NGAIZA SERIES OF ADVANCED HISTORY

ENJOY & MASTER ADVANCED HISTORY

HISTORICAL CONFLICTS

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 Six 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 978-9976-5530-4-8

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 Threats to World Peace from the 17th to 19th Centuries 2

2 Wars and Conflicts from the Late 19th Century to the 1940s 30

3 Cold War Politics and the Arms Race 60

4 New Threats to World Peace and Security 94

5 Civil and Ethnic Wars in the World 125

6 Development in Post-Colonial Africa 155

Part Two: Examination Questions 189

Part Three: Model Solutions to the Examinations 197

Index 323

PREFACE

This book was written because you deserve better.

Advanced Level History rewards understanding, yet many students reach Form Six still narrating events they cannot explain and reciting 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: why wars break out and how peace is made and lost, how rival powers and ideologies came to blows across the modern age, and how nations struggle to rebuild themselves in the aftermath of conflict. It is written in real events, real dates and real people, from the trenches of the World Wars to the tense standoff of the Cold War and the long labour of development in post-colonial Africa. 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 Six History syllabus, Historical Conflicts, in six chapters: threats to world peace from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries; wars and conflicts from the late nineteenth century to the 1940s; Cold War politics and the arms race; new threats to world peace and security; civil and ethnic wars in the world; and development in post-colonial Africa.

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 empires and alliances, of world wars and cold wars, of the long and bloody search for peace. 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 First World War broke out, but explain why it broke out 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 assassination at Sarajevo earns almost nothing, while to explain why a single murder could set the whole of Europe alight 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 First World War break out in 1914?

The confident answer that fails. The First World War broke out in 1914 when Archduke Franz Ferdinand was assassinated at Sarajevo, and one by one the great powers joined in until the fighting had spread across the world. *(It narrates the trigger as a story, yet explains nothing, and scores almost nothing.)*

The answer that scores. War came in 1914 because a single murder fell upon a continent already prepared for it. The alliance system had hardened Europe into two armed camps, the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente, so that a quarrel between two states could draw in six; militarism and the arms race had bred both the means and the expectation of war; imperial and naval rivalry, above all between Britain and Germany, had sharpened mutual fear; and Balkan nationalism was straining Austria-Hungary to breaking point. As a result the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo in June 1914 pulled the alliances into motion until a local killing had become a world war.

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 1919 Treaty of Versailles," not "a peace treaty"; "Gorbachev," not "a Soviet 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 origins of the Cold War.

A list of true facts (low marks). The United States and the Soviet Union held opposite ideologies, they fell out at the wartime conferences, the Soviet Union took control of Eastern Europe, and America alone possessed the atomic bomb. *(Every statement is true, yet nothing is joined, so it reads as memory, not argument.)*

The same facts as a chain (full marks). The Cold War grew out of a victory that left two rival powers facing each other with nothing between them. The wartime alliance had been one of convenience against Hitler, so once he was defeated its purpose dissolved and the deeper opposition of capitalism and communism returned. Disagreement at Yalta and Potsdam over the future of Poland and Germany turned suspicion into distrust; the Soviet grip on Eastern Europe looked to the West like limitless expansion, while to Stalin the Western powers and their atomic monopoly looked like a threat to a country twice invaded. As a result each side armed against the other, until by the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan of 1947 Europe had hardened into two hostile blocs.

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 things side by side, one alliance against another or capitalism against communism, and a rough sketch-map can locate a campaign, a frontier or the Cold War's divided Europe 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 Cold War hardened after 1945, or why the League of Nations failed to keep the peace. 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

THREATS TO WORLD PEACE FROM THE 17TH TO 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 of threats to world peace

Question 1

Long before the world knew a world war, the peace of nations was broken again and again by the ambitions of kings, the greed of merchants and the hunger for empire.

Explain the concept of a threat to world peace.

Model Answer

A threat to world peace is any event, action or condition that endangers the stability and security of nations and drives them towards war and conflict. Between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries such threats arose from the rivalries of the European powers and their expansion across the world. The concept of a threat to world peace may be explained as follows.

It is anything that endangers peace and security. A threat to world peace is any force, event or condition that undermines the stability and security of states and the peaceful relations between them. It carries within it the danger of war, conflict and disorder. It disturbs the settled order of nations and peoples. A threat is whatever pushes the world towards war.

It arises between and within states. Threats to peace may spring up between states, as in wars of rivalry and conquest, or within them, as in revolutions and civil strife. Both kinds endangered the peace of the age alike. Conflict could come from without or from within. The threat to peace wore many faces.

It sprang largely from European rivalry. In this period the chief threats to world peace came from the rivalries and ambitions of the European great powers. Their competition for power, trade and colonies set the world at odds with itself. Europe was the storm-centre of the age. The quarrels of the powers troubled the whole world.

It was driven by the pursuit of wealth. Much of the threat to peace came from the pursuit of wealth through trade, plunder and empire. Commercial rivalry, the slave trade and the scramble for colonies all bred bitter conflict. Greed for gain drove nations into war with one another. Wealth was too often won at the price of peace.

It was fed by ambition and nationalism. The ambitions of rulers such as Napoleon, and the rising force of nationalism, threatened the peace of Europe. Nations sought glory, unity and dominion at one another's expense. Ambition overrode the common peace of the continent. The pride of nations became a cause of war.

It endangered the whole world, not Europe alone. Because the European powers held colonies and trade across the globe, their conflicts spread far beyond Europe itself. Wars begun in Europe were fought also in Africa, Asia and the Americas. The threat was worldwide in its reach. Europe's quarrels became the world's wars.

It set the stage for greater conflicts. The threats of this period, the wars, rivalries and rising nationalism, prepared the way for the still greater conflicts of the twentieth century. They left behind a heavy legacy of hostility and division. The seeds of future war were sown in these years. This age foreshadowed the wars that were to come.

A threat to world peace is therefore any event, action or condition that endangers the security of nations and drives them towards war, whether between states or within them. In the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries these threats sprang above all from the rivalries, ambitions and expansion of the European powers, and they endangered not Europe alone but the whole world, preparing the way for the great conflicts that followed.

Question 2

The peace of these three centuries was assailed from every side, by the trader and the slaver, the revolutionary and the conqueror, the nationalist and the builder of empires.

Examine the main sources or forms of threats to world peace in the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries.

Model Answer

Between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries the peace of the world was threatened by a wide range of forces arising from the ambitions and rivalries of the European powers. These sources of conflict took many forms. The main sources or forms of threats to world peace in this period may be examined as follows.

