963 at Addis Ababa. The Organisation of African Unity was founded on the twenty-fifth of May 1963 at Addis Ababa by thirty-two independent African states. Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia was its first chairman. It was born of the dream of African unity. The OAU united the free states of Africa.

To promote the unity and solidarity of African states. The first objective of the OAU was to promote the unity and solidarity of the states of Africa. It sought to draw the new nations together as one. Unity was the very purpose of its being. The new nations were to stand together as one African family. The OAU stood for a united Africa.

To defend the sovereignty and independence of members. The OAU aimed to defend the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of its member states. It guarded the freedom the states had won. It upheld the borders of its members. The OAU was a shield for African independence.

To eradicate all forms of colonialism. A central objective was to eradicate colonialism in all its forms from the continent. The OAU pledged itself to complete the liberation of Africa. It supported the peoples still under foreign rule. It pledged support to the peoples still under foreign and settler rule. The final freeing of Africa was its great aim.

To coordinate cooperation for a better life. The OAU sought to coordinate and harmonise cooperation among its members for the better life of their peoples. It joined their efforts in economy, education and health. Cooperation was to serve development. The OAU worked for the welfare of Africans.

To promote non-interference in internal affairs. The OAU upheld the principle that no state should interfere in the internal affairs of another. Each member's sovereignty was to be respected. This rule guarded the independence of all. No member was to meddle in the internal affairs of another. Non-interference was a pillar of the charter.

To promote international cooperation. The OAU sought to promote cooperation with the wider world in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations and human rights. It gave Africa a common voice abroad. It joined Africa to the international community. The OAU spoke for Africa in the world.

To settle disputes peacefully. The OAU aimed to settle disputes among its members by peaceful means, through negotiation and mediation. It sought to keep peace within the African family. Quarrels were to be resolved without war. Quarrels between members were to be resolved by negotiation. The OAU worked to reconcile its members.

The objectives of the Organisation of African Unity, founded in 1963 at Addis Ababa, were therefore to promote the unity and solidarity of African states, to defend their sovereignty and independence, to eradicate colonialism, to coordinate cooperation for a better life, to uphold non-interference, to promote international cooperation and to settle disputes peacefully. Together these aims expressed the dream of a united and fully free Africa.

Question 25

For all that critics called it a mere talking-shop, the OAU held a quarrelsome continent together and helped to strike the last chains of colonial rule from Africa.

Assess the achievements of the Organisation of African Unity.

Model Answer

The Organisation of African Unity, founded in 1963, worked for nearly four decades to unite the continent and complete its liberation. It won real achievements even as it fell short of its highest dreams. The achievements of the Organisation of African Unity may be assessed as follows.

It united the states of Africa. The OAU brought together the many and diverse states of Africa into a single body. It held them together for nearly forty years without a permanent split. Unity itself was its first achievement. It held the continent together for nearly forty years without a split. The OAU made one forum for all Africa.

It advanced the liberation of Africa. The OAU gave strong support to the liberation movements still fighting colonial and white-minority rule. It helped to free Zimbabwe, Angola, Namibia and others. The final decolonisation of Africa was its greatest work. The OAU carried on the struggle for freedom.

It supported the fight against apartheid. The OAU led African opposition to apartheid in South Africa, pressing for its isolation in the world. It kept the cause before the eyes of nations. It helped in the long struggle that ended apartheid. It pressed for the isolation of South Africa in the world. The OAU stood firm against racial rule.

It gave Africa a common voice. The OAU gave the states of Africa a single voice in world affairs, at the United Nations and beyond. Together they carried more weight than alone. Africa spoke as one on great questions. At the United Nations the African states spoke with one voice. The OAU amplified the voice of the continent.

It created the African Development Bank. The OAU helped to found the African Development Bank in 1967 to fund the development of the continent. The bank pooled resources for African progress. It served the common growth of the members. Founded in 1967, the bank pooled resources for African growth. Cooperation was turned to development.

It gave rise to regional bodies. The spirit of the OAU encouraged the founding of regional groupings such as ECOWAS and SADC. These bodies deepened cooperation among neighbours. Unity grew at the regional level. Groupings such as ECOWAS and SADC grew from its example. The OAU inspired closer regional ties.

It mediated disputes among members. The OAU worked to settle quarrels among African states by peaceful means. It mediated in several disputes and border conflicts. It helped to keep the peace within the family. It intervened to calm border quarrels and civil conflicts. The OAU calmed disputes that might have grown to war.

It upheld respect for existing borders. The OAU established the principle that the colonial borders should be respected, so as to avoid endless conflict over territory. This rule spared Africa many wars of boundaries. Stability was preserved among states. The OAU held the map of Africa in place.

The achievements of the Organisation of African Unity were therefore substantial, for it united the diverse states of Africa, advanced the liberation of the continent, opposed apartheid, gave Africa a common voice, founded the African Development Bank, inspired regional bodies, mediated disputes and upheld respect for borders. Though it fell short of full African unity, the OAU did much to bind the continent together and to complete its freedom.

Question 26

The OAU could pass a hundred resolutions against colonialism and poverty, but with no power to enforce a single one, its words too often died on the air.

Examine the problems and failures of the Organisation of African Unity.

Model Answer

For all its achievements, the Organisation of African Unity fell far short of its dream of a united and prosperous Africa. It was hampered by weaknesses that limited its power throughout its life. The problems and failures of the Organisation of African Unity may be examined as follows.

It had no power to enforce its decisions. The OAU could pass resolutions but had no means to compel its members to obey them. Its decisions rested on goodwill alone. Without enforcement, its words often had little effect. It could pass resolutions but never compel a member to obey them. The OAU was in this sense a body without teeth.

It was weakened by ideological differences. Its members were divided between socialist and capitalist states, and between radical and moderate camps. These differences hindered common action. The OAU spoke with a divided voice. Socialist and capitalist members pulled the body in opposite directions. Ideology split the unity it sought to build.

It failed to achieve real political unity. The OAU never brought about the political union of Africa that its founders had dreamed of. The states clung jealously to their own sovereignty. A united Africa remained a distant hope. Each state clung jealously to its own hard-won sovereignty. The dream of one Africa was not realised.

It could not end neo-colonial exploitation. The OAU failed to free Africa from the economic domination of the former colonial powers. Neo-colonialism persisted despite its efforts. Economic dependence outlived political freedom. The former masters kept their grip upon African economies. The continent remained poor and exploited.

The principle of non-interference tied its hands. Because it upheld non-interference in members' internal affairs, the OAU could not act against tyranny and misrule within its own members. It stood by as dictators oppressed their peoples. The rule meant to protect sovereignty shielded oppressors. Non-interference weakened its authority.

It suffered from disputes and poor funding. The OAU was troubled by quarrels among its members and by the failure of states to pay their dues. Shortage of funds crippled its work. Disunity sapped its strength. Many members failed to pay the dues the body badly needed. The body was weakened from within.

It could not prevent conflicts and coups. The OAU proved unable to prevent the coups, civil wars and border conflicts that plagued the continent. Instability spread despite its existence. It could not keep the peace it desired. Coups and civil wars spread across the continent despite its charters. Disorder mocked its resolutions.

It was often called a mere talking-shop. Because it debated much but achieved little, critics dismissed the OAU as a mere talking-shop. Fine words were seldom matched by firm deeds. Its weakness earned it this scorn. It debated endlessly while its resolutions went unheeded. The gap between word and deed was wide.

The problems and failures of the Organisation of African Unity therefore lay in its lack of power to enforce decisions, its ideological divisions, its failure to achieve political unity or to end neo-colonial exploitation, the tying of its hands by non-interference, its disputes and poor funding, and its inability to prevent conflict. These weaknesses, which earned it the name of a talking-shop, led at last to its replacement by the African Union.

Question 27

Where a single state was too weak to stand against the world, African leaders reasoned that neighbours joined together might yet find strength and prosperity.

Examine regional cooperation and integration and the transition from the OAU to the African Union.

Model Answer

Alongside the OAU, African states sought strength through regional cooperation and integration, and at last replaced the OAU with the African Union. These efforts aimed at unity, development and greater weight in the world. Regional cooperation and the transition to the African Union may be examined as follows.

The purpose of regional cooperation. Regional cooperation aimed to join the efforts of neighbouring states for their common development and security. Small and weak states hoped to gain strength through union. Together they could achieve what none could alone. Cooperation was a path to strength.

It widened markets and trade. By joining together, states created larger markets in which their goods could be freely traded. Wider markets encouraged industry and commerce. Trade among neighbours was eased. Goods could move freely across a larger regional market. Integration opened new room for growth.

The regional economic bodies. African states formed regional groupings such as ECOWAS in 1975 in West Africa, SADC in 1980 in Southern Africa, and COMESA in 1993. These bodies deepened cooperation among their members. Each drew neighbouring states together. Regional blocs spread across the continent.

The East African Community. In East Africa, Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania cooperated through the East African Community, which after an early collapse was later revived. It joined the neighbours in trade and common services. It sought the integration of the region. The Community bound East Africa together.

The weaknesses of the OAU prompted change. The failures of the OAU, its lack of power and its inability to end conflict and poverty, called for a stronger body. African leaders sought a union with greater force. The old organisation had served its time. Its weakness prompted its replacement.

The founding of the African Union. The African Union was proposed at Sirte in 1999, its Constitutive Act was adopted in 2000 at Lome, and it was launched in 2002 at Durban. Thabo Mbeki of South Africa became its first chairman. The AU replaced the OAU. A new body was born for a new age.

The African Union aimed to do more. The African Union set out to promote not only unity but also development, peace and good governance more actively than the OAU had done. It claimed the right to act against grave wrongs within members. It aimed at deeper integration. The AU reached beyond the old body's limits.

Integration remained a work in progress. For all these efforts, full African unity and integration were still far from complete. Sovereignty, poverty and division continued to stand in the way. The dream advanced but was not achieved. Sovereignty, poverty and division still stood in the way. African unity remained a work in progress.

Regional cooperation and integration therefore offered African states strength through union, widening markets and joining neighbours in bodies such as ECOWAS, SADC, COMESA and the East African

Community, while the weaknesses of the OAU led to its replacement by the African Union, launched in 2002 to pursue unity, development and good governance more firmly. Yet full integration remained a work in progress, an unfinished chapter in the quest for African unity.

Administration in Tanzania since independence

Question 28

From a borrowed parliament in 1961 to a socialist one-party state and back to multiple parties, Tanzania's system of rule was remade again and again in a single generation.

Examine the development of the administrative system in Tanzania since independence.

Model Answer

Since winning independence in 1961, Tanzania has reshaped its administrative system several times, moving from inherited democracy through one-party socialism to multi-party rule. Its development offers a clear example of the post-colonial African experience. The development of the administrative system in Tanzania since independence may be examined as follows.

Independence under a parliamentary system in 1961. Tanganyika won its independence in 1961 under Julius Nyerere with an inherited British parliamentary system. Several parties were permitted, though TANU was overwhelmingly dominant. The borrowed model was the starting point. Independence began with a Westminster system.

The republican constitution of 1962. In 1962 Tanganyika became a republic with a strong executive president, as Nyerere took that office. Power was gathered in the presidency. The system moved away from the British model. Julius Nyerere became the first executive president of the republic. The republic strengthened the central executive.

The union with Zanzibar in 1964. In April 1964 Tanganyika united with Zanzibar, which had overthrown its Sultan in a revolution, to form the United Republic of Tanzania. The union created a special two-government structure. Two states were joined into one nation. The United Republic was born in 1964.

The one-party state of 1965. In 1965 Tanzania became a one-party state under an interim constitution, with TANU as the sole legal party. Political choice was henceforth exercised within the party. Unity was the reason given. TANU was made the sole legal party under the interim constitution. The one-party state was formally established.

The Arusha Declaration of 1967. In February 1967 the Arusha Declaration set Tanzania on the path of socialism and self-reliance under Ujamaa. The major means of production were nationalised. The administrative system was bent to building socialism. Arusha reshaped the whole direction of the state.

The permanent constitution of 1977. In 1977 Tanzania adopted a permanent constitution, and in the same year TANU and the Afro-Shirazi Party merged to form Chama Cha Mapinduzi. The ruling party and the state were consolidated. A lasting framework was set in place. The system was given a permanent form.

The return to multi-party democracy in 1992. In 1992 Tanzania amended its constitution to permit opposition parties once more, ending the one-party monopoly. Multi-party elections followed from 1995. The people regained a wider choice. The constitution was amended to permit opposition parties once more. Tanzania returned to multi-party rule.

Continuity amid change. Through all these changes, Tanzania kept a striking continuity and stability, with peaceful transfers of power and no successful coup on the mainland. The state endured while its system evolved. Stability marked its whole development. Change came without collapse.

The administrative system of Tanzania since independence therefore developed through the inherited parliamentary system of 1961, the republic of 1962, the union with Zanzibar in 1964, the one-party state of 1965, the socialism of the Arusha Declaration of 1967, the permanent constitution and the founding of Chama Cha Mapinduzi in 1977, and the return to multi-party democracy in 1992. Through all these changes it kept a rare continuity and stability.

Question 29

While coups toppled its neighbours one by one, Tanzania stood unshaken, a rare island of stability in a turbulent continent.

Account for the political stability of Tanzania since independence.

Model Answer

Tanzania has enjoyed a rare political stability since independence, escaping the coups and civil wars that shook so much of Africa. Several factors combined to give it this stability. The reasons for the political stability of Tanzania since independence may be examined as follows.

The unifying leadership of Nyerere. Julius Nyerere gave Tanzania wise, honest and widely respected leadership in its first decades. His authority held the nation together. He set an example of integrity and service. His honesty and modest living set an example for the whole nation. Nyerere's leadership was a rock of stability.

The promotion of national unity. The one-party state and the policy of Ujamaa were used to build a strong sense of one nation. Unity was placed above every other aim. The many peoples were bound into a single people. Ujamaa and the one-party state were used to bind the people together. National unity underpinned the peace.

The use of Kiswahili as a national language. Tanzania promoted Kiswahili as a common national language spoken across the country. A shared tongue bound the peoples together and reduced tribalism. Language became a force for unity. A shared tongue drew the many peoples closer together. Kiswahili helped to make one nation.

The weakness of tribalism. Tanzania had many small ethnic groups, none large enough to dominate, and its policies discouraged tribalism. Ethnic rivalry never gained the grip it had elsewhere. The politics of the tribe found little room. Weak tribalism spared Tanzania much conflict.

Control of the armed forces. After an army mutiny in 1964, Tanzania brought its armed forces firmly under the control of the party and the state. The army was kept out of politics. The danger of a coup was contained. After the mutiny of 1964 the army was firmly subordinated to the state. Firm control of the soldiers guarded the peace.

A relatively honest leadership. The leadership code of the Arusha Declaration curbed the greed of leaders and kept corruption within bounds. Government kept much of the people's trust. Honesty in leadership strengthened the state. The Arusha leadership code curbed the greed of those in office. Restraint at the top steadied the nation.

Peaceful transfers of power. Tanzania managed peaceful and orderly changes of president, as Nyerere handed power to his successor in 1985. Power passed by rule rather than by force. Orderly succession became a habit. Nyerere handed power to Ali Hassan Mwinyi in 1985. Peaceful transfer secured the state.

A shared national ethos. The ideals of Ujamaa, equality and self-reliance gave Tanzanians a shared sense of purpose and identity. A common ethos bound the nation together. The people felt themselves one. The ideals of equality and self-reliance gave the nation a common purpose. Shared values reinforced the peace.

The political stability of Tanzania since independence is therefore explained by the unifying leadership of Nyerere, the promotion of national unity, the use of Kiswahili, the weakness of tribalism, the firm control of the armed forces, a relatively honest leadership, peaceful transfers of power and a shared national ethos. Together these made Tanzania a rare island of stability in a turbulent continent.

Question 30

Rather than cling to the one-party state to the last, Tanzania chose to open its politics on its own terms, and made the change without a shot being fired.

Assess the transition from one-party to multi-party democracy in Tanzania.

Model Answer

In 1992 Tanzania ended nearly thirty years of one-party rule and returned to multi-party democracy. The transition was carried out peacefully and on Tanzania's own terms. The transition from one-party to multi-party democracy in Tanzania may be assessed as follows.

The background of one-party rule. From 1965 Tanzania had been a one-party state under TANU and later Chama Cha Mapinduzi. For nearly thirty years a single party held power. This was the system that came to be reconsidered. TANU and later Chama Cha Mapinduzi had ruled alone since 1965. One-party rule was the starting point.

The pressures for change. By the early 1990s the end of the Cold War, the failures of one-party rule and the pressure of donors pushed Tanzania towards reform. The winds of change blew across Africa. Both outside and inside forces called for openness. The end of the Cold War and donor pressure pushed reform forward. Pressure for change mounted.

The Nyalali Commission. In 1991 a presidential commission led by Chief Justice Nyalali was appointed to consult the people on multi-party democracy. It found opinion divided but recommended a return to multiple parties. The change was studied before it was made. The commission charted the way.

The legalising of opposition in 1992. In 1992 the constitution was amended to permit opposition parties once more, ending the one-party monopoly. Rival parties were registered and became lawful. The single-party clause was struck out. The one-party clause was struck from the constitution. Opposition returned to Tanzanian politics.

The first multi-party elections. Multi-party elections were held from 1995, in which several parties competed for power. The people were given a real choice at the polls. Contested elections returned to the country. The first multi-party polls were held in 1995. The vote regained its meaning.

The continued dominance of the ruling party. Despite the reform, Chama Cha Mapinduzi remained firmly in power, winning every election. The opposition stayed weak and divided. The change did not bring a change of ruling party. Chama Cha Mapinduzi won every election it contested. Dominance survived the coming of many parties.

A peaceful and orderly transition. The whole transition was carried out peacefully and lawfully, without the violence that marked change elsewhere. Reform came by constitution, not by force. Tanzania changed its system in good order. Reform came by constitutional amendment rather than by force. The transition kept the peace.

Its limits and challenges. Though multi-party democracy returned in form, it remained shallow, with a dominant party and a weak opposition. Real competition was limited. The promise of democracy was only partly fulfilled. A dominant party and a weak opposition left democracy shallow. The transition left work still to be done.

The transition from one-party to multi-party democracy in Tanzania was therefore a peaceful and orderly reform, driven by the end of the Cold War, the failures of one-party rule and donor pressure, prepared by the Nyalali Commission, and completed by the legalising of opposition in 1992 and the elections from 1995. Yet its results were limited, for the ruling party remained dominant and democracy shallow, so that the transition was real but incomplete.

The significance of post-colonial administrative systems

Question 31

The new states were handed a house that was cracked at its foundations, and the question of the age is whether they repaired it or let the cracks widen.

"The post-colonial African state inherited more problems than it solved." Discuss.

Model Answer

The claim that the post-colonial African state inherited more problems than it solved weighs the heavy colonial legacy against the record of the independent states. The claim carries much force, though the new states also had real achievements. It may be discussed as follows.

It inherited artificial and divisive borders. The new states inherited borders drawn by the colonial powers that threw rival peoples together and split others apart. These borders made unity a lasting struggle. The problem was inherited, not made. Peoples with no common bond were enclosed within one frontier. The colonial map burdened the new state.

It inherited a weak and dependent economy. The independent states inherited narrow, dependent economies built to serve the colonial power. Poverty and dependence were their starting point. This burden was passed down from colonialism. It depended on exporting a few raw materials at prices set abroad. The economy was crippled from birth.

It inherited ethnic division and weak institutions. Colonial divide and rule left deep ethnic divisions, and colonial autocracy left weak and authoritarian institutions. These inherited faults bred instability. The new state was flawed at its foundations. Division and weakness were part of the inheritance.

It often deepened its own problems. The new rulers frequently made matters worse through coups, corruption and dictatorship. Their own failures added to the inherited burdens. Some wounds were self-inflicted. Coups, corruption and dictatorship added to the inherited burdens. The state added new problems to the old.

Yet it won and defended independence. Against this, the post-colonial state achieved the great work of winning and defending national independence. It ended foreign rule and took its place among nations. Freedom itself was a solid achievement. The state secured the liberty of its people.

Yet it expanded education and services. The new states greatly expanded education, health and other services beyond anything the colonial power had provided. Schools and clinics spread to the people. Real progress was made in welfare. The state served its people as the colony never had.

Yet it built nations and advanced African unity. Many states succeeded in building a sense of nationhood, and through the OAU they advanced the liberation and unity of the continent. Nation-building bore real fruit. Africa was freed and drawn together. The state helped to make nations and to free a continent.

On balance the inheritance was heavy but not the whole story. Weighing all this, the post-colonial state did inherit grave problems, yet it also solved some and achieved much. Its record was mixed rather than one of simple failure. The inheritance was heavy but not the whole story. The claim is largely, though not wholly, true.

The post-colonial African state did therefore inherit grave problems, artificial borders, a weak economy, ethnic division and authoritarian institutions, and it often deepened them through coups and corruption. Yet it also won independence, expanded education and services, built nations and advanced African unity. The claim is thus largely valid, provided it is remembered that the new states, for all their inherited burdens, also achieved a great deal.

Question 32

The hard lessons of Africa's first decades of freedom, written in coups, debt and broken promises, are also a map showing the way to better government.

Examine the lessons that modern African states can draw from their post-colonial experience to improve governance today.

Model Answer

The experience of the post-colonial decades, with its failures and its successes, holds valuable lessons for the government of African states today. From this experience much can be learned about how to govern

well. The lessons that modern African states can draw to improve governance today may be examined as follows.

The need to place nation above tribe. The experience of ethnic conflict and civil war teaches that national unity must be placed above tribal loyalty. Tanzania's success with Kiswahili and unity shows the way. Nation-building must come before the tribe. Tanzania's use of Kiswahili and unity shows how it can be done. Unity is the first lesson of the past.

The value of accountable, good governance. The misrule of earlier decades teaches the value of accountable and transparent government. Leaders must answer to the people for their acts. Good governance guards against tyranny. Rulers must answer to the people for the power they hold. Accountability is a hard-won lesson.

The danger of the over-mighty executive. The slide into dictatorship teaches the danger of concentrating power in one office. The separation of powers and an independent judiciary must be upheld. Power must be checked by power. The over-mighty president is a warning from the past.

The heavy cost of corruption. The plunder of public wealth teaches that corruption must be fought without mercy. Graft robs the nation of its future. Honest use of resources is essential to progress. Graft robs a nation of the very resources it needs to grow. The cost of corruption is a lasting lesson.

The need for economic self-reliance. The bondage of neo-colonialism and debt teaches the need to build self-reliant economies. States must control their own resources and reduce dependence. Economic freedom completes political freedom. Reliance on foreign aid and loans has kept much of Africa dependent. Self-reliance is a lesson written in debt.

The worth of democracy and free elections. The failure of one-party and military rule teaches the worth of democracy and the free choice of leaders. The people must be able to change their rulers by the vote. Free elections guard against tyranny. The free choice of leaders guards against the return of tyranny. Democracy is a lesson bought dearly.

The benefit of regional cooperation. The weakness of small states alone teaches the benefit of regional cooperation and integration. Neighbours joined together find strength and wider markets. Unity brings what division cannot. United, neighbouring states find a strength that none has alone. Cooperation is a lesson for the future.

The importance of strong institutions. The instability of the past teaches the importance of building strong and lasting institutions rather than relying on single leaders. Institutions outlast the men who lead them. A state of laws is stronger than a state of one man. Sound institutions are the surest lesson.

The lessons that modern African states can draw from their post-colonial experience to improve governance today therefore include the need to place nation above tribe, the value of accountable governance, the danger of the over-mighty executive, the cost of corruption, the need for economic self-reliance, the worth of democracy, the benefit of regional cooperation and the importance of strong institutions. Learned from both the failures and the successes of the past, these lessons point the way to better government in Africa.

PART TWO
EXAMINATION QUESTIONS

Each question is a full essay in the manner of the National Examination. Read every question twice, decide what it is really asking, then plan before you write. Attempt each question under timed conditions, and check your work against the model solution only after you have written your own.

Question 1

"Pan-Africanism was born not in Africa but in the pain of its scattered children." Assess the validity of this statement with reference to the origins of the movement.

Question 2

Account for the rise of Pan-Africanism in the first half of the twentieth century.

Question 3

Examine the contribution of the Pan-African Congresses to the growth of the movement between 1900 and 1945.

Question 4

Compare the contributions of Marcus Garvey and W. E. B. Du Bois to the Pan-African movement.

Question 5

To what extent did cultural movements such as Negritude and Garveyism shape Pan-African consciousness?

Question 6

"The early history of Pan-Africanism belongs more to the New World than to Africa." How far do you agree?

Question 7

Assess the significance of the Fifth Pan-African Congress of 1945 to the decolonisation of Africa.

Question 8

How far was Pan-Africanism responsible for the growth of nationalism in colonial Africa?

Question 9

Account for the formation of the Organisation of African Unity in 1963.

Question 10

"The Organisation of African Unity was a compromise between two irreconcilable visions of African unity." Discuss.

Question 11

Evaluate the achievements of the Organisation of African Unity in advancing African liberation.

Question 12

Examine the factors that limited the effectiveness of the Organisation of African Unity.

Question 13

"Kwame Nkrumah did more than any other leader to keep the dream of continental unity alive." How valid is this claim?

Question 14

Assess the contribution of African political leaders to the Pan-African movement after 1945.

Question 15

Account for the failure of Pan-Africanism to achieve the political unification of Africa.

Question 16

To what extent has Pan-Africanism succeeded as an economic project rather than a political one?

Question 17

Discuss the view that Pan-Africanism remains relevant to Africa in the twenty-first century.

Question 18

"Pan-Africanism has been a movement of great ideals but modest achievements." Assess the validity of this statement.

Question 19

"Britain became the first workshop of the world less by invention than by circumstance." Assess the validity of this statement.

Question 20

Account for the outbreak of the Industrial Revolution in Britain during the eighteenth century.

Question 21

Examine the contribution of the Agrarian Revolution to British industrialisation.

Question 22

"The steam engine was the single most important invention of the Industrial Revolution." How valid is this claim?

Question 23

Assess the role of the textile industry in the early Industrial Revolution.

Question 24

Examine the part played by the transport revolution in Britain's industrial growth.

Question 25

To what extent did the Industrial Revolution depend on Britain's access to coal and iron?

Question 26

"The Industrial Revolution brought more misery than progress to the working class." Discuss.

Question 27

Account for the rapid growth of towns and cities during the Industrial Revolution.

Question 28

Assess the effects of the factory system on the lives of workers, women and children.

Question 29

"The Industrial Revolution created two new and hostile classes." How far do you agree?

Question 30

Examine the ways in which the Industrial Revolution transformed the British economy.

Question 31

"The Industrial Revolution was the true parent of modern capitalism." Discuss.

Question 32

Account for the rise of trade unions in nineteenth-century Britain.

Question 33

To what extent did the Industrial Revolution contribute to the growth of European imperialism?

Question 34

Compare the positive and negative consequences of the Industrial Revolution.

Question 35

Examine the impact of the Industrial Revolution on the wider world beyond Europe.

Question 36

"The Industrial Revolution changed the world more profoundly than any political revolution." Assess the validity of this statement.

Question 37

Examine the main features that distinguished the Second Industrial Revolution from the First.

Question 38

Account for the shift of industrial leadership from Britain to the United States and Germany in the late nineteenth century.

Question 39

"Electricity was to the Second Industrial Revolution what steam had been to the First." How valid is this claim?

Question 40

Assess the impact of mass production and the assembly line on twentieth-century industry.

Question 41

Examine the contribution of new sources of energy — electricity, oil and nuclear power — to modern industrial growth.

Question 42

"The motor car transformed twentieth-century society more than any other single invention." Discuss.

Question 43

Account for the rise of multinational corporations in the twentieth century.

Question 44

To what extent did the Third Industrial Revolution rest on the computer and information technology?

Question 45

Assess the social effects of automation on the modern industrial workforce.

Question 46

"The Fourth Industrial Revolution threatens as much as it promises." Discuss.

Question 47

Examine the impact of the modern industrial revolutions on the countries of the developing world.

Question 48

Compare the First Industrial Revolution with the technological revolutions of the twentieth century.

Question 49

"Globalisation was the child of the twentieth-century industrial revolutions." How far do you agree?

Question 50

Assess the validity of the view that modern industrial revolutions have widened the gap between rich and poor nations.

Question 51

Examine the main features of administrative systems in the ancient world.

Question 52

"Divine kingship was the foundation of administration in ancient Egypt." How valid is this claim?

Question 53

Account for the efficiency of the administrative system of ancient Egypt.

Question 54

Assess the importance of the Code of Hammurabi to the administration of ancient Babylon.

Question 55

Examine the role of religion in the administrative systems of the ancient world.

Question 56

"Athenian democracy was democracy only in name." Discuss.

Question 57

Account for the development of democracy in ancient Athens.

Question 58

Compare the administrative systems of Athens and Sparta.

Question 59

Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the Athenian democratic system.

Question 60

Examine the features of the administrative system of the Roman Republic.

Question 61

Account for the transformation of Rome from a republic into an empire.

Question 62

"The strength of the Roman Empire lay in its administration." How far do you agree?

Question 63

Examine the role of law in the administrative systems of the ancient world.

Question 64

"Ancient administrative systems rested on force rather than consent." Discuss.

Question 65

Assess the contribution of ancient administrative systems to the modern world.

Question 66

Account for the decline of administrative systems in the ancient world.

Question 67

Examine the ways in which world religions have influenced administrative systems.

Question 68

"Religion has been used more to legitimise power than to restrain it." Discuss.

Question 69

Account for the close union of Church and State in medieval Europe.

Question 70

Assess the influence of Christianity on administrative systems in medieval Europe.

Question 71

"Islam is a religion and a system of government in one." How valid is this claim?

Question 72

Examine the role of the caliphate in the administration of the early Islamic state.

Question 73

Account for the spread of Islam and its administrative influence in Africa.

Question 74

Compare the influence of Christianity and Islam on administrative systems.

Question 75

Assess the contribution of religion to law in the ancient and medieval worlds.

Question 76

Examine the role of religion in legitimising political authority.

Question 77

"Religion was a unifying force in the building of states and empires." Discuss.

Question 78

To what extent did religion shape the administration of the Ottoman Empire?

Question 79

Account for the use of the doctrine of the divine right of kings in Europe.

Question 80

Examine the influence of religion on education and social welfare under religious administrations.

Question 81

"Religion did as much harm as good to the administration of states." Discuss.

Question 82

Assess the influence of religion on colonial administration in Africa.

Question 83

Examine the main features of the slave mode of production.

Question 84

Account for the rise of slavery as a system of production in the ancient world.

Question 85

"Slavery was the foundation of the economy and administration of ancient Greece and Rome." How valid is this claim?

Question 86

Assess the role of slaves in the administration and economy of the Roman Empire.

Question 87

Examine the sources from which slaves were obtained in the ancient world.

Question 88

Account for the decline of the slave mode of production.

Question 89

Examine the main features of feudalism as a system of administration.

Question 90

"Feudalism was above all a system of land and obligation." Discuss.

Question 91

Account for the rise of feudalism in medieval Europe.

Question 92

Assess the role of the manor in the feudal administrative system.

Question 93

Compare slavery and feudalism as systems of production and administration.

Question 94

Examine the features of feudalism in Africa.

Question 95

Account for the decline of feudalism in Europe.

Question 96

"The transition from slavery to feudalism was a step forward for the labourer." Discuss.

Question 97

To what extent did feudalism provide effective government in the absence of a strong central state?

Question 98

Assess the contribution of slavery and feudalism to the development of later societies.

Question 99

Examine the main features of the modern administrative systems that arose in Europe.

Question 100

Account for the decline of absolute monarchy in Europe.

Question 101

Assess the contribution of Enlightenment thinkers to modern administrative systems.

Question 102

Examine the causes of the English Revolution of the seventeenth century.

Question 103

"The Glorious Revolution of 1688 laid the foundations of modern constitutional government." How valid is this claim?

Question 104

Account for the outbreak of the American Revolution.

Question 105

Assess the contribution of the American Revolution to modern administrative systems.

Question 106

Account for the outbreak of the French Revolution of 1789.

Question 107

"The French Revolution was driven more by the middle class than by the peasantry." Discuss.

Question 108

Examine the administrative reforms of the French Revolution.

Question 109

Assess the significance of the French Revolution to the development of modern Europe.

Question 110

"Napoleon destroyed the Revolution but preserved its reforms." Discuss.

Question 111

Examine the administrative reforms of Napoleon.

Question 112

Account for the rise of the nation-state in modern Europe.

Question 113

To what extent did the political revolutions establish the rule of law and constitutional government?

Question 114

Compare the French Revolution with the American Revolution.

Question 115

"The political revolutions replaced the rule of privilege with the rule of law." Discuss.

Question 116

Assess the impact of Europe's political revolutions on the wider world.

Question 117

Examine the main features of the capitalist system.

Question 118

"Crises are inherent in the capitalist system." Discuss.

Question 119

Account for the occurrence of economic crises under capitalism.

Question 120

Assess the causes of the Great Depression of 1929.

Question 121

Examine the effects of the Great Depression on the world.

Question 122

"The New Deal saved capitalism from itself." How valid is this claim?

Question 123

Account for the rise of socialism as an alternative to capitalism.

Question 124

Examine the main features of the socialist system.

Question 125

"The Russian Revolution offered the world an alternative to capitalism." Discuss.

Question 126

Assess the achievements and failures of the socialist system in the Soviet Union.

Question 127

Account for the rise of fascism as a response to capitalist crisis.

Question 128

Compare capitalism and socialism as systems of governance.

Question 129

Examine the features of the welfare state and the mixed economy.

Question 130

Assess Ujamaa as an African alternative to capitalism.

Question 131

To what extent did the alternative systems solve the problems of capitalism?

Question 132

"Capitalism has survived its crises by reforming itself." Discuss.

Question 133

Examine the administrative problems inherited by African states at independence.

Question 134

Account for the adoption of the one-party system in post-colonial Africa.

Question 135

"The one-party state was better suited to Africa than multiparty democracy." Discuss.

Question 136

Assess the achievements and failures of one-party rule in post-colonial Africa.

Question 137

Account for the frequency of military coups in post-colonial Africa.

Question 138

Examine the effects of military rule on African administrative systems.

Question 139

"Colonialism, not African leaders, was to blame for the failures of post-colonial states." Discuss.

Question 140

Assess the impact of the colonial legacy on post-colonial administration in Africa.

Question 141

Account for the problem of national unity in post-colonial African states.

Question 142

Examine the strategies adopted by African states to build national unity.

Question 143

"Neo-colonialism kept the new African states dependent." How valid is this claim?

Question 144

Assess the efforts of African states to achieve economic development after independence.

Question 145

Account for the wave of democratization in Africa in the 1990s.

Question 146

Examine the role of the state in development in post-colonial Africa.

Question 147

Compare the capitalist and socialist paths of development chosen by African states.

Question 148

To what extent have post-colonial African states overcome the problems of governance?

Question 149

"Corruption has been the greatest obstacle to good governance in Africa." Discuss.

Question 150

Assess the prospects for good governance and development in Africa.

PART THREE

MODEL SOLUTIONS TO THE EXAMINATIONS

Question 1

Pan-Africanism is the political and cultural movement that asserts the common identity, dignity and destiny of all people of African descent and their right to self-determination. The statement locates its birth in the diaspora rather than on the continent, and for the movement's origins this is largely valid. Its earliest consciousness, its founding leaders and its first organisations all arose among the enslaved and their descendants in the Americas and the Caribbean. Africa itself supplied the symbol of redemption toward which that consciousness reached, but not, before 1945, the leadership. The weight of the evidence therefore supports the claim for the movement's beginnings, with an important qualification.

The trans-Atlantic slave trade created a shared consciousness of suffering. For nearly four centuries the trade scattered millions of Africans across the plantations of the New World, severing them from language, land and lineage. Stripped of a common territory, they were bound instead by a common experience of bondage and racial contempt. It was from this shared wound, rather than from any African state, that the earliest sense of a single black people grew. This consciousness gave Pan-Africanism its deepest emotional root.

Racial oppression in the New World forced the first organised response. After emancipation the promise of equality was betrayed by segregation, by the Jim Crow laws of the American South and by the colour bar of the Caribbean. Educated men and women found themselves excluded despite their attainments, and this injustice drove them to act collectively. Figures such as W. E. B. Du Bois concluded that only an international movement could answer a global system of racism. The diaspora's grievance thus became the movement's spur.

The movement was named and launched from the diaspora. The very term "Pan-African" entered political use at the first Pan-African Conference, convened in London in 1900 by the Trinidadian barrister Henry Sylvester Williams. Its delegates were overwhelmingly of New World origin, drawn from the Caribbean and the United States. It was there that Du Bois issued his warning that the problem of the century would be the colour line. Africa contributed almost nothing to this founding moment, which belonged to the scattered.

Diaspora intellectuals supplied the founding ideas. The ideology of the movement was forged in the Americas by thinkers who married racial pride to political demand. Du Bois's writings gave it an analysis of race and empire, while Marcus Garvey of Jamaica preached the dignity of blackness and the promise of return. Both worked from the United States, using books, newspapers and speeches to define what Pan-Africanism meant. No African text, at this stage, shaped the movement so decisively.

The early congresses met on European and American soil. Between 1900 and 1927 the gatherings that carried the movement forward were held in London, Paris, Brussels, Lisbon and New York. This geography reflected where the movement's money, membership and leadership actually lay. The meetings took place in the very capitals of the powers that ruled Africa, far from the continent itself. Such distance underlines how far the early history was a diaspora enterprise.

Yet Africa supplied the symbol and the goal. Though the movement was made abroad, its object was always the continent, imagined as a homeland to be redeemed and a proof of black capacity. Ethiopia, ancient and uncolonised, held a special place in this imagination. The Italian invasion of 1935 provoked outrage among black people everywhere and quickened the movement. Africa was therefore never wholly absent; it was the idea around which the diaspora organised.

The continent's own leadership emerged only at the end of the period. Not until the Fifth Pan-African Congress at Manchester in 1945 did Africans themselves take command of the movement. There Nkrumah, Kenyatta and African trade unionists set its direction for the first time. This late arrival confirms that the origins, as opposed to the fulfilment, belonged to the diaspora. The statement holds for the birth of Pan-Africanism precisely because the continent entered so late.

The statement is therefore largely valid for the origins of Pan-Africanism. Its consciousness was born of the diaspora's enslavement, its ideology was written by New World intellectuals, and its early congresses met far from the continent. Africa supplied the goal and the symbol, but not, before 1945, the leadership that would carry the movement to victory. The movement was conceived in the pain of the scattered, and only later came home to the land of which it dreamed.

Examiner's Note

The word "born" fixes the question on origins; a full life-history of the movement drifts off the demand.

Weak scripts narrate slavery at length without linking that suffering to organised political action.

The top band concedes Africa's symbolic role yet still commits to a firm verdict on where the movement began.

Question 2

Pan-Africanism, the movement for the unity, dignity and self-determination of all people of African descent, grew from a scattered sentiment in 1900 into an organised international force by 1945. Its rise cannot be traced to any single cause, but to a chain of shared grievances, capable leaders and shocking events that reinforced one another. The memory of slavery supplied the feeling, racial injustice supplied the grievance, and a succession of congresses supplied the organisation. War and the assault on Ethiopia then accelerated the whole process. Together these forces account for so rapid a growth.

The legacy of the slave trade created a common consciousness. The scattering of millions across the Americas destroyed old territorial identities and forged in their place a sense of shared descent and shared suffering. This consciousness, carried in folk memory and the churches of the diaspora, made the idea of a single African people thinkable. Without it the later appeals to racial unity would have found no audience. It forms the deepest root of the movement.

Racial discrimination gave the movement a concrete grievance. The segregation of the American South, the lynching that accompanied it and the colour bar across the colonial world denied black people equality whatever their attainments. Educated professionals and clergymen felt this injustice most sharply and were driven to seek redress. Their conclusion that racism was a global system requiring a global answer turned private resentment into organised protest. Grievance became the engine of action.

The spread of education and the black press equipped the leadership. A growing class of black graduates from institutions such as Fisk, Howard and Lincoln produced the writers and organisers the movement required. Newspapers like Garvey's Negro World and Du Bois's The Crisis carried ideas across oceans and bound distant readers into one conversation. This machinery of print and learning allowed the movement to coordinate its efforts. It gave the rising movement its voice and its cadre.

Able leaders converted sentiment into a movement. Henry Sylvester Williams gave it its first conference in 1900, Du Bois gave it intellectual direction and international congresses, and Marcus Garvey gave it a mass following. Each supplied something the others lacked, in ideas, organisation or numbers. Between them they turned a diffuse feeling into bodies with programmes and members. Leadership of this quality was indispensable to the movement's rise.

The Pan-African Congresses built a durable platform. From the Paris meeting of 1919 through the sessions of 1921, 1923 and 1927, Du Bois convened gatherings that petitioned the colonial powers and publicised African grievances. These congresses kept the movement alive between the wars and accustomed its members to acting together across borders. Their very repetition created continuity and expectation. This regularity gave the movement the character of an institution.

The two World Wars radicalised black opinion. Africans and African-Americans who served in the trenches and the factories were promised dignity and returned to find it withheld. The wars also exposed the vulnerability of the imperial powers and discredited their claims to superiority. The disappointment of ex-servicemen and the visible weakening of empire together sharpened the demand for change. They swelled the ranks of the movement.

The Italian invasion of Ethiopia in 1935 acted as a galvanising shock. The assault on Africa's oldest independent state, and the League of Nations' failure to defend it, outraged black people across the world. Ethiopia had long been a symbol of African dignity, and its violation turned sympathy into militancy. The crisis gave Pan-Africanism a concrete cause around which to mobilise. It drew a new generation into activism.

The Manchester Congress of 1945 gathered these forces into a programme. There the movement passed from petition to a demand for outright independence, led for the first time by Africans such as Nkrumah and Kenyatta. The congress showed how far the earlier causes had matured, converting decades of grievance into a plan for liberation. It marked the point at which the rise of Pan-Africanism became irreversible. From feeling it had become a force.

The rise of Pan-Africanism is therefore best explained as a convergence rather than a single cause. A consciousness born of slavery met a grievance sharpened by discrimination, and both were organised by educated leaders through a series of congresses. War and the Ethiopian crisis then accelerated the movement until, at Manchester in 1945, it became the ideological engine of African liberation. Each cause reinforced the others, and it is their combination that accounts for so swift a growth.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" asks for causes woven into a chain, not a description of the congresses.

The trap is listing leaders and events without explaining why each drove the movement forward.

Strong answers rank the causes and show how war and the Ethiopian crisis accelerated an existing trend.

Question 3

The Pan-African Congresses were the chain of international gatherings, from the London Conference of 1900 to the Manchester Congress of 1945, through which a scattered sentiment became an organised movement. To examine their contribution is to trace a steady advance from cautious petition to an outright demand for independence. Each meeting added members, sharpened aims and trained leaders, even when its immediate results were slight. Their true value lay less in concessions won than in the momentum and doctrine they accumulated. Weighed together, they form the backbone of the movement's growth.

The 1900 London Conference founded the tradition. Convened by Henry Sylvester Williams, it first gave political currency to the term "Pan-African" and drew delegates from Africa, the Caribbean and the Americas. It was here that Du Bois pronounced the colour line the problem of the century, fixing the movement's central theme. Though it won no concrete gains, it established the practice of meeting. It set the agenda for all that followed.

The 1919 Paris Congress exploited the post-war settlement. Meeting while the victors redrew the world at Versailles, Du Bois's gathering pressed them to consider African interests and the fate of the former German colonies. It could not shift the powers, but it inserted an African voice into world diplomacy at a decisive moment. This tactic of seizing great occasions showed the movement learning to use international politics. It marked a step from protest toward engagement.

The congresses of 1921 and 1923 widened the movement. Held across London, Brussels, Paris and Lisbon, they carried colonial grievances into the very capitals of empire and debated programmes of gradual self-government. Their sessions publicised African complaints to metropolitan audiences who had scarcely heard them. By extending the movement's geographic reach they drew in new supporters. They kept the cause visible through the lean years between the wars.

The 1927 New York Congress showed both reach and fragility. Funded largely by African-American women's organisations, it confirmed the depth of support in the United States and the diaspora's leading role. Yet it also revealed how heavily the movement leaned upon Du Bois as organiser and financier. After it the congress movement lapsed for nearly two decades. This dependence exposed the fragility beneath the movement's apparent strength.

The 1945 Manchester Congress transformed the movement. Organised by George Padmore and Kwame Nkrumah with Du Bois presiding, it was dominated for the first time by African workers, students and trade unionists. It abandoned petition for a demand of outright independence, endorsing strikes and boycotts to achieve it. This radical turn converted Pan-Africanism into a practical programme for decolonisation. It was the summit toward which the earlier congresses had climbed.

The congresses trained the leaders of independent Africa. Manchester in particular launched a generation, for Nkrumah, Kenyatta and others carried its resolutions home to lead mass parties. The gatherings functioned as a school in which future statesmen learned organisation and doctrine. The contacts formed there endured into the era of independence. This nurturing of leadership was among the congresses' most enduring gifts.

Together they supplied continuity, doctrine and legitimacy. By meeting repeatedly across forty-five years the congresses preserved the idea, refined its aims and gave it an authority no single leader could confer. They accumulated a body of resolutions that later nationalists could invoke as precedent. This cumulative achievement, rather than any single victory, was their real contribution. It gave the movement a memory and a mandate.

Examined in sequence, the Pan-African Congresses show a movement maturing from petition to a demand for freedom. Their early sessions won little in concrete terms, but they built the network, the doctrine and the leadership on which later success depended. Manchester in 1945 gathered these gains into a programme that helped to decolonise a continent. Their contribution therefore lay in sustaining and radicalising the cause across two generations, rather than in any immediate victory.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" requires each congress weighed for its effect, not a bare list of dates and venues.

Candidates who halt at 1927 miss Manchester, where the decisive contribution lies.

The top band traces a rising line of radicalism from petition in 1900 to independence in 1945.

Question 4

Marcus Garvey and William Edward Burghardt Du Bois were the two commanding figures of early Pan-Africanism, yet they embodied rival methods, classes and temperaments. To compare them is to see how a single movement could contain a mass prophet and a scholarly strategist at once. They agreed on the dignity of the black race but disagreed on almost everything else, and their feud was famously bitter. A fair comparison, however, shows their contributions to have been complementary rather than merely opposed. Between them they gave Pan-Africanism both its passion and its machinery.

Both men made racial dignity the foundation of their politics. Each insisted, against the prevailing contempt of the age, on the worth, history and unity of people of African descent. This shared conviction placed both firmly within the Pan-African tradition. It was the common ground from which their many differences extended. Without it there would have been no movement for either to lead.

Their social bases, however, were sharply different. Du Bois addressed an educated elite, his "talented tenth", whom he expected to lead the race by example and argument. Garvey, by contrast, mobilised the ordinary black poor of Harlem and the Caribbean, who had never before been organised. This difference of audience shaped everything each man attempted. It set the scholar against the popular tribune.

Their organisations reflected these constituencies. Du Bois worked through the NAACP and his series of Pan-African Congresses, bodies of committee, petition and journal. Garvey built the Universal Negro Improvement Association, founded in 1914, which at its height claimed a following in the millions. The one was a network of notables, the other a mass movement with branches and processions. Their machinery matched their members.

Their methods diverged accordingly. Du Bois relied on reasoned argument, scholarship and diplomatic pressure through journals such as The Crisis. Garvey used spectacle, oratory and the newspaper Negro

World to stir emotion and pride. Where Du Bois sought to persuade the influential few, Garvey aimed to inspire the many. Persuasion and passion were their contrasting instruments.

Their visions of Africa contrasted most of all. Garvey preached a literal "Back to Africa" redemption and founded the Black Star Line shipping company to carry it out. Du Bois sought not emigration but equality and gradual self-government within a reformed world order. The one dreamed of physical return, the other of political rights. On the movement's ultimate aim they stood far apart.

Each was undone by a characteristic weakness. Garvey's commercial ventures collapsed, and in 1923 he was convicted of mail fraud and later deported, discrediting his movement. Du Bois's elitism and reserve limited his appeal to the very masses Garvey had reached. Their flaws were the shadows of their strengths. Each failed where the other might have succeeded.

Their combined legacy shaped the movement's future. Garvey bequeathed a tradition of black pride and mass mobilisation that inspired later figures from Nkrumah to the Rastafari. Du Bois bequeathed the congress movement and an intellectual framework that culminated at Manchester in 1945. Pan-Africanism drew on both inheritances at once. The movement was the richer for having contained them both.

In comparison, Garvey and Du Bois were opposites whose very differences completed the movement. One supplied the masses, the emotion and the pride; the other supplied the ideas, the diplomacy and the organisation. Their rivalry was genuine and damaging, yet their contributions proved complementary in the longer run. Pan-Africanism needed both the prophet and the professor, and it is their combination that gave the movement its full strength.

Examiner's Note

"Compare" demands similarities and differences set point against point, not two separate lives.

The trap is to champion one man and dismiss the other rather than weigh both fairly.

Reward the answer that shows their bitter rivalry was, in its historical outcome, complementary.

Question 5

Negritude and Garveyism were the cultural currents that, in the decades between the wars, restored pride in blackness and celebrated the African past. The question asks how far these movements of feeling and art shaped the political consciousness of Pan-Africanism. They contributed a great deal, for they supplied the dignity and self-belief on which any solidarity had to rest. Yet consciousness was also forged by concrete grievance and hard organisation, which culture alone could not provide. The honest verdict is that cultural movements were a major but not a sufficient cause.

Garveyism instilled racial pride on an unprecedented scale. Marcus Garvey's insistence that black was beautiful and Africa a glorious homeland reached millions who had been taught to despise themselves. This restored self-respect was the psychological precondition of any political unity. By giving ordinary people an identity to defend, Garveyism laid an emotional foundation for the movement. Pride came before programme.

Negritude reclaimed African culture from colonial contempt. The francophone writers Aimé Césaire, Léopold Senghor and Léon Damas asserted, from Paris in the 1930s, the value and beauty of African civilisation. Their poetry answered the assimilationist claim that Africa had no culture worth keeping. In doing so they armed a generation of francophone intellectuals with cultural confidence. That confidence would soon turn political.

These currents forged a shared heritage across borders. By celebrating a common African past they gave scattered black communities a sense of belonging to one people. This imagined community made solidarity between the Caribbean, the Americas and Africa feel natural. Cultural pride thus supplied the bond that political appeals could later mobilise. It stitched a dispersed people into an imagined whole.

Cultural awakening fed directly into political leadership. Léopold Senghor himself became the first president of Senegal, and the ideas of both currents shaped the nationalism of the post-war years. Nkrumah

drew on Garveyite pride, which he had encountered as a student in the United States. The line from cultural feeling to political action was direct and traceable. Poets and prophets bred politicians.

Yet culture alone did not create the movement. The Pan-African Congresses, the World Wars and grievances over land, taxation and rights gave the movement its political direction. Pride in heritage could inspire, but it could not by itself frame demands or organise protest. Something harder than poetry was required to confront empire. Culture lit the way, but did not march the road.

Material grievance supplied the sharper motive. Segregation, forced labour and the colour bar produced a resentment that would have fuelled resistance with or without Negritude. For many, closed doors and empty stomachs, not questions of culture, drove them into the movement. Cultural pride lent dignity to a struggle that economics and politics had already begun. The grievance was older than the poetry.

Culture and politics ultimately reinforced one another. The pride awakened by Garveyism and Negritude became a force only when harnessed to the political demands voiced at Manchester in 1945. Conversely, political movements drew energy from the cultural confidence these currents had built. The two strands were interwoven rather than separable. Together they made a consciousness both proud and purposeful.

To a large extent, then, cultural movements shaped Pan-African consciousness by restoring dignity and forging a sense of shared heritage. Without Garveyism and Negritude the movement would have lacked its emotional force and its self-belief. But that consciousness became a political force only when this pride was joined to concrete grievance and organisation. Culture was a powerful engine of the movement, yet it drove change only in harness with politics.

Examiner's Note

"To what extent" requires a measured verdict, not an unqualified endorsement of culture.

Weak answers describe Negritude's poetry without ever linking it to Pan-African unity.

The top band balances the cultural awakening against the political and economic drivers of consciousness.

Question 6

The claim asserts that the early history of Pan-Africanism belongs more to the New World than to Africa. For the period before 1945 this is largely defensible, since the movement's founders, ideas and gatherings were overwhelmingly of American and Caribbean origin. The continent supplied the symbol and the ultimate goal, but not, at first, the leadership or the organisation. Only at Manchester in 1945 did the centre of gravity shift decisively to Africa. The statement therefore holds strongly for the beginnings, provided one marks its clear turning point.

The movement's founders came from the New World. Henry Sylvester Williams of Trinidad, W. E. B. Du Bois of Massachusetts and Marcus Garvey of Jamaica launched and led the movement in its first decades. None came from the African continent, and their formation lay in the racial politics of the Atlantic world. The early leadership was thus emphatically of the diaspora. Its architects were New World men.

The ideas were forged in the diaspora's experience. Pan-African thought grew out of the slavery, segregation and colour bar of the Americas rather than the conditions of colonial Africa. Concepts such as the "talented tenth" and "Back to Africa" answered New World predicaments. The movement's intellectual vocabulary was therefore a diaspora creation. Its theory was written in exile.

The early congresses met far from Africa. Between 1900 and 1927 the gatherings were held in London, Paris, Brussels, Lisbon and New York, in the very capitals of empire. This geography reflected where the movement's members and money lay. Its distance from the continent underlines the New World's dominance of the early period. The movement's home was the metropole, not the colony.

The diaspora press carried the movement. Newspapers such as Garvey's Negro World and Du Bois's The Crisis, both produced in the United States, bound the movement together across oceans. It was through

this American and Caribbean print culture that Pan-African ideas circulated. The channels of communication, like the leaders, belonged to the New World. Africa read the news; it did not yet write it.

Africa nonetheless supplied the symbol and the goal. The continent was always the homeland to be redeemed and the proof of black capacity the movement sought. Ethiopia's ancient independence, and the outrage at its invasion in 1935, stirred Pan-African feeling everywhere. Africa was the object of the movement even when it was not yet its author. Its image inspired what its people did not yet lead.

African participation grew steadily across the period. Students, seamen and workers from the continent increasingly joined the movement in London and elsewhere between the wars. Bodies such as the West African Students' Union linked colonial grievances to Pan-African ideas. This rising involvement prepared the ground for the shift that came in 1945. The continent was moving from margin to centre.

The centre of gravity then moved to Africa. At the Manchester Congress of 1945 Africans took command, and Nkrumah, Kenyatta and their colleagues carried the movement home to lead independence struggles. From that point the continent, not the diaspora, set the movement's direction. The New World's dominance was thus decisive for the beginning but not the whole story. Manchester reversed the current.

One may agree largely with the claim: the early history of Pan-Africanism was indeed made in the New World, in its suffering, its leaders and its congresses. The diaspora supplied the founders, the ideas and the platforms, while Africa remained the distant object of their hopes. Only at Manchester in 1945 did the continent take the lead in its own cause. The statement is therefore valid for the origins, provided one marks the turning point at which Africa claimed the movement as its own.

Examiner's Note

"How far" invites agreement with qualification, not a flat endorsement of either side.

The trap is to ignore Africa's symbolic role and its late but decisive entry in 1945.

Top scripts identify Manchester as the moment the balance tips from diaspora to continent.

Question 7

The Fifth Pan-African Congress, held at Manchester in October 1945, is often regarded as the turning point of the movement. The question asks us to assess how far it mattered to the decolonisation of Africa. Its significance was considerable, for it supplied the programme, the method and many of the leaders of the liberation that followed. Yet independence still took years and depended also on wider forces beyond the movement's control. The congress was a decisive catalyst rather than a sole cause.

The congress shifted leadership from the diaspora to Africans. For the first time the delegates were predominantly African trade unionists, students and activists rather than American and Caribbean notables. This marked the movement's transfer to the continent it aimed to free. The change of personnel signalled a change of purpose toward practical liberation. Africa now spoke for itself.

It replaced petition with a demand for outright independence. Where earlier congresses had asked for reform and gradual self-government, Manchester demanded the immediate end of colonial rule. This hardening of aims gave the movement a clear and radical goal. It set the standard by which post-war nationalism would measure itself. The age of polite requests was over.

It endorsed mass action as the means. The congress resolved that independence might require strikes, boycotts and, if necessary, force, drawing on Gandhi's example of civil disobedience. This gave nationalists a strategy as well as an aspiration. The commitment to popular struggle distinguished the new phase from the lobbying of the past. Method now matched ambition.

It launched a generation of leaders. Kwame Nkrumah and Jomo Kenyatta, both present at Manchester, returned to lead Ghana and Kenya to freedom, and others followed their path. The congress served as a springboard for the men who would govern independent Africa. Its resolutions became their political inheritance. The delegates of 1945 became the presidents of the 1960s.

It linked the continental ideal to local struggles. By connecting Pan-African unity to the concrete grievances of individual colonies, the congress made each national movement part of a wider cause. This gave nationalists the confidence that they belonged to a rising tide. The two levels of struggle thereafter reinforced one another. Local battles gained a continental meaning.

Its influence was carried through Padmore and the organisers. George Padmore, its chief architect, became an adviser to Nkrumah and a bridge between the congress and the new Ghanaian state. The networks formed at Manchester endured into the era of independence. This continuity of personnel spread the congress's influence across the continent. Its spirit outlived its single sitting.

Its effects, however, were gradual rather than immediate. Ghana, the first to follow, did not gain independence until 1957, and many colonies waited far longer. Decolonisation also owed much to imperial exhaustion after the Second World War, to Cold War pressure and to local conditions. Manchester set the direction, but many other forces determined the pace. It was a beginning, not a conclusion.

The Fifth Pan-African Congress was therefore highly significant to African decolonisation. It gave the movement African leadership, a demand for outright independence and a strategy of mass action, and it launched the men who would realise them. Its effects unfolded slowly and alongside other forces, so it was a catalyst rather than the sole cause. Even so, Manchester set the continent decisively on the road to freedom.

Examiner's Note

"Assess significance" needs impact weighed and its limits acknowledged, ending in judgement.

Candidates who merely describe the congress miss the demand to judge its effect on decolonisation.

The top band ties named delegates to the specific independence struggles they later led.