Mercantile capitalism and commercial rivalry. The competition of the European powers for trade, markets and monopolies was a leading source of conflict. Nations fought over trade routes, colonies and the wealth of commerce, as in the Anglo-Dutch wars. Trade rivalry bred armed rivalry. Commerce set the powers at war.

The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade. The trade in African slaves, carried on from the sixteenth century, bred wars of capture and rivalry among the European traders. Guns were exchanged for captives, and Africa was set aflame with raiding. The slave trade spread insecurity across a continent. It was a grievous threat to peace.

Dynastic and religious wars. The wars of kings and faiths, above all the Thirty Years' War of 1618 to 1648, tore Europe apart. Catholic fought Protestant, and dynasties struggled for power and territory. Religion and royal ambition drove nations to war. Faith and crown were early threats to peace.

The French Revolution and revolutionary ideas. The French Revolution of 1789 overturned the old order in France and sent its ideas of liberty and equality across Europe. Kings feared the spread of revolution to their own lands. The clash of revolution and reaction bred war. New ideas threatened the peace of the old order.

The Napoleonic Wars. The wars of Napoleon Bonaparte, from 1803 to 1815, engulfed the whole of Europe. His drive to dominate the continent forced the powers into coalition after coalition against him. One man's ambition set the world at war. His armies overran the continent and forced coalition after coalition against him. Napoleon was the great threat of his age.

Aggressive nationalism and the wars of unification. The rising force of nationalism drove the wars that unified Germany in 1871 and Italy by 1870. New nations were forged by blood and iron on the battlefield. Nationalism upset the old order and bred war. The making of nations threatened the peace.

Imperialism and the scramble for colonies. The powers competed fiercely for colonies, markets and raw materials across Africa and Asia. This scramble for empire bred rivalry and near-war among them. Imperial greed carried conflict across the globe. The race for colonies endangered world peace.

Great-power rivalry and the shifting balance of power. The powers jockeyed endlessly for dominance, forming and breaking alliances to check one another. Wars such as the Crimean War of 1853 to 1856 sprang from this rivalry. The balance of power was maintained by the threat of war. Rivalry among the great powers troubled the peace.

The Eastern Question and the decline of the Ottoman Empire. The slow decline of the Ottoman Empire tempted the powers to compete for its lands in the Balkans. This Eastern Question bred the Crimean War and the Congress of Berlin of 1878. The scramble over the dying empire threatened peace. The Ottoman decline was a standing danger.

Militarism and the growth of armies. The powers built up great national armies through conscription and competed in military strength. This militarism made war both more likely and more terrible. Armed to the teeth, the nations stood ready for war. The growth of armies was itself a threat to peace.

The main sources or forms of threats to world peace in the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries therefore included mercantile rivalry, the slave trade, dynastic and religious wars, the French Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars, aggressive nationalism, imperialism, great-power rivalry, the Eastern Question and militarism. Springing from the ambitions and rivalries of the European powers, these forces endangered the peace of the whole world.

Mercantile capitalism and commercial rivalry

Question 3

Out of the counting-houses and harbours of Europe rose a new power, the merchant, whose thirst for profit would remake the world and unsettle its peace.

Examine the factors for the rise of merchant capitalism in Europe.

Model Answer

Merchant, or mercantile, capitalism was the system in which wealthy traders accumulated capital through commerce, and it rose in Europe from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Several factors combined to bring it about. The factors for the rise of merchant capitalism in Europe may be examined as follows.

The Commercial Revolution. The great expansion of European trade from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, known as the Commercial Revolution, was the seedbed of merchant capitalism. Trade grew enormously in volume, range and profit. Commerce became the road to great wealth. The Commercial Revolution gave capitalism its start.

The voyages of discovery and new trade routes. The voyages of discovery, such as those of Columbus in 1492 and Vasco da Gama in 1498, opened new sea routes to the Americas and the East. These routes brought Europe the trade of the whole world. New lands meant new wealth. Discovery widened the world of the merchant.

The plunder of the New World. The conquest of the Americas poured a flood of gold and silver into Europe, especially into Spain. This bullion swelled the capital of the merchant class. Plundered wealth financed further trade. Spain drew vast treasure from the mines of Mexico and Peru. The riches of the New World fed European capitalism.

The profits of the slave trade. The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade brought enormous profits to European merchants through the sale of slaves and plantation goods. This wealth was ploughed back into commerce and industry. Human misery was turned into merchant capital. The slave trade enriched the rising capitalists.

The growth of towns and markets. The growth of towns and trading centres gave the merchant class a base from which to work. Markets, fairs and ports multiplied across Europe. Urban commerce nourished the new capitalism. Great commercial cities such as Amsterdam and London flourished on trade. The town became the home of the merchant.

The support of strong states through mercantilism. The rising nation-states protected and promoted trade through the policy of mercantilism, granting charters and monopolies to their merchants. States and merchants worked hand in hand for wealth. Royal power backed commercial gain. Mercantilism nursed the growth of capitalism.

The rise of banking and finance. The growth of banking, credit and joint-stock companies provided the money and organisation that large-scale trade required. Merchants could now pool their capital and spread their risk. Finance became the servant of commerce. Banking gave capitalism its sinews.

The decline of feudalism. The slow decline of the feudal order freed land and labour for trade and wage-work. Serfs became workers and lords gave way to merchants. The old order yielded to the new. Serfs became free labourers and lords gave way to men of commerce. The fall of feudalism cleared the way for capitalism.

The rise of merchant capitalism in Europe therefore sprang from the Commercial Revolution, the voyages of discovery, the plunder of the New World, the profits of the slave trade, the growth of towns and markets, the mercantilist support of strong states, the rise of banking and the decline of feudalism. Together these factors raised the merchant to power and laid the foundations of the capitalist age.

Question 4

The flood of gold, spices and slaves that poured into Europe after 1500 did more than fill its treasuries, for it gave birth to capitalism itself.

Assess the significance of the Commercial Revolution to the rise of capitalism in Europe.

Model Answer

The Commercial Revolution was the great expansion of European trade that followed the voyages of discovery from the late fifteenth century. It contributed greatly to the rise of capitalism. The significance of the Commercial Revolution to the rise of capitalism in Europe may be assessed as follows.

It accumulated capital for investment. The vast profits of the expanded trade gathered into the hands of the merchant class as capital. This accumulated wealth could be invested in further trade and, later, in industry. Capital was the lifeblood of the new system. The Commercial Revolution built up the capital that capitalism required.

It widened markets across the world. The Commercial Revolution opened markets in the Americas, Africa and Asia for European goods. Trade was no longer local but global in its reach. Wide markets encouraged large-scale production. The world became the market of the European merchant.

It stimulated banking and finance. The growth of trade called forth new instruments of banking, credit and insurance to serve it. Great banking houses and money markets arose across Europe. Finance grew alongside commerce. Great banking houses and money markets arose to serve the merchants. The Commercial Revolution gave rise to modern finance.

It encouraged new forms of business. The scale of the new trade gave birth to the joint-stock company, such as the English East India Company of 1600. Merchants pooled their capital and shared their risks in great ventures. New forms of enterprise were born. Commerce created the modern company.

It shifted wealth to the merchant class. The Commercial Revolution enriched the merchants and traders, the rising bourgeoisie, at the expense of the old landed nobility. Wealth and power began to pass to the men of commerce. A new class rose to prominence. The merchant became a master of society.

It supplied raw materials and bullion. The expanded trade brought Europe the silver of America and the raw materials of the wider world. These fed the workshops and swelled the money supply. Materials and money flowed into Europe. The Commercial Revolution fed the growing economy.

It laid the base for the Industrial Revolution. By gathering capital, widening markets and building trade, the Commercial Revolution prepared the ground for the Industrial Revolution that followed. Commerce came before, and made possible, industry. The one revolution led on to the other. It was the foundation of the industrial age.

The Commercial Revolution was therefore of great significance to the rise of capitalism in Europe, for it accumulated capital, widened markets, stimulated banking, created new forms of business, enriched the merchant class, supplied raw materials and bullion, and laid the base for the Industrial Revolution. It was the commercial cradle in which European capitalism was born.

Question 5

Where merchants competed for the wealth of the world, their nations soon followed with fleets and guns.

Explain how commercial rivalry among the European powers threatened world peace.

Model Answer

The pursuit of trade and profit set the European powers against one another in fierce commercial rivalry from the seventeenth century. This rivalry was a leading threat to world peace. The ways in which commercial rivalry among the European powers threatened world peace may be explained as follows.

Competition for trade and markets. The powers of Europe, Portugal, Spain, Holland, Britain and France, competed fiercely for the trade of the world. Each sought to seize markets and trade routes from its rivals. This competition bred constant friction. The struggle for trade set the powers at odds.

The policy of mercantilism. Under mercantilism each state sought to monopolise trade and to enrich itself at its neighbours' expense. Trade was seen as a struggle in which one nation's gain was another's loss. This selfish policy bred hostility. Mercantilism made commerce a cause of conflict.

Trade wars between the powers. Commercial rivalry led to open trade wars, such as the Anglo-Dutch Wars of the seventeenth century fought over trade and shipping. Commerce was pursued by force of arms. Merchants' quarrels became national wars. Trade rivalry spilled over into war.

Rivalry over the slave trade. The powers competed bitterly for the profits of the slave trade, above all for the Asiento, the right to supply slaves to Spanish America. This rivalry set nation against nation on the African coast. The trade in slaves bred war among the traders. Slavery was a field of European conflict.

Competition for colonies and trading posts. The powers raced to seize colonies and trading posts to secure their commerce. Clashes over these possessions, in the Americas, Africa and the East, led to war. Colonial rivalry followed commercial rivalry. The struggle for trade became a struggle for empire.

Naval rivalry. To protect and extend their trade, the powers built great fleets and competed for command of the seas. Naval strength became the guardian of commerce. Rivalry at sea sharpened rivalry in trade. Britain and Holland built powerful fleets to guard their commerce. The fleets of the powers stood ready for war.

It drew the nations into war. Time and again, commercial disputes grew into armed conflicts between the powers. The quarrels of merchants became the wars of nations. Trade rivalry was a constant spark to conflict. Again and again a quarrel of merchants became a war of nations. Commerce and war marched together in this age.

Commercial rivalry among the European powers therefore threatened world peace through the competition for trade and markets, the selfish policy of mercantilism, trade wars, rivalry over the slave trade, competition for colonies, naval rivalry, and the constant drawing of nations into war. In this age the pursuit of commerce was among the surest roads to conflict.

The slave trade as a threat to peace

Question 6

The plantations of the New World cried out for labour, and Europe's merchants answered by turning millions of Africans into human merchandise.

Examine the conditions that led European merchants to enslave Africans in the New World.

Model Answer

From the sixteenth century, European merchants carried millions of Africans across the Atlantic to labour as slaves in the New World. Several conditions drove them to this trade in human beings. The conditions that led European merchants to enslave Africans in the New World may be examined as follows.

The demand for labour on the plantations. The plantations of the New World, growing sugar, tobacco and cotton, needed vast supplies of cheap labour. This hunger for labour was the root of the trade. The plantations could not run without workers. Their demand set the whole trade in motion.

The decline of the native American population. The peoples of the Americas were destroyed in great numbers by European diseases and harsh labour. The dwindling of this native labour left the plantations

short of hands. A new source of labour was sought. The loss of the Americans opened the door to African slavery.

The failure of European servant labour. The white indentured servants brought from Europe proved too few and too costly to meet the need. They could not endure the tropical plantations as hoped. European labour failed the planters. Indentured servants proved too few to work the vast plantations. Africa was turned to instead.

The suitability and availability of African labour. Africans were accustomed to farming and to tropical climates, and were held to be strong workers. Africa lay within reach across the Atlantic and could supply captives in great numbers. African labour seemed both fit and plentiful. The planters looked to Africa for their workers.

The great profits of the trade. The trade in slaves and plantation goods yielded enormous profits to the European merchants. The triangular trade enriched the ports of Europe. Greed for these profits drove the trade on. The triangular trade enriched the ports of Bristol, Liverpool and Nantes. The pursuit of gain overcame all scruple.

The existence of slavery within Africa. Some African societies already held slaves and were willing to sell captives to the Europeans. This eased the supply of slaves to the coast. The Europeans found partners in the trade. Coastal rulers sold captives to the Europeans for guns and goods. Existing slavery helped to feed the Atlantic trade.

The superiority of European weapons. The guns and gunpowder of the Europeans gave them the means to obtain and control slaves. Firearms were traded to the coastal states for captives. Superior weapons made the trade possible. Firearms gave the traders the power to obtain and hold their captives. The gun was the tool of the slaver.

The support of European governments and companies. European states and chartered companies, such as the Royal African Company, organised and protected the trade. Governments backed the slavers with law and force. The trade had the full support of the state. Kings and companies drove it forward.

The conditions that led European merchants to enslave Africans in the New World therefore included the demand for plantation labour, the decline of the native American population, the failure of European servant labour, the suitability and availability of African labour, the great profits of the trade, the existence of slavery within Africa, the superiority of European weapons, and the support of governments and companies. Together these turned Africa into the labour reserve of the New World.