Question 8

Nationalism in colonial Africa was the organised demand of colonised peoples for self-rule, which swept the continent after 1945. The question asks how far Pan-Africanism was responsible for its growth. The movement contributed much, supplying ideology, leaders and a sense of continental solidarity. Yet nationalism sprang also from grievances and forces rooted deep within the colonies themselves. Pan-Africanism was an important stimulus but not the sole cause.

Pan-Africanism supplied nationalism with an ideology. Its assertion of African dignity and the right to self-determination gave colonial protest a coherent philosophy and a continental horizon. This lifted scattered local complaints into a principled demand for freedom. The movement provided the very language in which nationalism came to speak. It gave discontent a doctrine.

It trained and inspired the nationalist leaders. Nkrumah, Kenyatta and others drew directly on the Manchester Congress and returned to build mass parties in their own countries. The movement thus furnished the leadership that turned discontent into organisation. Its influence is written in the careers of the founding fathers of independent Africa. The leaders were its pupils.

It linked local struggles to a continental cause. By connecting each colony's grievances to a shared African destiny, Pan-Africanism gave nationalists confidence and mutual support. Leaders could feel part of a rising tide rather than an isolated protest. This solidarity strengthened their resolve and their standing. Isolation gave way to a common front.

Yet colonial grievances were the deeper root. Land alienation, heavy taxation, forced labour and racial humiliation produced a resentment that would have fuelled nationalism regardless of external ideas. These daily injustices, not distant congresses, moved most people to resist. The grievances of empire were the soil in which nationalism grew. The wound came before the word.

The World Wars and global change accelerated the demand. Returning ex-servicemen who had fought for freedom abroad, wartime economic strain and the anti-colonial climate after 1945 all pushed the

colonies toward independence. The weakening of Britain and France made concession more likely. These forces owed little to Pan-Africanism directly. History was moving in the movement's favour.

Local organisation converted feeling into movements. Trade unions, farmers' associations, welfare societies and mission-educated elites built the parties that actually won independence. This grassroots machinery was the immediate agent of nationalism. Pan-African ideas mattered only when such bodies carried them to the people. Organisation turned mood into momentum.

The two levels reinforced one another. Pan-Africanism gave local nationalism a horizon and a vocabulary, while local grievances gave Pan-Africanism its mass base. Neither alone would have produced the independence wave that followed. Their interaction explains the speed of decolonisation after 1945. Idea and grievance advanced together.

Pan-Africanism was therefore an important but not the sole cause of African nationalism. It supplied the ideology, the leaders and the sense of solidarity that gave the movement coherence and confidence. The decisive energy, however, came from colonial grievances and the local organisations that channelled them. Pan-Africanism shaped and hastened a nationalism whose deepest roots lay within the colonies themselves.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires balancing Pan-Africanism against internal and global causes of nationalism.

The trap is to credit the movement with everything and ignore the grievances of empire.

Reward answers that separate ideology and leadership from the deeper local roots.

Question 9

The Organisation of African Unity, founded at Addis Ababa on 25 May 1963, was the first permanent body to unite the independent states of Africa. The question asks us to account for its creation. It arose from the momentum of Pan-Africanism, the practical needs of newly independent states, the unfinished business of liberation and the necessity of reconciling rival blocs. Cold War pressures and the fear of neo-colonialism added their own urgency. These causes together explain why the OAU was formed when it was.

The wave of independence created a need for common institutions. By 1963 some thirty African states had won freedom and required a forum to coordinate policy and to speak for the continent. Isolated, each was weak; united, they might carry real weight in the world. The sheer multiplication of new states made a collective body necessary. Numbers demanded machinery.

Pan-Africanism supplied the unifying ideal. Six decades of congresses had made African unity a familiar and cherished aspiration among the educated elite. The founders inherited a tradition that told them Africa should act as one. The OAU gave this long-nurtured ideal a concrete political form. The dream at last acquired an institution.

The liberation of the remaining colonies demanded coordination. In 1963 southern Africa, the Portuguese territories and other regions remained under white or colonial rule. Freeing them was thought to require united diplomatic and material support. A continental organisation was the natural instrument for this task. Solidarity needed a structure.

Rival blocs made a reconciling body urgent. The radical Casablanca group, led by Nkrumah, and the gradualist Monrovia group, led by Nigeria and Liberia, had divided the continent since 1961. Their split threatened to harden into permanent rivalry. The OAU was created precisely to bridge this dangerous division. Unity was the cure for disunity.

The fear of neo-colonialism pressed states together. Leaders worried that former colonial powers would continue to control African economies and politics from behind the scenes. Unity was seen as the shield against renewed domination. This shared anxiety drew otherwise divided states into common cause. A common fear bred common purpose.

The Cold War threatened to divide the continent. Both superpowers courted African states, and leaders feared their disputes might become proxy battlegrounds. A continental body promised to keep African quarrels within African hands. The wish to avoid superpower interference thus favoured unity. Africa sought to insulate itself from the global contest.

The leadership of key statesmen sealed the founding. Nkrumah of Ghana, Nyerere of Tanganyika, Nasser of Egypt and Emperor Haile Selassie, who hosted the summit, negotiated the charter. Their willingness to compromise turned aspiration into an institution. Personal diplomacy at Addis Ababa was the immediate agent of creation. Statesmanship gave the ideal its birth.

The OAU was formed, then, from the meeting of a long Pan-African ideal with the hard needs of thirty new states. Independence demanded common institutions, liberation demanded coordination, and rival blocs demanded reconciliation. The fear of neo-colonialism and Cold War division added urgency, while the diplomacy of leading statesmen supplied the means. The organisation expressed unity while accommodating the reality of many jealous sovereignties.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" asks why the OAU came into being, not what its charter contained.

The trap is to describe the organisation's aims and structure instead of explaining its causes.

Top scripts present the Casablanca–Monrovia split as the immediate spur to compromise.

Question 10

At its founding the OAU had to reconcile two conceptions of African unity: an immediate political union and a loose association of sovereign states. The statement calls these visions irreconcilable and the OAU their compromise. It is broadly valid, for the charter did indeed splice together radical and gradualist demands. Yet the word "irreconcilable" overstates the case, since both camps shared the ultimate goal of a strong and united Africa. The dispute was over method and pace rather than principle.

The Casablanca group demanded immediate political union. Formed in 1961 around Nkrumah, Nasser and Sékou Touré, it called for a United States of Africa with common institutions and even a joint military command. It regarded piecemeal cooperation as a betrayal of the Pan-African dream. This was the maximalist vision of unity. It wanted federation now, not later.

The Monrovia group preferred gradual cooperation. Comprising Nigeria, Liberia and most states, it favoured a union that respected sovereignty and advanced through economic and functional links. It feared that hasty federation would founder on Africa's diversity. This was the cautious, incremental vision. It trusted process over proclamation.

The charter largely embodied the Monrovia position. The OAU upheld the sovereign equality of member states and non-interference in their internal affairs. It created no supranational government, and so disappointed the radicals. In its institutional form the gradualists clearly prevailed. The structure was theirs.

Yet the radicals secured their goals in principle. The charter's firm commitment to liberation, solidarity and eventual unity honoured the Casablanca vision. The Liberation Committee, based in Dar es Salaam, gave that commitment practical teeth. The radicals lost the structure but won the movement's declared purpose. The spirit, if not the letter, was theirs.

The compromise reflected political reality. Leaders who had just won independence were unwilling to surrender it to a continental government. A loose union was the only arrangement to which thirty sovereign states would agree. The charter was shaped by what was possible, not merely by what was desired. Realism, not betrayal, produced the outcome.

The two visions shared the same ultimate end. Both Casablanca and Monrovia sought an Africa strong enough to resist domination and command respect. They differed over how fast and by what means to reach it, not over the destination itself. This common purpose makes "irreconcilable" too strong a word. They quarrelled over the road, not the goal.

The tension persisted in the organisation's later history. The unresolved argument between deeper union and jealous sovereignty ran through the OAU's decades and into the African Union. The compromise contained the dispute rather than settling it. This endurance confirms that the visions were rival strategies rather than opposed creeds. The debate was postponed, not closed.

The statement is therefore broadly valid but overstated. The OAU was a genuine compromise, tilted toward the gradualists in structure while preserving the radicals' dream as its declared purpose. The two camps differed sharply over pace and method, and their tension outlived the founding. But they shared the goal of a united and respected Africa, so they were rival strategies for one end rather than truly irreconcilable creeds.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" invites weighing the claim, including a challenge to the word "irreconcilable".

The trap is to accept the assertion whole without ever testing its strongest term.

The top band exposes the shared goal beneath the dispute over method and pace.

Question 11

A central purpose written into the OAU charter was to complete the liberation of Africa from colonial and white-minority rule. The question asks us to evaluate how far it achieved this aim. Its record here was real and substantial, for it built machinery, conferred legitimacy and sustained the long campaign against apartheid. Its principles and its poverty, however, limited what it could do. On liberation, nonetheless, the OAU compiled its proudest record.

It established dedicated machinery for liberation. The African Liberation Committee, based in Dar es Salaam, coordinated support for freedom movements across the continent. It channelled funds, arms and training to guerrilla armies fighting colonial and white-minority regimes. This institutional commitment gave the cause a permanent engine. Liberation became a standing programme, not a slogan.

It conferred legitimacy on the liberation movements. By recognising bodies such as the ANC, FRELIMO and the MPLA as authentic representatives, the OAU gave them international standing. This recognition helped them to win diplomatic and material support abroad. A united African endorsement strengthened their hand at the United Nations. Recognition was itself a weapon.

It sustained the diplomatic campaign against apartheid. The OAU kept South Africa isolated in international forums and pressed the wider world toward sanctions and expulsion. It made apartheid a permanent item on the global agenda for three decades. This sustained pressure contributed to the eventual collapse of the system. Persistence wore the regime down.

It supported the liberation of the Portuguese colonies. Through the Liberation Committee it aided the guerrilla wars in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau. These struggles helped to bring down the Portuguese empire by 1975. OAU backing was among the factors that made victory possible. African solidarity had a tangible result.

It aided the freedom of Zimbabwe and Namibia. The organisation supported the movements that won majority rule in Zimbabwe in 1980 and Namibia in 1990. Its diplomatic weight helped to keep these causes before the world. The completion of decolonisation owed something to its persistence. The map of free Africa grew on its watch.

Its principles, however, limited its reach. Respect for sovereignty and non-interference left the OAU unable to act against oppression by African governments themselves. It could confront white minority rule but not black tyranny. This selective concern exposed the limits of its liberation ideal. Freedom from empire did not mean freedom from despots.

Weak resources blunted its efforts. Chronic underfunding, unpaid dues and disunity among members meant its aid was often smaller than its rhetoric promised. The Liberation Committee frequently struggled

for money. Achievement therefore fell short of ambition even in its strongest field. The will outran the wallet.

Evaluated against its liberation aim, the OAU's achievements were considerable. It built the machinery, conferred the legitimacy and sustained the pressure that helped to free the Portuguese colonies, Zimbabwe and Namibia and to isolate apartheid. Its own principles and poverty limited how much it could do, and it stayed silent on oppression by African rulers. Yet in advancing liberation the OAU compiled the record that was its proudest and most tangible success.

Examiner's Note

"Evaluate" needs achievements weighed against limits and closed with a clear judgement.

The trap is to condemn the OAU wholesale for faults belonging to other fields of its work.

Reward answers that credit the Dar es Salaam Liberation Committee with specific, named results.

Question 12

For all the hopes vested in it, the OAU was frequently derided as weak, wordy and ineffective. The question asks us to examine the factors behind this limited effectiveness. Its constraints were built into its own charter, its resources and the conduct of its members. Principles meant to protect the new states also disabled the organisation from acting decisively. An examination of these factors explains why performance so often fell short of aspiration.

The principle of non-interference tied the OAU's hands. By pledging not to intervene in members' internal affairs, it could not act against coups, tyranny or atrocity within states. This left it mute before abuses such as those of Idi Amin in Uganda. The rule that protected sovereignty also protected oppressors. Restraint became complicity.

Respect for inherited colonial borders froze grievances. The charter's commitment to the frontiers drawn by Europe avoided border wars but preserved arrangements that divided peoples. Disputes such as the Western Sahara and the Ogaden festered as a result. Stability was bought at the price of justice. The map was fixed, the tensions were not.

The organisation possessed no means of enforcement. It had no army, no court with teeth and no power to compel members to obey its resolutions. Decisions therefore depended entirely on the goodwill of sovereign governments. Without sanctions, its many declarations often remained mere words. Resolutions without force are only requests.

Chronic underfunding crippled its work. Members frequently failed to pay their assessed dues, leaving the secretariat and the Liberation Committee short of money. Ambitious programmes went unrealised for want of resources. Financial weakness sapped the organisation's practical capacity. Poverty hollowed out its promises.

Cold War and ideological divisions split the membership. States aligned with rival superpowers, or with capitalist and socialist models, struggled to agree on common action. External patrons pulled members in different directions. This disunity paralysed the OAU on many major questions. A house divided could not act as one.

The conduct of member governments discredited it. Its silence in the face of dictators and internal massacres earned it the jibe of a "trade union of dictators". This tarnished its moral authority and its public standing. An organisation seen to shield tyrants could not command respect. Its reputation undercut its influence.

Personal rivalries and instability weakened common purpose. Feuds between leaders, frequent military coups and shifting alliances made sustained cooperation difficult. Summits often dissolved into posturing rather than decision. The turbulence of member states was mirrored in the organisation's own inconstancy. Instability within bred impotence without.

The OAU's limited effectiveness sprang, then, from causes woven into its very design. Non-interference and respect for borders protected sovereignty but disabled action, while the lack of enforcement left resolutions toothless. Poverty, Cold War division and the misconduct of members completed the tale of weakness. The organisation was constrained less by bad luck than by principles and circumstances that set the interests of states above the power of the whole.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" wants the causes of weakness analysed, not merely listed in passing.

The trap is to blame individual leaders rather than the structure and charter themselves.

Top scripts show how non-interference, designed to protect states, disabled the body from acting.

Question 13

Kwame Nkrumah, the first prime minister and president of independent Ghana, was the most tireless champion of a united Africa. The claim that he did more than any other leader to keep the dream of continental unity alive holds much validity. No contemporary matched his zeal, his writing or his willingness to spend Ghana's resources on the cause. Yet unity was the work of many hands, and his haste sometimes hindered as much as it helped. The verdict must be largely favourable but qualified.

Nkrumah made continental unity the centre of his politics. His book Africa Must Unite, published in 1963, argued for a single African government with common defence and economic planning. He returned to the theme in speech after speech at home and abroad. No other leader placed union so consistently at the heart of his programme. It was his lifelong obsession.

He led the radical Casablanca group. From 1961 Nkrumah pressed hardest for immediate political union, gathering like-minded states around him. He kept the boldest version of the Pan-African dream before the continent. Even in defeat his radicalism set the terms of the debate. He was the voice of the maximum demand.

He backed his words with Ghana's resources. Ghana, the first sub-Saharan colony to win independence in 1957, hosted Pan-African conferences and aided other liberation movements. Nkrumah spent freely to advance the cause well beyond his borders. His commitment was practical as well as rhetorical. He paid for the dream, not merely proclaimed it.

He inspired a generation of Pan-Africanists. His example and patronage encouraged nationalists across the continent and in the diaspora. Activists looked to Accra as a living centre of the movement. His influence reached far beyond Ghana itself. He made his capital a beacon of unity.

His ideas outlived his fall. Overthrown in 1966, Nkrumah nonetheless bequeathed a vision that resurfaced in the African Union of 2002 and its talk of continental government. His writings remained a reference for later advocates of unity. The dream he tended survived his political ruin. His defeat did not bury his idea.

Yet other leaders shared the labour. Nyerere, Haile Selassie, Sékou Touré and Nasser were indispensable to the founding of the OAU. Nyerere in particular sustained the liberation struggle from Dar es Salaam for decades. Nkrumah's contribution, however great, was therefore not solitary. Unity had many architects.

His radicalism also provoked resistance. His insistence on immediate union alarmed sovereignty-conscious states and helped to harden the Monrovia camp against him. Some judged his haste counter-productive, driving moderates away from his position. His zeal thus narrowed as well as advanced the cause. The dreamer sometimes divided the dreamers.

The claim is therefore largely valid. Nkrumah did more than any single figure to keep the ideal of continental unity alive, through his writing, his leadership of the radicals and his lavish support of the cause. But the achievement of even a loose union depended on the cooperation of leaders whose caution he often opposed, and his haste sometimes hardened their resistance. He was the dream's greatest champion, though not its sole keeper.

Examiner's Note

"How valid" invites agreement tempered by the contribution of other leaders.

The trap is a Nkrumah biography that never weighs rival claimants such as Nyerere.

The top band credits his idealism while noting that his haste narrowed his practical success.

Question 14

After the Manchester Congress of 1945 the leadership of Pan-Africanism passed from the diaspora to African statesmen. The question asks us to assess their contribution. It was decisive, for they carried the ideal into government, won the independence unity required and built the movement's institutions. Their jealous guarding of sovereignty, however, also fixed the limits of what unity could become. Their achievement was therefore real but self-bounded.

They brought Pan-Africanism home to Africa. Nkrumah, Kenyatta and others who had attended Manchester returned to lead mass nationalist parties on Pan-African principles. The movement's centre of gravity shifted from Harlem and London to Accra and Nairobi. This repatriation of leadership was their first great contribution. The continent took charge of its own cause.

They won the independence that any union required. By freeing their own territories they created the sovereign states from which an African union could be built. Ghana in 1957 was followed by a rush of independence around 1960. Without these victories there would have been no members to unite. Freedom was the precondition of unity.

They founded the continent's institutions. African leaders negotiated and signed the OAU charter at Addis Ababa in 1963. This gave the movement its first permanent political body and secretariat. The translation of ideal into institution was their collective achievement. Rhetoric acquired an address.

They drove the liberation of the remaining colonies. Leaders such as Nyerere made their countries rear bases for freedom fighters and sustained the Liberation Committee. Their solidarity helped to free the Portuguese colonies and, eventually, southern Africa. Pan-African leadership thus completed the work of decolonisation. Unity served liberation.

They advanced practical economic cooperation. Statesmen promoted regional bodies and development schemes as concrete expressions of unity. Organisations such as the East African Community grew from their efforts. This showed the ideal adapting to the needs of new states. Unity descended from principle to programme.

Their rivalries, however, divided the movement. The split between the Casablanca and Monrovia blocs exposed how personal and national ambition could obstruct unity. Feuds and Cold War alignments set leaders against one another. Division was the persistent shadow of their leadership. The unifiers were themselves divided.

Their attachment to sovereignty capped the ambition. Having just won independence, they refused to surrender it to a continental government. This ensured that union remained loose rather than federal. The very leaders who built the OAU also set the ceiling on its power. Their triumph contained its own limit.

African leaders after 1945 thus transformed Pan-Africanism from a diaspora ideal into a continental project with institutions of its own. They brought it home, won independence, founded the OAU and drove the liberation of the continent. Yet their rivalries divided the movement and their guarding of sovereignty fixed the ceiling of unity. Their contribution was decisive, but it carried within it the very limits that Pan-Africanism has never quite escaped.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" requires both the leaders' achievements and their limitations to be weighed.

The trap is to praise them uncritically and ignore how their rivalries divided the cause.

Reward the answer that sees sovereignty as at once their gift to Africa and their limit on unity.

Question 15

For all its ideals, Pan-Africanism never produced the single united Africa its boldest advocates sought. The question asks us to account for this failure of political unification. It is explained by the jealousy of newly won sovereignty, the irreconcilable pace of rival visions, the legacy of artificial borders and the pressures of the wider world. Economic weakness and political instability compounded these obstacles. Together they ensured that the dream of one Africa remained unrealised.

Newly independent states guarded their sovereignty jealously. Having just escaped colonial rule, leaders were unwilling to hand hard-won authority to a continental government. Sovereignty was the very prize of their struggle, not to be surrendered lightly. This reluctance was the single greatest obstacle to union. Independence bred a possessive nationalism.

Rival visions of unity could not be reconciled in practice. The radicals' demand for immediate federation clashed with the gradualists' preference for loose cooperation. The compromise embodied in the OAU chose the cautious path and left the argument unresolved. The movement could not agree even on how to unite. Division over method defeated union itself.

Artificial colonial borders divided the continent. The frontiers drawn in Europe cut across peoples and created states with little in common. These divisions fostered narrow national loyalties rather than a shared African identity. The inherited map worked steadily against unity. Geography had been rigged by empire.

Ideological and Cold War divisions split the leaders. Alignments with rival superpowers and with capitalist or socialist models set governments against one another. External patrons actively encouraged these divisions. The global contest reached into African councils and paralysed common action. The world's quarrels became Africa's.

Economic weakness and dependence hindered integration. Poor, primary-producing economies competed for the same markets and depended on former colonial powers for trade and aid. Rivalry for external favour discouraged the pooling of strength. Poverty made states cling to what little they controlled. Weakness bred not unity but competition.

Personal ambition and instability took their toll. Rivalries among leaders, and a wave of military coups from the 1960s, destroyed the stability that unification required. Governments rose and fell too rapidly for sustained cooperation. Turbulence within states undermined unity between them. The ground was too unsteady to build upon.

No external threat compelled union. Unlike states that federate under a shared danger, African governments faced no single enemy grave enough to force them together. The common fear of neo-colonialism proved too diffuse to override national interest. Absent such compulsion, sovereignty prevailed. Nothing external forced the continent's hand.

Pan-Africanism failed to unify Africa politically because too many forces pulled against it at once. The jealousy of new sovereignty, the clash of rival visions and the divisions of inherited borders were reinforced by Cold War rivalry, economic dependence and chronic instability. No common danger was pressing enough to overcome them. The dream endured as an ideal, but the conditions for a single African state never came together.

> **Examiner's Note**
>
> "Account for" asks why unification failed, not for a narrative of the OAU's history.
>
> The trap is to blame a single villain rather than the combination of forces at work.
>
> Top scripts rank the causes, placing the jealousy of newly won sovereignty foremost.

Question 16

Frustrated in its quest for political union, Pan-Africanism increasingly pursued economic integration as a more attainable goal. The question asks to what extent it has succeeded as an economic rather than a

political project. To a real but limited degree it has, for cooperation in trade and development has advanced where federation failed. Yet integration remains shallow and ultimately depends on the political will that has always been lacking. The success is genuine but partial.

Economic cooperation proved more achievable than political union. States unwilling to surrender sovereignty were readier to lower trade barriers and coordinate development. Economics offered gains without the loss of independence that federation implied. This made the economic path politically easier to travel. Trade asked less than union.

Regional bodies advanced integration in stages. Organisations such as ECOWAS in West Africa, SADC in the south and the East African Community linked neighbouring economies. They built roads, power grids and common markets that a single government could not. Regional integration became the practical face of unity. Unity grew from the region upward.

The African Union renewed the economic vision. Founded in 2002 to succeed the OAU, the AU embraced development programmes such as NEPAD. It shifted emphasis from the politics of liberation to the economics of growth. This reflected the maturing of the Pan-African project. The struggle turned from freedom to prosperity.

The Continental Free Trade Area marked a landmark. The AfCFTA, agreed from 2018 and launched in 2021, created the framework for a single African market of over a billion people. It is the most ambitious integration project the continent has attempted. Its promise is to boost trade among African states. It gave the economic dream a concrete form.

Yet economic integration remains incomplete. Poor infrastructure, competing rather than complementary exports and dependence on outside powers still limit intra-African trade, which remains a small share of the total. Many agreements exist more on paper than in practice. The economic union is still far from realised. Ambition has outrun achievement.

Political weakness constrains economic progress. Integration ultimately requires shared rules, courts and institutions, which sovereign states remain reluctant to accept. Without political will, economic schemes stall in committee. The old obstacle to political union therefore reappears in economic form. Sovereignty blocks the market as it blocked the state.

Economics and politics cannot finally be separated. Deep market integration demands common standards and enforcement, which are themselves political acts. The economic path therefore leads back to the questions of sovereignty the movement never resolved. Success in economics is bounded by failure in politics. The two projects share a single ceiling.

To a real but limited extent, then, Pan-Africanism has succeeded as an economic project where it failed as a political one. Regional bodies and the AfCFTA show integration advancing further in the market than in government. Yet trade among African states remains shallow, and every deep reform runs up against the reluctance to share sovereignty. The economic and political projects are bound together, so the economic success remains incomplete for want of political union.

Examiner's Note

"To what extent" needs a measured verdict spanning both the economic and political fields.

The trap is to treat economic and political unity as if they were wholly separate matters.

Reward answers citing bodies such as ECOWAS and the AfCFTA as concrete, dated evidence.

Question 17

Born to resist slavery and colonial rule, Pan-Africanism now confronts a continent of independent states facing new challenges. The question asks us to discuss whether it remains relevant in the twenty-first century. The case for continued relevance is strong, since its goals of unity, dignity and self-reliance still answer Africa’s condition. The obstacles it always faced, however, persist and temper its practical force. On balance the ideal endures, even where its realisation lags behind.

The African Union carries the ideal forward. Its founding in 2002, with talk of continental government and a pan-African parliament, shows the aspiration to unity surviving in institutional form. The movement's vocabulary lives on in official policy and summitry. Pan-Africanism remains the continent's guiding rhetoric. The dream has an institutional heir.

Economic integration answers present needs. The drive for a single market through the AfCFTA applies Pan-African unity to the demands of a globalised economy. In a world of vast trading blocs, African states increasingly see strength in combination. The economic case for unity is more compelling than ever. Necessity revives the old ideal.

Shared problems require common action. Terrorism, pandemics, organised crime and climate change cross borders and defeat any single state. Only the cooperation Pan-Africanism urges can address them effectively. Contemporary threats give the ideal a fresh practical point. Modern dangers argue for old solidarity.

The struggle for dignity continues. The movement's insistence on African self-respect remains relevant against enduring inequality and outside condescension. Campaigns over representation, reparations and the return of looted heritage echo its themes. The battle for dignity is far from won. Pan-Africanism still speaks to it.

Resistance to neo-colonialism keeps it alive. Concern over foreign control of resources, debt and markets revives the movement's old warnings about dependence. Debate over the influence of former colonial powers and new external actors continues. Pan-Africanism supplies the language of this resistance. Its warnings have not dated.

The diaspora connection endures. The African Union recognises the global diaspora as a component of the continent, reviving the movement's founding bond. Ties of culture, remittance and identity across the Atlantic remain strong. The original Pan-African link still matters. The scattered and the continent remain joined.

Old obstacles nonetheless persist. Jealous sovereignty, weak institutions, poverty and division still frustrate unity as they did in Nkrumah's day. Fine declarations often outrun performance on the ground. The gap between ideal and achievement tests the movement's relevance in practice. The dream endures; so do its enemies.

Pan-Africanism thus remains distinctly relevant in the twenty-first century. Through the African Union and the AfCFTA it offers a framework for unity, and its themes of dignity and self-reliance still answer real needs. Shared modern threats give cooperation fresh urgency, while old anxieties about dependence keep its warnings alive. The ideals endure, even though the obstacles to realising them have scarcely changed since the movement began.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" expects both the case for relevance and the obstacles that qualify it.

The trap is a vague celebration unsupported by any twenty-first-century evidence.

Top scripts cite the AU and AfCFTA yet still concede that the old barriers remain.

Question 18

This verdict sets the grandeur of Pan-Africanism's vision against the limits of what it actually accomplished. To assess it we must weigh the movement's undoubted failures against its real successes. It is partly valid, for the supreme aim of political union went unfulfilled. Yet to call the achievements merely "modest" understates the movement's part in decolonisation, in building institutions and in restoring dignity. The balanced judgement is that its boldest ideal failed while its practical impact was considerable.

Its ideals were indeed vast. Pan-Africanism sought nothing less than the unity, dignity and self-determination of all people of African descent across the world. It imagined a single continental

government and a redeemed race. Measured against so grand a vision, any achievement was bound to seem partial. The dream was almost limitless.

Its supreme aim of political union was never achieved. The dream of a United States of Africa foundered on sovereignty and division, and the OAU settled for a loose association. The continent remains a patchwork of separate states. On its highest ambition the movement plainly failed. The grandest goal eluded it.

Yet it helped to win independence. The movement supplied the ideology, the confidence and many of the leaders of African nationalism. From Manchester in 1945 flowed a generation that led their countries to freedom. Its part in ending colonial rule was far from modest. Decolonisation was its great success.

It built lasting institutions. The OAU in 1963 and the African Union in 2002 gave Africa a permanent continental voice where none had existed. These bodies, whatever their weaknesses, endure to this day. The creation of continental institutions was a solid achievement. The movement left a standing structure.

It advanced the liberation of southern Africa. Through the Liberation Committee the movement sustained the struggles that freed the Portuguese colonies, Zimbabwe and Namibia and helped to end apartheid. This was concrete and consequential work. Millions gained their freedom with Pan-African support. Liberation was no small legacy.

It restored dignity to a despised people. By insisting on the worth of blackness and the value of African civilisation, the movement changed how Africans and their descendants saw themselves. This psychological liberation was among its deepest effects. Its influence on identity cannot fairly be called modest. It gave a people back their pride.

Its economic and cultural legacy endures. From regional integration and the AfCFTA to a shared consciousness of African identity, the movement's influence remains visible today. It shaped a whole continent's sense of itself. These living legacies weigh against the charge of small achievement. The movement still echoes in the present.

The obstacles it faced were formidable. Sovereignty, poverty, arbitrary borders and Cold War division would have defeated any movement's grandest plans. Judged against these constraints, what Pan-Africanism achieved is the more impressive. Its shortfall reflects the difficulty of the task as much as any failure of will. The odds against it were long.

The statement is therefore partly valid. Pan-Africanism's supreme ideal of political union went unfulfilled, and in that sense its reach exceeded its grasp. But in hastening decolonisation, building the OAU and the AU, liberating southern Africa and restoring a people's dignity, its achievements were far more than modest. Set against formidable obstacles, it stands as one of the shaping forces of modern Africa, a movement whose ideals outran its unity but not its impact.

Examiner's Note

"Assess validity" requires the claim tested on both halves: the ideals and the achievements.

The trap is to accept "modest" uncritically and overlook decolonisation and the OAU.

The top band concedes the failed political union yet defends the movement's substantial real gains.

Question 19

The Industrial Revolution was the transformation, beginning in Britain around 1760, from an agrarian and handicraft economy to one dominated by machinery, factories and steam power. The statement holds that Britain led not through superior inventiveness but through favourable circumstances. It is partly valid, for a unique combination of capital, resources, labour and markets gave Britain its head start over every rival. Yet invention was itself one of those advantages, so the two cannot be wholly separated. The balanced verdict is that circumstance created the conditions in which British invention could flourish.

Britain enjoyed abundant capital for investment. Profits from the trans-Atlantic trade, colonial commerce and a developed banking system supplied the money to build factories and buy machinery. The slave and sugar economies had enriched the merchants of Bristol, Liverpool and Glasgow, who now sought fresh outlets for their gains. This wealth, accumulated over the preceding century, gave entrepreneurs the means to industrialise without waiting upon the state. Such capital was a circumstance rather than an invention, the very fuel on which industry ran.

The country possessed rich deposits of coal and iron. These lay close together and near navigable water, providing the fuel and the material for machines, engines and rails. The coalfields of the Midlands, the North and South Wales sat conveniently beside the ironstone that Darby and Cort had learned to work. No amount of ingenuity could have industrialised a land without such resources to hand. Geography thus favoured Britain from the start, for nature had stocked the workshop in advance.

The Agrarian Revolution released labour and food. Enclosure and improved farming raised output sharply while cutting the number of hands the land required. The dispossessed drifted to the towns, where they became the workforce of the new factories. At the same time the rising food supply fed the swelling industrial cities. This social circumstance was one that industry could not have done without, for full stomachs and idle hands alike served the mills.

A large empire supplied raw materials and markets. Colonies provided the raw cotton and other materials that the factories consumed, and bought British manufactures in return. This captive imperial market guaranteed the demand that made mass production profitable and safe. India and the Americas thus clothed and enriched Lancashire at once. Empire was a circumstance that underpinned industrial expansion, making the world Britain's customer.

Political stability and sound institutions encouraged enterprise. Britain avoided the revolutions that convulsed the Continent, and its laws protected property, contract and patents. This security gave investors the confidence to sink their capital in long and risky ventures. Parliament, dominated by men of property, legislated readily for enclosure and improvement. Stable government was therefore a decisive circumstance, for order made enterprise safe.

Yet invention was itself a genuine British strength. The spinning jenny, the water frame and, above all, Watt's steam engine of 1769 were British achievements that transformed production. These inventions sprang from a wider culture of practical improvement, tinkering and applied science. They were not merely lucky accidents but the fruit of a society that prized useful knowledge. Ingenuity therefore deserves real credit, for the machines did not build themselves.

Circumstance and invention finally reinforced one another. Favourable conditions drew forth invention, while invention turned those conditions into industrial dominance. Capital funded the inventor, coal powered his engine, and the profits he made enlarged the capital afresh. The two advantages were bound together in a single rising spiral. Britain led the world because both came together in the same island at the same time.

The statement is therefore partly valid. Britain's primacy owed much to circumstance: its capital, coal, freed labour, imperial markets and stable government. But invention was itself one of these advantages, and the circumstances mattered only because British ingenuity was there to exploit them. Britain became the workshop of the world because favourable conditions and inventive genius met in the same place at the same time, and neither alone would have sufficed.

Examiner's Note

The word "circumstance" sets up a weighing against "invention"; treat it as a debate, not a list of causes.

Weak answers narrate inventions without ever addressing the claim about circumstance.

The top band shows invention and circumstance reinforcing one another rather than choosing crudely between them.

Question 20

The Industrial Revolution was the shift from hand production to machine manufacture that began in Britain around 1760. To account for its outbreak there is to explain why this island, rather than any rival, industrialised first. A combination of agricultural change, accumulated capital, natural resources, a ready workforce, imperial markets, invention and stable government came together in Britain as nowhere else. These causes did not act singly but reinforced one another until the transformation was ignited.

The Agrarian Revolution laid the foundation. Enclosure, crop rotation and selective breeding, associated with men such as Townshend and Bakewell, raised food output sharply through the century. This fed a growing population and released labourers from the land for industry. The countryside could now sustain workers who grew none of their own food. Agriculture thus prepared the ground for the factory, for a fed and freed people awaited the mills.

Accumulated capital financed the new industry. Wealth from trade, banking and the colonies gave entrepreneurs the funds to build mills and buy machinery. Britain's developed financial system, with country banks and cheap credit, made investment easy to raise. Merchants enriched by overseas commerce looked for new and profitable ventures at home. This capital was the seed money of industrialisation, for money in hand made machines possible.

Abundant coal and iron supplied fuel and material. Britain's rich and conveniently placed deposits provided the energy and the metal that machines and engines demanded. Coal drove the steam engine, while iron, improved by coke smelting, built the machines and rails. The two lay close together and near water, which kept their cost low. These resources were indispensable to industrial growth, for the land itself was a storehouse.

A growing population provided labour and demand. Rising numbers, as death rates fell and towns grew, supplied both hands for the factories and mouths to buy their goods. This workforce gathered in the industrial districts where employment was found. A larger population meant a larger home market for cheap manufactures. Population change therefore both manned and fed the market, making people at once worker and customer.

Colonial markets and materials rewarded production. The empire furnished raw cotton and other materials and bought finished manufactures in return. This guaranteed outlet made the risk of investing in expensive machinery worthwhile. The Navigation Acts and naval power secured these markets against rivals. Empire and industry thus advanced together, for the colonies pulled the factories forward.

A wave of invention transformed the key industries. The flying shuttle, spinning jenny, water frame and Watt's improved steam engine multiplied output beyond anything hand labour could match. These machines mechanised first the textile trade and then much else besides. Each invention prompted the next, as spinning outran weaving and both demanded new power. Invention was the immediate spark that turned Britain's advantages into revolution.

Political stability and enterprise-friendly laws completed the picture. Britain's settled government, protection of property and encouragement of patents gave investors the confidence to build. Free from the upheavals of the Continent, entrepreneurs could plan for the long term. Parliament passed the enclosure and turnpike acts that industry required. Stability was the frame within which all the other causes could act, for security let ambition work.

The Industrial Revolution broke out in Britain because a rare combination of causes converged there. Agricultural improvement, accumulated capital, coal and iron, a growing workforce, imperial markets, invention and stable government each played its part and reinforced the others. No single cause would have sufficed on its own. Together, however, they made Britain the first industrial nation in the history of the world.

Examiner's Note
"Account for" wants causes in a reasoned chain, not a description of inventions alone. The trap is to treat the machines as the whole story and ignore the enabling conditions. Strong answers rank the causes and show how agriculture and capital underlay the rest.

Question 21

The Agrarian Revolution was the transformation of British farming in the eighteenth century through enclosure, new crops and improved methods. To examine its contribution is to see how changes in the fields made the factory possible. It fed the towns, released the workforce, supplied capital and widened the home market for manufactures. In each of these ways it prepared the conditions that industrial growth demanded, so that the two revolutions were inseparably linked.

Enclosure consolidated the land for efficient farming. The fencing of open fields and commons, sanctioned by thousands of private Acts of Parliament, replaced scattered strips with compact and improvable farms. Land could now be drained, manured and cropped scientifically rather than by communal custom. Output rose steadily as the improving landlord took the place of the village commoner. This raised the food supply that a growing population required, so the enclosed field fed the coming city.

New crops and rotations increased yields. The Norfolk four-course system, associated with "Turnip" Townshend, alternated wheat, turnips, barley and clover and abolished the wasteful fallow year. Turnips and clover restored the soil and fed livestock through the winter months. Farmers could therefore keep more animals and crop more land than before. Food production climbed accordingly, so that better husbandry meant fuller granaries.

Selective breeding improved livestock. Robert Bakewell of Leicestershire bred larger and meatier sheep and cattle that yielded far more from the same pasture. The average weight of animals sold at Smithfield rose markedly across the century. This swelled the supply of meat and wool for the growing towns. Improved herds thus supported a rising urban population, for the countryside fattened the future workforce.

Rising food output fed the industrial towns. A more productive agriculture could sustain great numbers who grew none of their own food. Without this surplus the crowding of people into factory towns would have brought famine, as it did elsewhere in Europe. British farms fed the cities that industry created. Agriculture therefore underwrote urbanisation, keeping the mills manned and supplied.

Enclosure released labour for industry. The dispossessed smallholders and commoners, deprived of their strips and grazing rights, drifted to the towns in search of work. This provided the ready workforce that the new factories demanded. What the village lost in hands the mill gained in labour. The land's loss was thus industry's gain, for the fields emptied so that the mills could fill.

Farming profits supplied capital for investment. Improving landlords and prosperous tenant farmers accumulated wealth from rising rents and grain prices. Much of this was lent or invested in canals, turnpikes and industrial ventures. The same families often held both broad acres and shares in industry. Money made on the land thus flowed into the factory, so that the harvest helped to pay for the machine.

A prosperous countryside widened the home market. Farmers and landowners with rising incomes bought manufactured goods, from cloth and tools to household wares. This growing domestic demand encouraged industrial production alongside the export trade. A wealthy agriculture and a busy industry fed each other's growth. Rural prosperity bought urban goods, binding the two revolutions together.

The Agrarian Revolution therefore made a decisive contribution to industrialisation. By feeding the towns, releasing labour, supplying capital and widening the market, it created the very conditions the factories required. Industry rose upon a foundation first laid in the fields, and without the improving farm the crowded mill could not have been fed. The two revolutions were, in truth, inseparably linked.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks how farming change enabled industry, not for a farming history in isolation.

The trap is to describe enclosure and crops without connecting them to industrial growth.

The top band ties each agrarian change to a specific industrial precondition.

Question 22

The steam engine, improved by James Watt from 1769, converted the energy of burning coal into reliable mechanical power. The claim ranks it the single most important invention of the age. It is largely valid, for steam freed industry from natural limits and powered factory, mine and transport alike. Yet other inventions and enabling conditions were also vital, so its primacy, though genuine, was not solitary. The honest verdict grants it first place among many.

Steam power freed industry from water and muscle. Earlier machines depended on rivers, wind or human and animal strength, all of them limited and unreliable. A dry summer or a frozen stream could halt a water mill entirely. Watt's engine, developed with Matthew Boulton from 1769, supplied constant power wherever coal could be carried. This liberated the factory from the riverbank, so that industry could now rise anywhere.

It multiplied the output of the factories. Applied to spinning and weaving, steam drove machinery faster and for longer than any water wheel could manage. Mills could now run day and night and through every season at a steady pace. A single engine could turn hundreds of machines at once. Production soared, and the engine turned quiet workshops into roaring powerhouses.

It transformed mining. Steam pumps, beginning with Newcomen's engine of 1712 and improved by Watt, cleared water from the deep pits. This allowed coal and metal ores to be won far below the levels once possible. More coal could then be raised to fire still more engines. Steam thus fed its own expansion, for the engine dug the very coal that drove the engine.

It revolutionised transport. Mounted on rails and in ships, the steam engine produced the railway and the steamship. Stephenson's Rocket of 1829 and the lines that followed carried goods and passengers at unheard-of speed. Raw materials reached the factory and finished goods the market swiftly and cheaply. Steam annihilated distance, and the railway remade the very map of the nation.

It made possible the concentration of industry. Because steam worked wherever coal was carried, factories no longer had to scatter along the rivers. They could cluster instead in towns upon the coalfields, close to both labour and fuel. This gave rise to the great industrial cities of the North and Midlands. The engine thus shaped the geography of industry, for where coal lay the cities grew.

Yet other inventions were also essential. The textile machines mechanised the first great industry, while Cort's puddling process and, later, Bessemer's converter transformed the making of iron and steel. Steam powered these processes, but each was indispensable in its own right. No single machine could have industrialised a nation alone. Invention was a team rather than a solo, and the engine needed machines to drive.

Enabling conditions were equally necessary. Capital to build the engines, coal to fire them, labour to tend them and markets to buy their produce were all required. Steam mattered so greatly precisely because these conditions existed to be exploited. In a land without coal or capital the engine would have remained a mere curiosity. The engine triumphed because the ground beneath it was ready.

The claim is therefore largely valid. The steam engine was the most versatile and transformative invention of the age, powering factory, mine and transport and reshaping where industry could grow. But it worked alongside the textile machines and the new metal processes, and it depended on capital, coal and markets to matter at all. It was the first among the inventions of the age rather than the only one that counted.

Examiner's Note

"How valid" invites strong agreement with due qualification, not an unconditional yes.

The trap is to describe the engine's workings without weighing it against other inventions.

The top band credits steam's versatility while acknowledging textiles, iron and enabling conditions.

Question 23

The textile industry, and cotton above all, was the first to be mechanised and led the early Industrial Revolution. To assess its role is to weigh how far it drove the wider transformation of the economy. It pioneered the machines, created the factory system, drew in steam and dominated the export trade. Its leadership in the early decades was decisive, though other industries came in time to share the burden of growth.

Textiles pioneered mechanisation. The flying shuttle of 1733, the spinning jenny of 1764, Arkwright's water frame and Crompton's mule mechanised spinning and weaving before any other industry. Each invention answered the bottleneck the last had created, as spinning raced ahead of weaving. Output multiplied many times over within a single generation. Cotton showed the world what machinery could achieve, and it became the proving ground of the age.

It gave birth to the factory system. Arkwright's water frame was too large for the cottage and required water power and many hands, so he gathered his workers under one roof at Cromford in 1771. This created the factory, the characteristic institution of the industrial age. Fixed hours, close discipline and the division of labour followed from it. The mill became the model for all later manufacture, for cotton built the first true factories.

It drove the demand for steam power. As spinning and weaving mechanised, the mills outgrew the rivers and turned to Watt's engine for reliable power. The steam-driven mills of Manchester multiplied through the early nineteenth century. Textile demand thus carried steam into the very heart of industry. The cotton mill was steam's first great customer, and so one revolution pulled the other forward.

It stimulated other industries. The building of machines, engines and mills created a steady demand for iron, coal and skilled engineering. Bleaching, dyeing and the early chemical trades grew up to serve the cotton mills. The growth of one industry thus rippled outward through the whole economy. Textiles pulled the wider industrial train, for their appetite fed their neighbours.

It dominated Britain's export trade. Cheap cotton goods were sold across Europe, Africa, India and the Americas, earning vast wealth and confirming Britain's industrial lead. By the mid-nineteenth century raw and finished cotton made up a large share of British exports by value. The looms of Lancashire came to clothe much of the world. Cotton became the nation's leading export, dressing and enriching Britain at once.

It reshaped society in the industrial towns. Manchester and the Lancashire towns swelled rapidly around the mills, with all the crowding, pollution and hardship that followed. A new working class and a new class of mill-owners took shape together within them. The industry thus created the classic industrial town and its attendant social problems. Cottonopolis, as Manchester was nicknamed, stood as the monument to this transformation.

Yet its leadership was later shared. Iron, coal, engineering and, above all, the railways became equally central to the economy as the century advanced. Cotton had led the way but no longer travelled alone. Its clear supremacy belonged chiefly to the early decades of the revolution. The pioneer was in time joined, and in part overtaken, by other great industries.

The textile industry's role was therefore central to the early Industrial Revolution. It pioneered the machines and the factory, drew in steam power, stimulated the iron and coal trades and dominated the export market. Though iron, engineering and the railways later shared its leadership, cotton had set the pattern that all industry followed. It was, in the fullest sense, the spearhead of the whole transformation.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants the industry's importance weighed, with its limits and later rivals noted.

The trap is to list textile machines without explaining their wider effects.

The top band shows cotton pioneering the factory and pulling steam and iron behind it.

Question 24

The transport revolution was the improvement of roads, canals and, above all, railways that accompanied British industrialisation. To examine its part is to see how the better movement of goods and people fed the growth of industry. It cheapened raw materials, widened markets and knit the whole country into a single economy. Transport was at once a servant and a spur of industry, both carrying its produce and calling new industry into being.

Improved roads quickened overland movement. The turnpike trusts, which charged tolls to fund repairs, multiplied across the eighteenth century. The engineers Telford and McAdam built harder, better-drained roads with smooth and durable surfaces. Coaches and carts now moved faster and more cheaply between the towns than ever before. Better roads began to shrink the country, and the highway came to serve the growing market.

Canals carried heavy goods cheaply. The Duke of Bridgewater's canal of 1761, built by Brindley to carry coal to Manchester, halved the price of coal in the city. A canal mania followed, linking coalfields, factories and ports across the land by water. Bulk cargoes such as coal, iron and grain now moved at a fraction of the old cost. Canals fed the furnaces and the mills, carrying what the rough roads never could.

Railways transformed transport entirely. The Stockton and Darlington line of 1825 and the Liverpool and Manchester Railway of 1830 proved the power of Stephenson's locomotives. Trains carried goods and passengers at speeds and in volumes never before imagined. A national network was flung across the country within a single generation. The railway became the arteries of the industrial economy, and steam on rails set the pace of the age.

Cheaper transport lowered the cost of production. Raw materials reached the factory and finished goods the market far more cheaply than before. This widened profit margins and encouraged manufacturers to enlarge their output. Goods once confined to a single district could now be sold across the kingdom. Transport savings thus became industrial gains, for every mile saved made goods cheaper.

Better transport widened the market. Faster and cheaper carriage allowed manufacturers to sell across the whole country and, through the ports, across the world. A national and then an imperial market opened to the produce of the factories. Producers were no longer confined to the customers within a day's cart-ride. Transport thus turned local trades into national industries, and the market grew with the network.

Railway building itself stimulated industry. The demand for rails, locomotives, bridges and stations boosted iron, coal and engineering enormously. The railway boom of the 1840s drew in vast investment and employed whole armies of navvies. Construction became a great industry in its own right. The railway thus fed the very industries that had built it, so that laying the line built the economy.

Transport bound the economy into one whole. Roads, canals and railways together knit regions, resources and markets into a single integrated system. This integration multiplied the effect of every other industrial advance. Coalfield, factory and port were now joined in one unbroken chain. Transport was the connective tissue of industry, and it made the scattered parts a single whole.

The transport revolution therefore played a vital part in Britain's industrial growth. By cheapening carriage, widening markets and stimulating the iron and coal industries, it both served and spurred the wider transformation. Railways above all bound the country into a single industrial economy. Industry could not have grown so far or so fast without the means to move its materials and its goods.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" wants the effect of transport on industry analysed, not a catalogue of canals and lines.

The trap is to describe Stephenson's engines without linking them to markets and costs.

The top band shows transport both serving industry and stimulating iron and coal in return.

Question 25

Coal and iron were the fuel and the material of the machine age, and Britain possessed both in unusual abundance. The question asks how far industrialisation depended upon them. To a very great extent it did, for without fuel and metal the engines and machines could not have existed at all. Yet resources alone were not enough, and capital, invention, labour and markets were equally required to turn them to use.

Coal powered the steam engine. Watt's engine burned coal to produce the mechanical power that drove factories, mines and transport alike. Without cheap and plentiful coal the engine would have been useless, and the water wheel would have remained supreme. Britain's vast reserves made steam power practical on a national scale. Coal was the energy of the whole revolution, the black fuel on which progress ran.

Iron built the machines and infrastructure. Machinery, engines, bridges and, later, the rails themselves were all made of iron. Darby's coke smelting of 1709 and Cort's puddling process of the 1780s made iron both cheap and plentiful. Structures such as the Iron Bridge of 1779 displayed the strength of the new material. Iron was the skeleton of industry, for the whole age was framed in metal.

Coal and iron lay conveniently together. Britain's deposits of the two were often found side by side and close to navigable water. This proximity greatly eased their extraction and lowered the cost of carrying them. The coalfields of the Midlands, the North-East and South Wales became the sites of industry. Nature had arranged the resources well, and convenience compounded their abundance.

The two resources reinforced each other. Coal was needed to smelt the iron, and iron was needed to build the engines that mined the coal. Each industry thus fed the growth of the other in a rising spiral. As the output of one climbed, so did the demand for the other. Their partnership was self-sustaining, for fuel and metal grew together.

They shaped the location of industry. Factories and towns clustered upon the coalfields, where fuel was cheap and close at hand. The map of industrial Britain came to follow its seams of coal and beds of iron. Regions once poor and remote became the workshops of the world. Resources thus drew industry to particular places, for where coal lay, industry gathered.

Yet resources required capital and invention to exploit. Coal and iron in the ground were worthless without the money to mine them and the machines to work them. Their value lay entirely in how they were extracted and used. A poorer or less inventive nation might have left them untouched beneath the soil. Resources were therefore necessary but not sufficient, for the seam still needed the entrepreneur.

Markets and labour were equally essential. Even with abundant fuel and metal, industry needed workers to labour and buyers to purchase its goods. These conditions worked together with the resources rather than in place of them. Coal and iron were but one pillar of the revolution among several. The whole edifice stood on more than a single leg.

The Industrial Revolution depended to a very great extent on coal and iron, which supplied the fuel and material without which the machine age was impossible. Their abundance and convenient location gave Britain a decisive advantage over its rivals. Yet they mattered only because capital, invention, labour and markets were present to exploit them. Coal and iron were a necessary foundation, but not the whole building.

Examiner's Note

"To what extent" requires a strong but qualified verdict, not an absolute one.

The trap is to describe coal and iron without weighing them against capital and markets.

The top band shows the two resources reinforcing each other yet needing capital to exploit.

Question 26

The Industrial Revolution utterly changed the lives of ordinary workers, for good and for ill. The statement holds that its miseries outweighed its progress for the working class. The case is finely balanced, for the

early decades brought real hardship while the longer run brought rising living standards. A fair discussion must therefore weigh the suffering of the early factory age against the improvements that industry eventually delivered.

The factory system imposed harsh discipline. Workers laboured twelve hours or more at the relentless pace of the machine, under strict rules and the constant threat of fines or dismissal. The easy rhythms of the old craft workshop were wholly lost. Labour became monotonous, regimented and closely supervised. The factory clock and the overseer now ruled the working day.

Wages were often low and insecure. Many workers earned barely enough to live, and could be thrown out of work by trade slumps or by new machines. Poverty and uncertainty haunted the labouring poor of the early factory towns. A downturn in trade could plunge whole districts into destitution overnight. Hardship was the common lot of the early factory hand, for bread was never quite secure.

Living conditions in the towns were wretched. The industrial cities grew far faster than housing, water or sewers could keep pace. Overcrowding, filth and disease bred in the slums, and cholera swept through them repeatedly. Engels described these horrors in his account of Manchester in 1845. Urban squalor was a real and deadly misery, for the town poisoned even as it grew.

Women and children suffered particular exploitation. Women and young children were employed for long hours in the mills and mines at the lowest wages. The smallest children crawled beneath machines or along narrow seams in danger and darkness. Their treatment shocked the reformers who later investigated it. This exploitation was among the darkest features of the age, for the mill spared neither child nor mother.

Yet industry eventually raised living standards. Over the course of the nineteenth century real wages rose and manufactured goods became cheaper and more plentiful. The working class slowly began to share in the wealth that its labour produced. Diet, clothing and housing improved for many by the century's end. Progress, though long delayed, was real, and the longer run repaid the early hardship.

Reform gradually softened the worst abuses. A series of Factory Acts, together with the Mines Act of 1842, limited hours and removed women and young children from the most dangerous work. Public health laws slowly began to clean the towns. The state came at last to curb the cruelties of early industry. Conditions improved as reform advanced, and law tamed the factory in time.

Workers won new means of self-defence. Trade unions, cooperatives, friendly societies and eventually the vote gave the working class the power to defend its interests. Organisation turned scattered victims into a purposeful movement. Workers could now bargain collectively and press their case in Parliament. Progress thus came partly through their own efforts, as they learned to combine and to vote.

The statement is therefore only half true. The early Industrial Revolution did bring real misery, in harsh factories, insecure wages, squalid towns and the exploitation of women and children. Yet in the longer run it raised living standards, provoked far-reaching reform and gave workers new power over their own lives. Misery marked its beginning, but progress was its ultimate legacy for the working class.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires both the misery and the progress to be weighed toward a verdict.

The trap is a one-sided catalogue of factory horrors with no mention of later gains.

The top band distinguishes the harsh early decades from the improving longer run.

Question 27

The Industrial Revolution was accompanied by an unprecedented growth of towns, as Britain changed within a few generations from a rural to an urban nation. To account for this urbanisation is to explain why people gathered in the industrial cities in such numbers. The pull of factory work, the push from the land, the concentration of industry, a rising population and improved transport all drove the movement. Together these forces swelled the towns with astonishing speed.

Factories drew workers to the towns. The new mills required large concentrations of labour gathered together in one place. Men, women and children moved from the villages to the towns in search of work and wages. The factory offered steadier, if harder, employment than the uncertain land. Employment was the great magnet of the age, and the factory gathered the people around it.

The Agrarian Revolution pushed people off the land. Enclosure and the mechanisation of farming sharply reduced the need for rural labour. Dispossessed smallholders and displaced labourers had little choice but to seek work elsewhere. The countryside could no longer employ all who had once lived upon it. The land thus expelled its surplus, and its loss filled the towns.

Industry concentrated near coal and water. Because steam-powered factories clustered upon the coalfields, the workers who served them clustered there too. Towns swelled wherever fuel and industry were found together. Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham grew where the resources and the mills lay. Geography fixed where the new cities rose, for coal drew the crowds.

Rising population supplied the numbers. A growing population, fed by improved agriculture and spared by falling death rates, provided the people to fill the towns. More births and longer lives swelled the ranks of potential townsfolk. There were simply more people needing homes and work than before. Demography drove the growth, for the nation had more mouths to move.

Transport made urban growth possible. Canals and railways carried food and fuel into the towns and manufactured goods out of them. This allowed dense populations to be supplied where no local farm could feed them. Without such carriage the great cities would soon have starved. Transport sustained the swelling cities, for the network fed the crowd.

Towns offered wider opportunities. Beyond the factory, the cities promised trade, services and a chance of betterment absent from the villages. This hope drew people quite as much as necessity drove them. The town seemed to open doors that the countryside kept firmly shut. Opportunity as well as need filled the streets, for the town promised more than the field.

Growth fed upon itself. As the towns grew they created still more work in building, shops, transport and services, which drew in yet more people. Urbanisation thus became a self-reinforcing process. Each new arrival added to the demand that summoned the next. The city grew because the city had already grown, and success bred further size.

The rapid growth of towns is therefore explained by a combination of pull and push. Factory work and urban opportunity drew people in, while agrarian change forced them off the land, and a rising population supplied the numbers that transport could sustain. Concentrated upon the coalfields, the industrial cities swelled with astonishing speed. Within a few generations they had transformed Britain into the first urban nation.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" asks why the towns grew, not for a description of urban conditions.

The trap is to describe slum life instead of explaining the causes of urbanisation.

The top band balances the pull of the factory against the push from the land.

Question 28

The factory system gathered workers under one roof to labour by machine, and in doing so it reshaped the lives of all who entered it. To assess its effects is to weigh the harm it did against the changes it set in motion. For workers, women and children alike the early factory brought discipline, danger and exploitation, though it also drew the reforms that eventually improved their lot. Its effects were harsh at first but by no means unchanging.

It subjected workers to a new discipline. Labour was now governed by the clock, the machine and the overseer, with long fixed hours and strict rules. The independence of the craftsman, who had set his own

pace, gave way to the routine of the hand. Fines and the threat of dismissal enforced obedience. Work became regimented and impersonal, for the factory bell now ordered daily life.

It exposed workers to danger and monotony. Unguarded machinery maimed the careless or the exhausted, and endlessly repeated tasks dulled both body and mind. Accidents, lung disease and deformity were common in the early mills. Little or no compensation awaited those injured at their work. The workplace was often perilous, for the machine could injure quite as readily as it employed.

It drew women into wage labour on unequal terms. Women worked long hours in the mills for wages well below those of men, often while still bearing the burdens of the home. Their labour was valued cheaply and their conditions were hard. Employers frequently preferred them precisely because they could be paid less. The factory both employed and exploited them, paying them least for working most.

It employed children in harsh conditions. Young children, some no more than six years old, worked long hours in the mills and mines. Small enough to crawl beneath the machines or along the narrow seams, they faced danger, exhaustion and cruelty. Parish apprentices were bound to the mills in large numbers. Childhood itself was sacrificed to production, and the youngest paid the heaviest price.

It separated work from home. Labour now took place in the factory rather than in the household, dividing families throughout the working day. The old unity of home and work, familiar in cottage industry, was broken. Parents and children might toil in different rooms or different mills. Family life was thus reshaped around the factory, and the hearth and the loom were parted.