Question 7

The guns that Europe traded for slaves turned neighbour against neighbour, and the hunt for human captives set Africa aflame with war.

Examine how the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade threatened peace and security in Africa.

Model Answer

The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade, carried on from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, was among the gravest threats to peace and security in Africa. It bred war, insecurity and ruin across the continent. The ways in which the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade threatened peace and security in Africa may be examined as follows.

It bred constant wars of capture. The demand for slaves set African societies at war with one another to seize captives for sale. Raiding and warfare became a way of obtaining slaves. The trade turned neighbour against neighbour. States raided their neighbours to seize captives for sale. War became the servant of the slave trade.

It spread guns through the continent. Firearms were traded to African rulers in exchange for slaves, and these guns fuelled yet more warfare. The spread of weapons made conflicts deadlier and more frequent. Guns and slaves were exchanged in a vicious circle. The trade armed Africa for its own destruction.

It caused terrible depopulation. Millions of Africans, above all the young and strong, were carried off to the New World. Whole regions were drained of their most productive people. Africa lost its fittest generations. Some regions lost their fittest people over several generations. Depopulation weakened societies across the continent.

It bred insecurity and kidnapping. People lived in constant fear of being seized by raiders and kidnappers. No one, young or old, was safe from capture and sale into slavery. Fear of the slaver hung over daily life. No traveller or villager was safe from the slave-raiders. The trade made insecurity a permanent condition of life.

It brought famine and economic ruin. The loss of labour and the disruption of farming brought famine and want to many areas. Fields lay untended as their tillers were carried away. Production gave way to plunder. Fields lay untilled as their labourers were carried away. The trade ruined the economy of the land.

It raised up predatory states. Some African states, such as Dahomey and Asante, grew powerful by raiding their neighbours for slaves. These predatory states thrived on war and capture. Power was built on the misery of others. Kingdoms such as Dahomey and Asante grew rich by raiding for slaves. The trade bred states that lived by the slave hunt.

It fuelled European rivalry on the coast. The European powers competed, often violently, for control of the slave trade and its forts along the African coast. Their rivalry brought further conflict to the region. Africa became a field of European quarrels. The trade drew foreign wars onto African shores.

It laid Africa open to later conquest. By depopulating and weakening African societies, the slave trade left them exposed to the later European conquest. The wealth it gave Europe helped to finance imperialism. The trade prepared the way for colonial rule. It was the prelude to the conquest of Africa.

The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade therefore threatened peace and security in Africa by breeding wars of capture, spreading guns, causing depopulation, breeding insecurity and kidnapping, bringing famine and ruin, raising up predatory states, fuelling European rivalry on the coast, and laying Africa open to later conquest. For three centuries it made the continent a place of war and fear.

Question 8

Africa's long commerce with Europe and the New World left it not richer but drained, its people scattered and its own development turned aside.

Assess how Africa was affected by its trade relations with Europe and America.

Model Answer

From the fifteenth century, Africa was drawn into trade relations with Europe and the Americas, above all through the slave trade. These relations affected the continent deeply, and for the most part for the worse. How Africa was affected by its trade relations with Europe and America may be assessed as follows.

It suffered heavy depopulation. The export of millions of slaves stripped Africa of its most productive people over three centuries. The young and the strong were carried away in vast numbers. The continent was drained of its labour. Depopulation was the deepest wound of the trade.

It was plunged into wars and insecurity. The trade set African societies at war to capture slaves and spread fear across the land. Raiding and kidnapping became common. Peace and security were destroyed. Raiding and kidnapping spread fear throughout the land. Africa was made a place of war.

Its economy was distorted. African energies were turned from farming and craft towards slave-raiding and the trade in captives. Productive work gave way to plunder. The economy was bent to serve the slaver. Energies were turned from farming and craft to the hunt for captives. Trade with Europe distorted African life.

It was drawn into underdevelopment. The trade drained Africa of its wealth and labour while enriching Europe, so that the continent was left behind. As Walter Rodney argued, this commerce helped to underdevelop Africa. The gap between Africa and Europe widened. Trade brought loss rather than gain.

It grew dependent on European goods. Africa came to depend on imported guns, cloth and alcohol, exchanged for its people. Local crafts declined as foreign goods poured in. Dependence took the place of self-reliance. Local crafts declined as foreign cloth and guns poured in. The trade bound Africa to Europe's manufactures.

It reshaped the map of African states. New coastal states rose on the profits of the trade while others were destroyed by it. The balance of power within Africa was overturned. Some grew strong and many fell. Some kingdoms rose on the profits of the trade while others fell. The trade remade the political map of the continent.

It prepared the way for colonialism. After the abolition of the slave trade, European commerce turned to so-called legitimate trade and then to outright conquest. The old trade relations opened the door to colonial rule. Commerce led on to colonisation. After abolition the same merchants turned to conquest. The trade was the prelude to empire.

Africa was therefore affected by its trade relations with Europe and America chiefly for the worse, through heavy depopulation, wars and insecurity, the distortion of its economy, its underdevelopment, its growing dependence on European goods, the reshaping of its states, and the preparing of the way for colonialism. What was called trade proved for Africa a long history of loss.

The great wars of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries

Question 9

A quarrel of faith that began when two royal officials were flung from a Prague window grew into thirty years of slaughter that consumed the heart of Europe.

Examine the causes of the Thirty Years' War of 1618 to 1648.

Model Answer

The Thirty Years' War, fought from 1618 to 1648, was one of the longest and most destructive wars in European history. It sprang from a tangle of religious and political causes. The causes of the Thirty Years' War may be examined as follows.

The religious conflict of the Reformation. The Reformation had split Europe between Catholics and Protestants, and the bitter hostility between them was the deepest cause of the war. Each side sought to defend and extend its faith. Religion divided the continent into armed camps. The quarrel of the churches lay at the root of the war.

The weakness of the Peace of Augsburg of 1555. The Peace of Augsburg had settled the quarrel between Catholics and Lutherans but had left out the Calvinists. This unstable settlement satisfied no one and soon broke down. Its gaps reopened the religious conflict. The failure of Augsburg helped to bring on the war.

Religious intolerance and persecution. Each faith persecuted the others where it held power, and men were oppressed for their beliefs. This intolerance bred deep resentment and revolt. Persecution turned faith into a cause of war. Men were persecuted and driven out for their beliefs. Religious hatred inflamed the whole of Germany.

The power struggle in the Holy Roman Empire. The Catholic Emperor Ferdinand the Second sought to impose his authority and his faith upon the German princes. The princes resisted this drive to centralise power. Emperor and princes were locked in a struggle. The contest for power within the Empire fed the war.

The rivalry of the great powers. The war became a struggle of the great powers, above all of France against the Habsburgs of Austria and Spain. France, though Catholic, fought to weaken its Habsburg rivals. Great-power rivalry widened the conflict. The war grew from a German quarrel into a European one.

The ambition of the Habsburgs. The Habsburgs of Austria and Spain sought to dominate Europe and to restore Catholic power. Their ambition alarmed the other states and provoked resistance. The drive of one house for mastery threatened all. Habsburg ambition was a leading cause of war.

Economic and territorial rivalry. The states and princes of Europe competed for lands, trade and wealth. These material rivalries sharpened the religious quarrels. Territory and riches were at stake as much as faith. Princes and states fought for lands, trade and wealth. Greed for land and gain helped to drive the war.

The formation of religious alliances. The Protestants formed a Union and the Catholics a League, so that Europe was divided into two armed camps. These alliances made a wide war more likely. A quarrel between two states could now draw in many. The rival leagues prepared the ground for a general war.

The Defenestration of Prague of 1618. The immediate spark was the Defenestration of Prague, when Bohemian Protestants threw the Emperor's officials from a castle window. This act of revolt set off the war. A single incident lit the long-laid fire. The rising in Bohemia began the Thirty Years' War.

The Thirty Years' War therefore sprang from the religious conflict of the Reformation, the weakness of the Peace of Augsburg, religious intolerance, the power struggle in the Holy Roman Empire, the rivalry of the great powers, Habsburg ambition, economic and territorial rivalry, the formation of religious alliances, and the Defenestration of Prague. Faith and power together plunged Europe into thirty years of war.

Question 10

When the guns fell silent in 1648, much of Germany lay in ruins, and out of the wreckage rose a new order of sovereign states.

Examine the effects of the Thirty Years' War and the significance of the Peace of Westphalia of 1648.

Model Answer

The Thirty Years' War ended in 1648 with the Peace of Westphalia, which reshaped Europe and its politics. The war and its settlement had far-reaching effects. The effects of the Thirty Years' War and the significance of the Peace of Westphalia may be examined as follows.

It caused massive loss of life. The war brought terrible slaughter, and some parts of Germany lost up to a third of their people to war, famine and disease. Whole districts were laid waste. The human cost was appalling. War, famine and plague swept away whole communities. Germany was drained of its population.

It brought the economic ruin of Germany. Farms, towns and trade were destroyed across Germany during the long years of fighting. The land was impoverished and its commerce broken. Economic ruin followed the armies. Farms, towns and trade were destroyed across the German lands. Germany was set back for generations.

It caused the decline of the Holy Roman Empire. The war shattered the power of the Emperor and left the German princes almost independent. The Empire became a name rather than a true state. Its authority was broken. The Emperor's power was broken and the princes grew all but independent. The Holy Roman Empire never recovered its old strength.

It raised France to the leading position. France emerged from the war as the strongest power in Europe, its Habsburg rivals weakened. The defeat of the Habsburgs cleared the way for French dominance. France gained land and prestige. With the Habsburgs weakened, France stood without a rival. The war made France the leading power of the age.

It weakened the Habsburgs. The war checked the ambition of the Habsburgs of Austria and Spain and ended their hope of dominating Europe. Their power was broken and their lands reduced. The great Catholic house was humbled. Austria and Spain lost their hope of dominating Europe. Habsburg supremacy was destroyed.

The Peace of Westphalia established state sovereignty. The Peace of Westphalia recognised the full sovereignty of states over their own affairs. This gave birth to the modern system of independent states. Each state became master in its own house. Westphalia founded the modern state system.

It brought a measure of religious toleration. The Peace extended recognition to Calvinism alongside Catholicism and Lutheranism. Rulers and their subjects gained greater freedom of faith. The religious quarrel was at last calmed. Calvinism was at last recognised alongside the older faiths. Toleration replaced the long war of the churches.

It confirmed the fragmentation of Germany. The settlement left Germany divided into hundreds of small states under their own princes. This disunity delayed the unification of Germany for some two centuries. Germany remained weak and divided. The Peace fixed the fragmentation of the German lands.

The Thirty Years' War and the Peace of Westphalia of 1648 therefore brought massive loss of life, the economic ruin and fragmentation of Germany, the decline of the Holy Roman Empire and the Habsburgs, the rise of France, the recognition of state sovereignty and a measure of religious toleration. Above all, the Peace of Westphalia founded the modern system of sovereign states.

Question 11

Born of a revolution that had shaken every throne in Europe, France under Napoleon set out to master the continent, and the powers rose to stop him.

Examine the causes of the Napoleonic Wars of 1803 to 1815.

Model Answer

The Napoleonic Wars, fought between 1803 and 1815, pitted France under Napoleon Bonaparte against a series of European coalitions. They arose from several causes rooted in the French Revolution and in Napoleon's ambition. The causes of the Napoleonic Wars may be examined as follows.

The rise of Napoleon Bonaparte. Napoleon seized power in France in 1799 and made himself Emperor in 1804, bringing to the state his boundless military ambition. His genius and his hunger for glory drove France to war. He sought to master the whole of Europe. The rise of Napoleon was the mainspring of the wars.

The ideas of the French Revolution. The Revolution had unleashed the ideas of liberty, equality and nationalism, which France carried across its borders. These ideas alarmed the kings of Europe and inspired France's armies. Revolution and reaction were set at war. The clash of new ideas and old thrones bred conflict.

The expansionist policy of France. Napoleon's France pursued a policy of conquest and expansion, seizing lands and installing loyal rulers across Europe. This drive for empire threatened every other state. France could not be contained. France seized lands and set Napoleon's kinsmen on foreign thrones. Expansion made war certain.

The fear of French dominance. Britain, Austria, Russia and Prussia feared that France would come to dominate the whole continent. To check this danger they formed coalition after coalition against Napoleon. Fear of French mastery united the powers. The dread of France drove them to war.

The weakness and disunity of the coalitions. The powers ranged against France were often disunited and were defeated one by one by Napoleon. Their weakness encouraged him to fight on and to expand further. Disunity among his enemies prolonged the wars. The powers' divisions fed the conflict.

Economic rivalry with Britain. Napoleon sought to ruin Britain, his most stubborn enemy, through the Continental System, a blockade of British trade from 1806. This economic warfare drew more states into the conflict. Trade and war were bound together. The struggle with Britain widened the wars.