Yet it provoked investigation and reform. The very scandals of the factory prompted royal commissions, public outcry and the Factory Acts that limited hours and protected the young. Reformers such as Lord Shaftesbury pressed the workers' cause in Parliament. The system's worst cruelties thus called forth their own remedy. Reform followed hard upon exposure, and the outcry curbed the abuse.

It eventually raised productivity and wages. Over time the sheer efficiency of the factory helped to lift output and, in the longer run, living standards. Workers came slowly to share in the greater wealth their labour created. Cheaper goods and rising real wages reached even the poor by the century's end. The system's gains were real, if long delayed, and hardship gave way to gradual improvement.

The factory system's effects were therefore harsh in the early decades and improving thereafter. It imposed discipline, danger and exploitation upon workers, women and children alike, and it divided work from home. Yet its very abuses drew the reforms that softened them, and its productivity eventually raised living standards. Its human cost was heavy, but its final legacy was mixed rather than wholly dark.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants the harms weighed against the reforms and gains, not a list of horrors.

The trap is to describe child labour vividly but ignore the Factory Acts and later improvement.

The top band treats women and children specifically, then reaches a balanced verdict.

Question 29

The Industrial Revolution reshaped society quite as thoroughly as it reshaped production. The claim is that it created two new and opposed classes, the industrial capitalists and the wage-earning workers. There is much truth in this, for the factory did divide society into owners and labourers with conflicting interests. Yet older classes survived and the new ones were not always at war, so the picture needs careful qualification.

It created a new industrial capitalist class. The owners of factories, mines and machines formed a wealthy bourgeoisie whose power rested on capital rather than on land. Men such as the great mill-owners rose from modest origins to command fortunes. This class had scarcely existed before industrialisation. The factory made a new kind of rich man, and capital became a fresh road to power.

It created a new industrial working class. The factory hands, owning nothing but their labour, formed a propertyless proletariat wholly dependent on wages. Concentrated in the mills and the crowded towns, they shared a common condition and a common grievance. They were a distinct new class, unlike the peasant or the independent craftsman before them. The machine made a new kind of worker, and labour became a class in itself.

The two classes had opposing interests. Owners sought profit through low wages and long hours, while workers sought better pay and shorter ones. This clash of interest set the one against the other from the very start. What enriched the master often impoverished the man. Their aims were structurally opposed, for wage and profit pulled in different directions.

The conflict expressed itself in struggle. Strikes, machine-breaking by the Luddites, the growth of trade unions and the Chartist movement all revealed the antagonism between the classes. Industrial conflict became a recurring feature of the age. The hostility was acted out in the streets and the mills, not merely felt in private. The factory bred the strike as surely as it bred the profit.

Thinkers gave the division a theory. Marx and Engels interpreted all history as class struggle and saw in the factory the seed of a coming revolution. Engels drew directly on his own observation of Manchester in 1845. Their writing sharpened the workers' awareness of the divide. The two classes thus acquired an ideology, and the conflict was named and analysed.

Yet older classes and ranks survived. The landed aristocracy and gentry remained rich and politically powerful throughout the century. Between the two extremes stood a broad middle of shopkeepers, clerks and professionals. Society was not, therefore, neatly split in two. The old order persisted alongside the new, and two classes did not exhaust the whole.

Class relations were not always hostile. Reform, rising wages, philanthropy and shared institutions could soften the antagonism into negotiation. Employers and unions increasingly bargained rather than merely fought. Many workers sought improvement within the system rather than its overthrow. The hostility was real but not constant, for bargaining often tempered the battle.

One may agree substantially with the claim. The Industrial Revolution did create a new capitalist class and a new working class whose interests often clashed, and that clash shaped the politics of the age. Yet older classes survived, a broad middle class flourished between the two, and hostility gave way at times to compromise. The revolution created two new classes, but it did not reduce the whole of society simply to their war.

Examiner's Note

"How far" invites agreement with qualification, not a flat endorsement of class war.

The trap is to assert class conflict without noticing surviving and intermediate classes.

The top band affirms the two new classes yet complicates the picture of pure hostility.

Question 30

The Industrial Revolution changed not only how goods were made but the whole structure of the British economy. To examine this transformation is to trace its effects across production, trade and the organisation of business. Manufacturing overtook agriculture, factories replaced workshops, output and trade soared, and finance and new industries flourished. The economy that emerged from these changes was, for the first time, recognisably modern.

Manufacturing overtook agriculture. Industry replaced farming as the leading source of national wealth and employment. By the middle of the nineteenth century most output and most workers were engaged in manufacture and trade rather than on the land. Britain became the first economy in history to make this decisive shift. The balance of the economy thus tilted for good, and the factory came to outweigh the farm.

The factory replaced the workshop. Production moved out of scattered homes and small workshops into large, powered factories. This concentrated capital, labour and machinery on an unprecedented scale

beneath a single roof. The old domestic "putting-out" system gave way to the mill and its discipline. The very unit of production was transformed, and the factory became the engine of national output.

Output rose to unprecedented levels. Machinery multiplied production far beyond anything hand labour could achieve, making goods cheaper and more plentiful than ever. Cotton cloth, iron and coal poured out in quantities the world had never before seen. Prices fell steadily as volumes soared. Abundance replaced scarcity in many goods, and the machine flooded the market.

Trade expanded enormously. Cheap manufactures were exported across the world, and raw materials imported in return, making Britain the hub of global commerce. The nation's ports and merchant fleet grew to match this traffic. The free-trade policies adopted from the 1840s widened the exchange still further. Britain traded as never before, becoming at once the world's workshop and its warehouse.

Banking and finance developed. Industry's hunger for capital spurred the growth of banks, joint-stock companies and a bustling stock exchange. Country banks and, later, limited-liability companies channelled the nation's savings into enterprise. A sophisticated financial system grew up to fund industry's needs. Money became as organised as manufacture, and finance matured beside the factory.

New industries and occupations arose. Engineering, railways, coal and chemicals became great industries, and wholly new trades and professions appeared. Clerks, engineers and managers multiplied alongside the mill hands and miners. The economy grew steadily more varied and complex. Work itself was transformed, as fresh industries reshaped the whole pattern of employment.

Capitalism became the organising principle. Private ownership, wage labour and the pursuit of profit in free markets came to govern economic life. Adam Smith's doctrine of laissez-faire, set out in 1776, became the ruling wisdom of the age. The economy now ran on capitalist lines as never before. A new economic order had arrived, in which profit and the market ruled.

The Industrial Revolution therefore transformed the British economy from top to bottom. Manufacturing overtook agriculture, factories replaced workshops, output and trade soared, and finance and new industries flourished under a triumphant capitalism. Britain emerged from these changes as the first modern industrial economy. It became the model that the rest of the world would in time set out to follow.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks how the economy changed, not for the causes of the revolution.

The trap is to drift into social effects rather than economic structure.

The top band links each change to the rise of a modern capitalist economy.

Question 31

Capitalism, the system of private ownership, wage labour and production for profit, reached its mature form in the industrial age. The statement calls the Industrial Revolution the parent of modern capitalism. This is largely persuasive, for the factory system embodied capitalism on a wholly new scale, though a commercial capitalism had existed before. The revolution did not invent capitalism so much as raise it to a new and dominant stage.

The factory embodied capitalist production. The ownership of the means of production by a few, and wage labour by the many, defined the factory. Here capital, in the form of buildings and machines, commanded the labour that it hired. This was capitalism displayed in its clearest and most concentrated form. The mill made the system visible, for the factory was capitalism built in brick and iron.

It generalised wage labour. Millions who had once worked their own land or plied a craft now sold their labour for a wage. This dependence on paid employment, rather than on land or tools of one's own, was the hallmark of the new order. The wage packet replaced the smallholding and the workshop. Wage labour became the normal human condition, and work itself became a thing that was bought.

It concentrated capital on a new scale. Industry both required and generated great accumulations of wealth in private hands. Building mills, railways and ironworks demanded sums no craftsman could ever command. Capital thus became the decisive force in economic life. The scale of private ownership was without precedent, and fortunes grew as never before.

It spread the pursuit of profit and the free market. Production was organised for profit and governed by the competition of the market, as Adam Smith had urged in his Wealth of Nations of 1776. Laissez-faire, the doctrine that the state should stand aside, became the ruling creed. Prices, wages and output were left to the market to decide. Profit set the terms of production, and the market ruled economic life.

It created the institutions of capitalism. Banks, joint-stock companies, stock exchanges and a wage economy grew up to serve the needs of industry. Limited liability, granted in the 1850s, encouraged investment on a still greater scale. These institutions gave capitalism its modern machinery. The system acquired its full apparatus, and finance matured alongside the factory.

Yet commercial capitalism preceded it. Merchants, banking and trade for profit had flourished long before, from the Italian city-states to the Dutch republic of the seventeenth century. Capitalism was not, therefore, born within the factory. The revolution inherited a system quite as much as it created one. The seed of capitalism was far older than the mill.

The revolution raised capitalism to a new stage. What industry did was to transform the older commercial capitalism into industrial capitalism, dominant and society-wide. Production, and not merely trade, now became the field of capital. The change was one of degree that became a change of kind. Capitalism came of age in the factory, even if it was not first conceived there.

The statement is therefore largely valid, with one important qualification. The Industrial Revolution did not first invent capitalism, which had existed in commerce for centuries. But it transformed that older capitalism into the industrial, society-wide system of the modern world, built upon the factory, wage labour and concentrated capital. It was the parent not of capitalism as such, but of capitalism in its modern form.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" invites weighing the claim, including the existence of earlier commercial capitalism.

The trap is to date all capitalism from the factory and ignore its commercial ancestry.

The top band distinguishes commercial from industrial capitalism and dates the latter here.

Question 32

Trade unions, associations of workers formed to defend their common interests, grew into a powerful force during the nineteenth century. To account for their rise is to explain why workers came to organise as they did. The conditions of the factory, the concentration of workers, the imbalance of power, changing laws and the example of early struggles all encouraged unionism. Together they turned scattered discontent into a durable and organised movement.

Harsh factory conditions gave workers a grievance. Long hours, low wages and insecure employment created a discontent that no individual could remedy alone. The factory hand, unlike the old craftsman, had little control over his own working life. Shared hardship naturally bred a desire for shared action. Grievance was the seed of the union, for common suffering sought a common remedy.

The factory concentrated workers together. Gathering many hundreds of labourers under one roof made organisation far easier than in scattered cottages and workshops. Workers who shared the same conditions readily arrived at the same demands. Numbers and proximity together made combination natural. Concentration thus bred combination, for the mill assembled its own opposition.

The imbalance of power drove workers to unite. Facing wealthy and organised employers, the individual worker had almost no bargaining strength. Only by combining could workers hope to negotiate on anything like equal terms. The withdrawal of labour, if done together, was their one real weapon. Unity was therefore their sole leverage, for numbers alone could answer wealth.

Changing laws permitted organisation. The Combination Acts had banned unions, but their repeal in 1824 and 1825 made combination lawful once more. Workers could now organise and bargain openly rather than in secret. Later legislation gradually extended their legal protections. The removal of the ban released the movement, for the law at last allowed the union.

Early struggles inspired and instructed. Episodes such as the Tolpuddle Martyrs of 1834, transported for swearing a union oath, and the great Chartist movement dramatised the workers' cause. Even in defeat these struggles spread the idea of organisation and taught its methods. They left behind martyrs and traditions to rally around. Example thus fed the movement, and its very martyrs made new converts.

The extension of the vote strengthened labour. As successive reform acts gave more working men the franchise, unions could press their case in Parliament as well as in the workplace. Political and industrial action now reinforced one another. Members of Parliament began to heed the organised working-class voice. The ballot backed the union, and workers gained a second weapon.

Success bred further organisation. As unions won concessions and grew respectable, more workers were drawn to join them and new unions were formed. The rise of large and stable unions in mid-century showed what organisation could achieve. Each victory encouraged imitation across other trades. The movement thus fed upon its own progress, for success steadily recruited members.

Trade unions rose in nineteenth-century Britain because the factory both aggrieved workers and gathered them together, while the imbalance of power made combination their only defence. Changing laws permitted organisation, early struggles inspired it, and political reform and steady success carried it forward. From scattered and secret protest there grew a durable and organised labour movement that would reshape the nation's politics.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of unionism, not a narrative of particular strikes.

The trap is to recount Tolpuddle or Chartism without explaining why unions arose.

The top band links factory conditions and worker concentration to the drive to organise.

Question 33

The later nineteenth century saw the European powers seize vast empires, above all in the scramble for Africa after 1880. The question asks how far the Industrial Revolution drove this imperialism. To a very great extent it did, for industry created the appetite for markets and materials and supplied the means of conquest. Yet strategic, national and ideological motives also played their part, so economics was the leading but not the sole cause.

Industry created a hunger for raw materials. The factories consumed vast quantities of cotton, rubber, palm oil and minerals that Britain itself could not supply. The search for reliable sources drove the powers to expand overseas. Colonies could guarantee the flow of these materials at low and steady cost. Industry thus reached out for what it required, and the factory sent the flag abroad.

It demanded new markets for manufactures. Producing far more than the home market could absorb, industrialists sought captive markets in Africa and Asia. Colonies promised guaranteed buyers for cheap factory goods, safe from foreign competitors. Overproduction at home thus pushed empire outward. The looms of Lancashire needed ever more customers, and the colonies were made to supply them.

It provided surplus capital for investment. The wealth generated by industry sought profitable outlets abroad in mines, railways, plantations and loans. The export of capital drew the European powers ever deeper into distant lands. Investors followed profit across the world. Money as well as goods thus went overseas, and empire followed the search for returns.

It supplied the tools of conquest. Steamships, railways, the telegraph and modern rifles and artillery, all products of industry, made the conquest and control of empires possible. European armies now enjoyed an

overwhelming advantage over those they faced. The distances that had once protected Africa and Asia were overcome. Industry thus armed the imperialist, and the machine gun followed the factory.

Industrial rivalry fuelled competition for colonies. As Germany, France, the United States and others industrialised, they competed with Britain for territory, materials and markets. This rivalry turned economic competition into a scramble for colonies, above all in Africa. Each power feared to be shut out by its rivals. Industry set the great nations racing one another for empire.

Theorists linked empire to industrial capitalism. Writers such as Hobson and, later, Lenin argued that imperialism was the highest stage of capitalism, driven by the search for outlets and profit. Their analysis reflected the plainly economic roots of much expansion. Empire and industry were seen as parts of a single system. Capitalism, they held, was compelled to expand or else to stagnate.

Yet other motives also drove imperialism. Strategic rivalry, national prestige, missionary zeal and racial ideas of a "civilising mission" all played their part alongside economics. The desire for naval bases or for national glory could move statesmen as much as trade. Empire, in truth, had mixed motives. The flag followed more than the ledger, even if trade led the way.

The Industrial Revolution contributed to the extent that it was the leading cause of European imperialism. It created the demand for markets, materials and investment outlets, and it supplied the ships, railways and weapons of conquest, while industrial rivalry sharpened the competition for colonies. Yet strategy, prestige and ideology also drove expansion. Industry was the engine of empire, though it was not its only fuel.

Examiner's Note

"To what extent" needs a strong economic case balanced against non-economic motives.

The trap is to assert an economic cause without evidence of materials, markets and tools.

The top band leads with industry's demands yet concedes strategy, prestige and ideology.

Question 34

The Industrial Revolution was among the most consequential changes in all human history, and its effects were deeply mixed. To compare its positive and negative consequences is to weigh the wealth and progress it created against the suffering and disruption it caused. On balance it laid the foundations of the modern world, though at a heavy cost to the first generations. Its blessings and its evils must therefore be set carefully side by side.

It raised production and wealth, but bred exploitation. Industry multiplied goods and national wealth on a scale never before seen, yet the early factories exploited their workers cruelly. Britain grew rich while many of its people grew wretched. Prosperity and misery advanced together in the very same decades. Abundance came at a heavy human price, and wealth and want went side by side.

It created employment, but imposed harsh conditions. The factories and mines gave work to millions who might otherwise have starved upon the land. Yet that work was long, dangerous and poorly paid, with little protection for the labourer. Jobs were plentiful but grim. Employment and exploitation thus went hand in hand, for the mill both fed and ground its hands.

It built great cities, but bred slums. Urbanisation concentrated people, services, culture and opportunity as never before. Yet it also produced overcrowding, filth, pollution and epidemic disease. The industrial city was at once an engine of progress and a nest of squalor. Growth and grime came together, for the town gave much and poisoned much.

It advanced technology, but displaced labour. Machines transformed production and daily life and multiplied what a single worker could make. Yet they threw skilled hand-workers, such as the handloom weavers, out of their livelihoods. Progress destroyed old trades even as it created new ones. Innovation had its casualties, for the machine both served and unseated the worker.

It widened the market and the world, but drove imperialism. Cheap goods, fast ships and the telegraph knit the globe into a single market. Yet the same search for materials and markets fed the conquest of colonies. Integration and subjugation advanced together across the century. The world shrank and was mastered at one and the same time.

It raised living standards in the long run. Over the decades real wages climbed and manufactured goods grew cheap and plentiful. Ordinary people came at last to live better, eat better and own more than their forebears. The delayed benefit was real and lasting. Progress eventually reached the many, and the long run repaid the early cost.

It reshaped society and ideas for good and ill. It created new classes, new conflicts and new movements, from trade unions and socialism to demands for reform and the vote. These transformed politics and society permanently. The revolution thus remade the human world as well as its goods. Its consequences long outlived the smoke of its first factories.

In comparison, the positive and negative consequences of the Industrial Revolution were closely intertwined. It created wealth, employment, cities, technology and, in time, higher living standards, yet it also brought exploitation, slums, displacement and imperialism. On balance it built the foundations of the modern world, but the cost fell heavily on the first generations who endured it. Progress and suffering were, in truth, the two faces of a single transformation.

Examiner's Note

"Compare" requires positives and negatives weighed together, not two separate lists.

The trap is to praise or condemn the revolution wholesale rather than balancing the two.

The top band pairs each benefit with its matching cost before reaching a verdict.

Question 35

The Industrial Revolution, though it began in Britain, in time transformed the whole world. To examine its impact beyond Europe is to trace how industrial power reshaped the economies and societies of Africa, Asia and the Americas. It turned much of the world into a supplier of raw materials and a market for European goods, and drew it into colonial subjection. Its effects abroad were, in the end, as profound as its effects at home.

It made the wider world a source of raw materials. Africa, Asia and the Americas were drawn upon for cotton, rubber, minerals and other materials to feed European industry. Whole regions were reshaped to produce a single crop or ore for export. Their economies were bent to serve distant factories rather than local needs. The world became Europe's quarry, and their resources fed foreign mills.

It turned distant lands into captive markets. European manufactures, cheap and abundant, flooded the markets of Asia and Africa. Local artisans could not compete with machine-made goods and were often ruined. The wider world became a market for the produce of European factories. Foreign goods swept through the bazaars, and native crafts withered before them.

It de-industrialised existing manufactures. India's once-great cotton industry, for example, was destroyed by British competition and by deliberate colonial policy. Established craft economies decayed under the relentless pressure of the machine. Lands that had exported fine cloth were reduced to exporting raw fibre. Old industries were thus destroyed abroad, as the loom of India fell to Lancashire.

It drove colonial conquest. The search for materials and markets led the European powers to seize colonies across the globe, above all in the scramble for Africa after 1880. Industrial appetite hardened into territorial empire. Whole continents were partitioned among the industrial nations. The factory pulled the flag across the world, and trade ended in conquest.

It bound the world into a single economy. Steamships, railways and the telegraph linked the continents into one interdependent system centred on industrial Europe. Goods, money and information now moved

around the globe with new speed. The world was integrated, though on deeply unequal terms. A single world economy was born, and distance shrank beneath the steam.

It entrenched global inequality. The gap between the industrial nations and the rest widened into a lasting division between rich and poor regions. Industrial Europe grew wealthy while the lands that supplied it remained poor. This division outlasted the very empires that had created it. Inequality became structural, and the divide it opened endures to this day.

It eventually spread industry beyond Europe. In time industrialisation reached the United States, Japan and, much later, other lands, breaking Europe's early monopoly. The methods of the factory proved exportable across the world. New industrial powers rose to challenge the old. Industry became a global phenomenon, and the workshop of the world at last had many homes.

The Industrial Revolution's impact on the wider world was therefore profound and lasting. It turned Africa, Asia and the Americas into suppliers of materials and markets for European goods, de-industrialised established economies, and drove the conquest of colonies. It bound the globe into a single and unequal economy, and only much later spread industry beyond Europe. The modern world of rich and poor nations was, in large part, its creation.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" wants the effects abroad analysed, not a history of European industry.

The trap is to stay in Europe and neglect Asia, Africa and the Americas.

The top band links industrial demand to de-industrialisation and colonial conquest abroad.

Question 36

Political revolutions have toppled thrones and remade states, but the Industrial Revolution transformed the very basis of human life. The statement claims that it changed the world more profoundly than any political revolution. This is largely persuasive, for it altered how people worked, lived and related to one another across the globe and for generations. Yet political revolutions too had vast effects, so the comparison must be carefully weighed rather than simply asserted.

It transformed the basis of production. It changed the very way in which goods were made, from hand and workshop to machine and factory. No mere change of government could alter the material foundation of life so deeply. The tools, the power and the organisation of work were all remade at once. The economy itself was transformed, for it changed how humanity made its living.

It reshaped where and how people lived. It turned rural populations into urban ones and remade daily life around the factory, the clock and the city. Whole societies were transformed in their habits, their homes and their work. The rhythms of the seasons gave way to the rhythms of the machine. The pattern of human life was rewritten, as industry moved humanity from field to town.

It created new classes and social relations. The industrial bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and the conflicts between them, reshaped both society and politics. New social forces were born that would come to dominate the modern age. Old bonds of village and craft dissolved into the relations of wage and profit. The very structure of society was changed, and the human order was remade.

Its effects were global and enduring. Beginning in Britain, the revolution spread across the world, and its consequences persist to this very day. No single political revolution ever reached so far or lasted so long. Its influence touched every continent and every succeeding generation. Its reach was worldwide, for it changed the whole planet and not merely one state.

It underlay the political revolutions themselves. The social forces that industry created drove movements from liberalism to socialism and beyond. Even great political upheavals often flowed from the changes industry had wrought. The Russian Revolution, for one, appealed to the very proletariat the factory had made. Industry thus shaped the very revolutions with which it is compared, setting the stage for upheaval.

Yet political revolutions had profound effects too. The French and Russian revolutions overturned whole social and political orders and spread ideas of rights, equality and popular sovereignty. Their impact upon human affairs was vast and enduring. Constitutions, nations and ideologies were born of them. Politics too could transform the world, and revolutions of state reshaped it as surely as any machine.

The two kinds of change were intertwined. Industrial and political revolutions influenced and reinforced one another rather than acting in isolation. The modern world grew out of both together, economics and politics entangled at every turn. Neither can be fully understood wholly apart from the other. Their effects cannot be neatly separated, for machine and manifesto worked as one.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The Industrial Revolution changed the basis of production, the pattern of life, the structure of society and the shape of the whole world more broadly and enduringly than any single political revolution. Yet political revolutions too transformed human affairs, and the two were deeply intertwined. Industry changed the world most profoundly, but it did so in partnership with the political revolutions it helped to cause.

Examiner's Note

"Assess validity" requires the industrial and political revolutions weighed against each other.

The trap is to praise industry without ever comparing it to political revolutions.

The top band shows industry underlying political change yet concedes the latter's own power.

Question 37

The Second Industrial Revolution, roughly from 1870 to 1914, built upon the first but differed from it in character and in scale. To examine its distinguishing features is to see how industry became science-based, electrified and organised as never before. New sources of energy, new industries, new methods and new leading nations set it apart from the age of coal and cotton. In each of these respects it marked a decisive advance beyond the first revolution.

It rested on new sources of energy. Where the First Revolution had run on coal and steam, the Second harnessed electricity and oil. Electricity, generated by dynamos and carried along wires, powered factories, homes and whole cities. The internal combustion engine, burning petroleum, opened a new age of transport. These new energies freed industry from the steam engine and the coalfield, and gave it a flexibility it had never known.

It was founded upon science rather than craft. The First Revolution had sprung largely from the practical tinkering of self-taught inventors. The Second grew instead from the deliberate application of chemistry, physics and engineering. Trained scientists and research laboratories now stood behind industrial advance, above all in Germany's chemical and electrical firms. Industry and organised science became partners as never before.

It created wholly new industries. Steel, chemicals, electricals, oil and, above all, the motor car arose as great industries in these decades. Bessemer's process of 1856 made cheap steel plentiful, and Benz and Daimler built the first automobiles in the 1880s. These industries had no real counterpart in the earlier age of textiles. The economy grew broader, deeper and far more varied than before.

It introduced mass production. Henry Ford's moving assembly line, introduced in 1913, allowed goods to be made in vast quantities at low cost. Scientific management, devised by F. W. Taylor, broke work into measured tasks to raise output further. Production became a flowing, standardised process rather than a craft. The very methods of manufacture were transformed.

It was organised on a far larger scale. Great corporations, trusts and cartels replaced the family firm of the earlier age. Companies such as Standard Oil and the German chemical giants commanded vast capital and many plants at once. Industry grew concentrated in fewer and mightier hands. The scale of enterprise dwarfed anything seen in the first revolution.

Its leadership passed to new nations. Britain, the pioneer, was overtaken in the newest industries by the United States and Germany. These younger powers led the world in steel, chemicals and electricals by 1900. The centre of industrial gravity shifted across the Atlantic and the North Sea. The Second Revolution was no longer a British monopoly.

It transformed communication and daily life. The telephone, the telegraph, the electric light and, soon, the motor car and radio reshaped how people lived and spoke. Cities were lit, homes were wired, and distances were dramatically shrunk. Everyday existence was altered more intimately than in the first revolution. The transformation reached at last into the ordinary home.

The Second Industrial Revolution therefore differed from the First in its energies, its science, its industries, its methods, its scale and its leading nations. Electricity and oil replaced steam and coal, and organised science replaced practical craft, while mass production and giant corporations transformed the making of goods. It was a deeper and broader transformation, one that carried industry decisively into the modern age.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks how the Second Revolution differed, not for a narrative of inventions alone.

The trap is to describe new machines without ever contrasting them with the age of coal and cotton.

The top band organises the answer around clear points of difference: energy, science, scale and leadership.

Question 38

By 1900 Britain, the first industrial nation, had been overtaken in the newest industries by the United States and Germany. To account for this shift is to explain why the pioneer fell behind its younger rivals. Newer plant, better technical education, larger markets, protective tariffs and richer resources all favoured the challengers. Britain's very priority in industrialising became, in part, a handicap.

Britain was burdened by its early start. Having industrialised first, Britain was equipped with the older factories, machines and methods of an earlier age. Its capital was sunk in plant that owners were reluctant to scrap and replace. The newcomers, building afresh, installed the latest and most efficient equipment from the outset. The pioneer was thus overtaken by those who had started later and cleaner.

Germany and America led in technical education. Both nations invested heavily in schools, universities and industrial research. Germany in particular produced the trained chemists and engineers who drove its dye and electrical industries. Britain, by contrast, long neglected technical and scientific training. Superior education gave the rivals a decisive edge in the new science-based industries.

The challengers commanded vast home markets. The United States enjoyed a huge and unified continental market, while Germany's unification in 1871 created a large protected one. These great markets allowed production on an enormous scale and at low cost. Britain's home market was modest by comparison. Size of market fed directly into size of industry.

Protective tariffs shielded the newcomers. Germany and the United States guarded their young industries behind high tariff walls. This let their steel, chemical and electrical firms grow strong before facing full competition. Britain, wedded to free trade, left its own industries exposed to all comers. Protection nurtured the rivals while free trade tested Britain.

The rivals embraced the new industries more boldly. America and Germany seized the lead in steel, chemicals, electricals and, soon, motor cars. Britain remained heavily committed to its older staple trades of textiles and coal. The future lay with the very industries the challengers dominated. Britain backed the past while its rivals backed the future.

Large corporations concentrated their strength. American trusts and German cartels pooled capital, research and production on a great scale. Firms such as Standard Oil and the German chemical combines commanded resources no British family firm could match. This concentration bred both efficiency and power. The scale of enterprise strongly favoured the newcomers.

Natural resources aided the challengers. The United States possessed abundant coal, iron, oil and land within its own borders. Germany drew on the coal and iron of the Ruhr and Silesia. These rich resources fed their surging new industries. Britain's smaller endowment simply could not compete on the same scale.

Industrial leadership shifted from Britain to the United States and Germany because the challengers enjoyed newer plant, better education, larger markets, protective tariffs, bolder new industries and richer resources. Britain's early start, once its glory, had left it with ageing methods and a narrow attachment to its older trades. The pioneer was thus overtaken by the very industrial forces it had first set in motion.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of Britain's relative decline, not a list of rival achievements.

The trap is to forget that Britain's decline was relative rather than absolute, for its output still grew.

The top band weighs Britain's early-start handicap against the rivals' education, markets and tariffs.

Question 39

Steam had been the driving power of the First Industrial Revolution, and the claim casts electricity in the same role for the Second. The comparison is largely valid, for electricity, like steam, was a versatile new power that transformed industry, transport and daily life. Yet oil and the internal combustion engine shared that role in the Second Revolution, so electricity's primacy, though real, was not solitary.

Electricity, like steam, was a versatile source of power. It could drive machines, light cities, heat homes and carry messages, serving countless purposes at once. Steam had similarly powered factory, mine and railway across the first revolution. Both were general-purpose energies that spread through the whole economy. In this sheer breadth of use the comparison holds firmly.

It freed industry from old constraints, as steam had done. Steam had released the factory from the riverbank; electricity released it from the coal-fired engine-house. Power could now be carried along wires to wherever it was needed, and each machine driven separately. Factories could be sited and arranged with a new freedom. Each energy in its turn liberated production.

It transformed transport, as steam had. Steam had produced the railway and the steamship; electricity produced the tram, the underground railway and the electric train. Cities were bound together and within themselves by electric transit. Movement both within and between towns was transformed. Both energies, in their ages, remade the way people travelled.

It reshaped daily life more intimately than steam. The electric light, the telephone and, soon, domestic appliances entered the ordinary home. Streets and houses were lit as never before, and the night itself was pushed back. Electricity touched private life in ways that steam never had. Here it went beyond even its great predecessor.

It enabled wholly new industries. Electrical engineering, telecommunications and, in time, electronics grew up around the new power. Firms founded by pioneers such as Edison and Siemens led the way. These industries had no real equivalent in the age of steam. Electricity thus generated an entire new sector of the economy.

Yet oil and the engine shared its central role. The internal combustion engine, burning petroleum, drove the motor car, the lorry and the aeroplane. This second new energy was quite as transformative as electricity itself. The Second Revolution rested upon two great new powers, not one. Electricity's primacy must therefore be shared with oil.

The comparison holds in importance but not in solitude. Electricity was indeed the versatile new power of its age, as steam had been of its own. But steam had stood very largely alone, whereas electricity reigned alongside oil. The parallel is therefore strong but not exact. Electricity was a steam for its age, though not the only power of it.

The claim is largely valid. Electricity, like steam before it, was a versatile new energy that transformed industry, transport and daily life, and it generated whole new industries of its own. Yet the Second Revolution differed in resting on two great powers rather than one, for oil and the engine shared electricity's role. Electricity was, in truth, the steam of its age, but it did not reign alone.

Examiner's Note

"How valid" invites a strong parallel tempered by an important qualification.

The trap is to describe electricity's uses without ever making the comparison with steam.

The top band affirms the parallel yet notes that oil shared electricity's central role.

Question 40

Mass production, and the moving assembly line devised by Henry Ford in 1913, transformed the way goods were made in the twentieth century. To assess its impact is to weigh its great gains in output and wealth against its costs to the worker. It cheapened goods, created a consumer society and spread across the world, yet it also deskilled labour and bred monotony. Its effects were vast and deeply mixed.

It multiplied output enormously. The assembly line, along which the product moved past stationary workers, raised production to undreamed-of levels. Ford's factories could turn out a Model T in a fraction of the former time. Goods poured forth in quantities never before seen. Mass production made sheer abundance the hallmark of the new age.

It slashed the cost of goods. By producing on so great a scale, manufacturers cut the price of each article sharply. The Model T fell in price until ordinary families could at last afford a motor car. Cheap goods reached a mass market for the first time in history. Mass production thus democratised consumption.

It created a consumer society. As goods grew cheap and plentiful, ordinary people could buy cars, appliances and countless other manufactures. Advertising and hire-purchase encouraged this new appetite for goods. A society organised around consumption began to take shape. The mass-produced article reshaped everyday life and expectation.

It raised wages and living standards. Ford's five-dollar day of 1914 showed that mass production could pay high wages and still return a profit. Higher pay let workers buy the very goods that they made. Mass production and mass consumption thus reinforced one another. Prosperity spread widely, at least within the industrial nations.

Yet it deskilled and dehumanised labour. The assembly line reduced the worker to a single repeated motion, demanding no craft and allowing no initiative. Work became monotonous, exhausting and mind-numbing. The skilled artisan gave way to the interchangeable hand. The human cost of this efficiency was heavy.

It concentrated economic power. Mass production demanded huge factories and vast capital, and so favoured the giant corporation. Firms such as Ford and General Motors grew to command whole industries. Economic power gathered in ever fewer hands. The scale of the method reshaped the very structure of business.

It spread across the world. The methods of Ford and Taylor were copied in Europe, the Soviet Union and beyond. Mass production became the model for modern industry everywhere it reached. Even the planned economies eagerly embraced its techniques. Its influence extended far beyond the country of its birth.

Mass production and the assembly line therefore transformed twentieth-century industry for good and ill. They multiplied output, cheapened goods, raised living standards and created a consumer society, spreading worldwide as the very model of modern manufacture. Yet they also deskilled labour, bred monotony and concentrated economic power. Their impact was immense, but its blessings were bought at a real human cost.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants the gains weighed against the human costs, ending in a clear judgement.

The trap is to praise Ford's efficiency without noting the monotony and deskilling of the line.

The top band links mass production to consumer society while conceding the cost to the worker.

Question 41

The industrial revolutions of the twentieth century were powered by new sources of energy that succeeded coal and steam. To examine the contribution of electricity, oil and nuclear power is to see how each drove modern industrial growth. Electricity lit and powered industry, oil moved the world, and nuclear energy offered a vast new store of power. Together they carried industry from the age of steam into the modern age.

Electricity powered the modern factory. Carried along wires from central power stations, electricity drove machines cleanly and flexibly wherever it was needed. It freed the factory from the single steam engine and allowed each machine to be driven on its own. Production grew more efficient and adaptable as a result. Electricity became the everyday power of modern industry.

Electricity transformed daily life and new industries. The electric light, the telephone and a host of household appliances reshaped the home and the city. Whole industries of electrical engineering and, later, electronics grew up around it. Its uses multiplied across both economy and society. Electricity was as much a social force as an industrial one.

Oil provided a mobile and powerful fuel. Petroleum fed the internal combustion engine, which powered cars, lorries, ships and aircraft. Unlike coal, oil was liquid, portable and immensely energy-rich. It made possible a mobility that the age of steam had never known. Oil became the very lifeblood of modern transport and industry.

Oil underpinned new industries and world politics. The motor, aviation and petrochemical industries all rested squarely upon it. Great companies, and even nations, were built on the control of its supply. Oil became a central matter of world politics and of war. The fuel shaped not only industry but the course of international affairs.

Nuclear power offered a vast new source of energy. From the 1950s the splitting of the atom was harnessed to generate electricity on a large scale. A very small quantity of fuel could yield an immense output of power. Nuclear energy promised abundant electricity for industry and cities alike. It represented a wholly new order of energy.

Nuclear power carried grave risks and limits. Accidents, radioactive waste and the ever-present fear of weapons shadowed its use. Its high cost and danger limited how far it could spread. The promise of limitless clean energy was never fully realised. Nuclear power's contribution was real but sharply constrained by its perils.

Together the new energies remade industry. Electricity, oil and nuclear power between them replaced the coal and steam of the first revolution. Each in its way freed industry from old limits and opened fresh possibilities. Modern industrial growth rested squarely upon their combined power. The energies of the modern age transformed what industry could achieve.

Electricity, oil and nuclear power therefore made a decisive contribution to modern industrial growth. Electricity powered and lit the modern world, oil gave it mobility and new industries, and nuclear energy offered a vast if perilous new store of power. Between them they succeeded coal and steam and carried industry deep into the twentieth century. Modern industry was, above all, the child of its new energies.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks how each energy contributed, not for a general history of modern industry.

The trap is to treat the three energies together instead of weighing each of them in turn.

The top band credits each source specifically while noting nuclear power's real limits.

Question 42

The motor car, made affordable by mass production, became one of the defining objects of the twentieth century. The statement claims that it transformed society more than any other single invention. There is much force in this, for the car reshaped work, cities, leisure and the whole economy. Yet rivals such as electricity and the computer also have strong claims, so the verdict must be carefully weighed.

The car transformed personal mobility. It gave ordinary people a freedom of movement never before possible, to travel where and when they wished. Distance and rural isolation were overcome for millions at a stroke. The motor car put the wider world within reach of the individual. This new personal mobility reshaped daily life profoundly.

It reshaped the landscape and the city. Roads, motorways, suburbs and filling stations spread across the land to serve the car. Cities sprawled outward as people could now live far from their work. The very geography of modern life was rebuilt around the automobile. Its influence was written plainly upon the map.

It drove the wider economy. The motor industry became one of the largest in the world, employing millions directly and indirectly. Steel, oil, rubber and glass all came to feed upon it. Whole national economies grew dependent on car manufacture. The car was a mighty engine of employment and growth.

It changed work and leisure. Commuting by car reshaped where and how people worked, while the car opened new worlds of travel and holiday. Family life and recreation increasingly revolved around it. The rhythms of modern living came to follow the automobile. It altered how people spent both their labour and their leisure.

Yet it brought serious costs. Pollution, accidents, congestion and dependence on oil all followed in the car's wake. Thousands died on the roads each year, and cities choked upon its fumes. The great transformation carried a heavy price. The car's blessings came mingled with real and lasting harm.

Other inventions rival its claim. Electricity underlay the whole modern world, and the computer reshaped work, communication and knowledge alike. Each of these has a comparable claim to have transformed society. The car was by no means without powerful competitors. Its supremacy therefore cannot simply be assumed.

The car's uniqueness lay in its personal reach. Unlike electricity or the computer, the car placed transforming power directly in the hands of the individual. It was owned, driven and cherished by ordinary people in their millions. This intimate, personal impact set it apart from its rivals. In reshaping private life so directly, its claim remains strong.

The statement carries much validity but must be qualified. The motor car did transform twentieth-century society profoundly, reshaping mobility, cities, the economy and daily life as few inventions ever have. Yet electricity and the computer have comparable claims, and the car's benefits came with heavy costs. It was among the most transformative inventions of the age, though not the unchallenged greatest.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires weighing the car's claim against both its costs and its rivals.

The trap is to praise the car alone without ever considering electricity or the computer.

The top band grants the car's unique personal reach yet concedes serious costs and competitors.

Question 43

The twentieth century saw the rise of great multinational corporations that operated across many countries at once. To account for their rise is to explain why business grew beyond national borders. Advances in transport and communication, the search for markets and materials, the power of mass production and the freeing of trade all drove the process. Together they made the global firm both possible and profitable.

Mass production demanded ever larger markets. Firms that produced on a vast scale needed to sell far beyond their own home countries. Expanding abroad secured the wide markets that great output required. The very logic of mass production pushed companies outward. Scale at home led naturally to reach across the world.

New transport and communication made global business possible. Steamships, aircraft, the telephone and, later, the computer allowed firms to manage operations across whole continents. Goods, money and instructions moved swiftly around the world. Distance ceased to be a barrier to central control. Technology thus knit the global corporation together.

The search for raw materials drew firms abroad. Companies sought reliable supplies of oil, minerals and other materials in distant lands. Owning foreign mines, wells and plantations secured these vital resources. Control from source to sale favoured going multinational. Materials, quite as much as markets, pulled firms overseas.

Cheaper foreign labour attracted investment. Firms established factories abroad to take advantage of lower wages and costs. Producing where labour was cheap raised their profits considerably. This drew manufacturing across borders, especially later in the century. The pursuit of cheaper production spread the corporation worldwide.

Tariffs and trade barriers encouraged local production. To leap over foreign tariffs, firms built factories inside the countries they wished to sell in. Producing locally avoided the duties charged on imports. This turned mere exporters into true multinationals. Trade barriers thus paradoxically helped to spread the global firm.

The freeing of trade after 1945 aided expansion. Institutions such as the GATT lowered barriers and stabilised the post-war world economy. A more open and orderly trading system encouraged firms to spread abroad. Post-war prosperity further fuelled their growth. Liberalised trade gave the multinationals room to flourish.

Great profits and power rewarded scale. The largest firms accumulated capital and influence that dwarfed many nation-states. This wealth financed yet further expansion across the globe. Size bred the very means to grow still larger. The rich rewards of scale drove the corporation ever outward.

Multinational corporations rose in the twentieth century because mass production demanded wider markets, while new transport and communication made global operation possible. The search for materials and cheap labour, the leaping of tariffs, the freeing of trade and the rewards of sheer scale all drove the process. Together these forces carried the corporation beyond the nation and made it a genuine global power.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of the multinationals' rise, not a description of particular firms.

The trap is to describe what multinationals do rather than explain why they arose.

The top band links mass production and communication to the drive to operate across borders.

Question 44

The Third Industrial Revolution, from the mid-twentieth century, is often called the digital or information revolution. The question asks how far it rested on the computer and information technology. To a very great extent it did, for the computer and its offspring reshaped industry, work and communication. Yet other advances, in automation, energy and materials, also contributed, so the computer's role, though central, was not the whole story.

The computer was the defining machine of the age. From the first electronic computers of the 1940s to the microprocessor of 1971, computing power grew explosively. The computer became the characteristic instrument of the revolution, as the steam engine had been of the first. It stood at the very centre of the transformation. The age itself took its name from the machine.

Information technology transformed industry. Computers came to control machines, manage stock and design products with a new precision. Automated and computerised factories rose sharply in efficiency and flexibility. Whole industrial processes were placed under digital control. Industry was reshaped by the new power to process information.

The microprocessor spread computing everywhere. The invention of the microchip put computing power into machines, offices and homes. The personal computer, from the 1970s, brought it directly to the individual. Computing ceased to be confined to great institutions and governments. The chip carried the revolution into everyday life.

The internet bound the world together. Growing from ARPANET in 1969 to the World Wide Web of 1991, the internet linked computers across the entire globe. Information, commerce and communication now moved instantly worldwide. A new networked economy began to take shape. The internet was the crowning achievement of the digital revolution.

It created wholly new industries. Software, electronics, telecommunications and the digital services of Silicon Valley grew into vast industries. Firms unheard of before rose swiftly to dominate the economy. These industries had no counterpart in any earlier age. The revolution generated an entire new economic sector of its own.

Yet other advances also contributed. Automation and robotics, nuclear and other new energies, and new materials such as plastics and semiconductors all played their part. The revolution was by no means the computer alone. Several strands of advance ran forward together. Technology moved ahead on more than a single front.

Still, information technology tied the whole together. Automation, communication and design all came in time to depend upon computing. The computer was the common thread that ran through every other advance. It magnified and connected all the rest. Information technology was, in truth, the very heart of the wider transformation.

The Third Industrial Revolution rested to a very great extent on the computer and information technology, which reshaped industry, created new sectors and bound the world through the internet. The computer was its defining machine, as steam had been of the first revolution. Yet automation, new energies and new materials also contributed, so the computer led a wider transformation rather than standing wholly alone.

Examiner's Note

"To what extent" needs the computer's central role balanced against the other advances.

The trap is to list gadgets without showing how information technology reshaped industry itself.

The top band makes the computer the thread running through automation, industry and communication.

Question 45

Automation, the replacement of human labour by machines and computers, has transformed the modern workplace. To assess its social effects on the workforce is to weigh its benefits against its costs. It has relieved drudgery and raised productivity, yet it has also destroyed jobs and widened inequality. Its effects upon working people have been profound and double-edged.

It relieved workers of dangerous and dreary toil. Machines took over heavy, repetitive and hazardous tasks in factory and mine alike. Dirty and dangerous work was increasingly performed by machine rather than by hand. Labour grew safer and less exhausting for a great many workers. Automation freed them from much of the old drudgery.

It raised productivity and wealth. Automated production turned out more goods with far less labour, lowering costs and prices. The overall wealth of the industrial societies grew accordingly. Higher productivity could in principle support higher living standards. Automation thus enlarged the economic cake to be shared.

Yet it destroyed many traditional jobs. Machines replaced human workers on the assembly line and in the office alike. Whole categories of work, especially routine and unskilled tasks, simply disappeared. Many workers found their hard-won skills suddenly obsolete. Automation brought unemployment quite as surely as it brought efficiency.

It demanded new and higher skills. The automated workplace needed technicians, programmers and the educated rather than the unskilled labourer. Those without such skills were increasingly left behind. A high premium was now placed on training and knowledge. Automation reshaped the very kind of worker that was wanted.

It widened inequality. The skilled and educated prospered while the displaced and unskilled suffered. The gap between the winners and losers of automation steadily grew. Wealth flowed to those who owned or commanded the machines. Automation sharpened the divisions within the workforce itself.

It changed the very nature of work. Physical labour gave way to the tending, programming and supervision of machines. Work became more mental and less muscular than before. New patterns of employment, in service and knowledge work, arose. The essential character of work was transformed.

It raised the fear of a workless future. As machines grew ever more capable, many came to fear that human labour might become unnecessary. Debate arose over how societies would provide for the permanently displaced. The promise of new leisure mingled with the dread of redundancy. Automation thus cast a long shadow over the future of work.

Automation's social effects upon the workforce have therefore been profoundly mixed. It has relieved drudgery, raised productivity and created new kinds of work, yet it has destroyed old jobs, demanded new skills and widened inequality. For some it has meant liberation and prosperity; for others, displacement and hardship. Its blessings and its burdens have fallen very unevenly upon working people.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" requires the benefits of automation weighed against its real costs to workers.

The trap is to treat automation as simple progress and ignore those it displaces.

The top band shows automation both freeing and threatening labour, and widening inequality.

Question 46

The Fourth Industrial Revolution, driven by artificial intelligence, robotics and digital technology, is unfolding in the present century. The statement holds that it threatens as much as it promises. This is a fair judgement, for its powerful technologies offer both great benefits and grave dangers. To discuss it is to weigh its promise of abundance and progress against its threats to work, privacy and equality.

It promises immense gains in productivity. Artificial intelligence, robotics and automation can produce goods and services with unprecedented efficiency. Tasks that once needed many hands may soon be done by very few. Wealth and output could rise dramatically as a result. The revolution genuinely promises a new age of abundance.

It offers advances in knowledge and welfare. Great computing power, vast data and biotechnology promise progress in medicine, science and daily life. Diseases may be conquered and problems solved that long defied humanity. Human welfare could be very greatly advanced. The revolution holds out a real hope of betterment.

It threatens the widespread loss of work. Machines that can think as well as move may replace not only manual but skilled and professional labour. Whole occupations could vanish before them within a generation. Mass unemployment is therefore a genuine and pressing fear. The threat to livelihoods lies at the very heart of the anxiety.

It endangers privacy and freedom. The gathering of vast data and the spread of surveillance give governments and corporations new powers over the individual. Personal life grows ever more exposed to

watching eyes. The tools of control multiply alarmingly. The revolution threatens liberty quite as much as labour.

It may widen inequality still further. The owners of the new technologies stand to gain enormously, while the displaced may be left far behind. Wealth could concentrate in ever fewer hands and nations. The gap between rich and poor may grow wider than ever. The revolution risks deepening division across the world.

It raises new ethical and social dangers. Artificial intelligence poses questions of control, bias and even safety that are far from solved. Autonomous machines and weapons carry risks that are still unknown. Society is scarcely prepared to govern such powers. The revolution runs ahead of our wisdom to control it.

Its outcome depends upon human choice. Whether the revolution liberates or harms will turn on how it is governed and how its gains are shared. Wise policy might spread its benefits and curb its dangers. The technology in itself is neither good nor evil. The promise and the threat alike lie finally in human hands.

The statement is a fair one. The Fourth Industrial Revolution does indeed threaten as much as it promises, offering abundance, knowledge and welfare on the one hand, and unemployment, surveillance and inequality on the other. Whether promise or threat finally prevails will depend upon how wisely humanity governs its new powers. The revolution's ultimate character remains, for now, unwritten.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires both the promise and the threat to be weighed, not one of them alone.

The trap is to enthuse over new technology while ignoring its dangers, or the reverse.

The top band concludes that the final outcome depends on how the revolution is governed.

Question 47

The industrial revolutions of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries have shaped not only the advanced nations but the developing world. To examine their impact is to see how modern industry and technology have affected the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. They have brought both dependence and opportunity, widening old gaps yet also opening new paths. Their effects have been at once profound and deeply uneven.

They deepened economic dependence. The developing world was often confined to supplying raw materials to the industrial nations. Its economies were shaped to serve foreign industry rather than their own needs. This dependence closely echoed the pattern of the colonial age. Modern industry left many nations mere hewers of wood and drawers of water.

They widened the technology gap. The advanced nations pulled steadily ahead in science, industry and wealth. The developing world struggled to acquire or afford the new technologies. A vast gap in capability opened between the rich and poor nations. The revolutions plainly favoured those who already led.

They created a digital divide. Access to computers, the internet and modern communications was concentrated in the wealthy nations. Much of the developing world was left on the wrong side of this divide. Information and its many opportunities were very unequally shared. The digital age reproduced old inequalities in a new form.

Multinational corporations reshaped their economies. Global firms invested in the developing world for its resources and its cheap labour. This brought welcome capital and jobs, but also foreign control of key industries. The profits earned often flowed abroad rather than staying at home. The multinationals proved a decidedly mixed blessing for host nations.

Yet industry brought opportunity to some. Certain nations, especially in East Asia, seized the chance to industrialise rapidly. The "Asian tigers", and later China, rose to great prosperity within a generation. Manufacturing shifted markedly toward the developing world. For those who grasped it, industry offered a real path out of poverty.

New technology allowed some to leap ahead. The mobile telephone, for instance, spread across Africa without the need for old wired networks. Nations could adopt the very newest technology directly, skipping earlier stages. Such "leapfrogging" opened fresh and unexpected possibilities. Modern technology was not only a barrier but sometimes a genuine shortcut.

The overall effect was deeply uneven. Some nations rose while others fell still further behind, and within nations the gains were unequally shared. The revolutions rewarded some peoples and marginalised others. No single common fate befell the developing world. Their impact was, in truth, as varied as the nations themselves.

The modern industrial revolutions therefore affected the developing world profoundly but very unevenly. They deepened dependence, widened the technology and digital gaps, and gave multinationals great power over local economies. Yet they also offered opportunity, allowing some nations to industrialise and even to leapfrog old stages of growth. For the developing world the revolutions were at once a burden and a chance, and much depended on how each nation responded.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" wants the varied effects on the developing world analysed, not a general history.

The trap is to present only dependence and ignore the East Asian success stories.

The top band balances dependence and the digital divide against opportunity and leapfrogging.

Question 48

The First Industrial Revolution of the eighteenth century and the technological revolutions of the twentieth share the character of profound transformation, yet differ greatly in their means. To compare them is to see both what unites and what divides the age of steam and the age of the computer. Each remade industry and society, but through different energies, methods and reach. Their likeness and their difference are equally instructive.

Both transformed the basis of production. The First Revolution mechanised industry with steam and machinery; the twentieth-century revolutions automated and computerised it. Each changed fundamentally how goods were made. In this deep transformation of production the two ages are truly alike. Both were, in the fullest sense, revolutions.

Both rested on new sources of energy, but different ones. The First ran on coal and steam; the twentieth century on electricity, oil, nuclear power and, latterly, information. Each age harnessed the characteristic new power of its time. The energies differed, though the pattern of a new power was shared. Here likeness and difference meet in a single point.

Both were driven by invention, but of contrasting kinds. The First sprang from practical craftsmen tinkering with machines in workshops. The twentieth grew instead from organised science and great research laboratories. Invention became a deliberate and collective enterprise. The very source of new ideas had changed, as craft gave way to science.

Both reshaped society, but at very different speeds. The First unfolded slowly over several generations; the twentieth-century revolutions moved with startling rapidity. Change came ever faster as the later century advanced. The pace of transformation itself accelerated sharply. Time seemed to compress between the two ages.

Both created new industries and new classes. The First made the factory proletariat and the industrial bourgeoisie; the twentieth made technicians, knowledge workers and a vast service economy. Each age generated its own distinctive social order. The structure of society was remade in both. New kinds of work bred new kinds of class.

The twentieth-century revolutions were far more global. The First began and long remained centred in Britain; the modern revolutions spread swiftly across the whole world. Technology now diffused with an

unprecedented speed. The later transformation was worldwide almost from the start. Its reach far exceeded that of steam.

The modern revolutions touched the mind as well as the muscle. The First had multiplied physical power through the machine; the twentieth multiplied mental power through the computer. Information and knowledge, and not merely force, were now transformed. This marked an entirely new frontier of change. The revolutions moved, in effect, from the body to the brain.

In comparison, the First Industrial Revolution and the technological revolutions of the twentieth century were alike in transforming production, energy, invention and society, yet they differed sharply in their means and their reach. Steam gave way to electricity, oil and the computer; craft gave way to science; and a British beginning gave way to a global transformation touching the mind itself. They were kindred revolutions of different ages, each remaking the world in its own way.

Examiner's Note

"Compare" requires likeness and difference set point against point, not two separate accounts.

The trap is to describe each revolution in turn without ever drawing the comparison.

The top band pairs each shared feature with the way the two ages differed within it.

Question 49

Globalisation, the drawing together of the world's economies and societies into a single system, advanced dramatically across the twentieth century. The statement calls it the child of that century's industrial revolutions. This is largely persuasive, for modern industry and technology supplied both the means and the motives of global integration. Yet globalisation had older roots too, so the industrial revolutions were its chief parent rather than its only one.

Modern transport shrank the world. The steamship, the aeroplane and the container ship carried goods and people across the globe swiftly and cheaply. Distance ceased to divide markets as sharply as it once had. The world was steadily knit together by modern carriage. Industry's transport made global exchange truly possible.

Modern communication united it further. The telegraph, telephone, satellite and internet allowed instant contact across whole continents. Information and money now moved around the world in a matter of moments. Business could be conducted globally and in real time. Communication technology bound the world tightly into one.

Mass production sought global markets. Firms that produced on a vast scale needed to sell and to source across the world. This drove an unceasing search for foreign markets and materials. Production itself pushed outward beyond the boundaries of the nation. Industry's sheer scale demanded a global reach.

Multinational corporations spread across borders. Great firms operating in many countries wove the world economy ever more tightly together. They organised production and trade on a truly global scale. Their networks became the very sinews of globalisation. The corporation carried integration across the whole earth.

The digital revolution created a global economy. The internet allowed commerce, finance and services to operate worldwide and instantly. Capital could flow across borders at the mere touch of a key. A single, networked world economy at last emerged. The computer completed what earlier industry had begun.

Yet globalisation had older roots. Trade, empire and migration had linked the world long before the twentieth century. The First Industrial Revolution had already begun to bind the globe together. Modern industry deepened a process that was already well under way. Globalisation was not born wholly in the twentieth century.

Still, the modern revolutions transformed its scale. What had been a slow and partial integration became swift, deep and truly worldwide. The twentieth century turned earlier links into a single global system. The

change of degree became, in effect, a change of kind. The modern revolutions made globalisation what it is today.

One may largely agree with the statement. The twentieth-century industrial revolutions supplied the transport, communication, mass production and corporations that drove globalisation, and the digital revolution completed a single world economy. Yet globalisation had older roots in trade and empire, so the modern revolutions deepened and transformed a process already begun. They were its chief parent, turning ancient links into the integrated world of today.

Examiner's Note

"How far" invites strong agreement tempered by globalisation's older roots in trade and empire.

The trap is to date all globalisation from the twentieth century and ignore what went before.

The top band credits modern industry with transforming the very scale of an older process.

Question 50

The industrial revolutions of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries have brought great wealth, but not to all nations alike. The view holds that they have widened the gap between rich and poor nations. This is largely valid, for the advanced nations have often pulled still further ahead. Yet some once-poor nations have risen with remarkable speed, so the picture is more complex than a simple, uniform widening.

The industrial nations advanced fastest. Those nations already rich commanded the new technologies, capital and skills, and so grew richer still. The gains of each new revolution flowed chiefly to them. The lead of the advanced nations steadily lengthened. Wealth bred the very means to greater wealth.

The developing world often supplied raw materials. Many poor nations remained mere producers of primary goods for the industrial economies. This dependent role kept them at the bottom of the global order. They gained little of the wealth their own materials helped to create. The structure of world trade continued to favour the rich.

The technology and digital gaps grew. Access to advanced science, industry and computing was concentrated in the wealthy nations. The poor struggled to acquire or even to afford the new technologies. A widening gap in capability opened between rich and poor. The revolutions rewarded, above all, those who already led.

Wealth and power concentrated in multinational firms. Global corporations, based mostly in the rich nations, commanded much of the world's industry and profit. Their gains flowed largely back to their home countries. Economic power gathered where it was already greatest. This concentration further deepened the divide.

Yet some poor nations rose dramatically. The East Asian "tigers", and later China and India, industrialised and grew rich with remarkable speed. They seized the very opportunities the revolutions offered. For them the gap narrowed rather than widened. The global pattern was plainly not one of universal widening.

Technology sometimes helped the poor advance. Innovations such as the mobile telephone spread rapidly through the developing world. Some nations leapt clean over the older stages of development. Modern technology offered shortcuts as well as barriers. It could narrow gaps quite as much as widen them.

The overall picture is one of uneven divergence. Between the very richest and poorest the gap has generally widened, yet a rising middle group has advanced fast. The revolutions have divided the developing world as much as separated it from the rich. Their effect on global inequality has therefore been complex. The gap widened in general, but not without important exception.

The view is largely valid but requires qualification. The modern industrial revolutions have on the whole widened the gap between the richest and poorest nations, through dependence, the technology gap and the concentration of wealth. Yet some once-poor nations have risen swiftly by seizing the new opportunities,

and technology has sometimes narrowed gaps as well as opened them. The revolutions have deepened global inequality overall, but their effects have been uneven rather than uniform.