The collapse of the old French monarchy. The Revolution had swept away the monarchy that might have restrained France's ambitions. In its place stood a militant republic and then Napoleon's empire. The old check on France was gone. No king now remained to restrain the ambitions of France. Its fall opened the way to endless war.

The breakdown of peace in 1803. The short-lived Peace of Amiens broke down in 1803, and war between France and Britain resumed. This renewal of hostilities began the Napoleonic Wars proper. The failure of peace was the immediate cause. War returned in 1803 and raged for twelve years.

The Napoleonic Wars therefore arose from the rise of Napoleon, the ideas of the French Revolution, the expansionist policy of France, the fear of French dominance, the weakness of the coalitions, economic rivalry with Britain, the collapse of the old monarchy and the breakdown of peace in 1803. The ambition of one man and one nation set all Europe at war for a generation.

Question 12

These were wars of a new kind, fought by whole nations in arms, spread across the globe, and driven by the genius and ambition of a single man.

Examine the main features of the Napoleonic Wars.

Model Answer

The Napoleonic Wars, waged from 1803 to 1815, were unlike the wars that had gone before them. They bore a number of distinctive features that marked a new age of warfare. The main features of the Napoleonic Wars may be examined as follows.

The leadership of Napoleon. The wars were dominated by the military genius of Napoleon Bonaparte, one of the greatest commanders in history. His skill and daring won him victory after victory. His leadership was the driving force of the wars. Napoleon was the soul of the whole struggle.

Their expansionist character. The wars were wars of conquest, in which France seized vast territories and installed rulers loyal to Napoleon. Much of Europe fell under French control. Expansion was their constant aim. Napoleon's kin and marshals were placed on the thrones of Europe. They were wars to build a French empire.

The formation of coalitions against France. To resist Napoleon, the powers formed a succession of coalitions, drawing in Britain, Austria, Russia and Prussia. Coalition after coalition was raised and broken. The wars were a long duel between France and the allied powers. Europe united by stages against France.

Large national armies raised by conscription. France raised huge armies through mass conscription, the levy of the whole nation in arms. Armies grew far larger than ever before. The whole people were mobilised for war. The whole nation was called to arms through mass conscription. National armies became a feature of the age.

The rise of nationalism. The wars stirred a powerful nationalism, both in France and among the peoples who resisted her, as in Spain and Germany. National feeling became a force in war. Peoples fought for their nations as well as their kings. Spain and Germany rose in national resistance to the invader. Nationalism was awakened by the wars.

The spread of revolutionary ideas. The armies of France carried across Europe the ideas of liberty, equality and the end of feudalism. Wherever they marched, the old order was shaken. Revolution travelled with the French soldier. Feudal privilege fell wherever the French armies marched. The wars spread the ideas of 1789.

Modern military strategy and tactics. Napoleon introduced new and bold methods of war, moving armies swiftly and concentrating force at the decisive point. His strategy transformed the art of war. Warfare was made faster and more deadly. He moved his armies swiftly and struck at the decisive point. The wars marked a revolution in tactics.

Economic warfare through the Continental System. Napoleon sought to defeat Britain by economic means, closing the ports of Europe to British trade from 1806. This Continental System was a new weapon of war. Commerce itself became a battlefield. Economic warfare was a mark of the struggle.

Their global reach. The wars were not confined to Europe but were fought at sea and in the colonies across the world. Battles were waged in the Americas, in Africa and in the East. The conflict spanned the globe. Battles were fought at sea and in the colonies across the world. It was a world war of its age.

Great naval and land battles. The wars were marked by mighty battles, such as Trafalgar in 1805 at sea and Waterloo in 1815 on land. Britain won command of the seas at Trafalgar, and Napoleon met his final ruin at Waterloo. Great battles decided the struggle. These names became famous in history.

The main features of the Napoleonic Wars were therefore the leadership of Napoleon, their expansionist character, the coalitions formed against France, the raising of large national armies, the rise of nationalism, the spread of revolutionary ideas, modern military strategy, economic warfare through the Continental

System, their global reach, and great naval and land battles. Together these made them a new kind of war and a turning-point in European history.

Question 13

Napoleon fell at Waterloo, but the ideas his armies had carried across Europe, of nation, liberty and law, could not be exiled with him.

Examine the effects of the Napoleonic Wars on Europe.

Model Answer

The Napoleonic Wars ended in 1815 with the final defeat of Napoleon, but their effects upon Europe were deep and lasting. They reshaped the map, the politics and the ideas of the continent. The effects of the Napoleonic Wars on Europe may be examined as follows.

The defeat and fall of Napoleon. Napoleon was finally defeated at the Battle of Waterloo in 1815 and exiled to the island of Saint Helena. His empire collapsed with him. The long domination of France was ended. He was exiled to the lonely island of Saint Helena. The fall of Napoleon closed an age.

The Congress of Vienna and the redrawing of Europe. The victorious powers met at the Congress of Vienna in 1814 and 1815 to redraw the map of Europe. They sought to restore order and a balance of power. Borders were fixed anew. The powers met in 1814 and 1815 to redraw the map. The Congress reshaped the continent.

The restoration of the old monarchies. The powers restored the monarchies that the Revolution and Napoleon had overthrown. The old ruling houses returned to their thrones. The principle of legitimacy was upheld. The old ruling houses were returned to their thrones. The wars ended in a restoration of the old order.

The rise of nationalism. The wars had awakened a nationalism that could not be undone, and which would later drive the unification of Germany and Italy. National feeling grew across Europe. The desire of peoples for their own nations was stirred. Nationalism became a lasting force.

The spread of revolutionary and legal ideas. The wars spread the ideas of liberty and equality and the reforms of the Napoleonic Code across Europe. These ideas survived Napoleon's fall. Law and administration were modernised in many lands. The Napoleonic Code reformed the law across much of Europe. The Revolution's ideas outlived the wars.

The weakening of France. France emerged from the wars defeated, reduced and exhausted after a generation of fighting. Her bid for the mastery of Europe had failed. French power was greatly diminished. A generation of war had left France exhausted and reduced. The wars left France weakened.

The strengthening of Britain. Britain emerged from the wars as the greatest naval and economic power in the world. Command of the seas and growing industry made her supreme. Britain gained most from the struggle. Command of the seas and growing industry made her supreme. The wars raised Britain to world power.

The Concert of Europe and a long peace. The powers agreed to work together to keep the peace, forming the Concert of Europe. This cooperation gave the continent a long period of relative peace. The great powers managed Europe together. The powers agreed to consult together to keep the peace. The wars gave way to an age of concert.