Examiner's Note

"Assess the validity" needs the claim of widening weighed against the East Asian success stories.

The trap is to assert a simple, universal widening and ignore China and the tigers.

The top band affirms a general widening while conceding uneven divergence and leapfrogging.

Question 51

An administrative system is the organised structure through which a state governs its people, collects its revenue and maintains order. To examine the main features of ancient administrative systems is to see what the great early states of Egypt, Mesopotamia, Greece and Rome held in common. Most rested upon strong central authority, a bureaucracy, religion, law, taxation and armed force. These features together made settled government possible across the ancient world.

Most were built on strong central authority. Power was usually concentrated in a king, pharaoh or emperor who stood at the very summit of the state. This central ruler gave the whole system its unity and its direction, so that policy issued from a single source. Even where assemblies or councils existed, one supreme authority commonly prevailed over them. Concentrated power was, in most cases, the very backbone of ancient government.

They depended on a trained bureaucracy. Officials, scribes and governors carried out the ruler's will across the length of the land. In Egypt the vizier and the scribes managed the realm, while in Rome magistrates and provincial governors did the same. This body of trained officials translated royal command into daily administration. No government of any size could function without such servants.

Religion sanctified the state. Rulers often claimed divine descent or the special favour of the gods, as the pharaoh did in Egypt. Religion bound subjects to obedience and clothed the ruler's authority in a sacred awe. Temple and throne thus supported and reinforced one another. Belief was among the strongest and cheapest pillars of ancient rule.

Law regulated society. Written codes such as Hammurabi's in Babylon and the Twelve Tables in Rome defined rights, duties and punishments for all. Law gave order and a measure of predictability to communal life. It bound both ruler and ruled within a single shared framework. Justice, written and known, was central to any lasting government.

Taxation sustained the state. Governments levied taxes in grain, goods, money or labour to support their courts, armies and public works. Egypt taxed the yearly harvest of the Nile, and Rome the produce of its many provinces. This steady revenue was the very lifeblood of administration. No state could rule for long without the means to pay its servants.

Armed force upheld authority. Armies defended the state against its external enemies and enforced obedience within its borders. The disciplined legions of Rome and the levies of Egypt secured their rulers' power. Force remained the ultimate guarantee of both order and revenue. Behind every ancient throne there stood, in the end, the sword.

Writing and record-keeping enabled administration. The invention of writing allowed laws, taxes, harvests and accounts to be recorded and preserved. Scribes kept the registers and archives on which orderly government depended. Writing alone made complex, large-scale administration possible at all. The written word was the indispensable tool of the ancient state.

The administrative systems of the ancient world therefore shared certain essential features: central authority, a bureaucracy, religion, law, taxation, armed force and written record. These elements, combined in varying ways from Egypt to Rome, made settled and lasting government possible. Though the forms differed from state to state, the underlying machinery of government was recognisably the same across the ancient world.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks for the common features analysed, not a description of one civilisation alone.

The trap is to narrate the history of Egypt or Rome rather than identify the shared features.

The top band draws examples from several ancient states to illustrate each feature.

Question 52

In ancient Egypt the pharaoh was regarded not merely as a ruler but as a living god upon earth. The claim holds that this divine kingship was the very foundation of Egyptian administration. It is largely valid, for the pharaoh's godhead gave the whole system its authority and its unity. Yet a practical bureaucracy and the wealth of the Nile were also essential, so divine kingship was the foundation but not the entire structure.

The pharaoh was held to be a god on earth. He was identified with the god Horus in life and with Osiris in death, and was called the son of the sun-god Ra. This divinity set him utterly above all his subjects, in a class quite apart. His word therefore carried the very authority of heaven itself. Godhead was the ultimate source of all his power.

Divine kingship gave the state its unity. All authority flowed downward from the single sacred person of the pharaoh. This concentration of power bound the whole of Egypt into one realm under one god-king. The unity of so long and narrow a land rested squarely upon his unique status. One god, in effect, meant one government.

It commanded the obedience of the people. Because the pharaoh was divine, to obey him was a religious duty and to resist him a sacrilege. Subjects rendered their labour and their taxes as though offering them to a god. Religion thus secured a willing and largely unforced submission. Belief did the quiet work of a thousand soldiers.

It justified the pharaoh's vast powers. As a living god, the pharaoh owned the land, commanded the labour of the people and directed the religion of the state. His divinity legitimised this sweeping and wholly unchecked authority. No earthly power or law could stand against a god. Divinity itself licensed his absolute rule.

It sustained great collective works. The building of the pyramids and temples, and the control of the Nile's irrigation, required the devoted labour of the whole people. Belief in the god-king inspired and organised this immense collective effort. Divine kingship could thus mobilise the entire nation at once. Faith itself, as much as force, raised the pyramids.

Yet a practical bureaucracy was also essential. The vizier, the nomarchs and the scribes actually governed the land day by day. Divine authority still needed human officials to gather the taxes and keep order. Administration rested on this trained service quite as much as on godhead. The god-king, in truth, ruled through mortal hands.

The wealth of the Nile underpinned the whole. The river's yearly flood produced the great agricultural surplus that fed the state and its many officials. Without this natural abundance no administration could have functioned at all. Divine kingship presided over, but did not itself create, this wealth. The Nile, in the end, paid for the pharaoh's rule.

The claim is largely valid. Divine kingship was indeed the foundation of Egyptian administration, for it gave the state its authority, its unity and the willing obedience of its people. Yet the system also rested upon a practical bureaucracy and the wealth of the Nile, without which even the god-king could not have ruled. Divinity was the foundation, but human service and natural abundance completed the structure.

Examiner's Note

"How valid" invites strong agreement tempered by the practical bases of Egyptian rule.

The trap is to describe pyramids and gods without ever linking divinity to administration.

The top band grants divine kingship as the foundation while crediting bureaucracy and the Nile.

Question 53

Ancient Egypt sustained one of the most durable and efficient administrations of the ancient world for some three thousand years. To account for this efficiency is to explain how so vast a realm came to be so well governed. Divine kingship, a trained bureaucracy, the unifying Nile, writing, taxation, provincial government and religion all contributed. Together they made Egyptian government remarkably orderly and long-lasting.

Divine kingship gave the system unquestioned authority. The pharaoh's godhead secured obedience without the need for constant force or supervision. His commands were obeyed throughout the land as the very will of a god. This willing submission made the daily work of government smooth and efficient. Authority flowed unopposed and unquestioned from the throne.

A trained bureaucracy carried out the work. The vizier headed a great hierarchy of officials, scribes and governors who managed the realm. Each of them knew his own duties and his place within the settled order. This disciplined and permanent service translated the pharaoh's will into action. Skilled officials were, in truth, the engine of the state.

The Nile unified and enriched the land. The river bound the whole of Egypt together as a single artery of transport and of trade. Its annual flood produced the surplus of grain that fed the state and its servants. Geography itself thus favoured a strong and centralised rule. The Nile made a single, governable Egypt possible.

Writing enabled precise record-keeping. The scribes recorded taxes, harvests, laws and accounts with great and lasting care. These records allowed the state to plan, to tax and to govern with real accuracy. The whole administration rested squarely upon the written word. Egypt, in a real sense, governed by the pen.

A well-organised system of taxation funded the state. Officials assessed and collected the produce of the land, storing grain against the years of famine. This steady revenue supported the court, the priesthood and the great public works. Sound finance quietly sustained an efficient rule. The granaries were, in effect, the treasury of Egypt.

Provincial government extended the centre's reach. The land was divided into districts, or nomes, each under a governor answerable to the pharaoh. This structure carried royal authority out to every corner of the realm. Local officials applied the central policy upon the ground. The provinces were thus firmly bound to the throne.

Religion reinforced order and stability. The priesthood upheld the divine order, or maat, that the pharaoh himself embodied and defended. Belief in this cosmic order encouraged both obedience and continuity. Religion and administration therefore worked together as one. Faith itself steadied and preserved the whole state.

The efficiency of ancient Egyptian administration is therefore explained by the union of divine authority with practical organisation. Divine kingship secured obedience, a trained bureaucracy did the work, and the Nile, writing, taxation, provincial government and religion all sustained the system. Together these made Egyptian government one of the most orderly and enduring the ancient world ever produced.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of efficiency, not a general description of Egyptian society.

The trap is to dwell on the pharaoh alone and ignore the bureaucracy and the Nile.

The top band shows divine authority and practical organisation working together.

Question 54

The Code of Hammurabi, promulgated by the Babylonian king Hammurabi around 1750 BCE, was one of the earliest and fullest written law codes of the ancient world. To assess its importance is to weigh its part in the administration of Babylon. It gave the state a common law, upheld royal authority and imposed order,

though custom and the king's own will also governed. It was a cornerstone, though not the whole, of Babylonian rule.

It gave Babylon a single written law. The code's some 282 provisions covered trade, property, family and crime across the whole realm. A common written law now replaced the varied and uncertain customs of many separate cities. This new unity greatly strengthened the administration of a diverse kingdom. One law, publicly proclaimed, now bound many scattered communities together.

It made justice public and predictable. The laws were carved upon a great stone stele, set up for all to see and to consult. Because they were known in advance, subjects could foresee the consequences of their actions. This predictability was the very essence of orderly and fair government. Justice thereby ceased to be arbitrary or the mere whim of an official.

It upheld the authority of the king. Hammurabi presented himself as the god-appointed giver of justice to his people. The code clothed his rule in the double sanction of the gods and of the law. Royal power was thereby both legitimised and greatly strengthened. The written law was made to serve and to glorify the throne.

It regulated economic and social life. The code fixed prices, wages and the terms of loans, trade and marriage among the people. This detailed regulation brought a welcome order to Babylon's busy commercial economy. Administration thus reached down into the smallest daily transactions. Law, in effect, organised the very marketplace of Babylon.

It embodied the principle of retribution. The famous rule of "an eye for an eye" set punishment in proportion to the offence, though it varied by class. This principle gave a rough but visible justice and helped to deter wrongdoing. Order was maintained through a healthy fear of the law. Retribution, plainly displayed, helped to uphold the public peace.

Yet custom and the king still governed much. Not every matter of life was covered by the code, and the king's personal will remained supreme above it. Local custom continued in force alongside the new written law. The code therefore guided but did not wholly replace royal power. Law and ruler, in practice, governed the kingdom together.

Its influence outlasted Babylon itself. The code shaped later law throughout the region and stands today as a model of early codified justice. Its example endured for centuries after the kingdom itself had fallen. Babylon's law thus outlived both Babylon's power and its empire. The stele still speaks, across the ages, to later generations.

The Code of Hammurabi was therefore of great importance to the administration of ancient Babylon. It gave the kingdom a single, public and predictable law, upheld the king's authority and regulated economic and social life. Yet custom and royal will still governed much beside it. The code was a genuine cornerstone of Babylonian administration, and one of the enduring achievements of the ancient world.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants the code's importance weighed, with its limits honestly acknowledged.

The trap is to recite "an eye for an eye" without explaining the code's administrative role.

The top band credits the written, public law while noting custom and royal power beside it.

Question 55

Religion and government were rarely separate in the ancient world, for belief and rule were closely entwined. To examine the role of religion in ancient administrative systems is to see how faith upheld the state. Religion sanctified rulers, secured obedience, provided officials and justified law. In these ways it was among the strongest supports of ancient government.

It sanctified the ruler. Kings and pharaohs claimed divine descent or the direct favour of the gods, as they did in Egypt and Babylon. This clothed their authority in a sacred and unquestionable awe. To rule at all was, in effect, to hold a religious office. Godhead or divine favour thus legitimised earthly power.

It secured the obedience of subjects. Because rulers were held to be sacred, obedience became a religious duty and rebellion a sin. Faith bound people to the state far more firmly than force alone ever could. Religion made subjects willing servants as well as fearful ones. Belief quietly upheld the whole social order.

It provided a class of officials. Priesthoods administered temples, lands and sometimes justice, forming part of the very machinery of state. In Egypt the priesthood was a great and immensely powerful institution. Religion thus supplied a body of literate, trained servants of government. Temple and state, in practice, shared their officers.

It justified law and morality. Law was very often presented as the direct will of the gods, as Hammurabi's code expressly claimed. This gave the law an authority reaching far beyond the king alone. Religion thereby underwrote the very rules of society. Divine will was made to stand behind all human law.

It unified the state. A common religion bound diverse peoples into a single community under the same shared gods. Great temples and public festivals expressed and constantly strengthened this unity. Faith was therefore a powerful bond holding the realm together. Shared worship helped, over time, to make shared subjects.

It sustained great public works. Belief inspired the building of temples, pyramids and monuments, and the vast labour these required. Religion mobilised the people's devotion and organised their collective effort. Faith itself raised the great enduring works of the ancient state. Devotion, quite as much as command, built the monuments.

Yet religion could also rival the state. Powerful priesthoods, as happened at times in Egypt, might challenge or constrain the ruler himself. Faith was by no means always the obedient servant of the throne. Religion could therefore check as well as support the ruler's power. The temple, on occasion, openly contested the palace.

Religion therefore played a central role in the administrative systems of the ancient world. It sanctified rulers, secured obedience, supplied officials, justified law and unified the state, and it inspired the great works of antiquity. On occasion it even rivalled the throne itself. In the ancient world, to govern was very largely to command in the name of the gods.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks how religion supported administration, not for an account of ancient beliefs.

The trap is to describe gods and temples without linking them to the work of government.

The top band shows religion sanctifying rule and even, at times, rivalling it.

Question 56

Ancient Athens is celebrated as the birthplace of democracy, in which the citizens ruled themselves directly. The statement claims that this democracy was democracy only in name. There is real force in the charge, for a large majority of the population was wholly excluded from power. Yet within the citizen body the system was genuinely and radically democratic. The truth lies between the two extremes.

Athenian democracy excluded the majority. Women, slaves and resident foreigners, or metics, had no political rights of any kind. Only adult male citizens, perhaps a fifth of the whole population, could take any part. The great majority of those living in Athens were thus shut out entirely. Democracy, in this sense, was plainly for the few and not the many.

Slavery underpinned the whole system. The leisure that citizens enjoyed for politics rested squarely on the labour of their slaves. A democracy of masters was therefore built upon the backs of the unfree. This

deep dependence gravely undercuts its democratic claim. Freedom for some, in truth, rested upon bondage for others.

Women were wholly excluded from public life. Athenian women could neither vote, hold office nor own significant property in their own right. Fully half of the free population thus had no political voice at all. This exclusion was total, unquestioned and lifelong. The demos, for all its pride, simply did not include its women.

Yet within the citizen body rule was genuinely popular. All citizens could speak and vote in the Assembly, which decided the great questions of state. Real power lay directly in the people's own hands, not merely their representatives'. This was democracy in a fuller and more direct sense than any modern system. The citizens, quite literally, governed themselves.

Office was open and accountable. Most offices were filled by lot and held only briefly, so that ordinary citizens governed in turn. Officials were closely scrutinised and could be tried and punished for failure. This deliberately prevented a permanent ruling class from ever forming. Power was shared out among the citizens, not monopolised by a few.

Payment enabled the poor to participate. Pericles introduced pay for public office and for jury service, so that even poor citizens could take part. Democracy was thereby not confined to the wealthy and leisured few. Participation was, in this way, made real for the common man. The system deliberately reached down to the ordinary citizen.

It was radical by the standards of its age. Compared with the monarchies and oligarchies all around it, Athens gave unprecedented power to ordinary men. Its democracy, however limited, was a genuinely remarkable achievement. Its exclusions, moreover, were common to every ancient society. Athens, whatever its faults, went further than any state before it.

The statement is therefore only half true. Athenian democracy did exclude women, slaves and foreigners, the great majority of the population, and in that sense fell far short of its name. Yet within the citizen body it was genuinely and radically democratic, giving ordinary men a direct share in power unmatched in the ancient world. It was a real democracy, though undeniably a narrow one.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires the exclusions weighed against the genuine democracy among citizens.

The trap is to condemn or praise Athens wholesale rather than balancing the two sides.

The top band judges Athens by both modern and ancient standards before concluding.

Question 57

Democracy did not appear in Athens all at once but developed through a series of reforms over some two centuries. To account for its development is to explain the causes and the stages of this remarkable change. Economic grievances, wise reformers, the decline of the old aristocracy and the demands of war and trade all played their part. Together they carried Athens from aristocracy to democracy.

Aristocratic misrule provoked discontent. Early Athens was ruled by a narrow and jealous nobility, and debt and injustice bred deep anger among the poor. Many small farmers had even fallen into debt-slavery to the rich. This mounting discontent created a strong and lasting pressure for reform. Grievance, in the end, first set the whole change in motion.

Solon's reforms began the process. Around 594 BCE Solon cancelled existing debts, ended debt-slavery and opened some offices by wealth rather than by birth. He gave the poorer citizens a real, if still limited, voice in the assembly. These measures laid the first foundations of democracy. Solon, in effect, opened the door to lasting change.

The reforms of Cleisthenes carried it further. In 508 BCE Cleisthenes reorganised the citizens into local demes and created the Council of Five Hundred. He deliberately broke the old power of the great noble

families. This is often called the true birth of Athenian democracy. Cleisthenes built the enduring framework of the whole system.

The growth of trade strengthened the common people. As Athens prospered through commerce and the sea, a class of merchants and craftsmen grew in wealth and confidence. These middling citizens increasingly demanded rights to match their new standing. Prosperity thus steadily fed the democratic movement. Trade, over time, empowered the ordinary demos.

Naval warfare raised the poorer citizens. The poor who rowed the fleet at Salamis in 480 BCE and after became vital to the power of Athens. Their indispensable service earned them growing political weight and confidence. The navy gave the common man a strong claim to a share in rule. The oar, in effect, helped to win the vote.

Pericles completed the radical democracy. In the mid-fifth century Pericles introduced pay for office and further extended the people's power. Even the very poorest citizen could now take a full and active part. Democracy reached its fullest ancient form under his leadership. Pericles, in this way, crowned the long work of reform.

Each stage built upon the last. The reforms of Solon, Cleisthenes and Pericles together formed a single continuous development. Each in turn extended power more widely than the one before it. Democracy thus grew by steady stages rather than by a single leap. The whole achievement was, in truth, the labour of many generations.

The development of democracy in Athens is therefore explained by a combination of grievance, reform and social change. Aristocratic misrule provoked demands that Solon, Cleisthenes and Pericles answered with successive reforms, while trade and naval war raised the common people. Step by step over two centuries, Athens moved from the rule of the few to the rule of the many.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes and stages of democracy's growth, not a portrait of Athens.

The trap is to name Pericles alone and omit Solon and Cleisthenes before him.

The top band traces the reforms as a connected development driven by social change.

Question 58

Athens and Sparta, the two greatest Greek city-states, developed strikingly different systems of government. To compare them is to set a democracy against a militarised oligarchy. They differed in who ruled, in their guiding aims and in their whole way of life, though both were self-governing states of citizens. Their famous contrast lit up the political life of all Greece.

Athens was a democracy; Sparta an oligarchy. In Athens the assembly of all citizens held the real power, while in Sparta a few institutions and elders ruled. The one system trusted the many, the other only the few. This was the deepest and most decisive of all their differences. Popular rule stood squarely against narrow rule.

Their governing institutions differed sharply. Athens governed through the Assembly, the Council of Five Hundred and large courts of citizens. Sparta was ruled by two hereditary kings, a council of elders, or Gerousia, and five overseeing ephors. The very structures of each reflected their opposite spirits. Assembly faced council and king.

Their aims stood in stark contrast. Athens prized freedom, culture and commerce above all; Sparta prized military strength and discipline. The one produced philosophers and playwrights, the other produced only soldiers. Their differing values plainly shaped their differing governments. Culture, in short, faced the armed camp.

Their treatment of citizens differed greatly. Athenian citizens lived varied lives of trade, politics, art and leisure. Spartan citizens, by contrast, were trained from early boyhood in the agoge for war alone. Sparta

subordinated the individual wholly and permanently to the state. Personal freedom thus faced a lifelong regimentation.

Both rested on unfree labour. Athenian democracy relied upon its many slaves, and Spartan society upon the helots who farmed its land. Neither city extended its citizenship at all widely to others. In this respect both were narrow by any modern standard. Both, in truth, were built upon the labour of the unfree.

Both excluded women from power, though differently. Neither city gave its women any political rights whatever, yet Spartan women enjoyed far more freedom and property than Athenian ones. The famous contrast between the cities extended even to their women. Exclusion, in each of them, simply took a different form.

Their stability differed markedly. Sparta's rigid system was stable but unchanging and inward-looking, while the democracy of Athens was vigorous but often prone to turbulence. The one endured by iron discipline, the other flourished by its openness. Order thus faced vitality. Each city, in the end, paid a price for its own chief virtue.

In comparison, Athens and Sparta embodied opposite ideals of government. Athens was an open democracy prizing freedom, culture and commerce; Sparta a disciplined oligarchy wholly devoted to war. Yet both were citizen states that rested on unfree labour and excluded women from power. Their famous contrast came to define the political imagination of Greece and of the ancient world.

Examiner's Note

"Compare" requires a point-against-point contrast, not two separate descriptions.

The trap is to describe Athens fully and Sparta fully without ever comparing them.

The top band pairs democracy against oligarchy across institutions, aims and society.

Question 59

The democracy of ancient Athens gave ordinary citizens a direct share in ruling their city. To assess its strengths and weaknesses is to weigh what it achieved against what it lacked. It gave real freedom, participation and accountability, yet it was narrow, unstable and at times prone to rashness. It was a noble experiment carrying serious flaws.

It gave citizens genuine self-government. All citizens could speak and vote in the Assembly on the great questions of state. Real power lay directly in the people's own hands rather than their rulers'. This was a real and, in its day, an exceedingly rare freedom. Athens, quite genuinely, governed itself.

It made office accountable. Officials chosen by lot served only briefly and were closely and regularly scrutinised. No ruling class or faction could entrench or perpetuate itself in power. This strict accountability guarded the city against the rise of tyranny. Power was thereby kept firmly in check.

It drew on the talents of many. By opening politics to all its citizens, Athens harnessed a wide range of ability and opinion. Open and vigorous debate sharpened and tested every decision. Broad participation genuinely enriched the quality of government. Many minds, working together, served the state.

It fostered civic spirit and culture. Sharing directly in rule gave citizens a deep stake and a real pride in their city. This civic spirit nourished the great age of Athenian art, drama and thought. Democracy and high culture thus flourished together in Athens. Freedom itself, in a real sense, helped to feed its genius.

Yet it excluded most of the population. Women, slaves and foreigners had no share whatever in political power. The celebrated democracy was confined to a small minority of the whole. Its freedom, however genuine, was very narrowly held indeed. Most who actually lived in Athens were shut out of it.

It could be rash and unstable. The Assembly might be swayed by clever speakers or by sudden passion into unwise decisions. Ambitious demagogues could flatter, mislead and inflame the people. Direct rule by the crowd always risked hasty and emotional judgement. The people could, and on occasion did, err very gravely.

It sometimes punished its best men. Athens exiled able leaders through ostracism and famously put the philosopher Socrates to death in 399 BCE. Popular feeling could turn cruel or unjust in a single moment. The system was capable of devouring its own finest citizens. Democracy, plainly, had its darker and more dangerous side.

The Athenian democratic system was therefore a mixture of high strengths and real weaknesses. It gave genuine self-government, accountability and civic vigour, and it nourished one of history's great civilisations. Yet it excluded the majority, could act rashly, and sometimes turned cruelly upon its finest citizens. It remains an inspiring but also a cautionary model of popular rule.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" requires strengths and weaknesses weighed toward a balanced judgement.

The trap is to praise Athenian freedom without noting its exclusions and its rashness.

The top band credits genuine self-rule while conceding narrowness and instability.

Question 60

The Roman Republic, which lasted from 509 to 27 BCE, governed Rome through a balance of magistrates, senate and popular assemblies. To examine its features is to see how Rome combined elements of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy in one constitution. Power was shared, limited and checked among these several bodies. This mixed constitution was long admired as a model of balanced government.

Executive power lay with elected magistrates. Two consuls, elected annually by the citizens, headed the state and commanded its armies. Their short and shared term deliberately prevented any one man from seizing lasting power. Lesser magistrates, such as praetors and quaestors, handled justice and finance. Power was thus divided among many and held only briefly.

The Senate guided the state. This council of experienced men, mostly former magistrates, controlled finance and foreign policy and advised the magistrates. Though formally only advisory, its practical authority was immense and abiding. The Senate gave the republic its continuity, its memory and its wisdom. It was, in effect, the very anchor of the state.

Popular assemblies gave citizens a voice. The assemblies of citizens elected the magistrates, passed the laws and declared war and peace. Through them the ordinary people shared directly in the work of government. This democratic element balanced the aristocratic power of the Senate. The people, in this way, genuinely had their part.

The tribunes protected the common people. Officials called tribunes of the plebs could veto any act that harmed the ordinary citizens. They guarded the plebeians against the power and ambition of the nobility. This unusual office checked the great men of the state. The common man thus had a powerful shield of his own.

Power was balanced and checked. Magistrates, Senate and assemblies each limited the others, and every office was collegial and brief. This careful balance deliberately guarded against tyranny of any kind. No single element of the state could dominate all the rest. The constitution, in a real sense, restrained itself.

Law regulated the state. The Twelve Tables of 451 BCE set down the rights and duties of citizens in writing for all to see. From these beginnings Roman law grew into a vast and sophisticated system. Law came to bind rulers and ruled alike within one frame. Rome governed, above all else, by its law.

The system rested on citizenship and service. Citizens owed military service to the state and enjoyed political rights in return. This reciprocal bond of duty and privilege held the republic firmly together. Citizenship was thus the very foundation of the whole state. The citizen was, in truth, its cornerstone.

The administrative system of the Roman Republic therefore rested on a balance of magistrates, Senate and assemblies, checked by the tribunes and bound by law. It blended monarchy, aristocracy and democracy

into a mixed constitution that both shared and limited power. This balanced system governed Rome for nearly five centuries and became a lasting model of republican government.

Examiner's Note
"Examine" asks for the features of the republic analysed, not the story of its fall.
The trap is to drift into the civil wars rather than describe the constitution itself.
The top band shows the balance of magistrates, Senate and assemblies as a mixed system.

Question 61

In 27 BCE the Roman Republic gave way to the rule of a single emperor under Augustus. To account for this transformation is to explain why the republic fell and the empire rose in its place. Overexpansion, the ambition of generals, army loyalty, social conflict and civil war all undid the old constitution. The republic collapsed under strains it could no longer bear.

Expansion overstrained the republican system. Rome's rapid conquests turned a single city-state into a vast Mediterranean empire the old institutions could not manage. Governing distant provinces far exceeded the reach of the republic's simple machinery. Its very success had outgrown its own constitution. Rome, in short, conquered far more than it could govern.

Powerful generals overshadowed the state. Commanders such as Marius, Sulla, Pompey and Julius Caesar built great armies loyal to themselves alone. These private armies became the ready instruments of personal ambition. Military power steadily eclipsed the old civil authority. The victorious general rose, in time, above the Senate.

The army's loyalty shifted to its leaders. Soldiers increasingly looked to their commanders for land and reward rather than to the distant state. This binding of the legions to ambitious individual men proved fatal. The republic gradually lost all control of its own armed forces. The sword now served the general, and no longer the Senate.

Social and class conflict weakened the republic. Bitter struggles between rich and poor, and between Senate and reformers, bred violence and instability. The murders of the reforming Gracchi brothers showed the breakdown of political order. This internal strife steadily sapped the strength of the constitution. Rome had begun, in earnest, to turn upon itself.

Civil wars destroyed the old order. Repeated wars between rival leaders, from Caesar and Pompey onward, shattered republican government beyond repair. Naked force replaced law as the true arbiter of power. The republic drowned, in the end, in its own blood. War itself, in effect, made the first emperors.

Augustus restored order under one ruler. After defeating all his rivals, Octavian, as Augustus, gathered every real power into his own hands from 27 BCE. He carefully kept the outward forms of the republic but ruled as an emperor. Lasting peace was bought at the heavy price of liberty. One man, at last, restored the order that many had lost.

The people accepted the change for the sake of stability. Exhausted by long decades of civil war and disorder, ordinary Romans welcomed the peace that Augustus brought. They plainly preferred order under an emperor to chaos under the republic. Sheer weariness thus eased the great transformation. Rome, in effect, chose peace over its ancient freedom.

Rome was transformed from republic to empire because expansion, ambitious generals, army loyalty, social conflict and civil war together destroyed the old constitution. Augustus then restored order by concentrating all power in himself, and a war-weary people accepted the change. The republic fell not to a foreign foe but to strains within, and from its ruins rose the Roman Empire.

Examiner's Note
"Account for" wants the causes of the republic's fall, not a narrative of battles.
The trap is to tell the story of Caesar without explaining the deeper causes at work.
The top band links overexpansion and army loyalty to the collapse of republican government.

Question 62

The Roman Empire endured for centuries and ruled many millions across three continents. The statement holds that its strength lay in its administration. This is largely true, for Rome's provincial government, law, roads and citizenship held the vast empire together. Yet its army and its wealth were also vital, so administration was the chief but not the sole source of its strength.

Provincial government held the empire together. The empire was divided into provinces, each placed under a governor answerable directly to the emperor. This structure carried Roman rule and Roman order to the most distant lands. Efficient provincial administration bound the whole vast realm together. The provinces were genuinely governed, and not merely conquered.

Roman law gave order and unity. A sophisticated and evolving legal system regulated the lives of the empire's many peoples. Law provided justice and predictability across widely varied and distant lands. It bound diverse subjects within a single common framework. Law was, in truth, the empire's strongest cement.

The grant of citizenship secured loyalty. Rome extended its prized citizenship ever more widely, until in 212 CE it was granted to almost all free inhabitants. This won the lasting allegiance of once-conquered peoples. Shared citizenship gradually turned mere subjects into Romans. Inclusion, over time, steadily bred loyalty.

Roads and communication unified the realm. A vast and durable network of paved roads carried armies, officials, messages and trade across the empire. Legions and news alike could move swiftly along them in any emergency. Good communication made effective central rule genuinely possible. All roads, as the old saying went, led to Rome.

Sound taxation funded the state. A regular system of taxation supported the army, the officials and the great public works. This steady revenue sustained the whole enormous machinery of empire. Finance quietly underpinned every branch of the administration. The taxes, in effect, paid for the long Roman peace.

Yet the army was also essential. The legions had first conquered the empire and now defended its long and threatened frontiers. Without this ever-present military power no administration could have held. Force ultimately underlay the entire imperial structure. The sword, throughout, guarded the law and the tax-collector.

Wealth and trade strengthened the empire. The prosperity of a vast, peaceful and connected market enriched both the state and its peoples. This great wealth supported the army and the administration alike. Economic strength thus reinforced the political order. Prosperity itself, in a real sense, sustained Roman power.

One may largely agree that the strength of the Roman Empire lay in its administration. Provincial government, law, citizenship, roads and taxation together held the vast realm in order for centuries. Yet the army that defended it and the wealth that funded it were equally necessary. Administration was the chief source of Rome's strength, but it rested throughout upon the legions and the empire's prosperity.

> **Examiner's Note**
>
> "How far" invites strong agreement balanced against the army and the economy.
>
> The trap is to list Roman achievements without weighing administration against force.
>
> The top band credits law, roads and citizenship while conceding the army's vital role.

Question 63

Written law was among the greatest instruments of government in the ancient world. To examine its role is to see how law upheld and organised the ancient state, from Hammurabi's Babylon to imperial Rome. Law gave order, justice, unity and legitimacy, and it bound ruler and ruled within a common framework. It was one of the true foundations of settled government.

Law gave order to society. Written codes defined rights, duties and punishments, replacing the dangerous uncertainty of mere custom. People now knew clearly what was permitted and what forbidden. This settled order was the very basis of communal life. Law, once written down, steadily tamed disorder and feud.

It made justice predictable. Because laws were written and made public, as upon Hammurabi's stele, their application could be foreseen. Justice thereby ceased to be arbitrary, hidden or simply corrupt. This predictability was the essence of fair and orderly government. The law, once displayed, spoke plainly and in advance.

It unified diverse peoples. A single common law bound the many communities of a kingdom or empire into one. Roman law in particular held together peoples of many different lands and tongues. Shared law helped, over time, to make shared subjects. One code could thus unite many separate nations.

It legitimised authority. Law was often presented as the very will of the gods or the justice of the king. This gave rulers a sanction reaching far beyond their mere force. Legitimacy of this kind greatly strengthened their rule. Law clothed raw power in the respectable garment of right.

It regulated economic life. Codes fixed the terms of trade, property, debt and contract among the people. This regulation brought a needed order to markets and to private dealings. Administration thus reached down into daily transactions. Law, in effect, organised commerce itself.

It bound ruler as well as ruled. In the best systems, such as the Roman, even the magistrates were subject to the law. This vital principle restrained the abuse of power from above. Law was therefore a check quite as much as a command. It could, at its finest, limit even the mighty.

Its influence endured beyond antiquity. Roman law in particular became the foundation of later legal systems across much of the world. The ancient codes shaped the course of justice for many centuries. Law was, in truth, antiquity's most lasting bequest to the future. The distant past still speaks, even today, through the law.

Law therefore played a central role in the administrative systems of the ancient world. It gave order, predictable justice, unity, legitimacy and economic regulation, and in the best states it bound rulers as well as their subjects. From Hammurabi to Rome, written law was one of the great instruments of government, and its influence has outlasted every ancient state that made it.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks how law served administration, not for a list of particular statutes.

The trap is to describe Hammurabi's code alone without the wider role of law.

The top band shows law giving order and legitimacy and even restraining the ruler.

Question 64

The great states of the ancient world governed millions, and the true basis of their authority is open to debate. The statement holds that they rested on force rather than on consent. There is much truth in this, for armies and coercion underlay most ancient rule. Yet religion, law and, in some states, participation also won a real measure of consent. Ancient government rested, in the end, on both force and belief.

Armies upheld most ancient states. The power of Egypt, Babylon and Rome was ultimately guaranteed by armed force. Rebellion was crushed and obedience compelled, when necessary, by the sword. Force stood always, however quietly, behind the throne. Power, in a real sense, grew from the point of the spear.

Conquest and subjection founded many realms. Great empires were built by war and then held down by garrisons of soldiers. Subject peoples obeyed very largely because they were compelled to. Domination, and not agreement, had first created these states. Empire, so often, was born directly of conquest.

Taxation and labour were frequently coerced. Rulers extracted grain, goods and forced labour from their unwilling subjects. The pyramids and the great public works were raised by such compelled effort.

Obedience of this kind was exacted rather than freely requested. The state simply took by force what it needed.

Yet religion won a genuine consent. Where rulers were held to be divine, subjects obeyed willingly as a sacred and joyful duty. Belief secured a submission that naked force alone never could. Faith quietly turned bare compulsion into real consent. Reverence, in this way, greatly eased the yoke of rule.

Law gave subjects a stake in order. Written codes offered ordinary people justice and protection as well as command. Subjects came, over time, to value the order that the law provided. This bred a genuine measure of acceptance and loyalty. Law thus helped to make even harsh rule tolerable.

Some states rested partly on participation. In Athens and in republican Rome, the citizens shared in government and consented to its very acts. Here consent was far more than merely nominal or forced. Participation of this kind genuinely legitimised authority. The citizen, in effect, freely agreed to be ruled.

Most systems combined force and consent. Even the most despotic states mixed coercion with belief and with benefit. Pure force alone could never have held great empires together for centuries. Consent, in some form, was almost always present as well. Ancient rule, in truth, blended the sword and the altar.

The statement is therefore only partly true. Ancient administrative systems did rest heavily on force, for armies and coercion underlay most of them. Yet religion, law and, in some states, real participation also won a measure of consent. The great ancient states endured not by force alone, but by a blend of compulsion and belief that made their rule broadly accepted.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires force weighed against the sources of consent, not force alone.

The trap is to assert coercion everywhere and ignore religion, law and Athens.

The top band concludes that ancient rule blended force with a real measure of consent.

Question 65

The administrative systems of the ancient world did not perish with the states that made them but shaped government ever after. To assess their contribution to the modern world is to trace what later ages inherited from them. Democracy, republican government, law, codification, bureaucracy and citizenship all descend in part from antiquity. Their contribution to modern government has been profound.

Athens bequeathed the idea of democracy. The Athenian experiment in popular self-government inspired all later democratic thought. The very word "democracy" and the concept itself descend directly from Greece. Modern democracy still consciously looks back to Athens. The idea, once born there, has never wholly died.

Rome bequeathed republican government. The Roman balance of magistrates, senate and assemblies influenced many later constitutions. Modern republics, including that of the United States, still echo these Roman forms. The idea of checked and balanced power is Rome's great legacy. Republics today continue, in many ways, to draw on Rome.

Roman law shaped modern legal systems. The sophisticated law of Rome became the foundation of the civil law across much of the world. Legal principles and terms descend in a direct line from it. Modern justice rests, in very large part, upon Roman ground. The law of Rome, remarkably, endures to this day.

Codified law began in the ancient world. Hammurabi's code and the Twelve Tables established the enduring principle of written, public law. This very principle now underlies all modern legal codes. Antiquity first taught the world to write down and display its laws. Codification, in short, is an ancient invention.

Bureaucracy descends from ancient models. The trained officialdom of Egypt and Rome clearly foreshadowed the modern civil service. Government by professional, salaried administrators is itself an

ancient idea. The bureaucratic state thus has very deep historical roots. Officials, in one form or another, have always served the state.

Ideas of citizenship endure. The ancient notion of the citizen, bearing both rights and duties, deeply shaped modern political thought. Citizenship remains, even now, central to the life of the modern state. The whole concept was first clearly forged in antiquity. The citizen is, in origin, an ancient rather than a modern figure.

Yet the inheritance was transformed. Modern systems extended political rights far beyond the narrow ancient citizen body. What was inherited from antiquity was reshaped, enlarged and greatly improved. The debt to the ancient world is real but by no means slavish. The modern world built upon, and then far beyond, the ancient.

The contribution of ancient administrative systems to the modern world has therefore been profound. Democracy, republican government, law, codification, bureaucracy and citizenship all descend in part from Egypt, Greece and Rome. Yet the modern world transformed this inheritance, extending rights and reshaping institutions. We govern ourselves, in large measure, with tools first forged in the ancient world.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants the ancient legacy weighed, including how far it was later transformed.

The trap is to list ancient achievements without linking them to modern government.

The top band credits the inheritance while noting the modern world reshaped and enlarged it.

Question 66

The great administrative systems of antiquity, for all their strength, eventually declined and fell. To account for this decline is to explain why states such as Rome could not endure for ever. Overexpansion, invasion, economic weakness, corruption and internal division all wore them down over time. No ancient system, however mighty, proved immortal.

Overexpansion strained the great states. Empires grew far too large to defend and to govern effectively from one centre. Distant frontiers and provinces exceeded the reach of the old central authority. Sheer size itself became, in time, a crushing burden. Empires collapsed, in part, under their own great weight.

Invasion battered the frontiers. External enemies, such as the barbarian peoples who assailed Rome, pressed hard upon its overstretched defences. Repeated waves of attack steadily drained the state's strength and treasure. This relentless foreign pressure greatly hastened the decline. In the end, the long frontiers gave way.

Economic weakness sapped the system. Heavy taxation, debased coinage and declining trade undermined the wealth on which government rested. States could no longer reliably pay their armies and their officials. This slow financial decay quietly crippled the administration. The very treasury of the state began to fail.

Corruption and inefficiency spread. As old standards fell, officials grew corrupt and government grew slack and idle. The whole machinery of state worked ever less well over time. Decay from within thus matched the growing pressure from without. Internal rot quietly weakened the state.

Internal division fractured authority. Civil wars, rival claimants to the throne and the splitting of empires shattered their unity. Divided bitterly against themselves, the great states could not resist their enemies. Internal strife thus greatly hastened the final collapse. Great states, in the end, often fell to themselves.

Loss of civic spirit weakened the state. As subjects grew indifferent, overtaxed or oppressed, the loyalty that had sustained government slowly faded. Men no longer served the state willingly as their forebears had. The old bond between citizen and state gradually loosened. Apathy, in this way, hollowed out authority from within.

Reliance on force outlived consent. When rulers came to rule by bare coercion alone, and belief and benefit had failed, obedience crumbled. Force without any consent could not, in the end, long endure. The

very foundations of authority thus gave way beneath them. Fear by itself, history shows, could not hold the state together.

The administrative systems of the ancient world declined because overexpansion, invasion, economic weakness, corruption and internal division together wore them down. As wealth, unity and civic spirit failed, the machinery of government could no longer hold. Even the mightiest ancient states proved mortal, and their fall left their great achievements to be inherited by the ages that followed.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of decline, not a narrative of one empire's fall.

The trap is to give only invasion and ignore the economic and internal causes.

The top band combines external pressure with internal decay to explain the decline.

Question 67

World religions such as Christianity and Islam have shaped not only belief but the very government of states across history. To examine their influence on administrative systems is to see how faith entered the machinery of rule. Religion legitimised authority, supplied law, provided officials, unified subjects and directed education and welfare. In these ways the great faiths left a deep and lasting mark on the administration of the world.

Religion legitimised political authority. Across the great civilisations, rulers claimed to govern by the will or the appointment of God himself. This idea appeared in the divine right of kings in Europe and in the Muslim caliphate alike. Such a sacred sanction placed the ruler's authority far beyond ordinary challenge or question. Subjects obeyed those whom heaven itself was said to have chosen, and faith thus turned mere power into rightful authority.

It supplied systems of law. The great faiths gave states whole codes of religious law, such as the canon law of the Church and the Sharia of Islam. These governed marriage, inheritance, morality and often a great deal else besides. Religious law shaped, and sometimes wholly replaced, the law of the secular state. Faith, in this way, wrote much of the very rulebook of society.

It provided a class of officials. The literate clergy and religious scholars often staffed the administration of states. In medieval Europe churchmen served as royal ministers and scribes, while in Islam the ulema advised rulers and judged disputes. Religion supplied the educated servants that any government required. The learned men of the faith became, in effect, the servants of the state.

It unified diverse subjects. A common religion bound the many peoples of an empire into a single community of belief. Christendom in Europe and the ummah in Islam each gave scattered subjects a shared identity. This unity of faith greatly strengthened the political unity of the state. Shared worship helped, over time, to make shared and loyal subjects.

It directed education and welfare. Religious institutions ran schools, universities, hospitals and charity throughout the medieval world. Monasteries and madrasas preserved learning and trained the officials of the state. Faith thus performed many functions that later fell to government. Religion educated, healed and relieved the people long before the state did so.

It shaped the aims and morality of government. Rulers were expected to defend the faith, enforce its morality and pursue its ends. Religion set the standards by which good government itself was judged. The very purposes of the state were bound up with those of the faith. Belief gave rule a moral and a sacred direction.

Yet religion could also divide and disrupt. Bitter conflicts between Church and State, and destructive wars of religion, could weaken as well as strengthen government. Faith was by no means always the obedient servant of order. Its influence could unsettle quite as much as it could sustain the state. Religion was, in truth, a double-edged force in administration.

World religions therefore influenced administrative systems in many deep and lasting ways. They legitimised authority, supplied law and officials, unified subjects, and directed the education, welfare and moral aims of government. From medieval Christendom to the Islamic caliphate, faith and rule were closely entwined. Religion was among the most powerful of all the forces that shaped the government of the world, though it could divide as readily as it could unite.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks how religion shaped administration, not for an account of religious doctrine.

The trap is to describe beliefs and worship without ever linking them to government.

The top band draws on both Christianity and Islam to illustrate each avenue of influence.

Question 68

Religion has stood in a close but deeply ambiguous relation to political power throughout history. The statement holds that it has served more to legitimise rulers than to restrain them. There is much truth in this, for faith has usually clothed authority in a sacred right. Yet religion has also, at certain times, checked and limited even the mightiest rulers. The record shows religion as both the servant and the conscience of power.

Religion has commonly legitimised rulers. Kings and caliphs alike claimed to rule by the direct appointment of God himself. This sacred sanction placed their power far beyond ordinary question. Divine right and the caliphate both turned earthly authority into a holy trust. Faith, in most ages, served above all to justify the ruler.

It secured the obedience of subjects. Because rulers were held to be sacred, to obey them became a positive religious duty. Faith bound subjects to the throne far more firmly than force ever could. Religion thus delivered a willing and even a joyful submission to power. Belief was, in truth, a mighty support of established authority.

It sanctified the social order. Religion often taught that the existing hierarchy of society was ordained by God himself. The poor were bidden to accept their station and to obey their betters. This blessed inequality and quietly discouraged all rebellion. Faith thereby consecrated the very order that power upheld.

Rulers exploited religion for their own ends. Kings and emperors used the Church or the ulema to bolster and adorn their rule. They posed as the devoted defenders of the faith in order to win support. Religion in their hands became a ready instrument of statecraft. Power, in this way, harnessed faith to its own worldly purposes.

Yet religion also restrained rulers at times. The medieval Church claimed the right to judge and even to excommunicate kings. Popes on occasion humbled emperors, as when Henry IV waited at Canossa in 1077. Faith could set limits that even the mighty came to fear. Religion was, at such moments, a genuine check upon power.

It supplied a standard of justice. Religious law and teaching held rulers to a moral account above themselves. A king who openly defied God's law might be condemned by the faith. This gave subjects a ground on which to resist a tyrant. Faith could, in this way, arm the conscience against the throne.

The balance leaned toward legitimation. On the whole, religion served power far more often than it restrained it. Its restraining role, though real, was occasional rather than constant. Most rulers found faith a support rather than a curb upon them. Legitimation was, in the end, religion's more common political work.

The statement is largely valid but a little too absolute. Religion has indeed been used, more often than not, to legitimise rulers, secure obedience and sanctify the social order. Yet it has also, at times, restrained rulers, humbled emperors and supplied a standard of justice against tyranny. Religion has been chiefly the servant of power, but it has sometimes been its conscience as well.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires legitimation weighed against religion's restraining role, not one alone.

The trap is to assert that religion only ever served power and ignore Canossa and canon law.

The top band concludes that legitimation predominated while restraint was nonetheless real.

Question 69

In medieval Europe the Church and the State were bound together as closely as at any time in history. To account for this union is to explain why religion and government became so deeply intertwined. The spiritual prestige of the Church, the ignorance of the age, the need for literate officials and plain mutual advantage all drew them together. Throne and altar came, in time, to depend wholly upon one another.

The Church held immense spiritual authority. As the guardian of salvation itself, the Church commanded the deep reverence of all Christians. Rulers therefore sought its blessing in order to legitimise their crowns. The Church's spiritual power made it quite indispensable to the State. Kings needed the Church, above all, to sanctify their rule.

The clergy monopolised learning. In an age of widespread illiteracy, churchmen were very often the only educated men. Kings accordingly employed them as ministers, scribes and administrators of the realm. The State thus depended on the Church for its trained servants. Government could scarcely function at all without the clergy.

The Church was a great landowner and power. It held vast estates and wielded enormous wealth and influence across Europe. No ruler could safely ignore so mighty an institution in his midst. The Church was a political quite as much as a spiritual force. Its sheer power compelled the State to work closely with it.

Kings were crowned and blessed by the Church. Coronation by bishops or by the Pope conferred a sacred legitimacy upon rulers. The king became the Lord's anointed through the Church's holy rite. This bound the throne to the altar at its very foundation. Sacred kingship was, in effect, a gift of the Church.

The Church needed the protection of the State. Against its enemies and against disorder, the Church relied upon kings for its defence. Rulers protected Church lands and enforced its authority by their arms. The State was the sword that the Church itself lacked. Mutual need therefore drew the two ever closer together.

A shared world-view united them. Both Church and State saw society as a single Christian order under God. Each was believed to have its appointed place within this divine scheme. This common vision made their union seem entirely natural and right. Faith and rule were understood as two parts of one whole.

Their union brought mutual advantage. The Church gained protection and wealth, while the State gained legitimacy and educated officials. Each strengthened the other in a lasting and profitable partnership. Self-interest thus cemented what shared belief had first begun. The great alliance served the deep interests of them both.

The close union of Church and State in medieval Europe is therefore explained by the Church's spiritual authority, its monopoly of learning, its wealth and the mutual advantage of the partnership. Kings needed the Church to sanctify and to staff their rule, while the Church needed kings to protect and enforce it. Bound together by a shared Christian vision and by common interest, throne and altar became, for centuries, inseparable.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of the union, not a general description of the medieval Church.

The trap is to describe Church power without explaining why the State so eagerly embraced it.

The top band shows mutual need, learning and legitimacy drawing throne and altar together.

Question 70

In medieval Europe Christianity shaped not only souls but the very government of kingdoms. To assess its influence on administrative systems is to weigh how deeply the Church entered the work of rule. It legitimised kings, supplied officials and law, and ran education and welfare, though it also rivalled and disrupted the State. Its influence was profound, but by no means wholly benign.

It legitimised royal authority. Throughout medieval Europe kings ruled as the Lord's anointed, solemnly crowned and blessed by the Church. This sacred sanction placed their power beyond ordinary challenge or revolt. Christianity thereby turned mere kingship into a holy and God-given office. The throne, in a real sense, rested upon the altar's blessing.

It supplied the State with officials. The literate clergy served as royal ministers, chancellors, judges and clerks across the kingdoms of Europe. The Church alone educated the men who actually governed the realm. Administration therefore depended heavily on churchmen for its very functioning. The clergy were, in effect, the civil service of the medieval age.

It gave Europe canon law. The Church's own developed legal system governed marriage, morals, wills and the affairs of the clergy. This canon law ran alongside, and often deeply shaped, the law of kings. Christianity thus provided Europe with a whole body of working law. The Church was a great lawgiver as well as a preacher of the faith.

It ran education and welfare. Monasteries and cathedral schools preserved learning and trained the officials of the realm, while the Church relieved the poor and tended the sick. These functions would later pass to the state, but were then the Church's alone. Christianity, in this way, educated and cared for the whole of society. Faith did much of the work of later governments.

It unified Christendom. A single shared faith bound the many quarrelsome kingdoms of Europe into one Christian order. The Church gave the continent a common identity that rose above its divisions. This unity of belief profoundly shaped the politics of the whole age. Christendom was a religious quite as much as a political idea.

Yet the Church rivalled the State. Popes and kings clashed repeatedly over authority, most famously in the Investiture Controversy. The Church boldly claimed a power standing above that of mere earthly rulers. This bitter rivalry disrupted as well as shaped medieval government. Christianity was a competitor for power as well as a support of it.

Its influence could breed intolerance. The Church persecuted heresy and enforced religious conformity, at times with great harshness. Religious uniformity was imposed upon society by the coercive power of the State. Christianity's influence on government was therefore not always just or gentle. Faith could darken as well as order the work of rule.

Christianity's influence on medieval European administration was therefore profound and many-sided. It legitimised kings, supplied officials and law, and ran education and welfare, while giving Europe the very unity of Christendom. Yet it also rivalled the State and bred intolerance. The Church was at once the servant, the partner and the rival of medieval government, and its mark upon European administration was deep and enduring.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" requires the Church's contributions weighed against its rivalry and intolerance.

The trap is to praise the Church's role without ever noting the Investiture Controversy.

The top band shows Christianity as servant, partner and rival of the medieval State.

Question 71

Islam, unlike some other faiths, has from its very origins joined religion closely to government and to law. The claim holds that it is a religion and a system of government in one. This is largely valid, for Islam

provided both a faith and a complete order of state and society. Yet in practice religion and politics were not always perfectly fused. The claim is broadly true but requires some qualification.

Islam unites religion and law. The Sharia, drawn from the Qur'an and the practice of the Prophet, governs worship, morality, family, trade and crime alike. It is at once a religious code and a complete legal one. Faith and law are therefore wholly one within Islam. The believer's entire life is governed by a single sacred law.

The Prophet was both religious and political leader. Muhammad led the early Muslim community at Medina as prophet, lawgiver, judge and ruler together. From the very outset faith and government were joined in one person. Islam was thus born as a community and a state at once. Religion and rule shared a single founder from the beginning.

The caliphate embodied this union. The caliph was the successor to the Prophet as both the religious and the political head of the community. He led the faith and governed the state in one and the same office. The caliphate therefore expressed the essential oneness of religion and government. Spiritual and temporal power were held firmly together in his hands.

The ummah was a religious and political community. Muslims formed a single community of believers that was also, at once, a body politic. Membership of the faith meant, in effect, membership of the state itself. The ummah recognised no real division between the two. To belong to Islam was, in this sense, to belong to its polity.

Islamic states governed by religious principle. Justice, taxation such as the zakat, and the very aims of rule were shaped throughout by the faith. The state existed, in large part, to uphold and to spread the religion. Government and religion therefore pursued a single common end. The Islamic state served the very faith that it embodied.

Yet religion and politics were not always fused in practice. Rulers often pursued naked worldly ambition, and dynasties frequently seized power by sheer force. The ideal union of the two was, at times, honoured only in name. Political reality could diverge sharply from religious principle. Practice, in short, often fell some way short of the high ideal.

The union has endured as a powerful ideal. The belief that Islam should govern the state as well as the soul has persisted to the present day. It continues to shape political thought across much of the Muslim world. The claim thus expresses a living and enduring ideal, not a dead one. Religion and government remain joined in the Islamic vision of society.

The claim is largely valid. Islam did indeed join religion and government into one, uniting faith and law in the Sharia, faith and rule in the Prophet and the caliphate, and faith and community in the ummah. Yet in practice rulers often diverged from the ideal, and worldly ambition intruded upon sacred principle. Islam is, in aspiration and very largely in history, a religion and a system of government in one.

Examiner's Note

"How valid" invites strong agreement tempered by the gap between ideal and practice.

The trap is to describe Islamic beliefs without showing the actual fusion of religion and government.

The top band affirms the union while noting that rulers often fell short of it.

Question 72

The caliphate was the institution that governed the Muslim community after the death of the Prophet Muhammad in 632. To examine its role is to see how the caliphs actually administered the early Islamic state. The caliph led the faith, commanded the armies, dispensed justice and organised the conquered lands. Through the caliphate, religion and government were joined together in the rule of a vast and growing empire.

The caliph was successor to the Prophet. He inherited Muhammad's role as leader of the whole community, though not, of course, his prophecy. This inheritance gave the caliph both religious and political authority at once. He governed as the head of the faith and of the state together. The office thus united spiritual and temporal rule in a single man.

The caliph led the community in religion. He directed the worship of the faithful, upheld the Sharia and defended the faith against its enemies. This religious leadership stood at the very centre of his office. The caliph was, above all, the guardian of the religion as well as the ruler. Faith lay at the heart of his whole authority.

The caliph commanded the armies of Islam. Under the early caliphs the Muslim armies conquered vast territories with astonishing speed. The caliph personally directed the great expansion of the state. Military leadership was thus among the chief functions of his office. Conquest carried the caliph's authority far and wide across the world.

The caliphate organised the conquered lands. Governors were appointed to rule the many provinces in the caliph's own name. Taxes, such as the land tax and the poll tax, were collected from the subject peoples. The caliphate thus built a working administration to govern its empire. Rapid conquest was followed, in time, by orderly and settled rule.

The caliph dispensed justice under the Sharia. He appointed judges, or qadis, to administer the religious law throughout the realm. Justice was firmly rooted in the faith and answerable, in the end, to the caliph. Law and religion were therefore wholly united in his rule. The caliphate governed, above all, by its sacred law.

The caliphate unified a diverse empire. A common faith and a single supreme ruler bound many peoples together into one. The ummah gave the sprawling empire a shared and powerful identity. The caliphate thus held its vast lands together in a religious unity. Islam itself was, in effect, the strongest bond of the state.

Yet the caliphate faced division and dispute. Bitter quarrels over the succession, as after the murder of Uthman, led to civil war and lasting schism. The unity of the office was by no means always maintained. Political conflict troubled and weakened the caliphate from very early on. The high ideal of unity proved, in practice, hard to keep.

The caliphate therefore lay at the very heart of the administration of the early Islamic state. The caliph led the faith, commanded the armies, organised the conquered provinces and dispensed justice under the Sharia, uniting a vast and diverse empire in a single religious community. Though disputes over the succession brought division and schism, the caliphate joined religion and government in the rule of one of history's great empires.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks how the caliphate administered the state, not for a life of the Prophet.

The trap is to narrate the conquests without analysing the caliph's actual governing role.

The top band shows the caliph uniting religious, military and administrative authority.

Question 73

Islam spread widely across Africa and deeply influenced the government of many African states. To account for this spread and influence is to explain how the faith advanced and what it brought to administration. Trade, conquest, the appeal of the faith itself and the patronage of rulers all carried Islam into Africa. With it came law, literacy and new models of the state.

Trade carried Islam across Africa. Muslim merchants brought the faith along the trans-Saharan caravan routes and down the Swahili coast of East Africa. Commerce and conversion advanced steadily together, hand in hand. Trade was therefore the chief highway by which Islam entered Africa. The merchant, in a real sense, was also the missionary.

Rulers adopted Islam for its advantages. Many African kings embraced the faith to gain literate officials, trade links and prestige. Conversion tied their courts to a wider and wealthier Muslim world. Islam thus offered rulers practical and political benefits as well as spiritual ones. Kings often found the new faith useful as well as true.

Islam brought literacy and administration. The faith carried with it the Arabic script, Islamic learning and the habit of written record-keeping. This gave African states the essential tools of a written government. Muslim scholars served their courts as scribes and trusted advisers. Islam thus equipped rulers with an educated and literate administration.

It brought a developed system of law. The Sharia offered African states a complete and widely respected code of justice. Muslim judges administered this religious law in the courts of the faithful. Islam thereby gave rulers a ready-made legal order to adopt. The faith shaped, in many places, the very justice of the state.

It provided models of the state. The caliphate and the great Islamic empires offered striking examples of religious government. States such as Mali and Songhai consciously drew upon these models. Islam thus shaped the very idea of the state in Muslim Africa. The faith gave ambitious rulers a proven pattern to follow.

Learning and cities flourished under Islam. Centres such as Timbuktu grew famous across the world for their Islamic scholarship. Islam fostered education, law and administration all together. The faith thereby enriched the whole culture of the African states. Mosque and madrasa worked together to strengthen the state itself.

Islam inspired new states through reform. Movements of religious reform, such as the jihad of Usman dan Fodio, founded the Sokoto Caliphate in 1804. Religious zeal could create entirely new Islamic administrations. The faith was thus able to build states as well as merely serve them. Reform gave rise, at times, to whole new governments.