The effects of the Napoleonic Wars on Europe were therefore the fall of Napoleon, the redrawing of the map at the Congress of Vienna, the restoration of the old monarchies, the rise of nationalism, the spread of revolutionary and legal ideas, the weakening of France, the strengthening of Britain, and the establishment of the Concert of Europe. The wars ended an age and shaped the century that followed.

Question 14

Bismarck needed a war to complete his German nation, and a doctored telegram gave him the quarrel with France he was looking for.

Examine the causes of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 to 1871.

Model Answer

The Franco-Prussian War, fought from 1870 to 1871, was the last of the wars by which Germany was unified. It arose from the rivalry of France and Prussia and the ambitions of Bismarck. The causes of the Franco-Prussian War may be examined as follows.

The rivalry of France and Prussia. France and Prussia were rivals for leadership in Europe, and neither would yield to the other. This deep rivalry set the two powers on a course towards war. Each watched the other with suspicion. The contest between them was a standing cause of conflict.

Bismarck's drive to unify Germany. Otto von Bismarck sought to complete the unification of Germany under Prussia, and believed a war with France would rally the German states. He worked deliberately to bring on such a war. Unification was his goal, and war his means. Bismarck's ambition drove the two nations to fight.

The growth of Prussian power. Prussia had grown strong and had defeated Austria in 1866, making herself the leading German power. This rising strength alarmed France. Prussia now overshadowed her neighbour. Prussia had crushed Austria in the war of 1866. The growth of Prussian power unsettled the balance and bred war.

French fear and jealousy. The France of Napoleon the Third feared and resented the rise of a united Germany on her border. She wished to check Prussia and to preserve her own prestige. Jealousy of Prussia inclined France to war. Napoleon the Third dreaded a strong united Germany on his border. French fear helped to bring on the conflict.

The dispute over the Spanish throne. A quarrel arose over the offer of the throne of Spain to a Hohenzollern prince, kin to the King of Prussia. France objected fiercely to this candidature. The dispute brought the two powers to the brink. France objected fiercely to a Hohenzollern prince taking the crown. The Spanish throne became the occasion of war.

The Ems Telegram. Bismarck cunningly edited a telegram from the Prussian king, the Ems Dispatch, to make it insult France. The doctored message inflamed opinion in both countries. Bismarck used it to provoke war. Bismarck edited the message to make it insult the French. The Ems Telegram was the spark to the powder.

The French declaration of war in 1870. Goaded by the Ems Telegram, France declared war on Prussia in 1870, exactly as Bismarck had wished. The declaration made France appear the aggressor. This was the immediate cause of the war. France walked into the trap Bismarck had laid.

The Franco-Prussian War therefore arose from the rivalry of France and Prussia, Bismarck's drive to unify Germany, the growth of Prussian power, French fear and jealousy, the dispute over the Spanish throne, the Ems Telegram and the French declaration of war in 1870. Bismarck's cunning turned this rivalry into the war that made the German Empire.

Question 15

In the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles the German Empire was proclaimed, and a defeated France was left nursing a grievance that would burn for fifty years.

Examine the effects and importance of the Franco-Prussian War.

Model Answer

The Franco-Prussian War of 1870 to 1871 ended in the defeat of France and the unification of Germany. Its effects and importance for Europe were very great. The effects and importance of the Franco-Prussian War may be examined as follows.

The defeat of France and fall of Napoleon the Third. France was swiftly and heavily defeated, and the Emperor Napoleon the Third was captured at the Battle of Sedan in 1870. His empire collapsed with his defeat. France was humbled before Germany. The war brought down the French Emperor.

The unification of Germany. The war completed the unification of Germany, and the German Empire was proclaimed at Versailles in 1871. The German states were joined under Prussian leadership. A new and powerful nation was born. The German Empire was proclaimed at Versailles in 1871. Unification was the great result of the war.

The Treaty of Frankfurt and the loss of Alsace-Lorraine. By the Treaty of Frankfurt of 1871, France paid a heavy indemnity and surrendered the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine to Germany. This loss wounded France deeply. The peace was harsh and humiliating. The treaty sowed lasting bitterness.

The rise of Germany as the leading power. The new German Empire became the strongest power on the European continent. Its industry and army were unrivalled. Germany now stood at the centre of European affairs. Its industry and army were now unrivalled on the continent. The war raised Germany to the first rank.

The shift in the European balance of power. The war overturned the old balance of power, as Germany replaced France as the dominant continental state. The centre of power moved eastward to Berlin. The map of power was redrawn. The balance of Europe was decisively shifted.

Lasting Franco-German hostility. The loss of Alsace-Lorraine left France burning for revenge against Germany. This desire for revanche poisoned relations between the two nations. A lasting enmity was born. France burned to recover the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. The war fixed a hatred that would endure for decades.

The birth of the French Third Republic. The fall of Napoleon the Third led to the founding of the French Third Republic. France turned from empire to republic. A new order of government arose from defeat. The fall of the Emperor gave birth to a new republic. The war remade the government of France.

It was a prelude to the First World War. The rise of Germany, the humbling of France and the grievance over Alsace-Lorraine all pointed towards a future war. The conflict planted the seeds of the First World War. It left Europe divided and armed. The war of 1870 foreshadowed the war of 1914.

The effects and importance of the Franco-Prussian War were therefore the defeat of France and fall of Napoleon the Third, the unification of Germany, the harsh Treaty of Frankfurt and loss of Alsace-Lorraine, the rise of Germany as the leading power, the shift in the balance of power, lasting Franco-German hostility, the birth of the Third Republic, and the sowing of the seeds of the First World War. The war remade the map and the politics of Europe.

Revolutions and the rise of nationalism

Question 16

In 1789 the greatest kingdom of Europe was bankrupt, its people starving and its nobles pampered, and the pent-up anger of a nation burst upon the old order.

Explain the causes of the French Revolution of 1789.

Model Answer

The French Revolution of 1789 overturned the old order in France and shook the whole of Europe. It sprang from deep-seated grievances and mounting pressures. The causes of the French Revolution of 1789 may be explained as follows.

The oppression of the old order. French society under the old order, the Ancien Regime, was divided into three estates, with the mass of the people bound in inequality. This unjust order weighed heavily upon the common people. Resentment of it ran deep. The old order itself was the root of the Revolution.

The privileges of the nobility and clergy. The first two estates, the nobility and the clergy, enjoyed great privileges and paid little or no tax. Their idleness and wealth angered the rest of the nation. Privilege bred bitter resentment. They held the best offices and paid little or no tax. The unjust favours of the few provoked the many.