Islam spread through Africa by trade, conquest and the patronage of rulers, and it deeply influenced African administration. It brought literacy, law, models of the state and, at times, whole new governments such as the Sokoto Caliphate. Kings adopted the faith for its practical as well as its spiritual gifts. Islam thus shaped the government of much of Africa, giving rulers both the tools and the pattern of the state.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of the spread and the nature of the influence, not a survey of countries.

The trap is to describe conversion without ever showing Islam's effect on administration.

The top band links trade and royal patronage to law, literacy and new states.

Question 74

Christianity and Islam, the two great missionary faiths, each profoundly shaped the government of the states they touched. To compare their influence on administrative systems is to see where they resembled and where they differed. Both legitimised rulers and supplied law and officials, yet they differed in how far they fused religion with the state. Their influence was alike in kind but notably different in degree.

Both legitimised political authority. Christianity crowned its kings as the Lord's anointed, and Islam made the caliph the successor to the Prophet. Each faith thus clothed its rulers in a divine and sacred sanction. Both religions turned earthly power into rightful, God-given authority. Legitimation of the ruler was plainly common to them both.

Both supplied systems of religious law. Christianity gave Europe its canon law, while Islam gave its lands the Sharia. Each of these governed morality, marriage, inheritance and much else besides. Religious law thus shaped the working of the state in both traditions. Faith was, in each, a great and active lawgiver.

Both provided educated officials. The Christian clergy and the Muslim ulema alike staffed and advised the governments of their states. Each faith supplied the literate men that the work of rule required. Religion therefore educated the very servants of the state in both. The learned men of the faith served the throne in each case.

Yet Islam fused religion and state more completely. In Islam, faith, law and government were one from the very start, in the Prophet and the caliphate. Christianity, by contrast, always distinguished the Church from the State, however closely allied. Islam thus united what Christianity kept in a close partnership. The degree of fusion differed sharply between them.

Christianity developed a separate Church. The Christian Church was an institution quite distinct from the State, with its own head in the Pope at Rome. This separation produced a long and bitter rivalry between Church and king. Islam, by contrast, had no such separate church to rival its ruler. Their very institutional structures therefore differed.

Both unified their subjects in faith. Christendom and the ummah each bound many diverse peoples into one great religious community. Shared belief thereby strengthened the political unity of states and empires. Both faiths were, in this way, powerful forces of political cohesion. Religion made shared and loyal subjects in each tradition.

Both could restrain and disrupt rulers. The Church humbled proud kings, and the ulema could judge the justice of caliphs. Each faith could therefore check as well as loyally serve its rulers. Both, too, brought upon their lands the terrible scourge of religious conflict. Their influence upon government was, in the end, double-edged alike.

In comparison, Christianity and Islam influenced administration in strikingly similar ways, each legitimising rulers, supplying law and officials, and unifying subjects in faith. Yet they differed in degree: Islam fused religion and government into one, while Christianity kept Church and State as allied but distinct powers. Both were mighty forces in the government of states, alike in their functions but different in their union of faith and rule.

Examiner's Note

"Compare" requires similarities and differences point against point, not two separate accounts.

The trap is to describe each faith in turn without ever drawing the comparison between them.

The top band pairs their shared functions with the key difference in Church-State fusion.

Question 75

Law and religion were closely joined in the ancient and medieval worlds, and a great deal of law grew directly from faith. To assess religion's contribution to law is to weigh how far the great codes and systems rested upon belief. Religion gave law its authority, its content and its courts, from Hammurabi to canon law and the Sharia. Its contribution was fundamental, though secular law also developed alongside it.

Religion gave law divine authority. Codes such as that of Hammurabi expressly claimed the sanction of the gods themselves. A law obeyed as the will of God carried a force far beyond the king's own. Faith thereby made law both sacred and deeply binding. Divine authority underlay a great deal of ancient and medieval law.

Religion supplied whole systems of law. The Sharia in Islam and the canon law in Christendom were themselves complete bodies of religious law. These governed vast and important areas of human life. Faith thus produced entire, working legal systems of its own. Religion was, in this way, a great and direct source of law.

Religion shaped the content of law. Rules concerning marriage, morality, inheritance and worship flowed directly from religious teaching. Faith defined what was right and wrong for the law then to enforce. The moral content of the law was therefore very often religious. Belief, in effect, filled much of the lawbook itself.

Religion provided courts and judges. The Church courts of Europe and the Muslim qadis both administered religious law. Faith thereby supplied the very institutions of justice themselves. Religious courts ran, in many places, alongside those of the secular State. The faith judged and punished as well as merely commanded.

Religion held rulers to legal account. Religious law could, in principle, bind the ruler quite as much as the ruled. A king who openly defied God's law might be condemned by the faith. Faith thus set a standard of justice standing above the throne itself. Religion could, at its best, limit even the lawgiver.

Religion preserved and transmitted law. The clergy and the religious scholars recorded, taught and interpreted the law across generations. Religious learning thereby kept legal knowledge alive through the centuries. Faith was, in effect, the great guardian of the law across the ages. The learned of religion carried the law forward in time.

Yet secular law also developed. Roman law and the legislation of kings grew steadily alongside the religious law. Not all law, therefore, flowed from faith alone. The State too was, throughout, an important source of law. Religion's great contribution was thus real but never quite total.

Religion's contribution to law in the ancient and medieval worlds was therefore fundamental. It gave law divine authority, supplied whole systems such as the Sharia and canon law, shaped its content, and provided courts and judges. It even held rulers to account and preserved legal learning across the ages. Yet secular law also grew alongside it, so religion was the chief but not the only source of law in these ages.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants religion's contribution weighed, with secular law duly acknowledged.

The trap is to list religious codes without showing how faith shaped law's authority and content.

The top band credits religious law while noting the parallel growth of secular law.

Question 76

Throughout history rulers have turned to religion to justify their power. To examine religion's role in legitimising authority is to see how faith made rule seem rightful and beyond challenge. Religion presented rulers as chosen by God, made obedience a sacred duty, and blessed the existing social order. Through these several means faith clothed the naked exercise of power in a holy right.

Religion presented rulers as chosen by God. Kings ruled by divine right, and caliphs as the successors to the Prophet himself. Pharaohs were held to be gods, and emperors the very agents of heaven. Faith thereby made the ruler God's own personal choice. Authority, on this view, descended directly from above.

It made obedience a religious duty. To obey the ruler was, in effect, to obey God, and to rebel against him was to sin. Faith thus bound subjects to the throne by their very conscience. Religion turned political submission into an act of piety. Obedience became, for the believer, a sacred obligation.

It surrounded rulers with sacred rites. Coronations, anointings and solemn religious ceremonies marked the ruler as holy. These rites conferred a divine legitimacy upon his very person. Faith thereby set the ruler apart from all others through ritual. Sacred ceremony, in this way, made naked power holy.

It blessed the existing social order. Religion often taught that the whole hierarchy of society was ordained by God. Each rank was bidden to accept its own appointed place within it. This consecrated inequality and quietly discouraged all revolt. Faith thus sanctified the very order that power upheld.

It gave rulers a sacred purpose. Kings were charged to defend the faith and to enforce its morality upon the land. This holy mission served to justify their sweeping authority. Religion thereby gave earthly rule a lofty and divine aim. Power was said to serve, in the end, the very ends of God.

It threatened the disobedient with divine punishment. Rebellion against the ruler risked not merely the sword but eternal damnation itself. Faith thus armed authority with the terrors of the next world. Religion

deterred all resistance through a deep and abiding fear of God. Heaven itself was made to guard the earthly throne.

Yet legitimation could also be withdrawn. If a ruler openly defied the faith, religion might turn decisively against him. Excommunication or religious condemnation could quickly unmake a king. The sacred sanction was therefore always conditional upon his conduct. The faith that gave legitimacy could also, in time, remove it.

Religion therefore played a powerful role in legitimising political authority. It presented rulers as chosen by God, made obedience a sacred duty, surrounded power with holy rites and blessed the social order. Through these means faith turned the mere possession of power into a rightful authority. Yet the sanction it conferred it could also withdraw, so religion was a mighty but ultimately conditional support of rule.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks how religion legitimised authority, not for a general survey of religions.

The trap is to describe rulers without showing the actual mechanisms of religious legitimation.

The top band shows faith conferring a legitimacy that it could also, at times, withdraw.

Question 77

Great states and empires have often been built and held together by a common faith. The statement claims that religion was a unifying force in their making. There is much truth in this, for shared belief bound very diverse peoples into one. Yet religion also divided and even destroyed states through bitter conflict. Faith was, in the record of history, both a builder and a breaker of empires.

A common faith unified diverse peoples. Religion gave the many scattered subjects of an empire a single shared identity. Christendom and the ummah each bound distant lands into one great community. Faith thus made a single people out of many separate nations. Shared belief was, in truth, a powerful and lasting bond.

Religion legitimised the imperial ruler. A common faith was often centred upon a sacred emperor or caliph. Loyalty to the religion thereby became loyalty to the state itself. Religion in this way focused all allegiance upon the throne. Belief and empire were joined together in the person of the ruler.

Religion inspired conquest and expansion. Faith could actively drive the very building of empires, as in the great Islamic conquests. Holy war and mission alike carried states ever outward. Religion thus supplied the burning zeal for expansion. Faith was, in this sense, a true engine of empire.

Religion provided a common law and culture. A shared faith brought with it a shared law, learning and custom across an empire. This deep cultural unity greatly strengthened the political unity. Religion thus knit the empire together in mind as well as in rule. A common creed helped to make a common civilisation.

Religion sustained loyalty and order. Belief bound subjects to obey their rulers and to accept their station. Faith thereby upheld the internal peace of the empire. Religion was, in this way, a great force for stability and cohesion. Belief helped, above all, to hold the vast states together.

Yet religion also divided states. Schisms, heresies and rival faiths could tear great states apart from within. The division of Christendom and bitter sectarian conflict weakened many states. Faith could shatter quite as easily as it could bind. Religion was, therefore, a potent source of division as well.

Religious conflict destroyed as well as built. The wars of religion tore kingdoms apart and toppled whole governments. Faith could drive men to fight one another as fiercely as to unite. Religion's unifying power thus cast a long and violent shadow. It could break, in the end, the very empires it had built.

The statement is largely valid but incomplete. Religion was indeed a powerful unifying force, binding diverse peoples, legitimising rulers and inspiring the building of empires such as those of Islam and Christendom. Yet the very same faith could divide through schism and destroy through religious war.

Religion was among the greatest of all builders of states and empires, but it was fully capable of breaking them as well.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires religion's unifying role weighed against its power to divide.

The trap is to celebrate unity alone and ignore schism and religious war.

The top band shows faith as both a builder and a breaker of states.

Question 78

The Ottoman Empire, one of the greatest of the Muslim empires, governed many peoples for centuries. The question asks how far religion shaped its administration. To a great extent it did, for Islam supplied the empire's law, its ruler's very title and its ordering of subjects. Yet practical and secular measures also governed, so religion was a major but not the sole shaper of Ottoman rule.

The Sultan claimed the title of Caliph. The Ottoman ruler was both emperor and, in time, the caliph of all Islam. His authority therefore rested on religious as well as political grounds. Religion in this way crowned and exalted the sultan's power. Faith stood, quite openly, behind the imperial throne.

Islamic law governed the empire. The Sharia regulated the daily lives of the Muslim subjects and shaped the courts. Religious law was thus central to the whole of Ottoman justice. Faith supplied a great part of the empire's legal order. The Sharia was, in effect, a firm pillar of the state.

The ulema formed part of the government. The religious scholars administered law, education and all religious affairs of the realm. They advised the sultan and staffed the courts throughout the empire. Religion thereby supplied an entire class of trained officials. The learned men of Islam served the Ottoman state directly.

The millet system organised subjects by religion. The non-Muslim communities were governed through their own religious leaders. Faith, and not nationality, thus ordered the many peoples of the empire. Religion in this way structured the very society of the state. The millet made religious faith the true basis of community.

Religion inspired the empire's expansion. Holy war against the unbeliever helped to justify Ottoman conquest. Faith thereby gave the empire both a mission and a burning zeal. Religion in this way drove the very growth of the state. Expansion itself was clothed in a holy and sacred purpose.

Yet secular law also governed. The sultans issued their own decrees, the kanun, alongside the sacred Sharia. Practical government plainly required a good deal more than religious law. Secular authority thus supplemented the sacred at every turn. The state, in the end, legislated well beyond the faith.

Practical needs shaped much administration. The devshirme, the standing army and the provinces were organised by worldly design. Sheer efficiency, as well as faith, guided much of Ottoman rule. Religion by no means governed every last detail of the state. The empire was, in truth, practical as well as devoutly pious.

Religion shaped Ottoman administration to a great extent. Islam gave the empire its caliph-sultan, its Sharia law, its ulema officials and its millet ordering of subjects, and it inspired the empire's expansion. Yet the sultans also ruled by secular decree and practical design, so religion was a major but not the exclusive shaper of Ottoman government. Faith and statecraft together governed the empire.

Examiner's Note

"To what extent" needs religion's role balanced against secular and practical government.

The trap is to describe Islam without noting the kanun and the practical machinery of state.

The top band credits Sharia, ulema and millet while conceding secular law and design.

Question 79

In early modern Europe rulers increasingly justified their power by the doctrine of the divine right of kings. To account for its use is to explain why kings and their supporters so eagerly embraced this idea. The wish to strengthen royal power, to resist rivals and to secure obedience all drew rulers to the doctrine. Divine right made the king answerable, it was claimed, to God alone.

It exalted the power of the king. The doctrine of divine right held that the king received his authority directly from God. This placed his power far above all earthly challenge or check. The doctrine thereby magnified the monarch above every possible rival. It made the king, in effect, supreme within his own realm.

It secured the obedience of subjects. If the king truly ruled by God's own appointment, then to resist him was to defy God himself. Faith thus bound subjects firmly to obey their monarch. The doctrine turned mere political obedience into a solemn religious duty. It armed the throne, in effect, with the force of conscience.

It countered the claims of the Church. Divine right made the king answerable to God alone, and not to the Pope in Rome. This conveniently freed rulers from all clerical control over them. The doctrine thus served kings against the rival power of the Church. It cut the throne loose, in effect, from the altar's rule.

It resisted the claims of parliaments and nobles. Against all who would limit the king, divine right boldly asserted his supremacy. It denied any earthly right to check or to bind the monarch. The doctrine thus served absolute against merely limited rule. It answered, in effect, the many enemies of royal power.

It suited the age of absolutism. As kings across Europe sought to centralise all power in themselves, divine right conveniently justified their ambition. The doctrine matched perfectly the rise of the absolute state. It gave a sacred sanction to strong and unfettered monarchy. Divine right and absolutism thus advanced hand in hand.

It was preached by Church and crown alike. Bishops and writers such as Bossuet in France expounded the doctrine at length. Rulers such as James I of England proclaimed it openly to their subjects. Both throne and pulpit therefore taught divine right together. The doctrine was spread, in effect, by the very powers it served.

Yet it provoked resistance and decline. The sweeping claims of the doctrine led in time to open conflict, as in the English Civil War. In the end it gave way to newer ideas of limited and constitutional government. Divine right could not, in truth, survive the great challenge to absolutism. Its very use bred the reaction that at last undid it.

The doctrine of the divine right of kings was used in Europe to exalt royal power, secure obedience, and resist the claims of Church, nobles and parliaments. It suited the age of absolutism and was preached by throne and pulpit alike. Yet its sweeping claims provoked resistance and, in time, decline. Divine right served the absolute monarch, but it could not outlast the great challenge to absolute rule.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the reasons for the doctrine's use, not merely its definition.

The trap is to define divine right without explaining why rulers so eagerly embraced it.

The top band links the doctrine to absolutism and to the conflicts with Church and parliament.

Question 80

Long before the modern state took charge of schooling and welfare, religion performed these tasks. To examine religion's influence on education and social welfare is to see how faith taught and cared for society. Religious institutions ran schools and universities, relieved the poor and tended the sick. Under religious administrations, faith was the great educator and the great provider for the people.

Religion founded schools and universities. Monasteries, cathedral schools and Islamic madrasas taught the young and preserved learning. The first great universities of Europe grew directly from the Church.

Faith was, in this way, the very cradle of formal education. Religion carried the torch of learning across the ages.

It trained the officials of the state. Religious education produced the literate men who actually governed the realm. Clergy and scholars alike staffed the administrations of states. Faith thus equipped government with its trained and educated servants. The school of religion was, in effect, the school of the state.

It preserved and transmitted knowledge. Monks patiently copied manuscripts, and scholars kept ancient learning alive. Religious institutions thereby guarded the accumulated wisdom of the past. Faith was, in the darker ages, the great keeper of knowledge. Religion saved much learning from being lost for ever.

It relieved the poor and the needy. The Christian Church gave alms, and Islam enjoined the zakat, the giving to the poor. Faith thus organised charity and relief across the whole of society. Religion cared for those whom the state entirely ignored. Belief, in effect, fed and clothed the poor of the land.

It tended the sick and built hospitals. Religious orders founded and ran hospitals and infirmaries for the suffering. Faith thereby brought care and comfort to the sick. Religion was, for many, the very first provider of medicine. The sick were tended, above all, in the name of God.

It shaped the values taught to society. Religious education instilled morality, obedience and faith in the young. It thereby helped to form the very character of the people. Religion taught not merely letters but virtue and duty. Faith shaped the minds and the morals of each new generation.

Yet religious education could be narrow. Learning was often confined to the faithful and directed to purely religious ends. Heresy and free thought were firmly discouraged, and sometimes punished. Religion's teaching could therefore limit quite as much as it enlightened. Faith set bounds to knowledge even as it spread it.

Under religious administrations, faith exerted a profound influence on education and social welfare. Religion founded schools and universities, trained officials, preserved knowledge, relieved the poor and tended the sick. It was the great educator and provider before ever the state assumed these roles. Yet its teaching could be narrow and its learning confined. Religion educated and cared for society, for good and, at times, for ill.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks how religion shaped education and welfare, not for a history of the faith.

The trap is to list institutions without linking them to teaching, welfare and the state.

The top band credits religion's provision while noting the narrowness of its learning.

Question 81

Religion has been among the most powerful of all forces in the government of states, but its effects have been deeply mixed. The statement holds that it did as much harm as good to administration. There is real force on both sides, for faith both strengthened and disrupted the state. A fair discussion must therefore weigh religion's great gifts to government against its evils.

Religion legitimised and stabilised government. It gave rulers a sacred authority and secured the ready obedience of their subjects. Faith thereby upheld public order and discouraged all rebellion. Religion was, in this way, a firm pillar of stable rule. It plainly strengthened the state and its government.

It supplied law, officials and welfare. Faith gave states their religious law, their educated administrators and their care for the poor. Religion thus performed many of the vital functions of government. It enriched, in this way, the whole machinery of the state. Faith served the practical work of administration well.

It unified diverse subjects. A single common religion bound the many peoples of an empire into one. Faith thereby gave states a welcome cohesion and identity. Religion was, in this respect, a powerful force for unity. It helped, above all, to hold great states together.

Yet religion bred conflict and division. Bitter schisms, heresies and rival faiths could tear states apart from within. The terrible wars of religion devastated whole kingdoms of Europe. Faith thus divided quite as readily as it united. Religion was, in this way, a real and dangerous source of strife.

It could produce intolerance and persecution. Religious uniformity was very often enforced by cruelty and by fire. Heretics and unbelievers were persecuted by the coercive power of the state. Faith thereby darkened government with the stain of bigotry. Religion could, at its worst, make rule deeply oppressive.

It could rival and weaken the State. The Church clashed repeatedly with kings for supremacy across Europe. Religious power thus challenged and undermined political authority. Faith could disrupt quite as much as it loyally served government. Religion was, in this respect, a dangerous competitor for power.

It could resist necessary change. Religious authority sometimes stubbornly opposed reform and progress. Faith could bind the state firmly to the ways of the past. Religion's deep conservatism thus hindered good and effective government. Belief could obstruct as well as guide the work of rule.

The statement holds much truth, for religion's effects on administration were genuinely double-edged. Faith legitimised and stabilised government, supplied law, officials and welfare, and unified subjects. Yet it also bred conflict, intolerance and rivalry with the State, and could resist necessary change. Religion did great good to the administration of states, but it did great harm as well, and the balance between them varied from age to age.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires religion's benefits and harms weighed toward a judgement.

The trap is to take one side and ignore either the gifts or the evils of faith.

The top band balances legitimation and welfare against conflict and intolerance.

Question 82

Religion, and Christianity above all, played a large part in the colonial administration of Africa. To assess its influence is to weigh how far faith served the colonial state. Missionaries educated and pacified, religion legitimised conquest, and the Church provided services the state neglected. Yet religion also, at times, resisted colonial abuses and awakened African aspiration. Its influence was powerful and decidedly two-sided.

Missionaries prepared the way for colonial rule. Christian missions often preceded, and greatly eased, the colonial conquest of Africa. They won converts and influence well before the flag itself arrived. Religion in this way helped to open Africa to European control. The missionary, in effect, went before the colonial administrator.

Religion legitimised colonial conquest. The idea of a "civilising mission" cast colonialism as the spreading of Christianity. Faith thereby gave the whole conquest a comforting moral justification. Religion in this way clothed the empire in a holy purpose. Belief was used, in effect, to excuse the seizure of Africa.

Missions educated Africans for colonial service. Mission schools trained the clerks, teachers and catechists whom the colonial state then used. Religion thus supplied the educated Africans that the administration required. Christianity in this way produced the junior servants of the empire. Mission education served, in effect, the colonial order.

The Church provided health and welfare. Missions built schools, hospitals and clinics across the whole of Africa. They thereby performed services that the colonial state itself neglected. Religion in this way cared for the colonial subjects. Faith brought welfare where the government would not.

Religion was used to pacify and control. Christianity taught obedience and the acceptance of established authority. It thereby discouraged active resistance to colonial rule. Faith in this way helped to keep the subject peoples quiet. Religion served, in effect, the peace and order of empire.

Yet missionaries sometimes checked colonial abuses. Some missions protested openly against forced labour and cruelty. Religion could thus speak for the African against the colonial state. Faith was, therefore, not always the mere servant of empire. The Church, on occasion, genuinely restrained the colonisers.

Religion also awakened African aspiration. Mission education produced the very leaders who would later demand freedom. The ideals of Christianity inspired resistance and a rising nationalism. Faith in this way helped to arm Africans against their rulers. Religion thus helped, in the end, to undo the empire it had served.

Religion's influence on colonial administration in Africa was therefore powerful and two-sided. Christianity prepared and legitimised the conquest, educated Africans for colonial service, and provided welfare, while teaching obedience to the colonial state. Yet missionaries also checked abuses, and mission education awakened the very aspirations that ended colonial rule. Religion was at once a servant of empire and, in time, a force for its undoing.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants religion's colonial role weighed, including its genuinely ambiguous effects.

The trap is to present missions only as servants of empire or only as its critics.

The top band shows Christianity both serving colonial rule and awakening resistance to it.

Question 83

The slave mode of production was the economic and social system in which slaves formed the chief source of labour. To examine its main features is to see how this order was organised in the ancient world, above all in Greece and Rome. It rested on the ownership of human beings, their unpaid labour, and a society divided sharply between masters and slaves. These features together defined one of history's great systems of production.

Slaves were owned as property. Under this system human beings were held as chattels, the outright property of their masters. They could be bought, sold, inherited or even destroyed at the owner's will alone. In the eyes of the law the slave was a thing rather than a man, ranked with the cattle and the tools of the estate. The slave thus had no legal person and no rights whatever of his own. Ownership of the labourer himself was the very foundation of the whole system.

Slaves were the chief producers. The main work of the economy, in the fields, the mines and the households, was done by slave labour. Masters lived comfortably from the endless toil of those they owned. From the great grain fields to the deep silver mines, it was the slave who dug, sowed and carried. The slave, and not the free peasant, was thus the central producer of wealth. Production of every kind rested squarely upon these unfree hands.

Slaves worked without wages. The labourer received only bare subsistence, food and shelter just enough to keep him working. His entire surplus product was taken directly by the master who owned him. Whatever he made above his own meagre upkeep belonged wholly to another. No wage, reward or share of any kind was ever owed to the slave. The exploitation of this wholly unpaid labour was total and unrelieved.

Society was divided into masters and slaves. The great division of this order lay between those who owned and those who were owned. A small class of masters lived entirely from the labour of a great class of slaves. No broad middle ground softened this stark division between the owner and the owned. This sharp and permanent split shaped the whole of society. Two opposed classes, in the end, defined the entire system.

Great estates and mines used slaves on a large scale. In Rome the vast estates, the latifundia, were worked by whole gangs of slaves. The mines and the workshops likewise consumed slave labour without end. Hundreds might toil together on a single estate under the overseer and his whip. Production was thus organised on a large and often brutal scale. The slave gang was the very engine of the ancient economy.

Slavery rested on force and conquest. The system depended on a constant fresh supply of slaves, won chiefly by war and conquest. Force first captured the slaves and force then kept them at their labour. Chains, branding and cruel punishment enforced the master's will upon the unwilling. Violence and coercion thus underlay the whole of the order. The system was built, and held together, by the sword.

Slaves also served in administration and skilled work. Educated slaves, often Greeks in Roman households, served as clerks, tutors, doctors and stewards. Not all slaves, therefore, toiled in the fields or the mines. A learned Greek slave might keep a rich man's accounts or teach his children their letters. Skilled and literate slaves thus ran much of the daily business of life. Slavery reached into administration as well as into hard labour.

The slave mode of production was therefore defined by the ownership of human beings, their unpaid labour, and a society split between masters and slaves. It organised production on great estates and in mines, rested on force and conquest, and used even educated slaves in administration. This system, above all in Greece and Rome, was one of the foundational orders of the ancient world.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks for the features of the system analysed, not a history of particular slaves.

The trap is to describe cruelty alone without showing how slavery organised production.

The top band shows ownership, unpaid labour and class division as one connected system.

Question 84

Slavery grew from a marginal practice into a whole system of production in the ancient world. To account for its rise is to explain why societies came to rest their economies on unfree labour. The growth of production, the spread of private property, war and the demand for labour all drove the change. Together these forces turned slavery into the very foundation of the ancient economy.

Production grew beyond the family's needs. As farming and craft advanced, far more labour was needed than a single family could ever supply. Extra hands were required to work the larger fields and the growing estates. A household could till its own plot, but not a great estate producing for the market. Slavery answered directly this growing demand for labour. Growth in production itself, in short, called forth the slave.

Private property created a class of owners. As land and wealth fell into private hands, a class arose that could own the labour of others. The wealthy sought workers who would enrich them still further. Once a man could own broad acres, it was a short step to owning those who worked them. Property in things thus led, in time, to property in persons. Ownership of land bred, in the end, the ownership of people.

War and conquest supplied the captives. The chief source of slaves throughout antiquity was the prisoner of war. As states conquered their neighbours, they enslaved the defeated in great numbers. A single successful campaign might pour tens of thousands of captives into the slave markets. Constant warfare thus fed an equally constant supply of slaves. Conquest was, in effect, the great manufacturer of slaves.

Slave labour was cheap and profitable. A slave, once bought, worked for no wage at all but his mere keep. His whole surplus product enriched the master who owned him. Unlike the hired man, he could be worked to the limit and never paid a coin. This great cheapness made slavery deeply attractive to the owners. Profit, above all, drew the wealthy toward unfree labour.

The growth of trade and estates raised demand. Expanding commerce and the rise of great estates needed large and controllable workforces. Slaves could be massed and worked in gangs as free men never could. As markets grew, so did the appetite for cheap, disposable labour. Economic expansion thus multiplied the demand for slaves. Bigger production, in short, meant far more slavery.

Debt and poverty enslaved the weak. The poor who fell hopelessly into debt might be sold outright into slavery. Poverty, as well as foreign war, thus helped to fill the slave markets. A failed harvest or a heavy

loan could reduce a free man to bondage. Internal misery thus added to external conquest. The weak were enslaved from within society as well as from without.

Custom and law upheld the system. Society came, over time, to accept slavery as natural and even just. The law carefully protected the master's property in his slaves. Philosophers and statesmen alike defended the institution as part of the natural order. Belief and law together thus firmly entrenched the whole system. Slavery thereby became a settled and lasting institution.

Slavery rose as a system of production because growing economies demanded labour that war, debt and conquest could supply cheaply. Private property created owners, great estates and trade raised demand, and law and custom entrenched the result. Driven by all these forces, slavery became the foundation of production in the ancient world, above all in Greece and Rome.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of slavery's rise, not a description of slave life.

The trap is to list the sources of slaves without explaining the demand that drove the system.

The top band links growing production and private property to the demand for unfree labour.

Question 85

Ancient Greece and Rome were among the greatest slave societies in all history. The claim holds that slavery was the foundation of their economy and administration. This is largely valid, for slaves produced much of the wealth and ran much of the business of these states. Yet free labour and free citizens also had their part, so slavery was the foundation but not the whole edifice.

Slaves produced much of the wealth. In both Greece and Rome, slaves worked the fields, the mines and the workshops. The prosperity of the citizen rested directly on their ceaseless toil. The grain that fed the cities and the silver that filled the treasury alike were won by slaves. Slave labour thus underpinned the entire economy. The wealth of these states flowed, in the main, from unfree hands.

Slavery freed citizens for politics and war. Because the slaves did the labour, citizens had the leisure for government, war and culture. Athenian democracy and Roman politics alike rested on this freedom. The citizen could sit in the assembly or march with the legion because a slave worked his land. The citizen's whole public life was thus bought by the slave's labour. Slavery, in this way, made active citizenship possible.

Great estates depended on slave gangs. The Roman latifundia were worked by whole masses of slaves. Large-scale agriculture simply could not have functioned without them. Cheap slave gangs allowed the rich to farm vast estates for profit. The very estates that fed the empire thus ran entirely on slavery. The slave gang was the true basis of ancient production.

Educated slaves ran much administration. In Rome, Greek and other slaves served as clerks, secretaries and stewards. They kept the accounts and managed the estates and offices of their masters. A great household or a public office might be run day to day by capable slaves. Administration therefore leaned heavily on skilled slaves. The daily business of the state used unfree hands.

Slavery shaped the whole of society. The division between master and slave ordered the whole of social life. Wealth, status and power were all bound up with the owning of slaves. To be a citizen of standing was, almost by definition, to be a slave-owner. Society itself was thus built around the institution. Slavery was woven deeply into the very fabric of life.

Yet free labour also had its place. Peasants, artisans and free workers laboured alongside the slaves in both states. Not all production, therefore, was slave production. Small farmers and craftsmen remained a numerous and important class. Free men too tilled the soil and plied their trades. The economy was by no means slave labour alone.

Citizens ran the core of government. The great offices of state were held by free citizens, and not by slaves. Slaves assisted in administration but did not themselves rule or command. Consuls, magistrates and generals were always free men of standing. Political power thus remained, throughout, in free hands. Government rested on the citizen as much as on the slave.

The claim is largely valid. Slavery was indeed the foundation of the economy and much of the administration of Greece and Rome, producing their wealth, freeing their citizens and running their business. Yet free labour shared in production and free citizens held political power. Slavery was the foundation of these societies, but it was not the whole of their economy or their government.

Examiner's Note

"How valid" invites strong agreement tempered by the role of free labour and citizens.

The trap is to describe slavery without weighing it against free labour and citizen rule.

The top band credits slavery as foundation while noting free labour and citizen government.

Question 86

In the Roman Empire slaves were far more than mere field hands; they entered almost every part of economic and administrative life. To assess their role is to weigh how far Rome truly depended upon them. Slaves produced its wealth, ran its estates and staffed its offices, though free labour and citizens also had their place. Their role was central to the empire, but it was not exclusive.

Slaves worked the great estates. The latifundia that fed Rome were tilled by whole gangs of slaves. Large-scale agriculture rested squarely on their labour. The corn, wine and oil of the empire were produced in great part by slave hands. The empire's very food supply thus depended upon the slave. Estate production was, in essence, slave production.

Slaves laboured in mines and workshops. The mines that yielded Rome's metals and the workshops that made its goods used slave labour throughout. The hardest and most dangerous work of all fell to the slave. In the deep silver and lead mines, slaves toiled in conditions that killed them quickly. Industry as well as farming thus rested upon them. The slave dug and manufactured for the empire.

Educated slaves ran administration. Greek and other learned slaves served as secretaries, accountants and clerks. They kept the records and managed the correspondence of the state and the estates. A wealthy master often left his whole business in the hands of a trusted slave. Administration therefore leaned heavily on their skill. The empire was, in real part, run by its slaves.

Slaves managed households and estates. Trusted slaves served as stewards, overseeing property and directing other slaves. They ran the daily affairs of the great houses of Rome. The steward bought, sold and kept accounts on his master's behalf. Management, as well as mere labour, thus fell to them. The slave steward, in effect, governed the estate.

Imperial slaves and freedmen staffed the government. The emperor's own slaves and freedmen ran whole departments of the imperial administration. Some rose to great influence and real power at court. Freedmen such as those under Claudius effectively directed the business of empire. The very machinery of empire thus employed unfree and freed men. Slavery reached, in this way, into the heart of government.

Slavery shaped the Roman economy. The supply, sale and labour of slaves were central to the whole of economic life. Slave markets and slave labour together underpinned the general prosperity. The price of slaves rose and fell like that of any other great commodity. The economy itself was thus organised around the institution. Slavery was, throughout, an economic foundation of Rome.

Yet free labour and citizens also mattered. Free peasants, artisans and citizens laboured and governed alongside the slaves. Rome was by no means run by slaves alone. Free tenants and small farmers worked much of the land of Italy. Free men, too, held the great offices and much of the property. Slavery was central to the empire, but not the whole of it.

Slaves therefore played a central role in the administration and economy of the Roman Empire. They worked its estates and mines, ran its households, and staffed its offices, even reaching the very heart of imperial government. Yet free labour and free citizens also produced and ruled. Rome depended heavily upon its slaves, but they were the foundation rather than the entirety of its economy and administration.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants the slaves' role weighed, with free labour and citizens acknowledged.

The trap is to confine slaves to the fields and ignore their administrative role.

The top band shows slaves in estates, offices and imperial government alike.

Question 87

The slave systems of the ancient world required a constant fresh supply of slaves. To examine the sources from which they were obtained is to see how this supply was maintained across the centuries. War, trade, birth, debt, punishment and kidnapping all filled the slave markets. Together these several sources fed the great slave economies of Greece and Rome.

War and conquest were the chief source. The prisoner of war was, throughout antiquity, the commonest of all slaves. As states conquered their enemies, they enslaved the defeated in great numbers. After a great victory, whole captured armies and even cities might be sold into bondage. A single campaign could produce slaves by the thousand. War was, above all, the great maker of slaves.

Trade carried slaves across the world. Merchants bought and sold slaves in markets across the Mediterranean and far beyond. The slave trade moved captives from where they were taken to where they were wanted. Great slave markets such as that on Delos handled thousands in a single day. Commerce thus distributed the whole supply across the ancient world. Trade was, in effect, the highway of ancient slavery.

Birth replenished the slave population. The children of slaves were themselves born into slavery. This natural increase renewed the supply steadily from within. A slave woman's children became the property of her master from birth. The slave household, in effect, bred its own successors. Slavery in this way constantly reproduced itself.

Debt enslaved the poor. Those who could not pay their debts might be sold outright into slavery. Poverty, as well as war, thus helped to fill the markets. In many early states the insolvent debtor became the property of his creditor. The weak were thus enslaved from within their own society. Debt could turn a free man into a slave overnight.

Kidnapping and piracy seized the free. Pirates and slavers seized free people in order to sell them. The coasts and the roads were unsafe for the weak and the unprotected. Whole coastal villages might be carried off by raiders in a night. Violence beyond formal war thus fed the trade. The kidnapper was a steady supplier of the slave market.

Punishment condemned criminals to slavery. Some were enslaved as a legal penalty for their crimes. The law itself, in this way, created slaves. Condemned men might be sent to the mines or the arena for life. Punishment thus added its own share to the supply. Justice, in effect, helped to fill the slave gangs.

Tribute and sale by families added more. Conquered peoples might render slaves as tribute, and the desperate might sell their own children. Weakness and poverty yielded slaves in many different forms. A subject state could be required to send slaves each year to its master. The supply was thus drawn, in the end, from every human misery. Every source of the vulnerable fed the system.

The slaves of the ancient world were therefore drawn from many sources: above all from war and conquest, but also from trade, birth, debt, kidnapping, punishment and tribute. These sources together maintained the constant supply that the slave economies required. War was the greatest maker of slaves, but every form of human misfortune helped to fill the markets of Greece and Rome.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks for the sources analysed, not a general account of slavery.

The trap is to name only war and neglect debt, birth and trade.

The top band ranks war first while showing the full range of other sources.

Question 88

The slave mode of production, dominant across the ancient world, eventually declined and gave way to feudalism. To account for its decline is to explain why societies ceased to rest upon slave labour. The end of conquest, the cost of slavery, slave revolts, and the rise of the tenant all played their part. Together they undid the slave system and prepared the way for the feudal one.

The end of conquest cut the supply of slaves. As the great Roman conquests ceased, the steady flow of war captives dried up. Slaves grew scarce and, in consequence, dear to buy. Once the frontiers stopped advancing, no fresh armies of captives reached the markets. The system thus lost its vital cheap supply. No new wars meant, in effect, no new slaves.

Slave labour proved costly and inefficient. Slaves worked unwillingly and required constant and expensive supervision. They took no care for tools or land that could never be their own. A gang driven by the whip produced far less than a man working for himself. This deep inefficiency made slavery steadily less profitable. The unwilling worker was always a poor one.

Slave revolts shook the system. Great risings, such as that of Spartacus in 73 BCE, showed the danger of massing slaves together. Fear and disorder attended the great slave gangs. A servile war could ravage whole provinces before it was crushed. Revolt thus made the whole system dangerously unstable. The slave could, at any time, turn upon the master.

The rise of the colonus transformed labour. Landowners increasingly settled slaves and the free poor on plots as tenants, the coloni. These tenants worked their own land and paid rent or service for it. A man with his own holding worked harder and needed no overseer. This arrangement thus proved far more productive than the slave gang. The tenant thus began to replace the slave.

The tied tenant became the serf. The coloni were gradually bound to the very land they worked, unable to leave it. This tie slowly turned them into the serfs of a new order. Imperial law itself fixed the colonus to his plot and his master. Slavery, in this way, gave way to serfdom. The bound tenant was the true seed of feudalism.

Economic crisis weakened the ancient economy. The decline of trade and towns in the late empire undermined the whole slave economy. The great estates turned inward toward self-sufficiency. As money and markets shrank, the buying of slave gangs made ever less sense. The conditions for a feudal order thereby emerged. Crisis itself reshaped the organisation of labour.

Christianity and changing values softened slavery. The spread of Christianity discouraged the enslavement of fellow believers. Moral attitudes slowly began to shift against outright chattel slavery. The Church taught that the slave, too, had a soul to be saved. Belief thus eased the transition toward serfdom. Values, as well as economics, were changing together.

The slave mode of production declined because the end of conquest cut the supply of slaves, while slavery's cost, inefficiency and revolts made it unprofitable and unstable. Landowners turned instead to tied tenants, the coloni, who became the serfs of the coming feudal order. Economic crisis and changing values completed the shift. Slavery thus gave way, gradually, to feudalism.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of decline and the shift to serfdom, not a narrative of Rome's fall.

The trap is to give only slave revolts and ignore the end of conquest and the rise of the colonus.

The top band links the drying supply and the tied tenant to the emergence of feudalism.

Question 89

Feudalism was the system of government and production that arose in Europe after the fall of Rome. To examine its main features is to see how society was ordered around land, obligation and personal ties. It rested on the granting of land for service, a hierarchy of lords and vassals, serfdom, and the local rule of the lord. These features together made feudalism a whole system of administration.

Land was granted in return for service. The lord granted land, the fief, to a vassal in exchange for military and other service. Land, and not money, was the reward of loyalty in this age. The vassal held his fief for just so long as he rendered the service owed. This exchange of land for service lay at the very heart of feudalism. The fief, in effect, bound man to man.

Society was a hierarchy of lords and vassals. From the king down through the great lords to the lesser knights ran a chain of lordship. Each man held land from the one above and owed him service in return. The greatest lords held directly from the king, and lesser men from them in turn. This hierarchy thus structured the whole of medieval society. Rank descended, in an orderly chain, from king to knight.

Personal bonds of homage held it together. The vassal swore homage and fealty to his lord, a solemn personal bond of loyalty. Kneeling before him, the vassal placed his hands between his lord's and swore to be faithful. Government thus worked through these binding ties between men. Faithfulness, and not bureaucracy, held the system together. Personal loyalty was, in truth, the cement of feudalism.

The manor was the unit of production. The land was worked through manors, largely self-sufficient estates. The lord's demesne and the peasants' holdings together made up each manor. On it the peasants worked both their own strips and the lord's home farm. Economic life thus centred wholly upon this basic unit. The manor, in effect, fed the entire feudal order.

Serfs were bound to the land. The peasants, or serfs, were tied to the manor and owed labour and dues to the lord. They could not lawfully leave the land that they worked. When the land was sold or granted away, the serfs passed with it to the new lord. Their unfree labour thus supported the lords above them. The serf was, in essence, the broad base of the pyramid.

The lord held local power. Each lord governed, judged and defended his own lands directly. Political, judicial and military authority all lay in his hands. He raised troops, held courts and collected dues within the bounds of his own domain. Power was thus local rather than central. The lord was, in effect, the ruler of his own domain.

Political authority was decentralised. In the absence of a strong central state, power was scattered among many lords. The kingdom was, in reality, a patchwork of separate lordships. The king himself was often little more than the greatest lord among many rivals. This fragmentation was itself a defining feature of the age. Feudalism, in short, divided power among the lords.

Feudalism as a system of administration therefore rested on the granting of land for service, a hierarchy of lords and vassals bound by personal loyalty, the manor as the unit of production, serfdom, and the local rule of the lord. Political power was decentralised among the many lords. These features together made feudalism a distinctive order of both government and production in medieval Europe.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks for the features of the system, not the story of its rise.

The trap is to describe knights and castles without the structure of land and obligation.

The top band shows land-for-service, hierarchy, serfdom and local rule as one system.

Question 90

Feudalism ordered the whole of medieval society through ties of land and duty. The statement holds that it was, above all, a system of land and obligation. This is largely true, for land granted in return for service

lay at the very heart of it. Yet feudalism was also a system of personal loyalty, local government and production. Land and obligation were central, but they were not quite the whole of it.

Land was the basis of the system. The fief, a grant of land, was the reward of service and the source of all wealth and power. To hold land was, in this age, to hold rank and authority. A man's whole standing was measured by the land that he held. Land was thus the very foundation of feudalism. Everything, in the end, rested upon the fief.

Obligation bound each rank to the next. The holder of land owed service, chiefly military, to the lord above him. Duty flowed steadily upward in return for land granted downward. Chief among these duties was the vassal's service in his lord's wars. Obligation was, in effect, the true price of the fief. Service was always owed for the land held.

The serf owed labour and dues. The peasant held his plot in return for labour and rent rendered to the lord. His heavy obligation supported the whole hierarchy above him. He worked the lord's demesne for set days each week and gave a share of his own crop. Land and duty together thus bound him firmly to the manor. The serf, in effect, paid for his land in toil.

Personal loyalty completed the bond. Homage and fealty added a deep personal tie to the mere exchange of land and service. Loyalty, as well as land, held lord and vassal together. To break faith with one's lord was reckoned the gravest of all feudal crimes. Feudalism was thus personal quite as much as territorial. The sworn oath, in effect, bound man to man.

It was also a system of local government. The lord who held the land also ruled, judged and defended it. Government was therefore bound up directly with landholding. Justice, defence and administration all lay in the hands of the landholder. Feudalism thus governed quite as much as it merely owned. Land, in this age, always carried real power with it.

It was a system of production too. The manor organised the labour that fed the whole of society. Feudalism was thus an economic as well as a political order. The wealth of lord and serf alike was drawn from the soil of the manor. It produced wealth quite as much as it ruled men. The land was worked as well as merely held.

Land and obligation nonetheless lay at the centre. Every other feature, loyalty, government and production, grew directly from the grant of land for service. This single exchange was the core from which all else flowed. Strip away the fief and its service, and the whole structure would fall. The statement therefore rightly names the very heart of the system. Land and duty were, in truth, its essence.

The statement is largely valid. Feudalism was, above all, a system of land and obligation, in which land was granted in return for service and duty at every level. Yet it was also a system of personal loyalty, local government and production. Land and obligation were the core from which these other features flowed, so the statement names the essence of feudalism while not quite exhausting it.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires the claim weighed, including the other features beyond land and duty.

The trap is to accept the statement without noting loyalty, government and production.

The top band shows land and obligation as the core from which all else grew.

Question 91

Feudalism arose in Europe on the very ruins of the Roman Empire and became the dominant order of the Middle Ages. To account for its rise is to explain why society came to be organised around land, lordship and service. The collapse of central authority, the terror of invasion, and the pressing need for protection all drove the change. Out of deep insecurity there grew the feudal order.

The collapse of Roman authority left a void. As the central power of Rome fell away, no strong state remained to govern or to protect. Local arrangements had, of necessity, to fill the resulting gap. No emperor

or standing army now kept the peace across the land. The absence of central rule thus opened the way for feudalism. Power fell, in effect, to the localities themselves.

Invasions created a need for protection. Vikings, Magyars and Saracens ravaged Europe, and no central army defended it. People therefore turned to local lords for their safety. A lord with a castle and armed men could shelter his people as no distant king could. The urgent need for protection thus bred the feudal bond. Sheer danger drove men to seek out a lord.

Land became the basis of power. In a collapsing economy of little trade or coin, land was the chief form of wealth. Power and reward were now measured out in land. With money scarce, a grant of land was the surest reward a lord could give. The grant of land thus became the key relationship. Land, in effect, replaced money as the currency of rule.

Lords exchanged land for service. Unable to pay their soldiers in coin, lords granted them land instead. The vassal received a fief and owed military service in return for it. The knight held his fief for just so long as he answered his lord's call to arms. This exchange thus founded the whole feudal hierarchy. Land, in this way, bought the loyalty of fighting men.

The weak commended themselves to the strong. Free men gave up their independence to a lord in return for his protection. This act of commendation created the ties of lordship and dependence. A free peasant might surrender his land and receive it back as a dependent holding. The weak everywhere thus sought out a protector. Insecurity itself, in effect, bound man to lord.

The coloni became serfs. The tied tenants of the late empire were bound ever more firmly to the land. They became, over generations, the serfs of the new manor. The tenant fixed to his plot in the late empire became the medieval serf. The base of feudalism thus grew directly out of the old order. The bound peasant carried over into the new age.

Custom hardened the arrangements into a system. Over the generations these local ties became fixed and hereditary. What began as mere expedients grew into a settled order of society. What one generation held by grant, the next came to hold by right of birth. Custom thus turned rough practice into full feudalism. Time itself made the whole system permanent.

Feudalism rose in medieval Europe because the collapse of Roman authority and the terror of invasion left men dependent on local lords for protection. With money scarce, land became the reward of service, binding vassal to lord and serf to manor. The weak commended themselves to the strong, and custom hardened these ties into a system. Feudalism grew, in short, out of insecurity and the primacy of land.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of feudalism's rise, not a description of its features.

The trap is to describe knights and manors without explaining why the system arose.

The top band links the collapse of central power and invasion to the need for local protection.

Question 92

The manor was the basic unit of the feudal order, at once an estate, a community and a little government. To assess its role is to weigh how far the whole of feudalism rested upon it. The manor organised production, bound the serf to the land, and gave the lord his local authority. It was the very foundation of the system, though the wider feudal hierarchy rose above it.

The manor was the unit of production. It was a largely self-sufficient estate that produced most of what it needed. The lord's demesne and the peasants' holdings together made up its land. It grew its own food, made its own goods and traded little with the wider world. The whole of economic life thus centred upon the manor. It was, in effect, the workshop of the feudal world.

It bound the serf to the land. The peasants of the manor were tied firmly to it and could not lawfully leave. Their labour and their dues supported the lord above them. The serf could neither quit the manor nor

marry without the lord's consent. The manor thus held the serf permanently in place. It was, in effect, the very frame of unfree labour.

It supported the lord and the hierarchy. The produce and services of the manor maintained the lord in his estate. Through him, the manor supported the wider feudal order above. From its produce the lord armed himself and served the greater lord above him. The whole hierarchy thus rested, in the end, on manorial labour. The manor fed the entire pyramid above it.

It was a unit of local government. The lord governed the manor, keeping order and defending its people. Government, as well as production, centred squarely here. Within its bounds the lord's word was, in effect, the law of the place. The manor was thus a place of rule as much as of labour. The manor, in effect, ruled as well as it fed.

It dispensed justice through the manor court. Disputes among the peasants and breaches of custom were tried in the lord's court. Justice was thus local and thoroughly manorial. There the villagers themselves often declared the custom by which they were judged. The court thus bound the community to the lord's authority. Law itself, in this age, lived upon the manor.

It was a self-sufficient community. The manor produced its own food, goods and services with little outside trade. It was therefore largely independent of the wider world. Miller, smith and ploughman together supplied nearly all that the manor required. Self-sufficiency thus defined the whole of its economy. The manor was, in a real sense, a world in itself.

Yet it stood within a wider hierarchy. The manor was not isolated but part of the great chain of lordship rising to the king. The lord himself, in his turn, owed service above him. Above the manor rose the ranks of lords, and above them all the king. The manor was thus the base, and not the whole, of feudalism. It rested, throughout, within a larger order.

The manor therefore played a foundational role in the feudal administrative system. It was the unit of production, the frame that bound the serf, the support of the lord and hierarchy, and a centre of local government and justice. Largely self-sufficient, it was a little world in itself. Yet it stood within the wider feudal hierarchy, forming the essential base on which the whole system rested.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants the manor's role weighed within the wider feudal system.

The trap is to describe farming on the manor without its governing and judicial role.

The top band shows the manor as a unit of production, government and justice at once.

Question 93

Slavery and feudalism were the two great systems of production that dominated the ancient and medieval worlds in turn. To compare them is to see how each organised labour and government, and how they differed. Both rested on the exploitation of an unfree labouring class by a landowning few, yet they differed in the status of the worker and the structure of power. They were kindred systems of unfreedom, but by no means the same.

Both rested on unfree labour. In each system a labouring class worked for a class of owners without freedom. The slave and the serf alike were exploited by those above them. In neither could the labourer freely sell his work or choose his master. Both economies thus rested squarely on compelled labour. Unfreedom was, in this way, common to them both.

Both were dominated by a landowning class. Masters in slavery and lords in feudalism owned the land and lived from the toil of others. A few owned, while the many laboured for them. In each, a small class lived in idleness upon the labour of the many. Both were, therefore, class systems of owners and workers. The land itself was held by the few in each.

Yet the slave was owned outright. The slave was mere property, a chattel to be bought and sold at will. He had no rights and no legal person of his own. He could be sold away from his own family at his master's whim. Slavery was thus the more total form of unfreedom. The slave belonged wholly and entirely to his master.

The serf, by contrast, held land and rights. The serf was bound to the land but was not owned as a thing. He had a plot to work, a family and certain customary rights. He kept a share of his own produce and passed his holding to his children. His unfreedom was real but distinctly less complete. The serf, in short, was tied to the land, not owned.

Their structures of power differed. Slavery flourished under strong central states such as Rome. Feudalism, by contrast, arose where central power had collapsed and lords ruled locally. The slave state was centralised, while feudalism scattered power among many lords. One system was thus centralised, the other deeply fragmented. Power itself was ordered quite differently in each.

Their labour was organised differently. Slaves were worked in gangs on great estates under close supervision. Serfs, by contrast, worked their own plots and the lord's demesne by custom. The supervised gang thus gave way to the peasant working his own strips. The whole organisation of labour had, in this way, changed. The gang yielded to the customary tenant holding.

Feudalism was more productive than slavery. The serf, with his own plot and family, worked far more willingly than the slave. This willingness made feudal labour distinctly more efficient. A man working partly for himself cared for the land as no slave ever did. The change thus marked a real advance in production. The tied tenant, in the end, outproduced the slave gang.

In comparison, slavery and feudalism were kindred systems, each resting on the exploitation of an unfree labouring class by a landowning few. Yet they differed sharply: the slave was owned outright and worked in gangs under a strong state, while the serf held land and rights and laboured locally under fragmented lordship. Feudalism, with its more willing labour, marked an advance over slavery in the organisation of production.

Examiner's Note

"Compare" requires similarities and differences point against point, not two separate accounts.

The trap is to describe each system in turn without ever comparing them.

The top band pairs their shared exploitation with the key difference between slave and serf.

Question 94

Feudal or feudal-like systems developed in several parts of Africa, especially in the interlacustrine kingdoms and in Ethiopia. To examine their features is to see how these African societies organised land, cattle and obligation. They rested on the control of land or cattle by a ruling class, on clientship, and on the labour and tribute of a dependent peasantry. These features gave African feudalism its own distinctive form.

A ruling class controlled the land. In kingdoms such as Buganda and Bunyoro, the land was held by the king and his chiefs. The ruling class granted land out and drew its wealth from it. The king was held to own all the land, which he parcelled out among his chiefs. Control of the land was thus the true basis of power. The chief held the land much as the lord did in Europe.

Land was granted in return for service. Chiefs received land and office from the king in exchange for their loyalty and service. As in Europe, land was here the reward of allegiance. A chief who failed in his duty might be stripped of both his land and his office. The grant of land thus bound the chief firmly to the king. Service, in this way, was always owed for the land held.

Cattle clientship bound men together. In Rwanda and Nkore, the ubuhake and similar systems tied client to patron through cattle. The lord granted out cattle, and the client owed service and loyalty in return. To

receive a lord's cattle was to become his man and to owe him service. Cattle, quite like land, thus created strong bonds of dependence. The herd, in effect, bound man to man.

A dependent peasantry laboured and paid tribute. The common people worked the land and rendered tribute and labour to their chiefs. Their toil directly supported the whole ruling class above. The bulk of the people were commoners who laboured for those set above them. The peasant thus sustained the lord in his power. Labour and tribute alike flowed steadily upward.

Systems such as nyarubanja tied land and labour. In Buhaya the nyarubanja system gave chiefs control of the land and the labour of those upon it. Tenants owed service in return for the land they held. The tenant who held such land owed both labour and a share of his harvest. Land and obligation were thus firmly joined together. The tenant, in effect, served for his very holding.

Ethiopia developed a land-based nobility. In Ethiopia, land grants such as the gult supported a warrior nobility. Peasants paid dues to the lords who held the land from the emperor. The soldier-nobles lived on the dues of the peasants who farmed their grants. A feudal hierarchy of land and service thereby arose. Ethiopia's order closely resembled that of European feudalism.

Yet African feudalism had its own character. Cattle, as well as land, and ties of kinship and clientship shaped these systems. They were by no means identical to the feudalism of Europe. Kinship, cattle and clientship together gave it a shape unlike Europe's. African feudalism thus took its own distinctive local forms. The pattern was recognisably feudal, but it was African.

Feudalism in Africa therefore rested on the control of land and cattle by a ruling class, on clientship, and on the labour and tribute of a dependent peasantry. In the interlacustrine kingdoms and in Ethiopia, land or cattle were granted for service, binding lord and client in relations of obligation. Though it took distinctive African forms, this was recognisably a feudal order of land, dependence and unfree labour.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks for the features of African feudalism, not a survey of every kingdom.

The trap is to describe kingdoms without showing the feudal relations of land and clientship.

The top band uses the interlacustrine states and Ethiopia to illustrate land, cattle and obligation.

Question 95

Feudalism, dominant across medieval Europe, gradually declined and gave way to the modern state and to capitalism. To account for its decline is to explain why the whole order of land, lordship and serfdom broke down. The growth of trade and towns, the money economy, the Black Death, and the rise of strong monarchies all undid it. Feudalism dissolved, in the end, as its very foundations were eroded.

The growth of trade and towns undermined it. As commerce revived, towns grew up outside the manorial world. Trade created wealth in money rather than in land. The townsman who lived by trade owed no service to any manorial lord. The self-sufficient manor thereby lost its old grip on society. Commerce steadily eroded the whole feudal economy.

The money economy replaced service. As money spread, lords increasingly took rent in coin rather than in labour. Serfs commuted their old services into simple money payments. A lord who took rent in coin no longer needed the serf's labour on his fields. The binding tie of land and service thus weakened. Money, in effect, loosened the whole feudal bond.

The Black Death shattered serfdom. The plague of 1348 killed so many that labour grew suddenly scarce and dear. The surviving peasants could now demand freedom and wages. With so few hands left, lords had to bargain for the labour they had once commanded. The great shortage of labour thus broke the serf's bondage. Death, ironically, helped to free the peasant.

Peasant revolts shook the system. Risings of peasants against their lords challenged the feudal dues and serfdom itself. These revolts, though often crushed, weakened the old order. Risings such as the English

revolt of 1381 openly demanded the end of serfdom. The serf increasingly resisted his ancient bondage. Revolt thus pressed hard against feudalism.

Strong monarchies centralised power. Kings built up central states, armies and taxes that bypassed the feudal lords. Royal power thereby replaced the scattered authority of the lords. Royal courts and officials increasingly took justice out of the hands of the lords. The rising central state thus undid the old feudal fragmentation. The king, in the end, overtopped the baron.

Paid armies replaced feudal levies. Monarchs raised professional armies paid in money rather than knights serving for land. The whole military basis of feudalism thereby dissolved. The king who could hire soldiers no longer depended on his vassals' knights. The soldier no longer served in return for a fief. War itself ceased to rest upon the feudal bond.

The rise of capitalism transformed the economy. New forms of production for the market gradually replaced the old manor. Wage labour slowly began to replace serfdom across the land. Production for profit and the market thus displaced the manorial order. A wholly new economic order emerged from the old. Capitalism, in effect, grew out of feudalism's decline.

Feudalism declined in Europe because the growth of trade, towns and money undermined the self-sufficient manor and turned service into rent. The Black Death and peasant revolts broke serfdom, while strong monarchies and paid armies replaced the scattered power and levies of the lords. As capitalism rose, the feudal order dissolved. Feudalism gave way, in the end, to the modern state and economy.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of decline, not a description of feudalism.

The trap is to give only the Black Death and ignore trade, money and the monarchies.

The top band links the money economy and strong monarchies to the breakdown of serfdom.

Question 96

The passage from the ancient slave economy to the medieval feudal one changed the whole condition of the labouring class. The statement holds that this transition was a step forward for the labourer. There is much truth in this, for the serf enjoyed rights and a security that the slave had wholly lacked. Yet the serf too was exploited and unfree, so the step forward was real but distinctly limited.

The slave had been owned as property. Under slavery the labourer was a mere chattel, bought and sold at will. He had no rights and no legal person of his own. He could be sold, beaten or even killed at his master's pleasure. His unfreedom was, in every sense, total. The slave belonged wholly and entirely to another.

The serf, by contrast, was not owned. The serf was bound to the land but was not owned as a thing. He could not be sold apart from the land he worked. He was tied to the soil, but he was not a chattel to be traded away from it. His status was thus distinctly above that of the slave. The serf was tied to the land, not owned as a chattel.

The serf held land and could support a family. Unlike the slave, the serf had a plot to work and a family of his own. He could keep at least something of the fruit of his labour. The plot he worked fed his household and gave him something of his own to defend. This gave him a real stake and a measure of security. The serf, in short, had both a household and a holding.

The serf enjoyed customary rights. Custom protected the serf's holding and limited what the lord could lawfully demand. He had rights, however modest, that the slave had entirely lacked. Long usage fixed his dues and shielded him from the lord's mere caprice. Custom thus gave him at least some shelter. The serf was not wholly at the mercy of his lord.

The serf worked more willingly and productively. Because he worked partly for himself, the serf laboured with more care than the slave. This was an advance in production as well as in mere condition.

Knowing part of the crop was his own, he tended the land with real care. Willing labour thus marked the true step forward. The serf, unlike the slave, had reason to work well.

Yet the serf remained unfree and exploited. The serf was still bound to the land and owed heavy dues and labour. His lord took his surplus much as the master had taken the slave's. He could not leave the manor, and the greater part of his labour went to the lord. Exploitation thus simply continued under a new form. The serf was freer than the slave, but he was not free.

The step forward was real but limited. The serf's gains in rights and security were genuine but only partial. He exchanged one form of unfreedom for a distinctly milder one. He had risen from chattel to bound tenant, but not yet to a free man. Progress was therefore real, yet plainly incomplete. The labourer rose, in the end, but not to freedom.

The statement is largely valid but must be qualified. The transition from slavery to feudalism was indeed a step forward for the labourer, for the serf held land, kept a family, enjoyed customary rights and worked more willingly than the slave. Yet the serf remained bound and exploited, owing heavy dues to his lord. The step forward was real, but it carried the labourer from one form of unfreedom to a milder one, not to freedom itself.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires the gains of the serf weighed against his continued unfreedom.

The trap is to celebrate the change without noting that the serf remained exploited.

The top band shows a real but limited advance from slave to serf.

Question 97

Feudalism arose precisely where strong central government had collapsed, and it took over the very tasks of rule. The question asks how far it provided effective government in that absence. To a considerable extent it did, for the local lord gave protection, justice and order where no state could. Yet its deep fragmentation also bred disorder and private war, so its government was effective but seriously flawed.

It provided local protection. Where no central army existed, the lord and his knights defended their own lands. People found real safety under a strong local protector. In a lawless age, the lord's castle was the one sure refuge from raiders. Feudalism thus answered directly the pressing need for defence. The castle, in effect, sheltered the surrounding countryside.

It maintained order and justice. The lord kept the peace and judged disputes in his own manor court. Local government thereby continued through his authority. Petty crimes and everyday disputes were settled swiftly in the lord's own court. Feudalism thus supplied a working justice where the state had failed. The lord's court genuinely served the local community.

It organised military service. The feudal bond raised and maintained fighting men through grants of land. Armies could thus be summoned without money or a central state. Each fief owed a set number of knights, ready at the lord's summons. Feudalism, in this way, provided for both defence and war. Land itself, in effect, raised the soldier.

It filled the vacuum left by Rome. Where the central state had wholly vanished, feudalism supplied a working order. Society did not collapse into anarchy but found instead a new structure. Where the empire's officials had vanished, the lord took up their tasks. Feudalism was thus a practical answer to the collapse. It governed, in effect, where nothing else could.

Yet its authority was fragmented. Power was scattered among many lords, with no common rule above them. This division fatally weakened government beyond the purely local level. What one lord decreed, his neighbour might freely ignore. Fragmentation was, therefore, a very serious flaw. No single authority, in the end, governed the whole.

It bred private war and disorder. Lords fought one another, and the strong openly oppressed the weak. Without a central power to restrain them, feuds flourished everywhere. Rival lords settled their quarrels by the sword rather than by law. Feudalism thus could not keep the wider peace of the realm. Local rule, all too often, meant local violence.

It could not provide unified government. Feudalism gave local order but no true national administration. The great tasks that lay beyond the manor simply went undone. No common law, coinage or army bound the many lordships into one. Only the later monarchies at last restored real unity. Feudalism governed the locality well, but never the realm.

Feudalism provided effective government to a considerable extent, giving protection, justice, order and military service where the central state had collapsed. It filled the vacuum left by Rome and kept society from anarchy. Yet its fragmented authority bred private war and could not provide unified rule. Feudalism was an effective answer to the absence of a strong state at the local level, but a flawed one for the realm as a whole.

Examiner's Note

"To what extent" needs feudalism's local effectiveness weighed against its fragmentation.

The trap is to praise or condemn feudal government without balancing local order and wider disorder.

The top band credits local protection and justice while conceding private war and disunity.

Question 98

Slavery and feudalism were successive stages in the development of production, and each left a deep mark on the societies that followed. To assess their contribution is to weigh what later ages truly owed to them. They advanced the forces of production, shaped lasting institutions of land and law, and prepared the way for capitalism. Their contribution was real and lasting, though it came at a heavy human cost.

They advanced the forces of production. Each system, in its turn, organised labour on a larger scale than before. Slavery built the great estates, and feudalism improved upon them with the manor. Each stage mastered more land and labour than the one that came before it. Production thus grew steadily through these successive stages. The economy advanced, in effect, from the one to the next.

Slavery built the wealth of the ancient world. The great civilisations of Greece and Rome rested squarely on slave labour. Their art, their learning and their cities were founded upon it. The temples, roads and monuments of antiquity were raised by slave hands. Slavery thus underwrote the whole achievement of antiquity. The ancient world itself was built upon the slave.

Feudalism preserved order after Rome. When central government collapsed, feudalism kept society from falling into anarchy. It carried Europe safely through the early Middle Ages. In its manors and lordships, a shattered society found a workable frame. Feudalism thus preserved and organised medieval life. It held society together through a dark and dangerous age.

Feudalism prepared the way for capitalism. Out of the feudal manor grew the trade, towns and money economy that became capitalism. The serf's advance over the slave pointed forward to the free labourer. Its towns, trade and money grew into the very order that replaced it. Feudalism was thus the seedbed of the modern economy. Capitalism, in effect, grew directly out of feudalism.

They shaped enduring institutions of land. Systems of landholding, tenure and rent descend in part from these two orders. The relations of land and labour they created long outlived them. Rent, tenure and the estate descend in part from these ancient forms. Later societies thus inherited their very forms of property. Land law itself still bears their lasting mark.

They left legacies of law and hierarchy. Ideas of obligation, service and rank descend directly from the feudal order. Social hierarchies were deeply shaped by these systems. The titles, ranks and duties of the feudal age long outlived it. Their influence thus lingered on in later society. Notions of rank and duty carried over into modern times.

Yet their contribution came at great human cost. Both systems rested wholly on the exploitation of the unfree. Their real achievements were built upon human suffering. The wealth and order they created were wrung from the labour of the unfree. Progress, in these ages, was thus bought with oppression. The heavy cost fell always upon the slave and the serf.

The contribution of slavery and feudalism to later societies was therefore real and lasting. Each advanced the forces of production, and between them they built the wealth of antiquity, preserved order after Rome, and prepared the way for capitalism. They shaped enduring institutions of land, law and hierarchy. Yet their achievements rested on the exploitation of the unfree, so their contribution to human development came at a heavy human cost.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants their contribution weighed, including its heavy human cost.

The trap is to treat them only as evils and ignore their part in developing production.

The top band shows them advancing production toward capitalism while resting on exploitation.

Question 99

The political revolutions of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries gave rise to a new kind of government in Europe. To examine the main features of these modern administrative systems is to see how they differed from the old order of absolute monarchy and privilege. They rested on constitutional government, the separation of powers, the rule of law, representative democracy and the nation-state. These features together defined the modern state.

Government rested on a constitution. Power was now limited and defined by a written or accepted constitution rather than the mere will of a king. Ruler and ruled alike were bound by a fundamental law standing above them. This replaced the arbitrary and personal authority of the old absolute monarchy. Government by settled rule thus took the place of government by whim. Constitutional government was the first great mark of the modern state.

Powers were separated. Following Montesquieu, the functions of making, executing and judging the law were placed in separate hands. Legislature, executive and judiciary were each to check and balance the others. No single body could now wield the whole power of the state at once. This division was held to be the very guardian of liberty. The separation of powers thus guarded the citizen against tyranny.

Government was bound by the rule of law. Under the new systems even the ruler was subject to the law rather than above it. The same law applied to all, high and low alike, ending the privileges of birth. Officials could act only as the law allowed them. This rule of law replaced the arbitrary command of kings. It made government predictable and just rather than capricious.

Authority rested on the people. Sovereignty was now held to lie with the people rather than with the crown. Representative assemblies, elected by the citizens, made the laws in their name. Government thus drew its legitimacy from the consent of the governed. Popular sovereignty and representation replaced the divine right of kings. The people, at least in principle, became the source of all authority.

Citizens held rights. The modern state recognised the citizen as a bearer of rights rather than a mere subject. Declarations of rights proclaimed liberty, equality before the law and the protection of property. These rights limited what the state could lawfully do to the individual. The subject of the king became the citizen of the nation. Guaranteed rights were a defining feature of the new order.

The nation-state replaced the dynastic realm. Government was now bound to a nation of citizens rather than to the person of a ruler. Loyalty was owed to the nation and its laws rather than to a dynasty. Nationalism gave the modern state a new and powerful unity. The state became the expression of a people rather than the property of a king. The nation-state was the characteristic form of modern government.

A professional bureaucracy administered the state. The modern state was run by salaried, trained officials chosen increasingly for their ability. Offices were filled by merit rather than by birth or purchase.

This professional civil service gave government a new efficiency and permanence. Careers were thrown open to talent as never before. Bureaucracy became the everyday machinery of the modern administrative state.

The modern administrative systems that arose in Europe therefore rested on constitutional government, the separation of powers, the rule of law, popular sovereignty, guaranteed rights, the nation-state and a professional bureaucracy. Together these features replaced the old order of absolute monarchy, privilege and personal rule. Forged in the political revolutions, they became the model of the modern state and spread, in time, across the world.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks for the features of modern government analysed, not a narrative of the revolutions.

The trap is to tell the story of the French Revolution instead of describing the new systems.

The top band contrasts each modern feature with the old order of absolutism and privilege.

Question 100

Absolute monarchy, in which the king ruled without effective check, dominated Europe in the seventeenth century but declined sharply thereafter. To account for its decline is to explain why the unchecked power of kings gave way to constitutional government. The rise of new classes, Enlightenment ideas, financial failure, revolution and the example of successful reform all undid it. Absolutism fell before the forces of a changing age.

A rising middle class demanded a share of power. The growth of trade and industry created a wealthy bourgeoisie excluded from political power. This class resented paying taxes while the nobility escaped them and it enjoyed no voice. It came to demand rights, representation and a say in government. Absolute monarchy could not for ever ignore so wealthy and able a class. Its ambition was a powerful solvent of royal absolutism.

Enlightenment ideas discredited absolute rule. Thinkers such as Locke, Montesquieu and Rousseau attacked the very foundations of absolutism. They argued for government by consent, the separation of powers and the sovereignty of the people. These ideas spread widely among the educated and undermined the divine right of kings. Absolute monarchy lost its intellectual justification. The Enlightenment armed its critics with a new political creed.

Financial crisis crippled the monarchies. Costly wars and extravagant courts drove the absolute states, above all France, toward bankruptcy. Kings could not tax the privileged orders and dared not reform without summoning assemblies. Financial failure forced them to seek the consent they had long ignored. The bankruptcy of the crown thus opened the door to revolution. Money, or the lack of it, undid the absolute state.

Revolution overthrew absolute kings. The English and French revolutions directly toppled or humbled absolute monarchs. The execution of Charles I in 1649 and of Louis XVI in 1793 shattered the myth of untouchable kingship. Revolution showed that even the mightiest monarch could be brought down. These upheavals swept away absolutism where argument alone had failed. Force, in the end, ended the rule of unchecked kings.

Successful examples inspired reform. England's constitutional monarchy and America's republic showed that free government could work. Their prosperity and stability contrasted with the crises of the absolute states. Reformers across Europe pointed to these models as proof that absolutism was neither necessary nor best. Success abroad thus encouraged the demand for change at home. Example was a powerful teacher against absolute rule.

The privileged orders resisted royal reform. Paradoxically, the nobility and clergy often blocked the very reforms that might have saved the monarchy. Their defence of privilege made the absolute state rigid

and unjust. Unable to reform itself, absolutism grew brittle and vulnerable. The selfishness of the privileged hastened the fall of the crown they served. Absolutism was undone in part by its own supporters.

Nationalism demanded a new kind of state. The rising idea of the nation held that government should serve a people, not a dynasty. This claim was incompatible with the personal rule of an absolute king. Nationalism called for citizens and constitutions rather than subjects and monarchs. It gave the demand for change a powerful new force. The nation, in the end, had no room for the absolute king.

Absolute monarchy declined in Europe because a rising middle class demanded power, Enlightenment ideas discredited royal absolutism, and financial crisis forced kings to seek consent. Revolution then toppled absolute rulers, while successful free governments abroad inspired reform and the privileged orders blocked the crown's own renewal. Driven by these forces, and by the new idea of the nation, absolutism gave way to constitutional government across Europe.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of absolutism's decline, not a description of absolute monarchy.

The trap is to describe one revolution alone rather than the broad forces at work.

The top band links the rising bourgeoisie and Enlightenment ideas to financial crisis and revolution.

Question 101

The Enlightenment of the eighteenth century was an age of political thought that reshaped ideas of government. To assess the contribution of its thinkers to modern administrative systems is to weigh how far they inspired the modern state. Locke, Montesquieu, Rousseau and others supplied the very principles of constitutional and representative government. Their ideas were profound, though revolution and practice were needed to realise them.

Locke supplied the idea of government by consent. John Locke argued that government rested on a contract with the people and existed to protect their natural rights. If it failed in this duty, the people might rightfully resist it. This struck at the root of absolute and divine-right monarchy. It gave the modern state its foundation in the consent of the governed. Locke's ideas shaped both the American and the French revolutions.

Montesquieu taught the separation of powers. In The Spirit of the Laws of 1748, Montesquieu argued that liberty required the separation of legislative, executive and judicial power. Each branch should check the others so that no one could grow tyrannical. This principle became a cornerstone of modern constitutions. The American Constitution in particular was built upon it. Montesquieu thus gave the modern state one of its central designs.

Rousseau proclaimed the sovereignty of the people. In The Social Contract of 1762, Rousseau declared that legitimate authority rested on the general will of the people. Sovereignty belonged to the citizens, not to any king. This idea inspired the democratic and republican movements of the age. It underlay the revolutionary claim that the nation itself was sovereign. Rousseau gave popular sovereignty its most powerful voice.

They asserted natural rights and equality. The Enlightenment thinkers held that all men possessed natural rights to liberty and equality before the law. This challenged the privileges of birth on which the old order rested. Their ideas were proclaimed in the great declarations of rights. Equality before the law became a founding principle of the modern state. The philosophers armed the age against privilege.

They championed reason and reform in government. The thinkers of the Enlightenment held that government should be rational, useful and just. They attacked cruelty, superstition and arbitrary power in the state. This spirit inspired reforms in law, administration and justice. Government came to be judged by reason rather than by tradition alone. The Enlightenment made reform itself a duty of the state.

Their ideas inspired the great revolutions. The American and French revolutions drew directly on Enlightenment thought. The Declaration of Independence and the Declaration of the Rights of Man echoed

Locke and Rousseau. The philosophers thus supplied the very language of revolution. Their ideas passed from the study into the constitution. Enlightenment theory became revolutionary practice.

Yet ideas alone did not build the modern state. The principles of the Enlightenment required revolution, struggle and long practice to be realised. Many of their ideals were only partly achieved, and some were betrayed. Theory had to be tested and tempered in the hard work of government. The thinkers inspired the modern state but did not by themselves create it. Ideas needed events to give them life.

The contribution of Enlightenment thinkers to modern administrative systems was therefore profound. Locke gave government its basis in consent, Montesquieu the separation of powers, and Rousseau the sovereignty of the people, while all asserted natural rights and the rule of reason. Their ideas inspired the great revolutions and shaped the modern state. Yet ideas alone were not enough, for it took revolution and long practice to turn Enlightenment theory into working government.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants the thinkers' contribution weighed, including the limits of ideas alone.

The trap is to list philosophers without linking each to a feature of the modern state.

The top band ties Locke, Montesquieu and Rousseau to consent, separation of powers and sovereignty.

Question 102

The English Revolution of the seventeenth century, from the Civil War to the settlement of 1688, transformed the government of England. To examine its causes is to see why king and Parliament came to blows and why absolute monarchy failed in England. The struggle sprang from disputes over sovereignty, money, religion and rights. These grievances, long building, at last drove the nation into revolution.

The struggle for sovereignty divided Crown and Parliament. At the root lay the question of who held supreme power, the king or Parliament. Charles I claimed to rule by divine right and sought to govern without any check. Parliament insisted that the king must rule with its consent and within the law. This deep clash over where sovereignty lay was the central cause of the conflict. It could not be settled except by force.

Disputes over taxation brought the quarrel to a head. Charles I levied taxes such as ship money without the consent of Parliament. Parliament held the ancient power of the purse and fiercely resisted these exactions. The king's attempt to raise money on his own authority struck at Parliament's rights. This financial conflict turned a constitutional dispute into an open breach. Money, as so often, lay near the heart of the quarrel.

Religious conflict inflamed the struggle. The Puritans and many in Parliament opposed the High-Church policies of Charles and Archbishop Laud. They feared a drift back toward Catholicism and resented the enforcement of ceremony. Religion thus added a bitter and passionate edge to the political dispute. Faith and politics became dangerously entangled. Religious fear made compromise far harder to reach.

The king tried to rule without Parliament. During his Personal Rule from 1629 to 1640, Charles governed for eleven years without calling Parliament at all. This confirmed the fear that he meant to make himself an absolute monarch. When at last forced to recall Parliament, he faced a body full of grievance. His long attempt at personal rule had poisoned the trust between them. It made a peaceful settlement almost impossible.

Ideas of law and liberty opposed absolutism. Parliament appealed to the common law, to Magna Carta and to the ancient liberties of the subject. These traditions held that even the king was bound by the law of the land. Against the claim of divine right stood the claim of parliamentary and legal rights. This clash of principles gave the struggle its deeper meaning. It was a contest of ideas as well as of interests.

Rebellion in Scotland and Ireland precipitated the crisis. The Scottish revolt against Charles's religious policy forced him to recall Parliament for money. The Irish rebellion of 1641 then raised the dangerous question of who should command an army. These crises brought the quarrel between king and Parliament

to breaking point. Distant rebellions thus lit the fuse at home. Events beyond England helped to trigger its revolution.

The attempt on the Five Members began the war. In 1642 Charles entered Parliament to arrest five leading members by force. This violation of Parliament's privilege destroyed the last hope of agreement. Both sides now prepared for war, and the Civil War broke out that year. The king's rash act turned political conflict into armed struggle. From that moment revolution was unavoidable.

The English Revolution sprang, then, from the long struggle between Crown and Parliament over sovereignty, taxation, religion and rights. Charles I's claim to absolute, divine-right rule collided with Parliament's insistence on law and consent, while religious fear inflamed the quarrel. Rebellion in Scotland and Ireland and the king's rash acts finally triggered war. Out of this revolution came the defeat of absolutism and the rise of constitutional government in England.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks for the causes analysed, not a narrative of the battles of the Civil War.

The trap is to describe the fighting rather than explain why king and Parliament clashed.

The top band links sovereignty, taxation and religion as the deep roots of the conflict.

Question 103

In 1688 the English drove out James II and offered the crown to William and Mary on conditions. The claim holds that this Glorious Revolution laid the foundations of modern constitutional government. This is largely valid, for it established the supremacy of Parliament and the rule of law over the crown. Yet the settlement was narrow and aristocratic, so it laid foundations without building the whole edifice.

It established the supremacy of Parliament. By inviting William and Mary to rule, Parliament showed that it, and not birth alone, could make a king. The monarch now held the throne on terms set by Parliament. This settled the long struggle in Parliament's favour. Henceforth the crown depended on Parliament rather than ruling above it. Parliamentary supremacy was the revolution's central achievement.

The Bill of Rights limited the crown. The Bill of Rights of 1689 forbade the king to tax, keep an army or suspend laws without Parliament's consent. It guaranteed free elections and free debate in Parliament. These limits bound the monarchy within the law for good. The arbitrary powers claimed by the Stuarts were stripped away. A written charter now fenced in the power of the crown.

It ended absolute monarchy in England. The revolution finally defeated the Stuart claim to rule by divine and absolute right. No English king could again govern without Parliament as Charles I had tried to do. Absolutism, which triumphed elsewhere in Europe, was decisively rejected in England. The crown became a limited and conditional office. This was a turning point in the history of government.

It secured regular Parliaments and the rule of law. The settlement ensured that Parliament would meet regularly and that law would bind ruler and ruled alike. The king could no longer set the law aside at his pleasure. Government by settled law replaced government by royal will. This rule of law became a foundation of the modern state. England was now governed by law rather than by whim.

It created a lasting constitutional monarchy. Out of 1688 grew the enduring English model of a monarch who reigns under Parliament and the law. This constitutional monarchy proved stable and was widely admired abroad. Montesquieu and others held it up as a model of balanced government. It influenced constitutions across Europe and beyond. The settlement thus shaped the wider development of free government.

Yet the settlement was narrow and aristocratic. The revolution gave power to Parliament, but Parliament represented only the propertied few. The mass of the people had no vote and no share in government. It was a victory for the landed and moneyed classes, not for democracy. In this sense its foundations were far from complete. Modern democratic government still lay well in the future.

Its principles nonetheless pointed forward. Though limited in its own day, the revolution established principles capable of wide extension. Parliamentary supremacy and the rule of law could later be joined to a broader franchise. The foundations laid in 1688 supported a democracy not yet built. Later reform enlarged what the revolution had begun. Its true significance lay in what it made possible.

The claim is largely valid. The Glorious Revolution of 1688 did lay the foundations of modern constitutional government, establishing the supremacy of Parliament, limiting the crown by the Bill of Rights and securing the rule of law. Yet the settlement was narrow and aristocratic, far short of democracy. It laid the foundations of the modern constitutional state without completing the building, which later ages of reform would raise upon them.

Examiner's Note

"How valid" invites strong agreement tempered by the settlement's narrow, aristocratic character.

The trap is to praise 1688 as democratic when the franchise remained tiny.

The top band credits parliamentary supremacy and the rule of law while noting the limits.

Question 104

In 1775 the thirteen American colonies rose in revolt against British rule, and in 1776 declared their independence. To account for the outbreak of the American Revolution is to explain why loyal colonies became rebels. Taxation without representation, commercial restriction, the desire for self-government and Enlightenment ideas all drove the breach. British attempts to tighten control after 1763 brought the crisis to a head.

Taxation without representation provoked resistance. After 1763 Britain taxed the colonies through measures such as the Stamp Act of 1765. The colonists insisted that they could not be taxed by a Parliament in which they had no representatives. "No taxation without representation" became their rallying cry. This denial of consent struck at what they held to be their rights. Taxation was the immediate spark of the whole quarrel.

Commercial restrictions bred resentment. The Navigation Acts and mercantilist policy bound colonial trade to British interests. The colonies were made to serve the wealth of the mother country rather than their own. This economic control chafed on a growing and ambitious people. Resentment of restriction fed the desire for freedom. The colonists came to see British rule as a shackle on their prosperity.

The colonies were used to self-government. For generations the colonies had governed much of their own affairs through elected assemblies. They had grown accustomed to managing taxation and local rule themselves. British attempts to override these assemblies were felt as tyranny. A people used to freedom resented the new controls. Long practice in self-rule made submission intolerable.

Enlightenment ideas justified the revolt. The colonists drew on Locke's teaching that government rested on consent and existed to protect natural rights. If it broke that trust, the people might rightfully resist. These ideas gave the revolution its principles and its language. The Declaration of Independence of 1776 proclaimed them to the world. Enlightenment thought turned rebellion into a cause of liberty.

Britain tightened its control after 1763. Victory in the Seven Years' War left Britain in debt and eager to control its colonies more closely. The old policy of "salutary neglect" gave way to firmer rule and new taxes. This sudden tightening after years of freedom alarmed the colonists. The change in British policy was a chief cause of the breach. New controls turned contented subjects into rebels.

A series of provocations inflamed feeling. Events such as the Boston Massacre of 1770 and the Boston Tea Party of 1773 hardened opinion. The Intolerable Acts of 1774, passed in reply, united the colonies against Britain. Each provocation and reprisal widened the gulf between the two sides. Anger mounted until compromise became impossible. A chain of incidents drove the colonies toward war.

A growing American identity sought expression. Distance and long separate development had bred a distinct American people. The colonists increasingly saw themselves as Americans rather than as Britons.

This new identity sought political expression in independence. The bond of loyalty to Britain had quietly weakened. A nation in the making now claimed a state of its own.

The American Revolution broke out because Britain taxed and restricted colonies that had long governed themselves and now claimed the rights of free men. Enlightenment ideas of consent justified their resistance, while Britain's tightening of control after 1763 and a chain of provocations brought matters to war. Behind it all, a distinct American people sought a state of its own. From these causes came the first great revolution of the modern age.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of the revolution, not a narrative of the War of Independence.

The trap is to give only taxation and ignore self-government, ideas and British policy.

The top band links taxation without representation to Enlightenment ideas and colonial self-rule.

Question 105

The American Revolution not only won the colonies their independence but created a new kind of state. To assess its contribution to modern administrative systems is to weigh how far it shaped the government of the modern world. It produced the first great modern republic, a written constitution, the separation of powers and a federal system. Its influence was profound, though its early promise was in some ways incomplete.

It created the first modern republic. The United States established a large and lasting republic without a king or hereditary ruler. Its government rested on the sovereignty of the people rather than on a crown. This showed that a great state could be governed as a republic. It broke decisively with the age of monarchy. The modern republic found in America its first enduring example.

It produced a written constitution. The Constitution of 1787 set out the framework of government in a single supreme written document. It defined and limited the powers of every branch of the state. This idea of a written, supreme constitution became a model for the world. Later nations everywhere drew up constitutions on the American pattern. The written constitution was among the revolution's great bequests.

It embodied the separation of powers. The Constitution divided power between Congress, the President and the Supreme Court. Each branch was given the means to check and balance the others. Montesquieu's principle was here first fully put into practice. This design guarded liberty by preventing any concentration of power. The separation of powers became a foundation of modern government.

It established the federal system. The revolution created a federal state, dividing power between the central government and the states. This allowed a large and diverse territory to be governed as one. Federalism offered a model for uniting many units under a single government. It has since been copied by nations across the world. The federal idea was a distinctive American contribution.

It protected rights by a bill of rights. The Bill of Rights of 1791 guaranteed the freedoms of the citizen against the state. Speech, religion, the press and fair trial were placed beyond the government's reach. This entrenched protection of individual rights shaped later constitutions everywhere. It made the guarding of liberty a central task of the state. The bill of rights became a model for the modern world.

It proclaimed government by consent and equality. The Declaration of Independence of 1776 asserted that all men are created equal and governments rest on consent. This principle challenged privilege and monarchy across the world. It gave the modern state its ideal of equal citizenship. The declaration inspired reformers and revolutionaries for generations. Its words became a charter of modern political freedom.

Yet its early promise was incomplete. The new republic kept slavery and limited the vote to propertied white men. Its noble principles were not at first extended to all. The gap between ideal and practice was wide and long-lasting. In this the revolution's contribution was unfinished. Its promise would only slowly be realised by later struggle.

The American Revolution's contribution to modern administrative systems was therefore profound. It created the first great modern republic, the written constitution, the separation of powers, federalism and the entrenched protection of rights, and it proclaimed government by consent and equality. These became models for the modern world. Yet its promise was at first incomplete, marred by slavery and a narrow franchise, and only later struggles fulfilled it.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants the revolution's contribution weighed, including its incomplete early promise.

The trap is to narrate the war rather than analyse the institutions it created.

The top band ties the republic, the written constitution and federalism to modern government.

Question 106

The French Revolution of 1789 overthrew the absolute monarchy and the old order of privilege in France. To account for its outbreak is to explain why the greatest kingdom of Europe collapsed into revolution. Absolutism, financial crisis, privilege, bourgeois ambition, peasant misery and Enlightenment ideas all combined against the old regime. Weak leadership and the American example brought the crisis to a head.

Absolute monarchy denied the nation a voice. France was ruled by an absolute king who governed without any representative assembly. The Estates-General had not met for 175 years before 1789. This left the nation with no lawful means to voice its grievances. Absolutism bred a dangerous build-up of discontent. A government that heard no complaint at last faced revolution.

Financial crisis brought the state to bankruptcy. Costly wars and a lavish court had driven the monarchy deep into debt. The king could not tax the privileged orders and dared not reform without consent. Bankruptcy forced Louis XVI to summon the Estates-General in 1789. The financial crisis thus lit the fuse of revolution. The state's ruin opened the door to its overthrow.

The privilege of the first two estates bred resentment. The clergy and nobility, the First and Second Estates, were largely exempt from taxation. The whole burden fell on the Third Estate of commoners. This gross injustice was bitterly resented by those who paid. The defence of privilege made the old order both unjust and rigid. Inequality before the law was a deep cause of the revolution.

The ambition of the bourgeoisie demanded change. The wealthy middle class had grown rich through trade and the professions. Yet it was excluded from power and honour by the privilege of birth. It came to demand equality, rights and a share in government. This able and frustrated class supplied the revolution's leaders. Bourgeois ambition was among the strongest forces for change.

Peasant misery fed the upheaval. The peasants bore heavy feudal dues, taxes and tithes while owning little land. Bad harvests in 1788 brought hunger and soaring bread prices. Desperation drove the countryside toward revolt in 1789. The misery of the peasantry gave the revolution its mass force. Hunger and injustice together roused the rural poor.

Enlightenment ideas inspired the demand for reform. The writings of Rousseau, Voltaire and Montesquieu spread ideas of liberty, equality and popular sovereignty. These ideas discredited absolutism and privilege among the educated. They gave the revolution its principles and its confidence. The philosophers armed the age against the old regime. Enlightenment thought turned grievance into a programme.

Weak leadership and the American example completed the crisis. Louis XVI was well-meaning but indecisive and unable to control events. The recent American Revolution had shown that a people could overthrow tyranny and win freedom. Its example inspired the French and drained their treasury besides. Weak leadership at the centre let the crisis run out of control. The old regime fell for want of a firm hand to save it.

The French Revolution broke out because an absolute and bankrupt monarchy, propping up the privilege of clergy and nobility, faced the united anger of an ambitious bourgeoisie and a starving peasantry.

Enlightenment ideas gave this discontent principles and confidence, while weak leadership and the American example brought the crisis to a head. From this convergence of causes came the greatest political revolution of the modern age.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes woven into a chain, not a narrative of 1789.

The trap is to list grievances without showing how bankruptcy forced the crisis open.

The top band ranks the causes and links financial crisis to the summoning of the Estates-General.

Question 107

The French Revolution was the work of several classes acting together against the old regime. The statement holds that the middle class drove it more than the peasantry. There is much truth in this, for the bourgeoisie led the revolution and gained most from it. Yet the peasantry and the urban poor supplied the force that made it succeed. The revolution was a coalition, led by the middle class but powered by the masses.

The middle class led the revolution. The bourgeoisie dominated the Third Estate and the National Assembly that challenged the king. Lawyers, writers and officials such as those of 1789 provided its leaders. It was the middle class that framed the revolution's demands and laws. Leadership of the movement lay firmly in bourgeois hands. The revolution was, at its head, a middle-class affair.

The middle class supplied the ideas and aims. The goals of the revolution, careers open to talent, equality before the law and constitutional government, were bourgeois aims. These answered the grievances of an able class excluded by birth. The Declaration of the Rights of Man expressed its ideals. The programme of the revolution was, in essence, the programme of the middle class. Its aims bore the stamp of the bourgeoisie.

The middle class gained most from the revolution. The abolition of privilege and feudalism opened careers and property to the bourgeoisie. Offices, land and honours once reserved to the nobility now lay open to talent and wealth. It was the middle class that rose to power in the new order. The chief beneficiaries of the revolution were the bourgeoisie. They inherited the France that the revolution made.

Yet the peasantry provided the mass force. The peasants rose across the countryside in the Great Fear of 1789. Their revolt forced the National Assembly to abolish feudalism in August of that year. Without this rural upheaval the revolution might have stalled. The peasantry supplied much of the movement's weight and menace. Their action drove the revolution forward at a crucial moment.

The urban poor powered the radical phase. The sans-culottes of Paris stormed the Bastille in July 1789 and later the palace itself. Their journées and risings pushed the revolution to its most radical acts. The poor of the cities gave the movement its cutting edge. They forced the pace when the bourgeoisie would have halted. The urban crowd was the muscle of the revolution.

Peasant grievances were among the deepest causes. The burdens of feudal dues, taxes and hunger had long oppressed the countryside. This misery gave the revolution its explosive mass discontent. The peasantry's grievances were not merely a support but a root of the upheaval. Their suffering helped to bring the whole old order down. The revolution drew deep energy from rural pain.

The revolution was a coalition of classes. The bourgeoisie could not have triumphed without the force of the peasants and the poor. Nor could the masses have framed a new order without middle-class leadership. Each class needed the other to overthrow the old regime. The revolution was thus a partnership, however uneasy. Led by the middle class, it was carried by the many.

The statement is largely valid but one-sided. The middle class did drive the revolution, leading it, supplying its ideas and gaining most from it. Yet the peasantry and the urban poor provided the force that made it succeed, from the Great Fear to the storming of the Bastille. The French Revolution was a coalition of classes, led and profited from by the bourgeoisie but powered by the anger of the masses.

Examiner's Note
"Discuss" requires the middle-class role weighed against that of the peasantry and urban poor.
The trap is to credit the bourgeoisie alone and ignore the force supplied by the masses.
The top band shows the revolution as a coalition, led by the middle class but powered by the poor.

Question 108

The French Revolution did not merely overthrow the old regime but built a new order of government in its place. To examine its administrative reforms is to see how it remade the state of France. It abolished feudalism, proclaimed the rights of man, established equality before the law and created constitutional and uniform government. These reforms transformed France and became a model for the modern state.

It abolished feudalism. On the night of 4 August 1789 the National Assembly swept away feudal dues, serfdom and noble privilege. The whole apparatus of the old rural order was destroyed at a stroke. Peasants were freed from the burdens their lords had long imposed. This ended the medieval structure of French society. The abolition of feudalism cleared the ground for a new order.

It proclaimed the rights of man. The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen of 1789 announced the liberty and equality of all men. It declared that sovereignty belonged to the nation and that law expressed the general will. These principles became the charter of the new state. They inspired reformers far beyond France itself. The declaration set out the creed of the modern citizen.

It established equality before the law. The revolution ended the privileges of birth that had divided French society. All citizens were now equal before the law and liable to the same taxes. Careers and offices were thrown open to talent rather than to rank. This principle of legal equality was among the revolution's greatest achievements. It replaced the rule of privilege with the rule of law.

It created constitutional government. The Constitution of 1791 turned France into a limited monarchy with an elected assembly. Power was divided and the king bound by law rather than absolute. Government now rested, at least in principle, on the consent of the nation. This was a decisive break with royal absolutism. Constitutional rule replaced the personal government of kings.

It reformed local government. The revolution swept away the tangled old provinces and created uniform departments. France was now divided into equal administrative units governed by the same rules. This brought order and consistency to the government of the country. Local administration was rationalised and made uniform throughout. The new departments gave France a modern administrative map.

It reformed law and justice. The revolution moved toward a single, uniform system of law for the whole nation. It established equality before the courts and reformed the harsh old penalties. Justice was to be public, uniform and open to all citizens alike. This prepared the way for the great codification that Napoleon would complete. Law became national rather than a patchwork of local custom.

It reshaped the relation of Church and State. The revolution nationalised the lands of the Church and brought the clergy under state control. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy of 1790 made priests officials of the nation. This asserted the authority of the secular state over the Church. Though it provoked bitter division, it advanced the modern separation of religion and government. The state now claimed supremacy over the Church.

The administrative reforms of the French Revolution therefore remade the government of France. It abolished feudalism, proclaimed the rights of man, established equality before the law, and created constitutional government, uniform local administration and a reformed system of justice. These reforms swept away the old regime and built the framework of the modern state. Carried across Europe, they shaped the administration of the modern world.

Examiner's Note
"Examine" asks for the reforms analysed, not a narrative of the revolution's politics.
The trap is to describe the Terror rather than the reforms of government.
The top band shows the reforms replacing privilege and absolutism with equality and law.

Question 109

The French Revolution of 1789 was among the most significant events in the history of Europe. To assess its significance to the development of modern Europe is to weigh how far it shaped the continent that followed. It destroyed absolutism and feudalism, proclaimed the rights of man, and gave birth to nationalism and modern politics. Its influence was immense, though it also brought terror, war and reaction.

It destroyed absolutism and feudalism in France. The revolution overthrew the absolute monarchy and swept away the feudal order. It ended the privileges of birth on which the old regime had rested. This example shook the thrones and hierarchies of all Europe. The old order could never again feel wholly secure. The revolution marked the end of the medieval state in France.

It proclaimed the rights of man and equality. The Declaration of the Rights of Man announced principles of liberty and equality for all. These ideals became the creed of liberalism across Europe. They inspired demands for rights and constitutions in country after country. The revolution gave the age a new political faith. Its principles outlived the revolution itself.

It spread the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity. The slogans and ideas of the revolution were carried across Europe by its armies and its example. Peoples everywhere learned the language of rights and citizenship. These ideals became a permanent part of European politics. They fed reform and revolution for generations. The revolution set the agenda of the modern age.

It gave birth to modern nationalism. The revolution made the nation, not the king, the source of authority. The idea of the nation-in-arms, defending itself in 1792, kindled a powerful nationalism. This force would remake the map of Europe in the century that followed. Nationalism became one of the great movements of modern times. The revolution was its seedbed.

It inspired revolutions and reform across Europe. The example of 1789 inspired the revolutions of 1830 and 1848 and countless reform movements. Liberals and nationalists everywhere looked back to the French Revolution. Its memory sustained the struggle against absolutism for a century. Europe was reshaped in its long shadow. The revolution's influence ran through the whole nineteenth century.

It created the model of the modern citizen-state. The revolution replaced the subject of a king with the citizen of a nation. It joined equality before the law to a uniform, centralised administration. This model of the citizen-state spread widely across Europe. It became the standard form of the modern state. The revolution defined what a modern government should be.

Yet it also brought terror, war and reaction. The revolution descended into the Terror and gave rise to the Napoleonic wars. Its excesses provoked a long conservative reaction after 1815. The path from revolution to liberty proved bloody and uncertain. Its significance was thus double-edged, for good and ill. The revolution's legacy included violence as well as freedom.

The French Revolution was therefore of immense significance to the development of modern Europe. It destroyed absolutism and feudalism, proclaimed the rights of man, spread the ideals of liberty and equality, and gave birth to nationalism and the modern citizen-state. It inspired reform and revolution for a century. Yet it also brought terror, war and reaction, so its great legacy was double-edged, shaping modern Europe for both good and ill.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants the revolution's significance weighed, including its darker consequences.

The trap is to praise its ideals without noting the Terror and the Napoleonic wars.

The top band links its ideals and nationalism to the shaping of the whole nineteenth century.

Question 110

Napoleon Bonaparte rose to power out of the French Revolution and ruled France for fifteen years. The statement holds that he destroyed the Revolution but preserved its reforms. There is much truth in this, for

he ended its political liberty while entrenching its social and legal gains. His rule was a paradox, at once the grave and the guardian of the Revolution. The statement captures this double character.

He destroyed the Revolution's political liberty. Napoleon ended the republic and crowned himself Emperor in 1804. He ruled as an autocrat, silencing opposition through censorship and police. The liberty that the Revolution had proclaimed was extinguished under his rule. In this sense he was the destroyer of the revolutionary cause. Political freedom perished in his hands.

He ended representative government. The Revolution had sought government by the consent of the nation. Napoleon replaced it with personal dictatorship dressed in plebiscites. The elected assemblies became powerless before his will. Representative government, the Revolution's political core, was destroyed. Power returned to a single ruler, as before 1789.

Yet he preserved equality before the law. Napoleon upheld the abolition of feudalism and privilege that the Revolution had achieved. Careers remained open to talent rather than to birth. He kept the principle that all citizens were equal before the law. In this the Revolution's greatest social gain survived. Equality outlasted the liberty that Napoleon had crushed.

He codified the Revolution's legal gains. The Napoleonic Code of 1804 enshrined civil equality, property rights and religious toleration in law. It gave permanent legal form to the Revolution's principles. The Code preserved the social order of 1789 for the future. It became one of the most influential law codes in history. Through it the Revolution's reforms were made lasting.

He preserved and strengthened its administrative reforms. Napoleon kept the uniform departments and centralised the state still further through his prefects. He built a professional bureaucracy chosen by merit. The rational, uniform administration begun in the Revolution was completed under him. Its machinery of government survived and grew stronger. He was the great organiser of the revolutionary state.

He spread the Revolution's reforms across Europe. Napoleon's conquests carried the Code, legal equality and the abolition of feudalism into other lands. Wherever his armies went, the reforms of 1789 followed. He thus spread the Revolution's achievements far beyond France. Europe was reshaped by the reforms he exported. His empire was, in this sense, the Revolution's missionary.

His rule was thus a paradox. Napoleon betrayed the Revolution's liberty while saving its equality and reform. He was at once its heir and its gravedigger. He destroyed the political revolution but entrenched the social one. This double character defined his whole relation to 1789. He buried the Revolution and preserved it in the same act.

The statement is largely valid. Napoleon did destroy the Revolution's political liberty, ending the republic and representative government and ruling as an autocrat. Yet he preserved and entrenched its social and legal reforms, above all through the Napoleonic Code, and carried them across Europe. He was at once the destroyer of the political revolution and the guardian of its enduring reforms, and in that paradox lies the truth of the statement.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires the destruction of liberty weighed against the preservation of reform.

The trap is to treat Napoleon as simply the heir or simply the betrayer of the Revolution.

The top band shows him ending political liberty while entrenching legal and social equality.

Question 111

Napoleon Bonaparte was not only a great general but one of the great organisers of the modern state. To examine his administrative reforms is to see how he remade the government of France. He codified its law, centralised its administration, opened careers to talent and reformed its finances, church and schools. These reforms gave France a strong and lasting modern state and influenced governments far beyond it.

He codified the law. The Napoleonic Code of 1804 gathered the law of France into a single, clear and uniform system. It enshrined equality before the law, the security of property and religious toleration. This replaced the tangled patchwork of old laws and customs. The Code became a model of law across much of the world. It was perhaps his most enduring achievement.

He centralised the administration. Napoleon governed the departments through prefects appointed by and answerable to himself. Every corner of France was thus brought under close central control. This created a strong, uniform and efficient administration. Power flowed from Paris to every locality through his officials. The centralised state he built long outlasted him.

He opened careers to talent. Napoleon filled offices by ability rather than by birth or purchase. He created the Legion of Honour to reward merit and service. Able men could now rise in the state whatever their origins. This principle of careers open to talent was a legacy of the Revolution. It gave the state the service of its best men.

He reformed the finances. Napoleon founded the Bank of France in 1800 and stabilised the currency. He reorganised the collection of taxes to make revenue regular and reliable. Sound finance restored the strength and credit of the state. The government could now pay its way and plan for the future. Financial order underpinned all his other reforms.

He reconciled Church and State. By the Concordat of 1801 Napoleon made peace with the Catholic Church. The clergy became salaried servants of the state, which retained the Church lands sold in the Revolution. This healed a bitter division without surrendering the state's supremacy. Religion was harnessed to the service of the nation. The settlement gave France religious peace.

He reformed education. Napoleon created lycées and the University of France to train the servants of the state. Education was organised to produce loyal and capable officials and officers. The state took charge of schooling as never before. This provided the trained men that his administration required. Education became an instrument of the modern state.

He built a uniform system of justice. Alongside the Civil Code, Napoleon issued codes of criminal and commercial law. Courts were organised into a clear and uniform national system. Justice was made consistent and equal across the whole of France. This completed the legal work begun in the Revolution. A single system of law now bound the nation together.

Napoleon's administrative reforms therefore remade the French state on lasting foundations. He codified the law, centralised the administration through the prefects, opened careers to talent, and reformed the finances, the Church, education and justice. Together these reforms gave France a strong, uniform and efficient modern state. Spread by his conquests, they influenced the administration of much of Europe and the world.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks for the reforms analysed, not a narrative of Napoleon's wars.

The trap is to describe his battles rather than his work of government.

The top band ties the Code, the prefects and careers open to talent to the modern state.

Question 112

The nation-state, in which government is bound to a nation of citizens, became the characteristic form of the modern European state. To account for its rise is to explain why dynastic and feudal realms gave way to nations. The decline of the old order, the French Revolution, nationalism and the work of Napoleon all drove the change. Unification movements and modern communications completed it.

The old dynastic and feudal states declined. Medieval Europe had been a patchwork of feudal lordships and dynastic realms. These rested on the person of a ruler or the ties of feudal service. As feudalism and absolutism decayed, a new basis for the state was needed. The decline of the old order opened the way for the nation. Something had to replace the dynasty as the ground of government.

The French Revolution proclaimed the sovereign nation. The Revolution declared that sovereignty belonged to the nation, not to the king. Government was now to serve a people rather than a dynasty. This idea gave the nation-state its founding principle. The nation became the source of all lawful authority. The Revolution thus gave the modern nation-state its charter.

Nationalism bound peoples together. A rising sense of shared language, history and culture drew peoples into nations. Nationalism taught that each nation should govern itself in its own state. This powerful feeling demanded the reshaping of Europe on national lines. It became one of the strongest forces of the age. Nationalism supplied the nation-state its driving energy.

Napoleon's conquests provoked national feeling. Napoleon's domination of Europe stirred resistance among the peoples he ruled. In Germany, Spain and elsewhere, opposition to France awakened national consciousness. The struggle against him strengthened the sense of nationhood. His empire thus fostered the very nationalism that would remake Europe. Foreign rule bred the desire for national states.

Popular sovereignty and citizenship spread. The revolutionary idea that the people were sovereign spread widely across Europe. Subjects of kings increasingly claimed to be citizens of nations. This new identity demanded government of the nation by the nation. Citizenship and nationhood advanced together. The idea of the sovereign people underlay the nation-state.

Unification movements created new nations. In the nineteenth century Italy and Germany were united into national states. Leaders and movements forged scattered territories into single nations. These unifications showed the nation-state triumphant. The map of Europe was redrawn on national lines. The great unifications were the nation-state's clearest expression.

Industry and communication fostered national unity. Railways, newspapers and mass education knit the people of each country together. Shared markets and a common press strengthened the sense of nationhood. Modern communication made the large nation-state possible to govern. Economic and cultural unity reinforced political unity. Industry helped to bind the nation into one.

The nation-state rose in modern Europe because the old dynastic and feudal order decayed while the French Revolution proclaimed the sovereign nation. Nationalism bound peoples together, and Napoleon's conquests stirred national feeling against him. Popular sovereignty spread, unification movements created new nations, and industry and communication fostered national unity. Driven by these forces, the nation-state became the characteristic form of the modern European state.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of the nation-state's rise, not a description of one country.

The trap is to describe nationalism without linking it to the decline of the old order.

The top band ties the sovereign nation of the Revolution to nationalism and unification.

Question 113

The political revolutions of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries aimed to replace arbitrary rule with lawful government. The question asks how far they established the rule of law and constitutional government. To a great extent they did, laying down constitutions, rights and representative institutions. Yet their achievement was uneven and incomplete, so they founded these systems more than they finished them.

They established written constitutions. The revolutions produced constitutions that defined and limited the powers of government. The American Constitution of 1787 and the French Constitution of 1791 set out fundamental law. Government was now to be bound by a supreme framework rather than by a ruler's will. This was a decisive step toward constitutional rule. The written constitution became a mark of the new order.

They subjected rulers to the law. The revolutions asserted that even kings and governments were bound by the law. The English Bill of Rights and the American constitution alike limited the executive. No ruler

could now lawfully act above or against the law. The rule of law replaced the arbitrary command of monarchs. Government became answerable to law rather than to will.

They proclaimed equality before the law. The revolutions swept away the privileges of birth that had divided society. All citizens were to be equal before the law and its courts. This principle of legal equality underlay the modern state. It replaced the rule of privilege with the rule of law. Equality before the law was among the revolutions' great gains.

They created representative institutions. Elected assemblies were established to make the laws in the name of the people. Congress in America and the National Assembly in France embodied representative government. Sovereignty was now held to rest with the represented nation. This gave constitutional government its democratic foundation. Representation became a principle of the modern state.

Yet their achievement was often unstable. In France constitutional government collapsed into the Terror and then into Napoleon's dictatorship. The path from revolution to lawful government proved bloody and uncertain. Constitutions were made and unmade in quick succession. The revolutions established principles more surely than stable institutions. Their gains were at first fragile and often reversed.

Their franchises remained narrow. The representative institutions they created rested on a very limited vote. Property and birth still excluded most people from power. The revolutions founded constitutional government, but not yet democracy. Their promise of equality was far from fully realised. Much remained for later ages to complete.

They laid enduring foundations for the future. Despite their limits, the revolutions established principles that later generations would build upon. Constitutions, rights and the rule of law became the enduring basis of the modern state. What they began imperfectly was later extended and secured. Their foundations supported the fuller democracy that followed. Their true achievement lay in what they made possible.

To a great but incomplete extent the political revolutions established the rule of law and constitutional government. They produced constitutions, subjected rulers to law, proclaimed equality before the law and created representative institutions. Yet their achievement was unstable and their franchises narrow, so they founded these systems rather than completing them. The revolutions laid the enduring foundations of constitutional government, which later ages would build upon and fulfil.

Examiner's Note

"To what extent" needs the real achievements weighed against instability and narrow franchises.

The trap is to claim the revolutions created full democracy at a stroke.

The top band credits constitutions and the rule of law while noting the work left for later ages.

Question 114

The American and French revolutions were the two great political upheavals of the late eighteenth century. To compare them is to see how far they resembled one another and how far they differed. Both drew on Enlightenment ideas and proclaimed the rights of man, yet they differed in their targets, their depth and their outcomes. They were kindred revolutions of liberty, but by no means the same.

Both were inspired by Enlightenment ideas. Each revolution drew on the thought of Locke, Montesquieu and Rousseau. Both appealed to natural rights, government by consent and the sovereignty of the people. Their great declarations echoed the same philosophy. The Enlightenment was the common source of both. They spoke, in this sense, a single political language.

Both overthrew an existing authority. The Americans threw off the rule of a distant British king and Parliament. The French overthrew the absolute monarchy and the old order at home. Each rose against a power it held to be unjust. Both were, in this sense, revolts against established authority. They shared the revolutionary act of overthrow.

Both proclaimed rights and equality. The Declaration of Independence and the Declaration of the Rights of Man announced liberty and equality. Each asserted that government must rest on the rights of the citizen. Both gave the age a charter of freedom. Their principles inspired reformers across the world. In their ideals the two revolutions closely agreed.

Yet they differed in their targets. The American Revolution was a war of national liberation against foreign rule. The French Revolution was an internal upheaval against a native king and privileged order. One cast off an external master; the other overturned its own society. Their targets were thus quite different in kind. The one looked outward, the other inward.

They differed in social depth. The American Revolution was largely political, leaving colonial society much as it was. The French Revolution was a deep social revolution that abolished feudalism and privilege. France was transformed from top to bottom as America was not. The French upheaval reached far deeper into society. It remade a social order, not merely a government.

They differed in their outcomes. The American Revolution produced a stable republic and an enduring constitution. The French Revolution descended into the Terror and ended in Napoleon's dictatorship. One achieved lasting order, the other violence and reaction. Their outcomes could hardly have been more different. Stability crowned the one, upheaval the other.

Both profoundly influenced the modern world. The American Revolution gave the world the model of the constitutional republic. The French Revolution spread the ideals of liberty, equality and nationalism across Europe. Each shaped the politics of the modern age. Together they inaugurated the age of revolutions. Their combined influence was immense and lasting.

In comparison, the French and American revolutions were alike in drawing on Enlightenment ideas, overthrowing established authority and proclaiming the rights of man. Yet they differed sharply: the American was a political war of liberation ending in stable republican order, while the French was a deep social revolution ending in terror and dictatorship. Both, however, shaped the modern world, together opening the great age of political revolution.

Examiner's Note

"Compare" requires similarities and differences point against point, not two separate accounts.

The trap is to describe each revolution in turn without ever comparing them.

The top band pairs their shared ideals with the key differences in target, depth and outcome.

Question 115

The old regimes of Europe had rested on privilege, in which birth determined rights, taxes and office. The statement holds that the political revolutions replaced this rule of privilege with the rule of law. There is much truth in this, for they swept away the privileges of birth and proclaimed equality before the law. Yet new inequalities of wealth survived, so the change was real but not complete.

The old order rested on privilege. Under the old regime birth determined a person's rights, duties and station. The nobility and clergy enjoyed exemptions and honours denied to the common people. Law itself differed according to rank. This rule of privilege was the foundation of the old society. It was exactly what the revolutions set out to destroy.

The revolutions abolished privilege. The French Revolution swept away feudal and noble privilege on the night of 4 August 1789. The exemptions of the clergy and nobility were ended at a stroke. Birth no longer conferred special rights before the law. This abolition of privilege was a central act of the revolution. It cleared the ground for a new principle of equality.

They established equality before the law. The revolutions proclaimed that all citizens were equal before the law and its courts. The same law and the same taxes were to apply to all. This equality replaced the graded rights of the old order. It became a founding principle of the modern state. Legal equality was the heart of the new order.

They opened careers to talent. Under the new order offices and honours were open to ability rather than birth. A man might now rise by merit as he could not before. This principle of careers open to talent embodied the rule of law over privilege. Talent, not blood, was to be the path to advancement. The revolutions rewarded ability in place of rank.

They subjected all to the same law. The revolutions held that ruler and ruled, rich and poor, were alike bound by the law. No one stood above it or enjoyed a separate justice. This rule of law replaced the arbitrary privileges of the powerful. Government itself was now answerable to law. Uniform law bound the whole nation together.

Yet new inequalities of wealth survived. The revolutions ended the privilege of birth but not the advantages of wealth. Property increasingly determined power and the right to vote. A new elite of the propertied replaced the old nobility in influence. Equality before the law did not bring equality in fact. Privilege changed its form rather than wholly vanishing.

The change was real but incomplete. The revolutions did replace the rule of birth with the rule of law, a genuine and lasting achievement. Yet full equality remained unrealised, and wealth bred new distinctions. The rule of law was established in principle more than perfected in practice. The transformation was profound but not total. Much was left for later ages to complete.

The statement is largely valid. The political revolutions did replace the rule of privilege with the rule of law, abolishing the privileges of birth, proclaiming equality before the law and opening careers to talent. Yet new inequalities of wealth survived, and full equality remained unrealised. The revolutions ended the rule of privilege of birth and founded the rule of law, though the promise of equality would only slowly be fulfilled.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires the abolition of privilege weighed against surviving inequalities of wealth.

The trap is to claim perfect equality was achieved and ignore property and the narrow vote.

The top band shows the rule of birth replaced by the rule of law, with wealth as a new divider.

Question 116

The political revolutions of Europe and America did not remain confined to the West but shaped the whole world. To assess their impact on the wider world is to weigh how far their ideas and models spread abroad. They carried the ideals of liberty and equality, the models of republic and constitution, and the force of nationalism across the globe. Their influence reached even the colonies that Europe itself ruled.

They spread the ideals of liberty and equality. The revolutions proclaimed the rights of man and the equality of all people. These ideals spread far beyond Europe and America. Peoples everywhere learned the language of rights and freedom. The revolutions gave the world a new political creed. Their ideals became a common inheritance of humanity.

They provided models of republic and constitution. The American republic and its written constitution offered a pattern for new states. Nations across the world drew up constitutions on the revolutionary model. The republic became a widely copied form of government. The revolutions thus shaped the institutions of many later states. Their models spread across the globe.

They inspired movements of independence. The example of America and France inspired revolts against colonial rule. The Haitian Revolution of 1804 and the liberation of Latin America drew directly on their ideals. Colonised peoples claimed the rights the revolutions had proclaimed. Independence movements were kindled by the revolutionary example. The age of revolution spread to the wider world.

They gave birth to worldwide nationalism. The idea that each nation should govern itself spread from Europe across the globe. Nationalism became a force in every continent. Peoples everywhere came to demand states of their own. The revolutions thus seeded a movement that would remake the world. Nationalism became one of the great forces of modern history.

They inspired later African nationalism. The principles of self-determination and the rights of man armed the opponents of colonial rule in Africa. African nationalists appealed to the very ideals that Europe had proclaimed. The revolutions' language of freedom served the anti-colonial struggle. Their ideals helped, in time, to end the empires that Europe had built. The colonised turned Europe's own creed against it.

They spread the modern nation-state and its administration. The revolutionary model of the citizen-state, with its uniform law and central administration, spread across the world. New nations adopted its constitutions, codes and bureaucracies. The modern state itself was in part a revolutionary export. Governments everywhere came to resemble the model forged in the West. The revolutions shaped the very form of the modern state.

Yet their ideals were often denied to the colonised. Europe proclaimed liberty at home while ruling empires abroad. The rights of man were long withheld from the colonised peoples. This hypocrisy revealed the limits of the revolutions' reach. Yet the very contradiction armed the colonised with Europe's own principles. The denial of the ideals abroad became a weapon against empire.

The impact of Europe's political revolutions on the wider world was therefore profound and lasting. They spread the ideals of liberty and equality, the models of republic and constitution, and the force of nationalism across the globe, inspiring independence movements from Haiti to Africa. They shaped the modern nation-state itself. Yet their ideals were long denied to the colonised, until at last those very ideals were turned against the empires that had proclaimed them.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants the global impact weighed, including the denial of the ideals to the colonised.

The trap is to confine the revolutions' impact to Europe and ignore the wider world.

The top band links liberty and self-determination to independence movements, including in Africa.

Question 117

Capitalism is the economic system based on private ownership, the profit motive and the free market. To examine its main features is to see how this order organises production and society. It rests on private property, wage labour, competition, the pursuit of profit and the accumulation of capital. These features together define the system that has dominated the modern world.

The means of production are privately owned. Under capitalism the land, the factories and the capital are owned by private individuals rather than by the state or the community. This private ownership of the means of production is the foundation of the whole system. The owners alone direct production and claim the profits it yields. Everything else in the system rests upon this single fact. Private property in the means of production is capitalism's first and defining mark.

Production is carried on for profit. The purpose of production under capitalism is not the satisfaction of need but the profit of the owner. Goods are made in order to be sold at a gain in the market. The relentless pursuit of profit drives all economic activity within the system. What is not profitable is not produced, however much it may be needed. This profit motive is the very engine of capitalism.

Labour is bought and sold as a commodity. The worker, owning no means of production, has nothing to sell but his own labour. He sells that labour to the capitalist for a wage, as any other commodity is sold. Wage labour is thus the characteristic relation of the capitalist system. The owner buys the worker's labour just as he buys his raw materials. The wage relation binds the worker to the capitalist.

The market governs the economy. Under capitalism prices, production and distribution are decided by the free play of supply and demand. No central authority plans the economy or directs its course. The market, and not the state, allocates resources and rewards. This reliance on the free market rather than on planning is a defining feature. The unplanned market is the system's only regulator.

Competition drives the system forward. Producers compete against one another for markets, for profits and for their very survival. This competition spurs efficiency and innovation, but it also brings ruin to the weak. It is the harsh discipline of the capitalist economy. The constant rivalry of the market shapes the whole system. Competition is at once the spur and the scourge of capitalism.

Capital is accumulated and reinvested. The profits won in the market are reinvested to expand production and win still greater profits. This ceaseless accumulation of capital drives the growth and expansion of the system. Wealth is used, above all, to make yet more wealth. The system can never stand still but must always grow. Endless accumulation is the restless dynamic of capitalism.

Society divides into opposing classes. Capitalism divides society into the owners of capital and the wage-earning workers who serve them. These two classes have directly opposing interests over the division of wages and profits. This class division is a structural feature of the system, not a mere accident. The bourgeoisie and the proletariat are its two great poles. Class conflict is thus built into the very order.

The capitalist system is therefore defined by the private ownership of the means of production, production for profit, wage labour, the free market, competition, the accumulation of capital and the division of society into classes. These features together make capitalism a distinctive order of production. It has been the dominant economic system of the modern world, and its crises and its rivals form the subject of this chapter.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks for the features of capitalism analysed, not its history or its evils alone.

The trap is to condemn capitalism without first describing how it actually works.

The top band shows private ownership, profit, the market and class division as one system.

Question 118

Capitalism has repeatedly been shaken by economic crises of boom and slump. The statement holds that such crises are inherent in the system itself. There is much force in this, for the very workings of capitalism tend to produce recurring crises. Yet the system has also shown a real capacity to reform and to survive them. Crises are inherent in capitalism, though they have not proved fatal to it.

Overproduction leads to recurring slumps. Driven by the pursuit of profit, capitalists tend to produce more than the market can absorb. When the goods pile up unsold, production is cut and the workers are dismissed. This overproduction brings on the slump that follows every boom. It is a recurring feature born of the workings of the system itself. Overproduction is the classic capitalist crisis.

Underconsumption starves the market of demand. Because the workers are paid as little as possible, they cannot buy back all that they produce. The mass of the people lack the means to consume the flood of goods. This gap between production and consumption steadily breeds crisis. Low wages thus undermine the very market they are meant to supply. Underconsumption is built into the wage system itself.

The anarchy of production breeds instability. Capitalism has no overall plan, each producer deciding alone in the pursuit of profit. This unplanned and competitive scramble leads to gluts, shortages and waste. The absence of coordination makes the whole system inherently unstable. Crises spring directly from this anarchy of production. The very lack of planning is a structural flaw.

The system moves in cycles of boom and slump. Capitalism swings repeatedly between expansion and collapse, boom and depression. These trade cycles have recurred throughout the whole of its history. The very rhythm of the system is thus one of recurring crisis. Every boom carries within it the seeds of the coming slump. The business cycle is inherent to capitalism.

Wealth concentrates while the many are impoverished. Capital tends to accumulate in ever fewer hands as competition destroys the weaker firms. This concentration steadily widens the gap between rich and poor. The resulting inequality weakens demand and breeds social tension. The concentration of wealth is itself a source of crisis. Capitalism tends toward a dangerously divided society.

Marxists held crisis to be the system's very fate. Marx argued that capitalism must suffer ever deeper crises until at last it destroyed itself. He saw crisis not as an accident but as the inner law of the system. This analysis gave the argument its powerful theoretical force. For Marxists, crisis was both inherent and ultimately fatal. The prophecy of collapse shaped a century of politics.

Yet capitalism has reformed and survived. Despite its many crises, capitalism has repeatedly adapted and endured. State intervention, welfare and regulation have softened the worst of its slumps. The system has proved far more flexible than its critics foretold. Crises are inherent in it, but they have not so far destroyed it. Capitalism has survived, above all, by reforming itself.

The statement holds much truth. Crises are indeed inherent in capitalism, springing from overproduction, underconsumption, the anarchy of production and the concentration of wealth, and recurring in cycles of boom and slump. Marx held such crises to be the system's fate. Yet capitalism has repeatedly reformed and survived them. Crises are woven into the system, but they have proved a chronic disease rather than a fatal one.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires the inherent tendency to crisis weighed against capitalism's power to survive.

The trap is to describe one depression rather than the structural roots of crisis.

The top band shows crisis as inherent in the system yet not, so far, fatal to it.

Question 119

Economic crises, in which production collapses and unemployment soars, have recurred throughout the history of capitalism. To account for their occurrence is to explain why the system falls repeatedly into slump. Overproduction, underconsumption, speculation, the anarchy of production and the collapse of credit all bring on these crises. Together they explain the recurring breakdowns of the capitalist economy.

Overproduction gluts the market. In the pursuit of profit, capitalists produce more goods than the market can absorb. When the unsold goods pile up, prices fall and production is sharply cut back. Factories then close and their workers are thrown out of employment. Overproduction is the most classic of all causes of capitalist crisis. The glut brings the boom to a sudden and painful end.

Underconsumption limits demand. The very workers who produce the goods are paid too little to buy them all back. The mass of the people simply cannot consume the flood of production. This shortfall of demand leaves goods unsold and triggers the slump. Low wages thus undermine the market on which profit depends. Underconsumption is a standing cause of capitalist crisis.

Speculation inflates unsustainable booms. In times of prosperity, reckless speculation drives up prices and the value of shares. This creates a bubble that has little basis in real production. When confidence at last fails, the bubble bursts and panic follows. Speculation thus turns a boom into a sudden and violent collapse. The Wall Street Crash of 1929 followed just such a bubble.

The anarchy of production causes imbalance. With no overall plan, each producer acts alone in pursuit of his own profit. This uncoordinated scramble produces gluts in some goods and shortages in others. The lack of any planning breeds waste and deep instability. Crises spring directly from this disorder of production. An unplanned system cannot keep itself in balance.

The collapse of credit spreads the crisis. Modern capitalism runs everywhere on credit and banking. When confidence fails, the banks call in their loans and credit suddenly dries up. The collapse of credit turns an ordinary downturn into a general crisis. Bank failures then deepen and spread the slump still further. Financial panic magnifies and prolongs the crisis.

Crises spread through the world market. Capitalism binds the whole world into a single interconnected market. A slump in one great country spreads swiftly to all its trading partners. The interdependence of nations turns a local crisis into a global depression. The Great Depression spread across the entire world in just this way. Crisis travels along the very channels of trade.

The trade cycle recurs by its own logic. Boom breeds overconfidence, overproduction and speculation, which together end in slump. The slump then clears the ground for a new boom, and the whole cycle repeats. This rhythm of expansion and collapse is built into the system itself. Crises recur, in the end, because the cycle recurs. The business cycle is the very pattern of capitalist crisis.

Economic crises occur under capitalism because overproduction and underconsumption leave goods unsold, while speculation inflates booms that must in time burst. The anarchy of production breeds imbalance, the collapse of credit spreads the slump, and the world market carries crisis from nation to nation. Driven by these forces, capitalism moves in recurring cycles of boom and slump. Crisis is, in the end, the recurring price of an unplanned system.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of recurring crisis, not a description of one depression.

The trap is to give only 1929 and ignore the deeper structural causes at work.

The top band links overproduction and underconsumption to speculation and the trade cycle.

Question 120

The Great Depression that began in 1929 was the deepest economic crisis in the history of capitalism. To assess its causes is to weigh the forces that plunged the world into slump. Overproduction, unequal wealth, reckless speculation, a weak banking system and the collapse of trade all played their part. The Wall Street Crash was the spark, but the deeper causes lay in the workings of the system.

Overproduction outran the market. Through the 1920s American industry and agriculture produced more than could be profitably sold. The productive power of the economy had outrun the demand for its goods. Unsold stocks piled up until production had at last to be cut. This overproduction was a fundamental cause of the crisis. The market could not absorb what the system produced.

Wealth was very unequally distributed. The prosperity of the 1920s flowed chiefly to the rich, while workers and farmers gained little. The mass of the people were paid too little to buy the flood of goods. This gross inequality left demand too weak to sustain production. Underconsumption thus lay at the root of the coming slump. Low incomes undermined the market itself.

Reckless speculation inflated a bubble. In the boom of the 1920s, Americans speculated wildly on the rising stock market. Shares were bought on credit in the expectation of ever-rising prices. This created a vast bubble with little basis in real value. Such feverish speculation made a crash inevitable. The market had lost all touch with reality.

The Wall Street Crash triggered the collapse. In October 1929 the New York stock market crashed, wiping out fortunes overnight. Confidence collapsed and panic spread through the whole economy. The crash turned the bursting bubble into a general crisis. It was the spark that set off the Depression. The fall of Wall Street shook the entire world.

The banking system was weak and fragile. Thousands of small and unregulated banks had lent recklessly during the boom. When the crash came, depositors panicked and banks failed by the thousand. The collapse of the banks destroyed savings and dried up all credit. This banking failure deepened and spread the crisis. Financial collapse magnified the slump.

International trade and finance broke down. The world economy was burdened by war debts, reparations and rising tariff walls. As nations raised barriers such as the Smoot-Hawley tariff, world trade collapsed. The interdependence of the world economy spread the American crisis abroad. The breakdown of trade turned a national slump into a world depression. Crisis spread along the channels of commerce.

Governments failed to act in time. Wedded to laissez-faire, governments at first did little to check the slump. They clung to the gold standard and to balanced budgets as the crisis deepened. This inaction allowed the Depression to run its full and ruinous course. The failure of government worsened and prolonged the disaster. Old orthodoxies proved helpless before the crisis.

The Great Depression sprang, then, from overproduction and the unequal distribution of wealth, which left demand too weak, and from the reckless speculation that ended in the Wall Street Crash of 1929. A fragile banking system, the breakdown of world trade and the inaction of governments deepened and spread the slump. The crash was the spark, but the deeper causes lay in the very workings of the capitalist system.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants the causes weighed, distinguishing the spark from the deeper structural roots.

The trap is to give only the Wall Street Crash and ignore overproduction and inequality.

The top band ranks the causes and links the crash to underlying overproduction and weak demand.

Question 121

The Great Depression of the 1930s was a catastrophe that touched almost every part of the world. To examine its effects is to see how deeply the crisis reshaped economies, societies and politics. It brought mass unemployment, the collapse of trade and widespread misery, and it drove the rise of political extremism. It also ended the age of laissez-faire and spread its ruin even to the colonies.

It caused mass unemployment. As factories closed and trade collapsed, workers were thrown out of employment by the million. In the United States roughly a quarter of the workforce lost their jobs. Across the industrial world millions were left idle and without income. Mass unemployment was the most visible effect of the Depression. The dole queue became the symbol of the age.

It ruined banks and businesses. The crisis brought a wave of bankruptcies and bank failures across the world. Savings were wiped out as banks collapsed and firms went under. The machinery of credit and enterprise was shattered. This financial ruin deepened the general misery. Businesses and banks fell together in the slump.

It collapsed world trade. As nations raised tariffs to protect themselves, international trade fell steeply. The value of world trade shrank to a fraction of its former level. Exporting countries were devastated by the loss of their markets. The collapse of trade spread the crisis around the globe. Protectionism deepened the very slump it sought to escape.

It brought widespread poverty and misery. The Depression plunged millions into hunger, homelessness and despair. Families lost their homes, their savings and their hope. Soup kitchens and shanty towns spread through the great cities. Human suffering on a vast scale was the Depression's cruellest effect. Poverty stalked even the richest nations.

It fuelled the rise of political extremism. The misery of the Depression drove desperate peoples toward extreme movements. In Germany it helped to bring Hitler and the Nazis to power in 1933. Fascism and communism alike fed on the failure of the old order. The crisis thus poisoned the politics of the age. Economic ruin bred political catastrophe.

It ended the age of laissez-faire. The failure of the free market to right itself discredited the old orthodoxy. Governments were forced to intervene in the economy as never before. The New Deal and the ideas of Keynes marked this new departure. State management of the economy replaced laissez-faire. The Depression transformed the role of government.

It spread ruin to the colonies. The collapse of world prices devastated the colonies that exported raw materials. Africa, Asia and Latin America suffered as the demand for their goods fell away. Colonial peoples were impoverished by a crisis made in the industrial world. The Depression thus reached the furthest corners of the globe. Its effects were felt far beyond the West.

The effects of the Great Depression on the world were therefore profound and far-reaching. It brought mass unemployment, ruined banks and businesses, collapsed world trade and spread poverty and misery. It fuelled the rise of extremism, ended the age of laissez-faire and reached even the distant colonies. The Depression reshaped the economy, society and politics of the world, and its shadow hung over the whole decade that followed.

Examiner's Note
"Examine" asks for the effects analysed, not the causes of the Depression.
The trap is to describe only unemployment and ignore the political and colonial effects.
The top band links economic ruin to the rise of extremism and the end of laissez-faire.

Question 122

Faced with the ruin of the Great Depression, President Roosevelt launched the New Deal from 1933. The claim holds that it saved capitalism from itself. This is largely valid, for the New Deal reformed and rescued a system that the crisis had brought to the edge of collapse. It preserved capitalism by intervention rather than replacing it with revolution. Yet its success was real but incomplete.

The Depression threatened capitalism's survival. The crisis had brought mass suffering, anger and a loss of faith in the system. Extremist movements of left and right fed on the failure of capitalism. The very survival of the free-market order was in doubt. Something had to be done to save it from collapse. The stakes could hardly have been higher.

The New Deal intervened to rescue the system. Roosevelt abandoned laissez-faire and used the power of the state to fight the slump. The government now took active responsibility for the economy. This intervention marked a decisive break with the old orthodoxy. The state stepped in to save the market from itself. Active government replaced helpless inaction.

It provided relief and public works. The New Deal created jobs through great public-works programmes and relief for the unemployed. Bodies such as the Works Progress Administration put millions back to work. This relieved the worst of the suffering and restored some demand. Public spending began to lift the economy. Government action softened the human cost of the crisis.

It regulated banking and finance. The New Deal reformed the banks and the stock market to prevent another collapse. Deposits were insured and finance was brought under regulation. This restored confidence in the shattered financial system. The reforms guarded against a repeat of 1929. Regulation made capitalism safer and steadier.

It introduced welfare and reform. Measures such as the Social Security Act of 1935 gave citizens protection against poverty and old age. The New Deal built the beginnings of an American welfare state. This reform reconciled the people to the capitalist system. It gave capitalism a human face it had lacked. Welfare bound the citizen to the reformed order.

It preserved capitalism rather than replacing it. For all its reforms, the New Deal kept private property and the market economy. It sought to mend capitalism, not to abolish it. In this it differed utterly from the socialist alternative. The New Deal was reform in order to conserve. It saved the system by changing it.

Yet its success was real but incomplete. The New Deal eased the Depression but did not fully end it, for unemployment remained high until the war. Some of its measures were limited or struck down. Full recovery came only with the Second World War. Its rescue of capitalism was genuine but not complete. Reform relieved the crisis without wholly curing it.

The claim is largely valid. The New Deal did save capitalism from itself, using state intervention, relief, regulation and welfare to rescue a system that the Depression had brought to the brink. It preserved capitalism by reforming it rather than replacing it with revolution. Yet its success was incomplete, for full recovery awaited the war. The New Deal saved capitalism, but by changing it into a reformed and managed system.

Examiner's Note
"How valid" invites strong agreement tempered by the New Deal's incomplete recovery.
The trap is to describe the New Deal's measures without the argument that they saved the system.
The top band shows reform preserving capitalism, while noting the war completed the recovery.

Question 123

Socialism arose in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as the great alternative to the capitalist order. To account for its rise is to explain why so many came to seek a different system. The evils of capitalism, the suffering of the workers, the theory of Marx, and the recurring crises of the system all drove the movement. The Russian Revolution then showed that socialism could take power.

The evils of capitalism provoked a reaction. Capitalism brought vast wealth to the few but poverty and insecurity to the many. Its exploitation, inequality and crises bred deep discontent among the workers. Socialism arose as a protest against these evils and a demand for justice. The wrongs of the system called forth its rival. Socialism was, in origin, a reaction against capitalist injustice.

The Industrial Revolution created a suffering working class. The factory system gathered a great class of workers who owned nothing but their labour. Long hours, low wages and squalid towns were their common lot. This exploited proletariat became the natural base of the socialist movement. Their suffering gave socialism its mass following. The working class was the soil in which socialism grew.

Marx and Engels gave socialism a theory. In the Communist Manifesto of 1848 and later works, Marx and Engels supplied a scientific socialism. They analysed capitalism, predicted its fall and called the workers to unite. This theory gave the movement a doctrine, a goal and a confidence in victory. Socialism was thus armed with a powerful body of thought. Marxism became the creed of the movement.

The recurring crises of capitalism discredited it. The repeated slumps and depressions of capitalism seemed to prove the system unjust and unstable. Each crisis threw millions into unemployment and misery. These failures strengthened the case for a planned, socialist alternative. Capitalism's crises were socialism's opportunity. The instability of the market drove men toward the plan.

Trade unions and workers' parties organised the movement. The workers formed unions and socialist parties to advance their common cause. These organisations gave socialism political weight and a mass following. Across Europe socialist movements grew into powerful forces. Organisation turned discontent into a movement for change. Labour built the machinery of socialism.

The Russian Revolution showed socialism could win. In 1917 the Bolsheviks seized power and founded the first socialist state. This showed that socialism was not a mere dream but a practical possibility. The example of Soviet Russia inspired socialists across the world. Revolution turned theory into a living reality. Russia gave the movement a model and a hope.

The promise of equality and planning attracted many. Socialism offered a vision of a just, equal and classless society. It promised to replace the anarchy of the market with rational planning. This ideal of fairness and order drew millions to the cause. The dream of a better world was socialism's deepest appeal. Its promise answered the failures of capitalism.

Socialism rose as an alternative to capitalism because the evils of the system, the suffering of the workers and the recurring crises of the market bred a demand for something better. Marx gave the movement a theory, trade unions and parties gave it organisation, and the Russian Revolution showed that it could take power. Driven by these forces and by the promise of equality, socialism became the great rival of the capitalist order.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of socialism's rise, not a description of socialist doctrine.

The trap is to describe capitalism's evils without linking them to the socialist response.

The top band links working-class suffering and Marx's theory to the example of 1917.

Question 124

Socialism is the system that seeks to replace private ownership and the market with collective ownership and planning. To examine its main features is to see how it differs from capitalism. It rests on the public

ownership of the means of production, central planning, production for use, and the goal of an equal, classless society. These features together define the socialist alternative to the capitalist order.

The means of production are publicly owned. Under socialism the land, factories and capital are owned by the state or the community rather than by private individuals. This abolishes the private ownership on which capitalism rests. The wealth-producing resources belong, in principle, to the whole people. Public ownership is the foundation of the socialist system. It is the very opposite of the capitalist principle.

The economy is centrally planned. In place of the free market, a central authority plans what shall be produced and how. The state directs production toward chosen goals rather than leaving it to competition. This planning is meant to replace the anarchy of the market with order. Central planning is a defining feature of socialism. The plan takes the place of the market.

Production is carried on for use, not profit. Socialism aims to produce goods to meet human needs rather than to yield private profit. What is produced is decided by need, not by the prospect of gain. This reverses the guiding principle of capitalism. Production for use is the socialist ideal. Need, not profit, is meant to direct the economy.

Private property in production is abolished. Socialism ends the private ownership of the means of production and with it the exploitation of labour. No class can live from the labour of another through owning capital. This is held to abolish the root of class oppression. The abolition of private capital is central to the system. It strikes at the source of inequality.

Distribution aims at greater equality. Socialism seeks a fairer distribution of wealth than capitalism allows. Rewards are meant to follow work or need rather than the ownership of capital. This aims to end the extremes of wealth and poverty. Greater equality is a chief goal of the system. Fairness in distribution is its promise.

The goal is a classless society. Socialism aims ultimately at a society without exploiting and exploited classes. By abolishing private capital it hopes to end the division between owners and workers. The classless society is the distant goal toward which it strives. This vision distinguishes socialism from every class system. The end of class is its highest aim.

The state and party lead the system. In practice the socialist state, often led by a single party, directs the economy and society. The state owns, plans and administers on behalf of the people. This gives government a far larger role than under capitalism. The leading role of the state is a marked feature of the system. Power is concentrated in the socialist state.

The socialist system is therefore defined by the public ownership of the means of production, central planning, production for use, the abolition of private capital, and the pursuit of equality and a classless society, all led by a powerful state. These features together make socialism the direct opposite of capitalism. Whether it fulfilled its promise is a question its history, above all in the Soviet Union, must answer.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks for the features of socialism analysed, not a defence or attack on it.

The trap is to praise or condemn socialism without describing how it is meant to work.

The top band contrasts each socialist feature with the capitalist principle it replaces.

Question 125

In 1917 the Bolsheviks seized power in Russia and set out to build a socialist society. The statement holds that the Russian Revolution offered the world an alternative to capitalism. This is largely valid, for it created the first socialist state and a working model of a planned economy. Yet the alternative it offered proved flawed and coercive. It was a genuine alternative, but not the ideal its supporters proclaimed.

It created the first socialist state. The Russian Revolution founded the world's first state built on socialist principles. For the first time, a great country was governed in the name of the workers. This showed that

socialism could be more than a theory or a dream. The existence of the Soviet state was itself an alternative to capitalism. It stood as a living rival to the Western order.

It abolished capitalism in Russia. The revolution nationalised industry, banking and the land. Private ownership of the means of production was swept away. Capitalism was replaced by a wholly different economic order. This break with the market was complete and dramatic. Russia showed that capitalism could be overthrown.

It introduced central planning. The Soviet state planned its economy through the Five-Year Plans from 1928. Production was directed by the plan rather than by the market. This offered the world a concrete model of a planned economy. Planning became the hallmark of the socialist alternative. The plan replaced the profit motive.

It inspired socialists and the colonised worldwide. The Soviet example inspired socialist movements across the world. It also encouraged colonised peoples struggling against imperial rule. Russia became a beacon for revolutionaries everywhere. Its influence spread far beyond its own borders. The revolution offered hope to the oppressed of many lands.

It appeared to succeed during the Depression. While capitalism reeled in the slump of the 1930s, the Soviet Union seemed to grow. Its rapid industrialisation contrasted with Western unemployment. This apparent success made the socialist alternative newly attractive. Many looked to Russia as a system that worked. The Depression enhanced the Soviet example.

Yet the alternative proved coercive and flawed. The Soviet system rested on dictatorship, repression and the loss of freedom. Under Stalin it brought terror, forced collectivisation and famine. The alternative to capitalism was bought at a fearful human cost. Its ideals were betrayed by its practice. The model was as much a warning as an example.

Its economy suffered deep weaknesses. Central planning brought shortages, inefficiency and a lack of consumer goods. The system struggled to match the productivity of the capitalist West. In time these weaknesses would bring the Soviet Union down. The alternative proved less prosperous than it promised. Its economic flaws were, in the end, fatal.

The statement is largely valid. The Russian Revolution did offer the world an alternative to capitalism, creating the first socialist state, abolishing the market and building a planned economy that inspired millions. Yet the alternative proved coercive, repressive and, in the end, economically flawed. It was a genuine and influential alternative to capitalism, but a deeply imperfect one, as much a warning as a model.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires the reality of the alternative weighed against its coercion and flaws.

The trap is to praise or condemn the Soviet system without weighing both sides.

The top band shows a genuine alternative that was also repressive and economically weak.

Question 126

The Soviet Union was the first and greatest experiment in building a socialist society. To assess its achievements and failures is to weigh what the planned economy accomplished against what it cost. It industrialised a backward country and provided security and welfare, yet it rested on dictatorship and suffered deep economic weaknesses. Its record was one of striking success bought at a terrible human price.

It industrialised a backward country. Through the Five-Year Plans from 1928, the Soviet Union transformed a peasant land into an industrial power. Factories, steelworks and cities rose at astonishing speed. In a single generation Russia became one of the world's great industrial nations. This rapid industrialisation was the system's proudest achievement. Planning had wrought a real economic miracle.

It secured full employment and welfare. The Soviet system abolished unemployment and guaranteed work to all. It provided free education, health care and cheap housing for its people. The insecurity of the

capitalist worker was unknown in the Soviet Union. Social security was among the system's real gains. The people were shielded from want and idleness.

It advanced education and made a superpower. The Soviet Union raised a largely illiterate people to mass literacy and scientific achievement. It produced great advances in science, culminating in the space race. From backwardness it rose to become a world superpower. These were genuine and remarkable achievements. Socialism had lifted Russia to the front rank of nations.

It defeated Nazi Germany. The planned economy armed and sustained the Soviet Union through the Second World War. It bore the main weight of the struggle against Hitler and triumphed. This victory saved the country and helped to free Europe. The system had proved its strength in the supreme test of war. Soviet endurance broke the Nazi power.

Yet it rested on dictatorship and terror. The Soviet system was built and held together by a ruthless dictatorship. Under Stalin it brought purges, labour camps and the death of millions. Freedom of speech, thought and politics was crushed. The achievements were bought at a fearful cost in human lives. Tyranny was the dark side of the plan.

Its economy was inefficient and short of goods. Central planning proved clumsy and wasteful in supplying consumer goods. Shortages, queues and shoddy products were a constant feature of Soviet life. Agriculture, ruined by forced collectivisation, never fully recovered. The system produced steel and rockets but not enough bread and shoes. Inefficiency dogged the planned economy.

It stagnated and finally collapsed. In its later decades the Soviet economy slowed and fell behind the capitalist West. Unable to reform or to satisfy its people, the system lost its vitality. In 1991 the Soviet Union collapsed altogether. Its failures at last outweighed its achievements. The great experiment ended in dissolution.

The socialist system in the Soviet Union therefore compiled a record of striking achievements and grave failures. It industrialised a backward land, secured full employment and welfare, advanced education and defeated Nazism. Yet it rested on dictatorship and terror, suffered chronic inefficiency and shortage, and in the end collapsed. Its achievements were real but bought at a terrible human cost, and its deep flaws proved, in the end, fatal.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" requires the achievements weighed squarely against the failures.

The trap is to give only the industrial triumphs or only the terror, not both.

The top band credits industrialisation and welfare while conceding dictatorship and inefficiency.

Question 127

Fascism rose in Italy and Germany between the wars as a violent response to crisis. To account for its rise is to explain why peoples turned to dictatorship in their hour of trouble. The crisis of capitalism, the fear of communism, wounded nationalism and the weakness of democracy all drove the movement. Charismatic leaders and powerful backers then carried fascism to power.

The crisis of capitalism bred desperation. The Great Depression threw millions out of work and into misery. The failure of the economic system left people angry and afraid. In their desperation they turned to any movement that promised a way out. Fascism fed on the ruin of the capitalist crisis. Economic collapse prepared the ground for dictatorship.

Fear of communism drove men to fascism. The Russian Revolution had raised the spectre of communist upheaval across Europe. Frightened middle and upper classes sought a bulwark against revolution. Fascism presented itself as the defender of property and order against the left. Fear of communism thus swelled the fascist ranks. Anti-communism was a chief source of its support.

Wounded nationalism fuelled the movement. In Germany the humiliation of the Versailles settlement bred bitter resentment. Fascism promised to restore national pride and to avenge past defeats. This wounded nationalism gave the movement a powerful emotional appeal. National grievance and economic crisis reinforced one another. Fascism fed on the desire for national revival.

The weakness of democracy discredited it. The democratic governments seemed helpless before the economic crisis. Their failure to solve unemployment discredited parliamentary rule. Many came to believe that only a strong dictator could act. The weakness of democracy opened the door to fascism. Disillusion with democracy was fascism's opportunity.

Charismatic leaders exploited the crisis. Leaders such as Mussolini and Hitler offered strength, order and hope. They used propaganda and oratory to win desperate peoples to their cause. Their forceful leadership contrasted with the weakness of democratic politicians. Such leaders turned crisis into their own opportunity. The demagogue thrived on the general despair.

Powerful elites backed the fascists. Industrialists and conservatives supported fascism as a shield against the left. Their money and influence helped the movement to power. The elites preferred a fascist dictator to the risk of revolution. This backing was crucial to the fascists' success. The powerful lifted fascism into office.

Fascism promised order, work and national revival. To a people sick of crisis, fascism offered jobs, order and greatness. It promised to end the chaos and restore the nation's strength. This appeal drew millions of the desperate to its banner. The promise of a way out was fascism's great attraction. It offered hope where democracy had failed.

Fascism rose as a response to capitalist crisis because the Great Depression bred desperation, while fear of communism and wounded nationalism drove peoples toward dictatorship. The weakness of democracy discredited it, charismatic leaders exploited the crisis, and powerful elites gave their backing. Promising order, work and national revival, fascism offered a violent alternative to a failing order. It was, in the end, a dark child of the capitalist crisis.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of fascism's rise, not a description of fascist rule.

The trap is to describe Hitler's policies rather than explain why fascism arose.

The top band links the Depression to the fear of communism and the failure of democracy.

Question 128

Capitalism and socialism have been the two great rival systems of the modern world. To compare them is to see how each organises production, wealth and government, and how they differ. Both are systems for ordering the economy and society, yet they rest on opposite principles of ownership, planning and purpose. Each has its own strengths and its own grave weaknesses.

Both are systems of production and governance. Each is a complete way of organising the economy and the society built upon it. Both seek to order production, distribution and the life of the people. In this broad sense they share a common purpose. They are rival answers to the same great questions. Both aim to govern the economic life of a nation.

They differ in ownership. Under capitalism the means of production are owned privately by individuals. Under socialism they are owned collectively by the state or the community. This opposition over ownership is the deepest of all their differences. Private property faces public property. Ownership divides the two systems at the root.

They differ in the way the economy is directed. Capitalism leaves production to the free play of the market and competition. Socialism directs it through central planning by the state. The market thus faces the plan as rival guides of the economy. One trusts competition, the other coordination. Their methods of direction are wholly opposed.

They differ in their guiding aim. Capitalism produces for the profit of the owner. Socialism produces, in principle, for the use and need of the people. Profit faces need as the driving purpose of production. This difference of aim shapes each whole system. What one exists to serve, the other rejects.

They differ over equality. Capitalism accepts great inequalities of wealth as the price of enterprise. Socialism seeks a far more equal distribution of wealth and reward. Inequality thus faces equality as a social goal. The one prizes incentive, the other fairness. Their visions of a just society differ sharply.

They differ over freedom and control. Capitalism allows wide individual freedom in economy and often in politics. Socialism, in practice, has concentrated power and control in the state. Individual liberty thus faces collective control. Each secures some freedoms while limiting others. Their balance of liberty and order is very different.

Each has its strengths and weaknesses. Capitalism is efficient and dynamic but unequal and prone to crisis. Socialism offers security and equality but has proved inefficient and coercive. Neither has been without grave faults in practice. Each answers the failings of the other. The choice between them has divided the modern world.

In comparison, capitalism and socialism are rival systems of governance resting on opposite principles. They differ over ownership, planning, purpose, equality and freedom, private property and the market facing public ownership and the plan. Each has real strengths and grave weaknesses: capitalism dynamic but unequal and unstable, socialism equal and secure but inefficient and coercive. Their long rivalry has shaped the whole history of the modern world.

Examiner's Note

"Compare" requires the two systems set point against point, not described in turn.

The trap is to praise one and condemn the other rather than weighing both fairly.

The top band pairs ownership, planning and purpose while conceding the faults of each.

Question 129

The welfare state and the mixed economy were the great reform of capitalism after the Depression and the Second World War. To examine their features is to see how the state came to temper the free market. They combined private enterprise with public welfare, regulation and the management of demand. This reformed capitalism sought a middle way between the free market and full socialism.

It combined private enterprise with state intervention. The mixed economy kept private ownership and the market but joined them to an active state. Enterprise remained largely in private hands, yet government now shaped the economy. This blend of market and state was its essential character. It was neither pure capitalism nor full socialism. The mixed economy stood between the two.

The state provided social welfare. The welfare state gave its citizens protection against poverty, sickness and old age. It provided health care, education, pensions and unemployment benefit. These services shielded the people from the insecurity of the market. Social welfare was the heart of the new system. The state now cared for its citizens from cradle to grave.

The state regulated the market. Government now curbed the abuses of unchecked capitalism through regulation. It protected workers, consumers and savers from exploitation and collapse. The market was no longer left wholly to itself. Regulation tamed the worst excesses of the system. The state set rules for the private economy.

The state managed demand. Following the ideas of Keynes, governments used spending and taxation to steady the economy. In a slump the state spent to create jobs and revive demand. This management of demand aimed to prevent mass unemployment. Keynesian policy sought to iron out the trade cycle. The state now steered the economy away from crisis.

Key industries were sometimes nationalised. In several countries the state took ownership of vital industries such as coal, rail and steel. This gave government direct control over the commanding heights of the economy. Public ownership stood alongside private enterprise. Nationalisation was a socialist element within the mixed economy. The state became a producer as well as a regulator.

Taxation redistributed wealth. Progressive taxation took more from the rich to fund services for all. This redistribution reduced the extremes of wealth and poverty. The proceeds paid for welfare and public services. Taxation made the reformed system fairer than before. Redistribution softened the inequalities of capitalism.

It aimed to reform, not to abolish, capitalism. The welfare state sought to mend the capitalist system rather than overthrow it. It kept the market and private property while curbing their evils. In this it differed from the socialist alternative. Reform, not revolution, was its guiding principle. It saved capitalism by giving it a human face.

The welfare state and the mixed economy therefore combined private enterprise with an active state that provided welfare, regulated the market, managed demand, sometimes nationalised industry and redistributed wealth through taxation. This reformed capitalism sought a middle way between the free market and full socialism. By curbing the evils of capitalism while keeping its dynamism, it aimed to reform rather than abolish the system, and it shaped the post-war Western world.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks for the features of the welfare state, not a history of the Depression.

The trap is to treat it as full socialism rather than a reform of capitalism.

The top band shows welfare, regulation and demand management as a middle way.

Question 130

Ujamaa was the African socialism adopted in Tanzania under Julius Nyerere from 1967. To assess it as an African alternative to capitalism is to weigh its ideals and its social gains against its economic difficulties. It sought equality, self-reliance and communal cooperation rooted in African tradition. Its aims were noble and its social achievements real, though its economic record fell short of its hopes.

Ujamaa was a distinctly African socialism. Set out in the Arusha Declaration of 1967, Ujamaa sought a socialism rooted in African values. Its very name meant familyhood, the spirit of the extended family. It aimed to build socialism on African rather than foreign foundations. Ujamaa was thus a homegrown alternative to capitalism. It drew on Africa's own communal traditions.

It rested on communal ownership and cooperation. Ujamaa gathered people into cooperative villages to farm and produce together. Land and labour were to be shared for the common good. This communal production was meant to replace private enterprise. Cooperation, not competition, was its guiding principle. The village community was its economic base.

It aimed at national self-reliance. Ujamaa sought to free Tanzania from dependence on foreign capital and aid. It stressed the nation's own effort and resources rather than outside help. Self-reliance was a central pillar of the policy. It aimed to break the grip of neo-colonial dependence. Tanzania was to stand on its own feet.

It sought equality and an end to exploitation. Ujamaa aimed to prevent the growth of an exploiting class in Tanzania. Leaders were forbidden to enrich themselves through private business. The policy sought a fair and equal society without extremes of wealth. Equality was among its highest goals. It set its face against capitalist exploitation.

It achieved real social gains. Under Ujamaa Tanzania made great advances in education, health and literacy. Schools and clinics spread across the country, and literacy rose dramatically. The policy also strengthened national unity and peace. These social achievements were genuine and lasting. Ujamaa lifted the welfare of the people.

Yet its economic record disappointed. Agricultural production fell rather than rose under communal farming. The villagisation programme was often hurried and sometimes forced. The economy grew dependent on foreign aid despite the goal of self-reliance. Ujamaa's economic hopes were largely unfulfilled. Its practice fell short of its promise.

Its ideals nonetheless commanded respect. Even in economic failure, Ujamaa won admiration for its honesty and its ideals. It kept Tanzania united, peaceful and free of the worst corruption. Its vision of a just and self-reliant Africa retained its appeal. The experiment failed economically but not morally. Its ideals outlived its difficulties.

Ujamaa was therefore a noble but flawed African alternative to capitalism. Rooted in African tradition, it sought equality, self-reliance and communal cooperation, and it achieved real gains in education, health and unity. Yet its communal farming and villagisation brought economic disappointment, and self-reliance was not attained. Ujamaa succeeded in its social ideals more than in its economics, an honourable experiment that fell short of its own high hopes.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants Ujamaa's ideals and social gains weighed against its economic failures.

The trap is to praise or condemn it wholesale rather than weighing both sides.

The top band credits the social achievements while conceding the economic shortcomings.

Question 131

The problems of capitalism, its inequality, insecurity and recurring crises, called forth a series of alternative systems. The question asks how far these alternatives actually solved those problems. To a real but limited extent they did, easing insecurity and inequality where capitalism had failed. Yet they often created grave new problems of their own. The alternatives answered some of capitalism's evils but not all, and at a cost.

Socialism abolished capitalist exploitation in principle. By ending private ownership, socialism sought to abolish the exploitation of the worker. In the Soviet Union unemployment was ended and the profit motive removed. In principle it solved the central injustice of capitalism. This was a real answer to a real evil. Socialism struck at the root of exploitation.

Socialism provided security and equality. The socialist states offered full employment, welfare and a rough equality. The insecurity that haunted the capitalist worker was removed. Education and health were provided for all. In these respects socialism solved genuine problems of capitalism. Security replaced the fear of want.

The welfare state tamed capitalism's worst evils. The mixed economy softened inequality and insecurity through welfare and regulation. It protected citizens against poverty, sickness and old age. This reform answered many of the grievances against capitalism. The welfare state cured much that laissez-faire had left to fester. Reform tamed the harshness of the market.

Demand management reduced the crises. Keynesian policy allowed governments to soften the slumps that had plagued capitalism. By managing demand, states largely prevented a return of mass depression. The trade cycle was tamed if not abolished. This solved, in part, capitalism's problem of recurring crisis. The great slumps did not return as before.

Yet socialism created new and grave problems. In solving exploitation, socialism brought inefficiency, shortage and tyranny. The planned economies could not match the productivity of the market. Freedom was crushed in the name of equality. The cure, in the Soviet case, proved worse than the disease. New evils replaced the old.

Some alternatives failed altogether. Fascism answered the crisis with dictatorship and ended in catastrophe and war. Ujamaa, for all its ideals, struggled economically. Not every alternative solved capitalism's problems, and some deepened them. The record of the alternatives was decidedly mixed. Several remedies proved worse than the malady.

Capitalism itself reformed and survived. In the end it was reformed capitalism, not its rivals, that best combined prosperity with security. The welfare state solved many problems while keeping the market's dynamism. Capitalism proved able to absorb the criticisms of its rivals. It survived by learning from the alternatives. The reformed system outlasted its challengers.

To a real but limited extent the alternative systems solved the problems of capitalism. Socialism abolished exploitation and provided security, while the welfare state and demand management tamed inequality and crisis. Yet socialism created new evils of inefficiency and tyranny, and some alternatives failed outright. In the end it was reformed capitalism that best answered its own problems. The alternatives eased capitalism's evils, but none wholly solved them without cost.

Examiner's Note

"To what extent" needs the gains of the alternatives weighed against the new problems they caused.

The trap is to praise the alternatives without noting their inefficiency and coercion.

The top band shows the alternatives solving some problems while reformed capitalism solved others.

Question 132

Capitalism has faced repeated crises and powerful rivals, yet it endures to this day. The statement holds that it has survived by reforming itself. There is much truth in this, for capitalism has shown a remarkable capacity to adapt and change. Through reform it has answered its critics and outlasted its rivals. Yet its crises continue, so its survival by reform is real but never final.

Capitalism has repeatedly faced grave crises. The system has been shaken by depressions, world wars and the challenge of socialism. Its recurring slumps threw millions out of work and threatened its very survival. Its critics repeatedly foretold its imminent collapse. Capitalism has lived through crisis after crisis. Its history is one of repeated trial.

It survived the Great Depression through reform. The Depression brought capitalism to the very brink of collapse. The New Deal and similar measures rescued it through state intervention. Government action saved the system where the free market had failed. Reform, not revolution, carried capitalism through its greatest crisis. It survived the 1930s by abandoning laissez-faire.

It adopted the welfare state and mixed economy. After the Second World War capitalism reformed itself into a mixed economy. It joined private enterprise to public welfare and regulation. This softened the inequality and insecurity that had bred discontent. The welfare state gave capitalism a human face. Reform reconciled the people to the system.

It embraced the management of demand. Following Keynes, governments learned to steady the economy and prevent deep slumps. The management of demand tamed the trade cycle that had plagued capitalism. Mass depression did not return as it had before. This reform answered capitalism's problem of recurring crisis. The system learned to steer around disaster.

It absorbed the criticisms of socialism. Capitalism reformed itself in part to meet the socialist challenge. It reduced inequality and provided the security its rivals had promised. By adopting some of its critics' demands, it drew their sting. Reform allowed capitalism to answer the appeal of socialism. It survived by learning from its enemies.

It outlasted its socialist rival. In the end the reformed capitalist economies proved more productive than the planned ones. The Soviet Union stagnated and collapsed in 1991. Capitalism outlived the great alternative that had challenged it. Its adaptability triumphed over the rigidity of the plan. Reform had secured its survival and its victory.

Yet its crises continue and reform has limits. Capitalism still suffers crises, as the crash of 2008 made plain. Inequality has returned, and reform has not banished instability. Its survival by reform is a continuing struggle, not a final triumph. The system endures, but its problems are never wholly solved. Reform must go on, for the crises recur.

The statement is largely valid. Capitalism has indeed survived its crises by reforming itself, rescuing itself through the New Deal, the welfare state and the management of demand, and absorbing the criticisms of socialism until it outlasted its rival. Yet its crises continue and reform has its limits, as recent slumps have shown. Capitalism has survived by its remarkable adaptability, but its survival is a continuing task rather than a settled victory.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires capitalism's adaptability weighed against the continuing return of crisis.

The trap is to treat capitalism's survival as final rather than an ongoing struggle.

The top band shows reform saving the system while conceding that crises still recur.

Question 133

When African states won their independence, they inherited a difficult legacy from colonial rule. To examine the administrative problems they inherited is to see the burdens under which the new states began. Artificial borders, ethnic division, weak institutions, a shortage of trained personnel and dependent economies all beset them. These inherited problems shaped the whole course of post-colonial government.

They inherited artificial colonial borders. The frontiers drawn by Europe cut across peoples and threw old rivals together within one state. These borders bore no relation to African nations or communities. They lumped hostile groups into a single country and split single peoples between many. This artificial map became a lasting source of instability. The new states began within frontiers not of their own making.

They inherited deep ethnic divisions. Within these borders lived many peoples of different language and culture. Colonial rule had often sharpened these divisions through its policy of divide and rule. The new states thus struggled to forge one nation from many groups. Ethnic division threatened the very unity of the state. Tribalism was among the heaviest of the inherited burdens.

They inherited weak institutions. Colonial rule had built administrations to control the people, not to serve or represent them. Democratic and representative institutions were left undeveloped at independence. The new states thus lacked strong, rooted institutions of self-government. This institutional weakness made stable and lawful rule difficult. Government rested on dangerously shallow foundations.

They inherited a shortage of trained personnel. Colonialism had educated very few Africans for administration or the professions. At independence there were too few trained officials, doctors, engineers and teachers. The new states struggled even to staff their own governments. This shortage of skilled personnel crippled the work of administration. There were simply too few hands to run the new state.

They inherited dependent economies. Colonial economies had been built to export raw materials to Europe. The new states depended on one or two crops or minerals for the bulk of their income. This left them poor, vulnerable and tied to their former rulers. Economic dependence sharply limited their real freedom. Political independence had come without economic independence.

They inherited authoritarian administrative structures. The machinery of colonial rule had been designed for command and coercion. The new leaders inherited a centralised, top-down administration built to dominate. This authoritarian inheritance shaped the character of post-colonial government. The habits of colonial rule long outlived the colonisers themselves. The state remained, in its structure, a tool of control.

They inherited soaring popular expectations. Independence had been won on the promise of a better and freer life. The people now expected rapid development, jobs, schools and services. The new states could not easily meet these hopes with their scanty means. Unfulfilled expectations soon bred disappointment and discontent. The gap between promise and reality strained the new governments.

African states therefore inherited at independence a heavy burden of administrative problems: artificial borders, ethnic division, weak institutions, a shortage of trained personnel, dependent economies, authoritarian structures and soaring expectations. These inherited difficulties, all rooted in the colonial past,

shaped the whole course of post-colonial government. The new states began their independent life under a legacy that would test them severely for decades to come.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks for the inherited problems analysed, not the history of decolonisation.

The trap is to narrate the independence struggles rather than the burdens they left behind.

The top band roots each problem, borders, personnel and dependence, in the colonial legacy.

Question 134

Soon after independence, many African states abandoned multiparty politics for the one-party system. To account for its adoption is to explain why so many new nations chose rule by a single party. The need for unity, the demands of development, the fear of ethnic division and the example of the independence movement all drove the change. The one-party state was presented as the answer to Africa's problems.

It was held to promote national unity. The new states feared that rival parties would divide their fragile nations. A single party, it was argued, could unite all citizens behind one goal. The one-party system was presented as the guardian of national unity. Leaders held that Africa could not afford the luxury of division. Unity was the chief justification for one-party rule.

It was thought to prevent ethnic division. In many states political parties tended to form along ethnic lines. Multiparty competition thus threatened to sharpen tribalism and conflict. The one-party system was meant to keep ethnicity out of politics. It sought to prevent parties from becoming tribal factions. Avoiding ethnic strife was a powerful motive for its adoption.

It was seen as necessary for development. The new leaders argued that development demanded unity of effort and purpose. Opposition and debate were held to waste energy the poor nation could not spare. A single party could mobilise the whole people for the task of building the nation. Development, it was claimed, required concentration rather than division. The one-party state was cast as an engine of progress.

The nationalist movement had been a broad single front. The struggle for independence had usually been led by one great mass movement. This party had come to embody the nation and its hopes. It seemed natural that the movement that won freedom should govern alone. The one-party state grew directly out of the independence movement. The party of liberation became the party of the state.

Opposition was often weak or discredited. The dominant nationalist party frequently commanded overwhelming popular support. Rival parties were small, divided or tainted by association with the colonisers. In these conditions a single party easily became supreme. The weakness of opposition eased the path to one-party rule. There was often little effective challenge to the ruling party.

It was justified by an African tradition of consensus. Leaders such as Nyerere argued that African society governed by discussion and consensus, not by faction. The one-party state was said to suit this tradition better than adversarial politics. Debate could take place within the single party rather than between rival ones. Africa's own heritage was invoked to justify the system. Consensus, not conflict, was held to be the African way.

It also served the ambitions of the rulers. The one-party system conveniently removed all rivals to the governing leaders. It allowed them to entrench their power and silence opposition. National unity thus served the interests of the rulers as well. The desire to hold power reinforced the higher justifications. Self-interest and principle together favoured the one-party state.

The one-party system was adopted in post-colonial Africa because it was held to promote national unity, to prevent ethnic division and to serve development. It grew naturally from the broad nationalist movements, was eased by the weakness of opposition, and was justified by an African tradition of consensus. Yet it also served the ambitions of the rulers. For all these reasons the single party became the dominant form of early post-colonial government.

Examiner's Note
"Account for" wants the reasons for the one-party state, not a judgement on it.
The trap is to condemn one-party rule rather than explain why it was adopted.
The top band balances unity and development against the self-interest of the rulers.

Question 135

On winning independence, many African states chose the one-party over the multiparty system. The statement holds that the one-party state was better suited to Africa. There is a real case for this, given Africa's need for unity and development. Yet the one-party state also brought authoritarian rule and stagnation. The verdict must weigh the genuine arguments in its favour against its heavy costs.

It could foster national unity. In states threatened by ethnic division, a single party could unite the people. It kept the fragile nation from splitting into rival factions. This unifying role was a real strength of the system. For divided new states, unity was a pressing need. The one-party state answered a genuine African problem.

It could keep ethnicity out of politics. Where parties tended to form on tribal lines, the single party could prevent this. It sought to make the nation, not the tribe, the basis of politics. This guarded against the dangers of ethnic competition. In deeply divided societies this was a genuine advantage. The system aimed to tame the peril of tribalism.

It could concentrate effort on development. The one-party state could mobilise the whole nation behind the task of development. It avoided the divisions and delays of party conflict. For poor states with much to do, this focus was attractive. Concentration of effort was held to be essential to progress. The system promised unity of purpose in a great task.

It could suit an African tradition of consensus. Leaders argued that African society decided by discussion until agreement was reached. The one-party state, with debate inside the party, echoed this tradition. In this sense it could be defended as genuinely African. It seemed to fit the culture better than adversarial politics. Consensus was held to be the African way of ruling.

Yet it tended toward authoritarian rule. In practice the one-party state often silenced all opposition and criticism. It concentrated power dangerously in the ruling party and its leader. Without rivals, governments grew unaccountable and sometimes despotic. This slide into authoritarianism was its gravest fault. Unity too easily became the excuse for tyranny.

It removed the checks on bad government. With no opposition, there was little to expose corruption or incompetence. Rulers could not easily be criticised, checked or replaced. This absence of accountability bred stagnation and abuse. The people had no lawful means to change a failing government. The one-party state lacked the correctives of democracy.

Its record in practice was disappointing. Many one-party states fell into corruption, economic failure and even dictatorship. The unity and development they promised often failed to appear. Their poor record led, by the 1990s, to a return of multiparty politics. Experience told against the one-party claim. The system was judged and found wanting.

The statement has real force but cannot be wholly accepted. The one-party state answered genuine African needs for unity, for the taming of ethnicity and for concentrated development, and it could claim roots in a tradition of consensus. Yet in practice it tended toward authoritarian rule, removed the checks on bad government and often ended in failure. It was suited to some of Africa's problems, but its heavy costs told against it in the end.

Examiner's Note
"Discuss" requires the case for the one-party state weighed against its authoritarian costs.
The trap is to condemn or praise it wholesale rather than balancing the two.
The top band grants its unifying role while conceding its slide into unaccountable rule.

Question 136

The one-party state was the dominant form of government in Africa for a generation after independence. To assess its achievements and failures is to weigh what it accomplished against what it cost. It preserved unity and stability and advanced nation-building in several states, yet it also bred authoritarian rule, corruption and stagnation. Its record was mixed, with real gains bought at a heavy political price.

It preserved national unity in many states. In deeply divided societies the single party held the fragile nation together. It prevented the splintering of the state into rival ethnic factions. In countries such as Tanzania it fostered a genuine sense of nationhood. This preservation of unity was a real achievement. It kept many new states from falling apart.

It maintained peace and stability. A number of one-party states enjoyed long periods of internal peace. By suppressing factional conflict, they avoided the civil wars that tore other lands apart. This stability allowed some progress to be made. Order was among the system's genuine benefits. It gave several states a valuable calm.

It advanced nation-building and social services. Some one-party states made real gains in education, health and national identity. Tanzania under Nyerere, for example, spread literacy and forged a united nation. The single party could mobilise the people for these tasks. Such social achievements were not to be despised. Nation-building was a real success in places.

Yet it became authoritarian and suppressed freedom. The one-party state often silenced all opposition and criticism. Freedom of speech, press and assembly was frequently crushed. Citizens lost the right to organise against their rulers. This suppression of liberty was its gravest failure. Unity too often became the excuse for tyranny.

It bred corruption and unaccountable rule. With no opposition to check them, rulers grew unaccountable and often corrupt. Public office became a road to private wealth for the powerful. There was little means to expose or punish abuse. Corruption flourished in the shelter of the single party. Unchecked power bred misgovernment.

It often failed to deliver development. Despite its promises, one-party rule frequently brought economic stagnation. Mismanagement, corruption and the stifling of enterprise held back progress. The prosperity the system pledged often failed to appear. Its economic record was, in many states, disappointing. Development lagged behind the rhetoric.

It sometimes ended in dictatorship or coup. The concentration of power in one party and leader invited abuse. In some states it degenerated into personal dictatorship, as under Amin in Uganda. In others it was overthrown by military coup. The system's own faults often destroyed it. Its end was frequently violent or ignominious.

The record of one-party rule in post-colonial Africa was therefore genuinely mixed. It preserved national unity, maintained stability and advanced nation-building and social services in several states. Yet it also became authoritarian, bred corruption, often failed to deliver development, and sometimes ended in dictatorship or coup. Its real achievements were bought at a heavy political price, and its failures led, in the end, to its rejection.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" requires the achievements weighed squarely against the failures.

The trap is to give only the unity and stability or only the tyranny, not both.

The top band credits nation-building while conceding authoritarianism and stagnation.

Question 137

Military coups became a common feature of politics in post-colonial Africa. To account for their frequency is to explain why armies so often seized power from civilian governments. Weak institutions, economic

failure, corruption, ethnic tension and the strength of the army all made coups likely. The legacy of colonialism and the pressures of the Cold War added to the danger.

Civilian institutions were weak. The new states lacked strong, rooted democratic institutions to defend themselves. Constitutions and parliaments had shallow foundations and little authority. Weak civilian government was easily pushed aside by force. This institutional fragility invited military intervention. There was little to protect elected rule from the army.

Economic failure bred discontent. Poverty, unemployment and failed development bred widespread discontent. When civilian governments could not improve life, they lost popular support. The army often stepped in claiming to rescue the nation. Economic failure thus prepared the ground for coups. Hardship undermined the legitimacy of civilian rule.

Corruption discredited civilian governments. Many civilian regimes fell into corruption and self-enrichment. Their misrule angered the people and the soldiers alike. The army frequently justified its coups as a cleansing of corruption. Misgovernment thus gave the military its excuse. Corruption eroded the standing of elected leaders.

Ethnic and regional tensions destabilised the state. Ethnic and regional rivalries often threatened to tear the new states apart. In such conflicts the army might seize power as an arbiter or a partisan. These tensions made civilian government unstable and coups more likely. Division within the nation invited intervention by force. Tribalism helped to unseat civilian rule.

The army was often the only organised force. In weak states the army was frequently the best-organised and most disciplined body. It held the monopoly of weapons and could act decisively. This gave it the power to seize the state almost at will. The strength of the army made coups easy to carry out. Force lay ready in the hands of the soldiers.

Personal ambition drove some officers. Ambitious officers were tempted by the power and spoils that a coup could bring. Some seized the state for their own enrichment and glory. Personal greed thus reinforced the deeper causes of instability. Ambition turned soldiers into rulers. The lure of power moved many a coup.

Colonial legacy and Cold War pressures added to the danger. Colonialism had left weak, artificial states with little legitimacy. During the Cold War the superpowers sometimes backed coups to install friendly regimes. External interference thus encouraged military intervention. The wider context made African governments still more fragile. Outside pressures compounded the internal weaknesses.

Military coups were frequent in post-colonial Africa because weak civilian institutions could not withstand the army, while economic failure and corruption discredited elected governments. Ethnic tensions destabilised the state, the army was often the strongest organised force, and ambitious officers sought power. The colonial legacy and Cold War interference added to the danger. Together these forces made the coup a recurring feature of African politics.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of the coups, not a narrative of particular seizures of power.

The trap is to describe one coup rather than explain why coups were so common.

The top band links weak institutions and economic failure to the strength of the army.

Question 138

Military rule became widespread in post-colonial Africa as coups toppled civilian governments. To examine its effects on administrative systems is to see how the soldiers governed once in power. Military rule suspended constitutions, banned politics and militarised the state, sometimes bringing order but more often repression. Its overall effect on African administration was, on balance, damaging.

It suspended constitutions and civilian government. On seizing power, the military usually suspended the constitution and dissolved parliament. It ruled instead by decree through a council of officers. Lawful, constitutional government was set aside. This overturned the very basis of civilian administration. Rule by decree replaced rule by law.

It banned parties and suppressed politics. Military regimes commonly outlawed political parties and banned political activity. Opposition and public debate were silenced under the soldiers. Political life was frozen for the duration of military rule. This closed down the open politics of the state. The barracks silenced the assembly.

It sometimes restored short-term order. In states torn by chaos or corruption, the army could impose a temporary order. Its discipline and decisiveness might restore a measure of stability. Some coups were welcomed at first as a rescue from misrule. Order was, on occasion, a genuine short-term effect. The soldiers could bring a brief calm.

It militarised the administration. Military rulers placed officers in charge of ministries and public bodies. The habits and hierarchy of the army were imposed on civil administration. Government became command from above rather than public service. This militarisation distorted the machinery of the state. The soldier displaced the civil servant.

It brought repression and the abuse of rights. Military regimes frequently ruled through fear, detention and violence. Human rights were widely abused under the soldiers. Critics were silenced, imprisoned or worse. Repression became the everyday method of government. The gun replaced consent as the basis of rule.

It rarely solved economic problems. The soldiers proved no better than civilians at managing the economy. Corruption and mismanagement often continued or grew worse under military rule. The economic failures that had prompted the coup usually persisted. Military government seldom brought the promised recovery. The army could not conjure prosperity.

It bred instability and further coups. Military rule often set off a cycle of coup and counter-coup. One seizure of power invited the next, as officers fought for control. This chronic instability crippled orderly administration. Military intervention thus deepened the very disorder it claimed to cure. The coup bred more coups.

Military rule therefore had a largely damaging effect on African administrative systems. It suspended constitutions, banned politics and militarised the state, and though it sometimes restored a brief order, it more often brought repression, economic failure and further instability. By replacing lawful government with rule by decree and the gun, military rule set back the development of stable administration across much of post-colonial Africa.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks for the effects of military rule analysed, not the causes of the coups.

The trap is to describe one regime rather than the general effects on administration.

The top band concedes brief order while showing the deeper damage of militarised, repressive rule.

Question 139

The post-colonial African states struggled with instability, poverty and misrule. The statement lays the blame for their failures on colonialism rather than on African leaders. There is much truth in this, for colonialism left a crippling legacy. Yet African leaders also made grave errors of their own. The failures of the new states sprang from both the colonial inheritance and the choices of those who led them.

Colonialism left artificial borders and ethnic division. The frontiers drawn by Europe threw hostile peoples together and split others apart. This artificial map was a lasting source of conflict and instability. The ethnic divisions it created were not of the leaders' making. Much later strife had its roots in the colonial partition. For this the colonisers, not the leaders, must bear the blame.

Colonialism left weak institutions and few trained people. Colonial rule had built no strong democratic institutions and educated few Africans. The new states began with shallow foundations and too few skilled hands. This inheritance handicapped them from the very start. The leaders could not quickly repair so deep a deficiency. The fault here lay with the colonial past.

Colonialism left dependent economies. The colonial economy tied Africa to the export of a few raw materials. The new states inherited poverty and dependence, not prosperity. This economic weakness was the work of colonialism, not of African leaders. It sharply limited what any government could achieve. The leaders inherited a rigged and dependent economy.

Neo-colonialism continued the external control. Even after independence, foreign powers and firms retained great economic influence. Unequal trade and dependence on aid kept the new states weak. This continued external control was beyond the leaders' power to end. Neo-colonialism perpetuated the failures of the colonial system. Outside forces still shaped Africa's fate.

Yet many African leaders also failed. Some leaders fell into corruption, tyranny and the abuse of power. They enriched themselves, silenced opponents and mismanaged their states. These failings cannot be blamed upon colonialism. The choices of the leaders themselves deepened the crisis. Africa's rulers bear real responsibility of their own.

Some leaders squandered their opportunities. Where some leaders built unity and made progress, others favoured their own ethnic group or ruined the economy. The wide difference in their records shows that leadership mattered. Good leaders eased the colonial legacy; bad ones worsened it. The outcome depended in part on the men in power. Leadership could make or break the new state.

The blame was therefore shared. Colonialism created the difficult conditions in which the new states began. But the choices of African leaders then made those conditions better or worse. Neither factor alone explains the record of post-colonial Africa. Responsibility lay with both the colonial legacy and the leaders. The failures had, in truth, more than one author.

The statement is partly valid but too one-sided. Colonialism did leave a crippling legacy of artificial borders, weak institutions and dependent economies, and neo-colonialism prolonged it. Yet African leaders also failed through corruption, tyranny and mismanagement, and the difference in their records shows that leadership mattered. The failures of the post-colonial states sprang from both the colonial inheritance and the choices of those who governed after it.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires the colonial legacy weighed against the responsibility of African leaders.

The trap is to blame one side entirely and ignore the other.

The top band shows colonialism setting the conditions and leaders' choices shaping the outcome.

Question 140

The states of independent Africa were profoundly shaped by the colonialism that preceded them. To assess the impact of the colonial legacy is to weigh how far it determined the fate of post-colonial administration. It bequeathed artificial borders, ethnic division, weak and authoritarian institutions and dependent economies. This legacy was largely a burden, though the leaders' own choices still mattered.

Artificial borders bred lasting instability. The colonial frontiers ignored the map of African peoples entirely. They threw rivals together and divided single communities between states. This became a permanent source of conflict and instability. The new administrations had to govern within these unnatural bounds. The inherited borders undermined stable government.

Ethnic divisions undermined national unity. Colonial divide and rule had deepened the divisions between African peoples. The new states struggled to build one nation from many suspicious groups. Politics tended to fracture along the ethnic lines colonialism had sharpened. National unity was gravely handicapped from the start. Tribalism was a poisoned colonial bequest.

Weak and authoritarian institutions were inherited. Colonial administration had been built to command, not to represent, the people. It left behind centralised, top-down structures and no tradition of democracy. The new states inherited the machinery of control rather than of consent. This authoritarian legacy shaped their whole style of rule. The colonial state lived on in the post-colonial one.

A shortage of trained personnel crippled administration. Colonialism had educated very few Africans for the tasks of government. At independence there were too few officials, professionals and technicians. The new administrations struggled to function for want of skilled people. This shortage was a direct and crippling colonial legacy. The lack of trained hands hampered every ministry.

Dependent economies limited real freedom. The colonial economy had tied Africa to exporting a few primary goods. The new states inherited poverty, dependence and vulnerability to world prices. This economic weakness restricted what any government could do. Political independence was hollowed out by economic dependence. The colonial economy long outlived colonial rule.

The centralised bureaucratic state shaped governance. Colonialism left a powerful, centralised bureaucracy as the core of the state. Post-colonial rulers inherited and often strengthened this apparatus. Government remained remote, coercive and centralised. The habits of the colonial bureaucracy persisted after independence. The state stayed a machine for control.

Yet the legacy did not determine everything. Alongside the burdens, colonialism also left roads, schools and some institutions to build on. The very different records of African states show that leaders' choices mattered too. The colonial legacy shaped, but did not wholly determine, the outcome. Much still depended on how it was handled. The inheritance was a powerful start, not a fixed destiny.

The impact of the colonial legacy on post-colonial administration in Africa was therefore profound and largely burdensome. It bequeathed artificial borders, ethnic division, weak and authoritarian institutions, a shortage of trained personnel and dependent economies. This inheritance shaped the whole character of the new states. Yet it did not determine everything, for the choices of African leaders still helped to decide whether the legacy was overcome or made worse.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants the colonial legacy weighed, including the room left for leaders' choices.

The trap is to treat the legacy as an excuse that removes all African responsibility.

The top band shows the legacy as a heavy burden that nonetheless left choices open.

Question 141

National unity proved one of the hardest tasks facing the new states of Africa. To account for the problem is to explain why forging one nation was so difficult. Artificial borders, ethnic diversity, colonial divide and rule, regionalism and weak national identity all worked against unity. These forces made the building of a united nation a central struggle of post-colonial government.

Artificial borders lumped diverse peoples together. The colonial frontiers had gathered many different peoples into a single state. These groups often shared no common language, history or loyalty. The new state had to unite peoples who had never before been one. This artificial grouping made national unity inherently difficult. The borders themselves worked against the nation.

Ethnic and tribal loyalties divided the people. In most African states loyalty was owed first to the ethnic group, not the nation. These strong tribal identities competed with any sense of common nationhood. Ethnic feeling pulled the new states apart from within. Tribalism was the deepest obstacle to national unity. The tribe rivalled the nation for men's allegiance.

Colonial divide and rule sharpened divisions. The colonial powers had often set one group against another to ease their rule. They favoured some peoples and regions over others. This deliberate policy left a legacy of suspicion and rivalry. Divisions sharpened by colonialism outlived it. The colonisers had sown discord among the peoples.

Regionalism and uneven development bred resentment. Colonialism had developed some regions while neglecting others. This left deep inequalities between the parts of each new state. Favoured and neglected regions eyed one another with resentment. Regionalism thus strained the unity of the nation. Uneven development pulled the state apart.

Religious differences added to the division. Many African states were divided between Christians, Muslims and traditional believers. These religious differences sometimes overlapped with ethnic and regional ones. Faith could become another line of division within the nation. Religious diversity complicated the task of unity. Belief, too, could split the people.

National identity was new and weak. The African nations were recent creations with little shared past. There had been no long history to bind their peoples together as one. A sense of common nationhood had still to be built almost from nothing. This weakness of national identity was a fundamental problem. The nation was an idea not yet rooted.

Politics fractured along ethnic lines. Competition for power and resources often followed ethnic divisions. Parties and factions formed around tribes rather than ideas. This turned political life into a contest between ethnic groups. Such politics deepened the very divisions it fed on. Ethnicity and power became dangerously entangled.

The problem of national unity in post-colonial Africa arose because artificial borders lumped diverse peoples together while ethnic and tribal loyalties divided them. Colonial divide and rule, regionalism, religious differences and a weak national identity all worked against unity, and politics too often fractured along ethnic lines. For these reasons the building of one nation from many peoples became a central and enduring struggle of the new states.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of the unity problem, not solutions to it.

The trap is to describe one civil war rather than explain the general difficulty.

The top band links artificial borders and ethnic loyalty to colonial divide and rule.

Question 142

Faced with deep ethnic and regional divisions, the new states of Africa laboured to build national unity. To examine the strategies they adopted is to see how they sought to forge one nation from many peoples. They used the one-party state, national languages, unifying ideologies and balanced representation among their tools. These strategies aimed to overcome the divisions inherited from the colonial past.

They adopted the one-party state. Many states banned rival parties and governed through a single national party. This was meant to unite all citizens behind one movement and one goal. It sought to prevent politics from splitting along ethnic lines. The one-party state was a chief instrument of national unity. A single party was to embody the whole nation.

They promoted a national language. Some states adopted a common language to bind their peoples together. Tanzania, most famously, made Swahili the national language above all tribes. A shared tongue helped to create a sense of common nationhood. Language became a powerful tool of unity. It gave the nation a voice of its own.

They built unifying national ideologies. Leaders promoted national ideologies and programmes to foster a common identity. Tanzania's Ujamaa and national service sought to make citizens of tribesmen. Such ideologies gave the people a shared purpose above ethnicity. Nation-building was pursued as a deliberate policy. A common creed was meant to unite the nation.

They discouraged ethnic organisations. Governments often banned tribal parties, associations and appeals. Politics based on ethnicity was outlawed as a threat to unity. This sought to keep tribalism out of public life. Suppressing ethnic organisation was a common strategy. The tribe was to be kept out of politics.

They balanced ethnic representation. Some states carefully shared offices and resources among their ethnic groups. This aimed to give every people a stake in the nation. Balanced representation sought to reassure the many communities. Fair inclusion was used to bind groups to the state. Sharing power helped to hold the nation together.

They used education and national symbols. Schools taught a common history and loyalty to the nation. Flags, anthems and national days fostered a shared identity. These symbols and lessons built a sense of belonging. Education was harnessed to the making of the nation. The young were taught to be citizens first.

They strengthened the central government. Most states chose strong, unitary central governments over federal ones. Centralisation was meant to hold the diverse nation firmly together. Regionalism and separatism were resisted by concentrating power. A strong centre was seen as the guarantor of unity. The unitary state guarded against fragmentation.

African states therefore pursued national unity through a range of strategies: the one-party state, national languages, unifying ideologies, the discouragement of ethnic organisation, balanced representation, education and strong central government. These tools sought to forge one nation from the many peoples the colonial borders had gathered. Their success varied greatly, but together they represent the sustained effort of the new states to overcome division and build a nation.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks for the strategies analysed, not the causes of disunity.

The trap is to describe the problem of unity rather than the responses to it.

The top band uses concrete examples such as Swahili and Ujamaa to illustrate the strategies.

Question 143

Political independence did not bring Africa full economic freedom. The claim holds that neo-colonialism kept the new states dependent on the former colonial powers. This is largely valid, for foreign control of trade, capital and aid continued after independence. Yet African states were not wholly powerless, and their own choices mattered too. Neo-colonialism kept most states dependent, though not absolutely so.

Foreign firms controlled the economies. At independence, multinational companies still owned the mines, plantations and industries. The commanding heights of the economy remained in foreign hands. Africans governed politically but did not control their own wealth. This foreign ownership was the core of neo-colonial dependence. The economy was ruled from abroad.

Trade continued on unequal terms. The new states still exported cheap raw materials and imported dear manufactures. The terms of trade favoured the industrial nations, not Africa. This unequal exchange kept African states poor and dependent. Trade perpetuated the old colonial relationship. The pattern of colonial commerce lived on.

Dependence on aid and loans grew. Lacking capital, the new states relied on foreign aid and loans to develop. This dependence gave the lenders influence over African policy. Mounting debt bound the states ever more tightly to outside powers. Aid became a new chain of dependence. The donor gained power over the recipient.

Former colonial powers retained influence. France, Britain and others kept close political, military and cultural ties with their former colonies. These links allowed continued interference in African affairs. The old rulers guided their former subjects from behind the scenes. This influence was a mark of neo-colonial control. The colonisers had left but not wholly departed.

Nkrumah named and analysed the phenomenon. Kwame Nkrumah described neo-colonialism as the last stage of imperialism in 1965. He argued that Africa was politically free but economically enslaved. His analysis gave the argument its force and its name. The concept expressed a real and widespread experience. Nkrumah's warning captured Africa's predicament.

Yet African states retained some agency. The new states were not wholly powerless before the outside world. Some diversified their economies or bargained for better terms. The very different fortunes of African states show that choices mattered. Neo-colonialism constrained, but did not wholly determine, their fate. Dependence was severe but not absolute.

Internal failures also caused dependence. Corruption, mismanagement and poor policy deepened Africa's dependence from within. Not all economic weakness could be blamed on outside forces. The choices of African leaders also shaped the outcome. Dependence had internal as well as external causes. The fault lay partly at home.

The claim is largely valid. Neo-colonialism did keep most new African states dependent, through foreign control of their economies, unequal trade, reliance on aid and the lingering influence of the former colonial powers. Nkrumah rightly named this continuing bondage. Yet African states retained some agency, and internal failures also deepened their dependence. Neo-colonialism kept Africa dependent to a great but not an absolute degree.

Examiner's Note

"How valid" invites strong agreement tempered by African agency and internal failings.

The trap is to blame outside forces alone and ignore corruption and mismanagement.

The top band credits neo-colonial control while conceding that choices at home mattered too.

Question 144

On winning independence, the new African states set out to develop their poor and dependent economies. To assess their efforts is to weigh what they attempted against what they achieved. They adopted development plans, built industries and expanded services, following both socialist and capitalist paths. Their efforts brought real social gains, but economic development largely fell short of their hopes.

They adopted national development plans. The new states drew up plans to guide and speed their development. The government took the lead in directing the economy toward growth. This planning reflected a faith in state-led development. Ambitious targets were set for industry and agriculture. Development became a central task of the state.

They pursued industrialisation. Many states sought to build their own industries through import substitution. Factories were established to make goods once bought from abroad. This aimed to reduce dependence and create employment. Industrialisation was a chief goal of development. Africa sought to make what it had once imported.

They created state enterprises. Governments nationalised key industries and set up parastatal companies. The state became a major producer and employer in the economy. This gave government direct control over development. Parastatals were central to the development effort. The state took the economy into its own hands.

They invested in education and health. The new states expanded schools, universities, clinics and hospitals. This investment in people was among their most successful efforts. Literacy and health improved markedly in many countries. Human development was a real achievement. The people gained schooling and care as never before.

They followed different economic paths. Some states, such as Tanzania, chose African socialism, while others, such as Kenya, chose capitalism. Each path was tried as a road to development. The varied results showed the difficulty of the task. No single path proved a sure success. Africa experimented with rival strategies.

Yet many efforts ended in disappointment. Falling commodity prices, mounting debt and mismanagement crippled development. Industries often proved inefficient and dependence deepened rather than eased. By the 1980s many states faced economic crisis. The development effort largely fell short of its aims. Prosperity proved harder to win than freedom.

External forces constrained development. Unequal trade, neo-colonial dependence and world recession held Africa back. The states struggled against forces beyond their control. Their efforts were limited by a hostile world economy. Development was frustrated by the wider system. Africa laboured against heavy external odds.

The efforts of African states to achieve economic development after independence were therefore earnest but only partly successful. They adopted plans, pursued industrialisation, created state enterprises and invested heavily in education and health, following both socialist and capitalist paths. Real social gains were made, above all in human development. Yet economic development largely fell short, frustrated by debt, falling prices, mismanagement and a hostile world economy.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants the development efforts weighed against their limited results.

The trap is to list policies without judging how far they succeeded.

The top band credits the social gains while explaining why economic development fell short.

Question 145

After decades of one-party and military rule, a wave of democratization swept Africa in the 1990s. To account for it is to explain why so many states returned to multiparty politics at once. The failure of the old regimes, economic crisis, popular pressure and the end of the Cold War all drove the change. External pressure and a global trend toward democracy completed it.

The old regimes had failed. Decades of one-party and military rule had brought corruption, repression and stagnation. The systems that had promised unity and development had largely disappointed. Their evident failure discredited authoritarian government. This loss of faith prepared the ground for change. The old order had exhausted its credit.

Economic crisis discredited authoritarian rule. The economic collapse of the 1980s left many states impoverished and indebted. Governments could no longer buy support or deliver development. Economic failure fuelled anger against the ruling regimes. Hardship drove the demand for political change. The crisis undermined the dictators' hold.

Popular pressure demanded reform. Students, workers, churches and a growing civil society pressed for democracy. Protests and strikes across the continent demanded an end to one-party rule. This popular movement forced concessions from reluctant governments. The people themselves drove the return to multiparty politics. Pressure from below shook the regimes.

The end of the Cold War removed old supports. The fall of the Soviet Union discredited the socialist one-party model. The superpowers no longer propped up friendly dictators as before. Authoritarian regimes lost their external protectors. The changed world order left them exposed. The end of the Cold War pulled the ground from under them.

Western donors demanded democratic reform. After the Cold War, Western aid was increasingly tied to democracy and good governance. Governments dependent on aid had to accept political reform. This donor conditionality pushed states toward multiparty elections. External pressure reinforced the demand for change. The purse strings compelled reform.

A global wave of democracy swept the world. The late 1980s and 1990s saw democracy spread across many continents. Africa was carried along by this worldwide movement. The example of change elsewhere inspired reformers at home. The global tide encouraged African democratization. Africa joined a wider "third wave" of democracy.

Rising expectations demanded accountability. A better-educated and more aware population demanded a say in government. People increasingly insisted that rulers be accountable to them. This rising expectation could no longer be denied. The demand for participation swelled across the continent. Africans claimed the right to choose their governments.

The wave of democratization in 1990s Africa arose because the old one-party and military regimes had failed, while economic crisis and popular pressure demanded change. The end of the Cold War removed the dictators' external supports, and Western donors tied their aid to democratic reform. Carried along by a global wave of democracy and by rising expectations, much of Africa returned to multiparty politics within a few years.

Examiner's Note

"Account for" wants the causes of democratization, not a description of particular elections.

The trap is to give only internal or only external causes rather than both.

The top band links the failure of the old regimes to the end of the Cold War and donor pressure.

Question 146

In post-colonial Africa the state took the leading part in the drive for development. To examine its role is to see how central government shaped the economy after independence. The state planned, owned, built and provided, becoming the chief agent of development. Its role was dominant, though its record was mixed and its overreach eventually brought reform.

The state planned the economy. The new governments drew up development plans to guide the whole economy. They set targets and directed resources toward chosen goals. Planning reflected a deep faith in state-led development. The state, not the market, was to steer the economy. Central planning was the hallmark of the developmental state.

The state owned key industries. Governments nationalised industries and created parastatal companies. The state became a major producer, employer and investor. The commanding heights of the economy passed into public hands. Public ownership was central to the development strategy. The state took direct charge of production.

The state built the infrastructure. Governments constructed roads, railways, power and water supplies. This infrastructure was seen as the foundation of development. Only the state could mobilise the resources for such works. Building the framework of the economy was a chief state role. The state laid the ground for growth.

The state expanded education and health. The new states invested heavily in schools, clinics and universities. This provision of services was among their most successful efforts. Human development was pursued as a public responsibility. The state took charge of educating and caring for the people. Welfare was a major task of government.

The state regulated the economy. Governments controlled prices, trade and the movement of capital. They sought to guide private activity toward national goals. Regulation gave the state a firm grip on economic life. The market was subordinated to the plans of government. The state directed as well as produced.

Yet the state often over-extended itself. The developmental state grew bloated, inefficient and corrupt. It took on more than it could manage well. Overreach led to waste, debt and economic crisis. The state's very dominance became a source of failure. Too much government hampered development.

Its dominance was later rolled back. The economic crises of the 1980s discredited the all-powerful state. Structural adjustment programmes forced governments to cut back their role. The market was given greater play as the state retreated. The era of the dominant developmental state came to an end. Reform trimmed the overgrown state.

The state therefore played the leading role in development in post-colonial Africa. It planned the economy, owned key industries, built infrastructure, expanded education and health, and regulated economic life. Its role was dominant and brought real gains, especially in human development. Yet the state often over-extended itself into inefficiency and crisis, and its dominance was later rolled back under the pressures of economic reform.

Examiner's Note

"Examine" asks for the state's role analysed, not a judgement for or against it.

The trap is to describe development plans without showing the breadth of the state's role.

The top band shows the state as planner, owner and provider, while noting its overreach.

Question 147

After independence, African states chose between two broad paths of development, the capitalist and the socialist. To compare them is to see how each sought to develop the new nations and how they differed. Both aimed at growth and an escape from poverty, yet they differed sharply over ownership, the role of the state and foreign capital. Their results, too, were markedly different.

Both aimed at national development. Whether capitalist or socialist, each path sought to develop the poor new economies. Both wished to escape poverty and dependence and to build the nation. In this shared goal the two paths agreed. Development was the common aim of both. Each was a road to the same destination.

They differed over ownership. The capitalist states, such as Kenya and the Ivory Coast, kept private ownership and enterprise. The socialist states, such as Tanzania and Nkrumah's Ghana, favoured state and communal ownership. Private property thus faced public ownership. This difference over ownership was fundamental. The two paths began from opposite principles.

They differed over the role of the state. The socialist path gave the state strong control and central planning. The capitalist path left more to the market and private initiative. State direction thus faced the free market. Each assigned government a very different role. Plan and market were their rival guides.

They differed over foreign capital. The capitalist states welcomed foreign investment and Western ties. The socialist states restricted foreign capital and stressed self-reliance. Openness to the outside thus faced economic nationalism. Their attitudes to the world economy diverged. One embraced foreign capital, the other resisted it.

They differed over equality. The socialist path stressed equality and the prevention of a rich class. The capitalist path accepted inequality as the price of growth. Fairness thus faced incentive as the guiding value. Each held a different vision of a just society. Equality and enterprise were their rival ideals.

Their results differed markedly. The capitalist states often grew faster but with greater inequality and dependence. The socialist states achieved more in equity and services but faltered economically. Neither path proved a clear or complete success. The outcomes reflected the strengths and faults of each. Growth and fairness were unevenly shared between them.

Both, however, struggled against dependence. Whichever path they chose, African states remained tied to the world economy. Capitalist and socialist alike faced debt, falling prices and neo-colonial pressure. Dependence constrained the results of both strategies. In this shared struggle the two paths met. Neither escaped the burdens of the wider system.

In comparison, the capitalist and socialist paths of African development shared the aim of escaping poverty but differed sharply over ownership, the role of the state, foreign capital and equality. The capitalist states grew faster but more unequally, while the socialist states gained in equity but faltered economically. Both, however, struggled against a common dependence. Neither path proved a sure road to development, and each carried its own strengths and faults.

Examiner's Note

"Compare" requires the two paths set point against point, not described in turn.

The trap is to praise one path and condemn the other rather than weighing both.

The top band pairs ownership, the state and foreign capital while noting their shared dependence.

Question 148

The states of independent Africa inherited grave problems of governance and have struggled with them for decades. The question asks how far they have overcome these problems. To a real but limited extent they have, for democracy has spread and some states have achieved stability and growth. Yet coups, conflict, corruption and weak institutions persist. Progress has been genuine but uneven and incomplete.

Democracy has spread across the continent. Since the 1990s multiparty elections have become the norm in much of Africa. Many states now change their governments peacefully through the ballot. This advance of democracy marks a real gain in governance. The age of the automatic one-party state has passed. Accountability has grown where once there was none.

Some states have achieved stability and unity. A number of African states now enjoy lasting peace and national unity. Peaceful transfers of power have taken place where once coups reigned. These states show that stable governance is attainable in Africa. Their success is an encouraging sign. Order and unity have been won in places.

Several economies have grown strongly. In recent decades a number of African economies have grown at impressive rates. A rising middle class and new industries have emerged. This growth suggests that development is not beyond reach. Economic progress has accompanied better governance. Prosperity has begun to return to parts of Africa.

Regional and continental cooperation has advanced. The African Union and regional bodies have strengthened cooperation among states. Institutions now exist to promote peace, integration and good governance. This continental effort supports better government at home. Africa increasingly acts together on its problems. Cooperation has grown across the continent.

Yet coups and conflict persist. Military coups and civil wars have by no means disappeared from Africa. Some states have relapsed into instability and violence in recent years. These setbacks show how fragile good governance remains. The old dangers have not been finally overcome. Instability still shadows parts of the continent.

Corruption and weak institutions remain. Corruption continues to drain resources and undermine trust in many states. Institutions are still weak and the rule of law insecure. These enduring faults hold back good governance. Much of the old problem persists beneath the new forms. The deeper weaknesses have not been cured.

Progress has been real but uneven. Some states have advanced greatly while others have stagnated or declined. The continent's record in governance is deeply mixed. Progress has been genuine but far from universal. Africa's states have overcome their problems only in part. The task of good governance remains unfinished.

To a real but limited extent, then, post-colonial African states have overcome their problems of governance. Democracy has spread, some states have won stability, growth and unity, and continental cooperation has advanced. Yet coups, conflict, corruption and weak institutions persist, and progress has been deeply uneven. Africa has moved forward in governance, but the old problems are eased rather than solved, and much remains to be done.

Examiner's Note

"To what extent" needs the real gains weighed against the problems that persist.

The trap is to give only the progress or only the failures rather than both.

The top band credits democratization and growth while conceding coups and corruption remain.

Question 149

Corruption has been a persistent evil in the government of post-colonial Africa. The statement holds that it has been the greatest obstacle to good governance. There is much force in this, for corruption has crippled

development and undermined trust across the continent. Yet other obstacles have been equally grave, and corruption itself springs from deeper weaknesses. It has been a major obstacle, though perhaps not the single greatest.

Corruption has diverted resources from development. Vast sums meant for development have been stolen by corrupt officials. Money for schools, roads and hospitals has vanished into private pockets. This theft has starved the continent of the means to progress. Corruption has been a direct drain on development. Stolen wealth could not build the nation.

It has undermined public trust and legitimacy. Corruption has bred deep cynicism about government among the people. Citizens have lost faith in rulers who enrich themselves at public expense. This loss of trust has weakened the legitimacy of the state. Corruption has poisoned the bond between government and people. It has eroded respect for authority.

It has bred inefficiency and poor services. Where office is bought and sold, ability counts for little. Corruption has filled administration with the unfit and the greedy. Public services have decayed as a result. Corruption has made government wasteful and ineffective. Misgovernment has followed in its train.

It has fuelled instability and coups. The corruption of civilian governments has often provoked military intervention. Soldiers have justified their coups as a cleansing of corruption. Corruption has thus helped to destabilise the state. It has been a cause of political breakdown. Misrule has invited the man on horseback.

Yet other obstacles have been equally grave. The colonial legacy, ethnic division, weak institutions and dependence have all hindered good governance. These deep-rooted problems were not created by corruption. Africa's difficulties have had many sources. Corruption has been one obstacle among several great ones. It has not stood alone.

Corruption itself springs from weak institutions. Corruption flourishes where institutions are weak and accountability absent. It is a symptom of deeper faults as much as a cause of them. Strong institutions would check the corruption that weak ones allow. To blame corruption alone is to mistake effect for cause. The disease has a deeper root.

It has been a major but not the sole obstacle. Corruption has undoubtedly done grave damage to African governance. Yet it has worked alongside other obstacles rather than above them all. It is best seen as one of several great barriers to good government. To single it out as the greatest is to oversimplify. The truth is more complex than the claim allows.

The statement has real force but overstates the case. Corruption has indeed been a major obstacle to good governance in Africa, diverting resources, undermining trust, breeding inefficiency and fuelling instability. Yet the colonial legacy, ethnic division, weak institutions and dependence have been equally grave, and corruption itself springs from these deeper weaknesses. Corruption has been one of the greatest obstacles to good governance, but not the single greatest.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires corruption weighed against the other obstacles to good governance.

The trap is to accept the claim without testing it against other causes.

The top band shows corruption as a major obstacle that is also a symptom of weak institutions.

Question 150

After decades of struggle, the future of governance and development in Africa remains an open question. To assess the prospects is to weigh the continent's grounds for hope against its enduring problems. Democratization, economic growth and a young population offer real promise. Yet corruption, conflict and dependence still threaten. The prospects are genuinely hopeful but far from assured.

The spread of democracy offers hope. Multiparty government and peaceful transfers of power have taken root in much of Africa. This advance in accountability bodes well for better governance. Citizens

increasingly demand and expect a say in their rulers. Democracy provides a foundation on which to build. The trend toward accountable government is encouraging.

Economic growth has revived. Many African economies have grown strongly in recent decades. New industries, services and a rising middle class have emerged. This growth suggests that development is within reach. Prosperity has begun to return to the continent. The economic outlook has brightened in places.

A young and educated population is a great asset. Africa has a large and growing population of young people. Rising education and skills give the continent great human potential. This youthful energy could drive future development. The people themselves are Africa's richest resource. A capable generation is coming of age.

Regional integration strengthens the continent. The African Union and bodies such as the Continental Free Trade Area promote cooperation. Integration offers larger markets and a stronger common voice. Acting together, African states can achieve more than apart. Cooperation improves the prospects for all. Unity is a source of new strength.

Yet corruption and weak institutions still threaten. Corruption and the weakness of institutions continue to hold Africa back. Without stronger governance, growth and democracy remain fragile. These enduring faults endanger the prospects for progress. Old weaknesses could yet undo new gains. The deeper problems have not vanished.

Conflict and instability persist. Civil wars, terrorism and recent coups still afflict parts of the continent. Instability destroys the conditions for good governance and development. These dangers cloud Africa's prospects. Peace remains fragile in many regions. Conflict could still derail the continent's advance.

Much depends on leadership and reform. Whether Africa realises its promise will turn on the quality of its leaders and institutions. Committed reform could unlock the continent's great potential. Poor leadership could squander it once again. The future lies, in large part, in African hands. The outcome is not yet decided.

The prospects for good governance and development in Africa are therefore genuinely hopeful but far from assured. The spread of democracy, the revival of growth, a young population and rising integration all offer real promise. Yet corruption, weak institutions, conflict and dependence still threaten to hold the continent back. Africa's future will depend, above all, on the quality of its leadership and the strength of its institutions, and that future remains open to be won.

Examiner's Note

"Assess" wants the grounds for hope weighed against the enduring problems.

The trap is to be simply optimistic or simply gloomy rather than balanced.

The top band concludes that the prospects are real but depend on leadership and reform.

INDEX

A

abolition of slavery, 10–11, 13, 18, 34, 166, 173, 352–353, 355, 359–360, 368. *See also* slavery; Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade
absolutism, 154–162, 165–168, 177, 179–184, 249, 326, 344–348, 351, 353–354, 356, 358
Addis Ababa, 21, 235–236, 261–262, 266. *See also* Organisation of African Unity
African Union (AU), 4, 22–24, 238–239, 263, 265–266, 268–270, 390, 392. *See also* Organisation of African Unity
Agrarian Revolution, 245, 271–273, 279. *See also* enclosure
America, *see* United States
American Revolution, 162–165, 183, 250, 349–351, 359. *See also* Declaration of Independence
apartheid, 21–23, 61, 236–237, 263–264, 270. *See also* South Africa; segregation
Arkwright, Richard, 275
artificial intelligence, 49–54, 296–297. *See also* Industrial Revolution, Fourth
Arusha Declaration (1967), 208–211, 239–240, 373. *See also* ujamaa; Nyerere, Julius
Ashoka, 66–68, 71, 110–111
assembly line, 246, 288, 291, 296. *See also* Ford, Henry
Athens, 77–79, 90, 129, 247, 305–309, 313. *See also* democracy
AU, *see* African Union
Augustus (Octavian), 81, 128, 310
automation, 45, 47, 49–50, 52, 246, 294–296

B

Back-to-Africa Movement, 4, 12–17. *See also* Garvey, Marcus
Berlin Conference, 3, 215
Bessemer, Henry, 274, 288
Bill of Rights (English), 156, 160–162, 164, 182, 348, 350, 357. *See also* Glorious Revolution
Black Star Line, 14–16, 257. *See also* Garvey, Marcus
Blyden, Edward Wilmot, 2–5, 7, 20. *See also* Pan-Africanism
Bonaparte, Napoleon, *see* Napoleon Bonaparte
bourgeoisie, 38, 155, 157, 159, 165, 177–181, 280, 287, 298, 345–346, 351–353, 362
BRICS, 55–56
Britain (England), 9, 11, 25–30, 32–35, 37–40, 43, 45, 47–48, 55–56, 97, 99, 155, 157–163, 169, 179–180, 182, 200–201, 245–246, 261, 270–272, 275–279, 281–282, 284–287, 289–290, 298, 326, 345, 347–350, 385
bureaucracy, 64–65, 67, 69–72, 76, 81, 86, 100–101, 113, 121, 123, 127–128, 141, 143–144, 152–153, 156–157, 169–170, 178–179, 182–183, 203, 212, 215, 301–303, 313–314, 335, 344–345, 355, 361, 383

C

caliphate, 92–94, 100–103, 122–123, 248, 315–316, 319–325. *See also* Islam
capitalism, 2, 8–9, 25, 27, 31–33, 35, 37, 40–41, 54, 153, 175–181, 184–213, 217, 237, 245, 250–252, 264, 267, 280–283, 285, 340–341, 343–344, 361–376, 386–387, 389. *See also* socialism; laissez-faire
  compared with socialism, 37, 175, 178, 184, 187–188, 191, 196, 198, 200–204, 208–213, 217, 237, 251–252, 264, 267, 366–369, 371–376, 386–387, 389
  crises of, 185–213, 250–251, 362–367, 369–376
  features of, 178, 184–185, 188, 202, 204, 212, 250–251, 282, 344, 361–362, 367–368, 372–374, 389
  rise of, 9, 175–179, 181, 195, 200, 208, 280, 282, 341, 367
cash-crop economy, 58, 192, 194–195. *See also* colonialism
Charles I, King of England, 157–159, 179, 345, 347–348. *See also* English Revolution
Chartism, 33–35, 41, 281, 284
China, 19, 55–56, 68–71, 89–90, 112–114, 117, 132, 143–144, 297, 300–301
Christianity, 91–92, 94–100, 102, 104–105, 112, 115–116, 121–123, 131, 137, 141, 145, 248, 315–318, 321–322, 327–329, 334, 384. *See also* Church, the
  spread of, 105, 122, 131, 248, 321, 328–329, 334
  the Church and, 95–98, 112, 122, 131, 137, 141, 145, 248, 317–318, 322, 327–329, 334
Church, the, 94–99, 112, 121–123, 131, 135, 137, 140–142, 145, 165, 167, 248, 315–318, 322–323, 326, 328–329, 353, 356. *See also* Christianity; papacy
city-state (polis), 71–72, 77, 79, 85, 103, 283, 307, 310. *See also* Athens; Sparta
Cleisthenes, 78, 306–307. *See also* democracy
Cold War, 48, 212, 214, 222, 226, 232–233, 241, 260–262, 264–267, 270, 380, 387–388
colonialism, 20, 22–23, 60, 209, 214–216, 226–227, 230–231, 235–237, 242–243, 252, 261–

262, 267, 269, 328, 376, 380–386. *See also* imperialism; neo-colonialism
and underdevelopment, 23, 209, 227, 231, 237
legacy of, 22–23, 214–216, 226–227, 230–231, 237, 242–243, 252, 261–262, 269, 376, 380–383, 385–386
resistance to, 22–23, 60, 209, 214, 216, 226–227, 235–236, 242, 252, 261–262, 269, 376, 382–383, 385
colour bar, 2–3, 253–254, 258. *See also* segregation
COMESA, 238
communism, 171, 175, 201–202, 205–209, 232–233, 365, 367, 370–371. *See also* Marx, Karl; socialism
Communist Manifesto, 171, 201, 367. *See also* Marx, Karl
Confucius, 112–113
constitutional monarchy, 161–162, 179–180, 345, 348. *See also* Glorious Revolution
Continental Free Trade Area, 268–270, 392
Crompton, Samuel, 275
Cromwell, Oliver, 157–159, 162. *See also* English Revolution

D

Declaration of Independence, 164, 346, 349–350, 359. *See also* American Revolution
democracy, 23, 34, 77–79, 90, 123, 162, 173, 183–184, 191–192, 205–208, 210, 217–220, 222–223, 231–233, 239–241, 243, 247, 251–252, 291, 305–309, 313–314, 331, 344, 346, 348–349, 358, 370–371, 376, 378, 380, 382–383, 387–388, 390–392. *See also* Athens
in ancient Athens, 77–79, 90, 247, 305–308, 313
in post-colonial Africa, 217–220, 222–223, 231–233, 239–241, 243, 251–252, 378, 383, 387–388, 390–391
modern representative, 34, 77, 162, 173, 183–184, 206, 217–218, 222, 231–233, 239, 241, 243, 306, 309, 313, 344, 348–349, 358, 371, 376, 380, 383, 387–388, 390
Depression, Great, *see* Great Depression
diaspora, African, 2–7, 11–12, 14–20, 23, 253–255, 258–259, 265–266, 269. *See also* Pan-Africanism
divine right of kings, 93, 95, 122, 155, 157, 159, 165, 167, 170, 248, 315, 323, 326, 344–345, 347. *See also* absolutism
Du Bois, W. E. B., 3, 5, 7, 17–20, 244, 253–258. *See also* Pan-Africanism; Pan-African Congresses
dynasty, 69–70, 93, 108, 113–114, 117, 132, 143–144, 319, 344, 346, 356–357

E

East Africa, 89, 146–147, 193, 238, 320
East African Community, 22, 232, 238, 266, 268
ECOWAS, 22, 236, 238, 268
Edison, Thomas, 290
Egypt, 55–56, 63–66, 74, 85–86, 89–91, 93, 120, 127, 247, 262, 301–303, 305, 312–314
emancipation, 3, 10–11, 13, 253. *See also* slavery
enclosure, 27–28, 177, 271–273, 279. *See also* Agrarian Revolution
Engels, Friedrich, 171, 201–202, 278, 281, 367. *See also* Marx, Karl; communism
England, *see* Britain
English Revolution, 155, 157–159, 161–163, 165, 179–180, 249, 347–348. *See also* Cromwell, Oliver; Glorious Revolution
Enlightenment, the, 121, 154–156, 163, 165–167, 179, 249, 345–347, 349–352, 358–359
Ethiopia, 18, 21, 55–56, 146, 148, 205, 207, 217, 222–223, 235, 253–255, 259, 339–340. *See also* Haile Selassie

F

Factory Acts, 43, 278, 280. *See also* factory system
factory system, 25–26, 29–32, 40, 43, 245, 275, 278–280, 282, 367. *See also* Industrial Revolution
feudalism, 69, 125–154, 156, 159, 164–166, 168–170, 173, 175–184, 249, 334–344, 351–357, 359. *See also* Middle Ages; serfdom; manorialism
decline of, 130–131, 134–135, 137, 139–140, 144, 150–153, 175–177, 181–182, 249, 334, 336–337, 339–344, 356
lord and vassal in, 69, 135–152, 165, 176, 335–343, 353, 356
manorialism and, 131, 135–141, 150–152, 176, 249, 335–338, 340–343
origins of, 127, 137, 139–140, 147–150, 152–154, 156, 165, 176–177, 249, 335–337, 339–342
serfdom under, 131, 135–139, 144, 146, 150–151, 153, 173, 176, 334–344, 353
First World War, 18, 26, 37, 174, 187, 189, 193, 204–208
Ford, Henry, 288, 291. *See also* mass production
France, 9, 26–27, 37–38, 55–56, 97, 155, 160, 164–172, 179–182, 261, 285, 326, 345, 351–360, 385. *See also* French Revolution

French Revolution (1789), 121, 156, 159, 162, 164–171, 178–180, 183, 250, 345–346, 351–354, 356–359. *See also* Rights of Man, Declaration of; Napoleon Bonaparte
and Napoleon, 166, 168–169, 183, 250, 354, 356, 359
causes of, 164–165, 170–171, 351–352
course of, 166, 180, 183, 352, 354, 359
effects of, 159, 167–168, 170–171, 180, 250, 345, 354, 359

G

Garvey, Marcus, 5, 7, 11–16, 18–20, 244, 253–254, 256–258. *See also* Universal Negro Improvement Association; Back-to-Africa Movement
Germany, 26, 37–39, 45, 48, 55–56, 172–173, 187, 191–192, 206–207, 246, 285, 288–290, 357, 365, 370–371
Ghana, 21, 60, 217, 220–221, 259–260, 262, 265–266, 389. *See also* Nkrumah, Kwame
globalisation, 23, 55–57, 247, 269, 299–300
Glorious Revolution (1688), 154, 159–161, 180, 250, 348–349. *See also* Bill of Rights
Great Depression, 187–200, 202–204, 206–208, 213, 250–251, 363–366, 369–373, 375. *See also* New Deal; Wall Street
and the rise of fascism, 187, 191–192, 204, 206–208, 213, 365, 370–371
causes of, 187–189, 192–193, 200, 202, 204, 206–208, 250, 364–366, 371
effects of, 187–195, 197, 199, 204, 206–207, 251, 365–366, 369
New Deal and, 191–192, 198–200, 213, 251, 366, 375
Greece, 77, 79, 104, 121, 128–130, 249, 301, 307–308, 313–314, 329–333, 343

H

Haile Selassie, 21, 223, 235, 262, 265. *See also* Ethiopia
Hinduism, 71, 91, 105–109
Hitler, Adolf, 187, 191–192, 206–208, 365, 370–371

I

IMF, *see* International Monetary Fund
imperialism, 2, 4, 17–20, 38, 42, 176, 186–187, 196, 204, 216, 227, 246, 284–286, 385. *See also* colonialism
Industrial Revolution, 9, 25–62, 121, 171, 245–247, 270, 272, 275, 277–278, 280–290, 292, 294–300, 367. *See also* factory system; steam engine
and the working class, 32, 34–35, 171, 245–246, 277, 281, 367
causes of, 26–27, 32, 38, 41, 44, 52, 171, 272, 278, 285, 294, 367
effects of, 25–26, 32, 40–41, 43, 47, 49–51, 53, 245–246, 278, 281, 285–288, 297–300
in Britain, reasons for, 9, 25–28, 32, 34, 37–38, 40, 43, 245–246, 270, 272, 277–278, 286, 290
inventions of, 25–29, 32, 38–40, 42, 44, 49–50, 52–54, 62, 245–246, 270, 272, 275, 277, 282–283, 288, 295, 299
Industrial Revolution, Fourth, 49–53, 55–57, 246, 296–297. *See also* artificial intelligence
Industrial Revolution, Second, 26, 37–38, 48, 246, 288–289
Industrial Revolution, Third, 45–49, 52, 246, 294–295. *See also* automation
International Monetary Fund (IMF), 230
Islam, 87–88, 91–92, 94, 100–105, 121–123, 248, 315–316, 318–322, 324–327. *See also* caliphate; Muhammad, Prophet
caliphate and, 94, 100–103, 122, 248, 316, 319–322, 325
spread of, 100, 103, 105, 122, 248, 319–321, 324
Italy, 18, 26, 37, 39, 128, 130, 172–173, 187, 191–192, 205–208, 332, 357, 370
Ivory Coast, 58, 389

J

Japan, 45, 48, 55, 116–117, 142–145, 191, 287
Jim Crow laws, 253. *See also* segregation
Judaism, 114–116

K

Kenya, 18–19, 58, 60, 193–194, 217, 238, 259, 386, 389
Kenyatta, Jomo, 18, 20, 253, 255–256, 259–260, 266
Keynes, John Maynard, 192, 197–201, 213, 365, 372, 374–375. *See also* Great Depression; New Deal

L

laissez-faire, 177, 282, 364–366, 374–375. *See also* capitalism; Smith, Adam
League of Nations, 255
Lenin, Vladimir, 175, 186, 202, 285. *See also* Russian Revolution; communism
Liberia, 13, 16–17, 261–262
London, 2–3, 5, 17–20, 34, 253, 255, 258–259, 266

London Conference (1900), 2, 5, 17–19, 253, 255, 265. *See also* Williams, Henry Sylvester
Louis XVI, King of France, 166, 179, 345, 351. *See also* French Revolution
Luddism, 33–35, 41, 281

M

Magna Carta, 347
Mali, 64, 86–87, 89–90, 103, 321. *See also* Mansa Musa
Manchester, 17–21, 253, 255–260, 266, 270, 275–276, 278–279, 281. *See also* Manchester Congress
Manchester Congress (1945), 18–21, 244, 255–256, 259–260, 266. *See also* Pan-African Congresses
Mandate of Heaven, 63, 68–71, 91, 94, 113, 143. *See also* China
manor system, *see* manorialism
manorialism, 131, 135–141, 150, 152, 176, 249, 335–338, 340–343. *See also* feudalism
Mansa Musa, 86–87, 103. *See also* Mali
Marx, Karl, 30, 41, 171, 174, 185, 201–202, 213, 281, 363, 367. *See also* Engels, Friedrich; communism; socialism
Mecca, 86–87. *See also* Islam
mercantilism, 6, 9, 176–177, 349
Mesopotamia, 71–72, 301
Middle Ages, 95, 100, 131, 135, 137, 139–140, 173, 176, 183, 336, 343. *See also* feudalism
monarchy, 66–67, 69, 71, 77, 79, 81, 87–88, 94, 96–97, 103, 106, 119, 121, 154–162, 164–168, 171, 173–174, 179–184, 214, 217, 222–223, 249, 306, 309, 326, 340–341, 343–348, 350–351, 353–354, 358
Muhammad, Prophet, 87–88, 100–102, 115–116, 122, 257, 319–323. *See also* Islam
Mussolini, Benito, 187, 191, 205–208, 371

N

Napoleon Bonaparte, 38, 166, 168–171, 183, 250, 353–359. *See also* French Revolution
  reforms of, 166, 168–171, 183, 250, 353–356
  wars and empire of, 38, 166, 168, 354–357
nationalisation, 60, 201–202, 210–211, 239, 353, 369, 373, 386, 388. *See also* socialism; ujamaa
nationalism, 23, 60, 156, 168, 170–173, 183, 192, 194–197, 201–202, 204–208, 210–211, 219, 239, 244, 256–257, 259–261, 265–267, 270, 329, 344, 346, 353–354, 356–357, 359–361, 369–371, 373, 377, 386, 388–389
  African, 23, 194–197, 244, 256, 260–261, 265–266, 270, 329, 361, 377, 386
  and independence movements, 172, 196–197, 219, 244, 259–261, 267, 270, 360–361, 377
  in Europe, 168, 170–173, 183, 194, 196, 202, 204–205, 208, 265, 354, 356–357, 359–361, 369–371, 373, 389
Negritude, 244, 257–258. *See also* Senghor, Leopold
Négritude, *see* Negritude
Negro World, 254, 258. *See also* Garvey, Marcus
neo-colonialism, 23, 216, 219, 226–227, 230–231, 237–238, 243, 252, 261–262, 267, 269, 373, 382, 385–387, 389. *See also* imperialism; underdevelopment
NEPAD, 24, 268
New Deal, 192, 198–200, 212–213, 251, 365–366, 375–376. *See also* Roosevelt, Franklin D.
Newcomen, Thomas, 274. *See also* steam engine
Nicholas II, Tsar, 173–174. *See also* Russian Revolution
Nkrumah, Kwame, 18, 20–21, 60–61, 216–217, 220, 227, 244, 253, 255–257, 259–262, 265–266, 269, 385–386, 389. *See also* Pan-Africanism; Organisation of African Unity
  and Ghana, 21, 60, 217, 259–260, 262, 265, 389
  and Pan-Africanism, 18, 21, 244, 253, 255, 257, 261–262, 265–266, 269
Nyerere, Julius, 208–210, 213, 218, 239–240, 262, 265–266, 373, 377, 379. *See also* ujamaa; Arusha Declaration

O

OAU, *see* Organisation of African Unity
Octavian, *see* Augustus
one-party state, 175, 183, 214, 217–223, 229, 231–233, 239–241, 243, 251, 377–379, 384–385, 387–388, 390
Organisation of African Unity (OAU), 4, 21–24, 235–239, 242, 244, 261–268, 270. *See also* African Union
  formation of, 21–23, 235–237, 244, 261–266, 268, 270
  weaknesses of, 22–24, 237–239, 244, 263–267, 270
overproduction, 185–189, 192–193, 284, 362–365. *See also* Great Depression

P

Padmore, George, 18, 256, 260. *See also* Manchester Congress
Pan-African Congresses, 5, 12, 17–19, 244, 254–256, 258–260. *See also* Du Bois, W. E. B.; Manchester Congress

Pan-Africanism, 2–24, 244–245, 253–261, 265–270. *See also* Du Bois, W. E. B.; Garvey, Marcus; Nkrumah, Kwame; Pan-African Congresses; Negritude
and decolonisation, 4, 7, 12, 18–23, 244, 255–256, 260–261, 265–266, 268–270
concept and features of, 2, 4–5, 17, 266
Congresses of, 4–5, 17–21, 244, 254–257, 259, 261, 266
in the diaspora, 2–7, 11–14, 18, 20, 23, 244, 253–254, 258–259, 265–266, 269
origins and rise of, 2–4, 6, 18, 244, 254–255, 258, 261, 268
role of Du Bois in, 7, 17, 19–20, 244, 257
role of Garvey in, 5, 11, 14, 16, 19, 244, 257
papacy, 92, 94–99, 121–122, 317, 322, 326. *See also* Church, the
Paris, 3, 17–20, 95, 166, 169–172, 253–255, 257–258, 352, 356
Pericles, 78, 306–307. *See also* Athens; democracy
pharaoh, 63–65, 85–86, 89–91, 93–94, 123, 301–303, 305, 323. *See also* Egypt
plantation system, 2, 5–6, 8–11, 26, 133–134, 253, 284, 294, 385. *See also* slavery
polis, *see* city-state
proletariat, 176, 281, 287, 298, 362, 367. *See also* bourgeoisie; Marx, Karl
Protestantism, 99, 121, 158–161, 177. *See also* Reformation, the

R

Reformation, the, 99, 121, 177. *See also* Protestantism
Renaissance, the, 121, 176–177
republic, 13, 16, 79–81, 154, 158–159, 164, 166, 168, 172, 179, 183, 191, 206–207, 239, 247, 283, 309–310, 313–314, 345–346, 350–351, 355, 359–361
Rights of Man, Declaration of the, 166–168, 170, 183–184, 346, 352–354, 358–361. *See also* French Revolution
Robespierre, Maximilien, 166. *See also* French Revolution
Rodney, Walter, 8–9, 196–197, 227. *See also* underdevelopment
Rome (Roman Empire), 79–81, 95–96, 99, 121, 123, 126–133, 136–137, 139–140, 152, 206, 247, 249, 301–302, 309–314, 322, 326, 329–336, 339, 342–344
administration of, 79–81, 95–96, 99, 123, 127–133, 137, 139–140, 152, 206, 247, 249, 301, 309–314, 330–333, 335–336, 343
decline and fall of, 95, 130–131, 137, 139–140, 249, 310, 314, 334–336, 339, 342–343
slavery in, 126–133, 136–137, 152, 249, 329–334, 339, 343–344
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 191–192, 198–199, 366. *See also* New Deal; Great Depression
Russia, 55–56, 173–175, 187, 367–370. *See also* Russian Revolution
Russian Revolution (1917), 173–175, 178, 184, 187, 201–202, 251, 287–288, 367–370. *See also* Lenin, Vladimir

S

SADC, 22, 236, 238, 268
samurai, 142–145. *See also* Japan; feudalism
Scramble for Africa, 286
Second World War, 48, 58–59, 187, 191–192, 199, 260, 366, 370, 372, 375
segregation, 2–3, 10, 12–13, 16, 18–19, 61, 253–254, 258. *See also* colour bar; Jim Crow laws
self-determination, 3–4, 18, 20, 253–254, 260, 361. *See also* nationalism
self-reliance, 7, 14, 16, 23, 208–211, 216, 239–240, 243, 268–269, 373–374, 389. *See also* ujamaa
Senghor, Leopold, 257. *See also* Negritude
serfdom, 65, 131, 135–139, 144, 146, 150–151, 153, 172–173, 175–176, 334–344, 353. *See also* feudalism
serfs, *see* serfdom
sharia, 13, 91–92, 100–103, 122–124, 208, 228, 308, 315, 319–323, 325, 385. *See also* Islam
shogun, 117, 142–145. *See also* Japan
slavery, 2–13, 15–18, 22–23, 26, 65–66, 72–73, 77–79, 125–153, 175, 248–249, 253–255, 258, 268, 271, 305–306, 308, 329–334, 338–339, 341–344, 350–351. *See also* Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade; feudalism
abolition of, 10–11, 13, 18
in Greece and Rome, 65, 78–79, 126–133, 136–137, 152, 249, 305–306, 308, 329–334, 339, 343–344
trans-Atlantic, 2, 5–9, 11, 26, 133–134, 253, 258, 271
Smith, Adam, 177, 282–283. *See also* capitalism; laissez-faire
socialism, 37, 41, 171, 173–175, 178, 184, 187–188, 191, 196, 198–213, 217, 219, 237, 239, 251–252, 264, 267, 286–287, 366–376, 386–387, 389. *See also* communism; ujamaa
African (ujamaa), 187, 208–210, 213, 217, 219, 239, 251, 373, 386

in the Soviet Union, 175, 188, 201–204, 208–209, 213, 251, 367–370, 374–375, 387
scientific (Marxian), 41, 171, 174, 201–202, 205, 207–209, 213, 367, 371
Songhai, 64, 87–89, 103, 321
South Africa, 19, 21–24, 55–56, 59–61, 236, 238, 263
sovereignty, 4, 21–22, 71, 78, 87, 121, 154–157, 164–165, 167, 170, 180, 182–183, 216, 235–238, 262–270, 288, 344–348, 350–351, 353, 357–358
Soviet Union (USSR), 175, 188, 201–204, 213, 251, 291, 368–370, 374–375, 387. *See also* Russian Revolution; communism
Sparta, 65, 77, 79, 130–131, 247, 307–308, 334
spinning jenny, 25, 27–28, 54, 271–272, 275. *See also* Hargreaves, James
Stalin, Joseph, 203, 369–370
steam engine, 25–30, 39–40, 42–44, 53, 245, 271–272, 274, 277, 288, 294. *See also* Watt, James
Stephenson, George, 274, 276

T

TANU, 208, 210, 217–218, 239, 241. *See also* Nyerere, Julius
Tanzania (Tanganyika), 146, 193–195, 208–211, 213, 217–219, 223, 232–233, 235, 238–241, 243, 262, 373–374, 379, 384, 386, 389. *See also* ujamaa; Arusha Declaration
tariffs, 188–190, 193, 289–290, 294, 364–365. *See also* mercantilism
Taylor, Frederick W., 288, 291. *See also* mass production
theocracy, 93–94
trade unions, 20, 35–36, 41, 191, 195, 204–205, 207, 246, 253, 256, 259, 261, 264, 278, 283–284, 286, 367
Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade, 2, 5–9, 26, 253. *See also* slavery
trans-Saharan trade, 66, 87–88, 126, 134, 320. *See also* Mali; Songhai

U

ujamaa, 208–213, 217, 219, 239–240, 251, 373–374, 384–385. *See also* Nyerere, Julius; Arusha Declaration; socialism
Arusha Declaration and, 208–211, 239, 373
assessment of, 211–213, 240, 251, 373–374
villagisation under, 209–211, 373–374
underdevelopment, 8–9, 23, 58, 196–197, 213, 227, 231. *See also* Rodney, Walter; neo-colonialism
UNIA, *see* Universal Negro Improvement Association
United Nations, 22, 216, 236, 263
United States, 10–12, 14, 26, 37–39, 45, 47–48, 55–56, 188–193, 198–199, 246, 253, 255, 258, 262, 270, 285, 287, 289–290, 313, 350, 365
Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA), 12–14. *See also* Garvey, Marcus
urbanisation, 25, 31–32, 41, 43, 273, 278–279, 285. *See also* Industrial Revolution
USSR, *see* Soviet Union

V

vassalage, 87, 117, 135, 137–142, 144, 150, 335–337, 341. *See also* feudalism
villagisation, 211, 374. *See also* ujamaa

W

Wall Street, 187–189, 193–194, 208, 363–365. *See also* Great Depression
Wall Street Crash (1929), 187, 189, 193, 363–365. *See also* Great Depression
water frame, 27, 271–272, 275. *See also* Arkwright, Richard
Watt, James, 27–28, 39, 271–272, 274–275, 277. *See also* steam engine
Wealth of Nations, The, 42, 283. *See also* Smith, Adam
welfare state, 45, 47, 187, 197, 200–201, 213, 251, 366, 372–376. *See also* Keynes, John Maynard
West Africa, 16, 103, 193, 222, 238, 268
William of Orange (William III), 160. *See also* Glorious Revolution
Williams, Eric, 9. *See also* slavery; capitalism
Williams, Henry Sylvester, 2, 4–5, 17, 253–255, 258. *See also* Pan-African Congresses
World Bank, 230
World War I, *see* First World War
World War II, *see* Second World War