The heavy burden on the Third Estate. The Third Estate, the commoners, bore almost the whole burden of taxation while enjoying no privileges. Peasants, workers and the middle class alike felt the weight. The many carried the load for the few. Peasants, workers and the middle class carried the whole load. This injustice was a leading cause of revolt.

The financial crisis of the state. The French monarchy was bankrupt, ruined by extravagance and by costly wars, including its aid to the American Revolution. The state could no longer pay its debts. This financial crisis forced the calling of the Estates-General. Bankruptcy brought the old order to breaking point.

Economic hardship and high prices. Bad harvests and rising bread prices brought hunger and misery to the French people in the years before 1789. The poor could scarcely afford to eat. Economic distress sharpened their anger. Bad harvests sent the price of bread beyond the reach of the poor. Hunger drove the people towards revolt.

The absolutism of the monarchy. The kings of France ruled as absolute monarchs, claiming to govern by divine right and answerable to none. This unchecked power denied the people any share in government. Resentment of royal despotism grew. The demand to limit the crown helped to spark the Revolution.

The influence of Enlightenment ideas. The philosophers of the Enlightenment, such as Voltaire, Rousseau and Montesquieu, taught liberty, equality and the sovereignty of the people. Their ideas undermined the old order in men's minds. They gave the revolutionaries a vision to fight for. Enlightenment thought was a powerful cause of the Revolution.

The example of the American Revolution. The success of the American Revolution showed that a people could overthrow tyranny and found a free state. French soldiers who had fought in America brought home its ideas. The American example inspired the French. It proved that revolution could succeed.

The weak leadership of Louis the Sixteenth. King Louis the Sixteenth was well-meaning but weak and indecisive, unable to master the crisis. His feeble leadership let the situation slip out of control. A stronger king might have saved the monarchy. His weakness helped to bring on the Revolution.

The French Revolution of 1789 therefore sprang from the oppression of the old order, the privileges of the nobility and clergy, the heavy burden on the Third Estate, the financial crisis of the state, economic hardship, the absolutism of the monarchy, the influence of Enlightenment ideas, the example of the American Revolution and the weak leadership of Louis the Sixteenth. These causes together brought down the greatest monarchy of Europe.

Question 17

The Revolution swept away kings and privileges in France, and its cry of liberty, equality and fraternity echoed across a startled Europe.

Examine the effects of the French Revolution of 1789 on Europe.

Model Answer

The French Revolution of 1789 had effects far beyond France, transforming the politics and ideas of the whole of Europe. The effects of the French Revolution on Europe may be examined as follows.

The overthrow of the old order in France. The Revolution swept away the absolute monarchy and the feudal privileges of the old order. The king was overthrown and later executed. A new order was raised in place of the old. The king was overthrown and later sent to the guillotine. The Revolution destroyed the Ancien Regime.

The Declaration of the Rights of Man. The Revolution proclaimed the Declaration of the Rights of Man in 1789, asserting liberty, equality and the sovereignty of the people. These rights became a charter for reformers everywhere. The Declaration set out the principles of a new age. It became a beacon to the peoples of Europe.

The spread of liberty and equality. The ideas of liberty and equality spread from France across the whole of Europe. Peoples everywhere began to question the rule of kings and nobles. The old order was shaken

far beyond France. Peoples everywhere began to question the rule of kings. The Revolution's ideals crossed every border.

The rise of nationalism. The Revolution gave birth to the modern idea of the nation, sovereign and united. National feeling was awakened both in France and among her neighbours. Nationalism became a mighty force. The modern idea of the sovereign nation was born. The Revolution taught peoples to think as nations.

The spread of republican and democratic ideas. The Revolution spread the ideas of the republic and of government by the people. Kings were no longer held to rule by right divine. Democratic thought gained new strength. Kings were no longer held to rule by right divine. The Revolution advanced the cause of self-government.

It led to the Napoleonic Wars. The Revolution led directly to a generation of war, as revolutionary and then Napoleonic France fought the powers of Europe. The wars carried the Revolution's ideas across the continent by force of arms. Revolution and war went together. The upheaval of 1789 set Europe alight.

It frightened the monarchies into reaction. The kings of Europe were terrified by the fate of the French monarchy and set themselves against all reform. A wave of reaction followed the Revolution. The powers combined to defend the old order. Fear of revolution bred stubborn conservatism.

It inspired later revolutions. The French Revolution inspired the risings of 1830 and 1848 and the revolutions of later generations. Its example lived on in every struggle for liberty. It became the mother of modern revolutions. It stirred the risings of 1830 and 1848 and beyond. Its influence outlived its own age.

The effects of the French Revolution on Europe were therefore the overthrow of the old order in France, the Declaration of the Rights of Man, the spread of liberty, equality and nationalism, the growth of republican and democratic ideas, the coming of the Napoleonic Wars, the reaction of the monarchies and the inspiring of later revolutions. The Revolution of 1789 reshaped the whole political life of Europe.

Question 18

The Revolution taught the peoples of Europe a lesson they never forgot, that sovereignty belonged not to kings but to the nation.

Assess the influence of the French Revolution on the rise of political consciousness and democracy in Europe.

Model Answer

The French Revolution of 1789 did much to awaken political consciousness and to advance democracy in Europe. Its influence on the political life of the continent was profound. The influence of the French Revolution on the rise of democracy in Europe may be assessed as follows.

It proclaimed the sovereignty of the people. The Revolution declared that sovereignty belonged to the nation and not to the king. Power was said to flow from the people themselves. This principle struck at the root of absolute monarchy. Popular sovereignty became the foundation of democracy.

It asserted the rights of man. The Declaration of the Rights of Man of 1789 proclaimed that all men were born free and equal in rights. These rights became the common demand of reformers. The individual was set above the arbitrary power of the state. The rights of man became a democratic creed.

It established the ideas of liberty and equality. The Revolution made liberty and equality the watchwords of a new political age. These ideals inspired the struggle against privilege and tyranny. They became the goals of democratic movements. Liberty and equality reshaped political thought.

It gave birth to constitutional government. The Revolution produced written constitutions to limit and define the powers of government. Rulers were now to be bound by law. Constitutional government spread from France across Europe. Written constitutions were drawn up to bind the rulers. The Revolution advanced the rule of law.

It awakened the common people to politics. The Revolution drew ordinary people into political life as never before. The masses became aware of their power and their rights. A new political consciousness was born. The masses became aware of their power and their rights. The people entered the stage of history.

It inspired reform and revolution across Europe. The example of the Revolution stirred demands for rights and representation throughout Europe. It inspired the risings of 1830 and 1848. Peoples everywhere sought a share in their own government. The Revolution set Europe on the road to democracy.

It provided the ideals of modern democracy. The principles of the Revolution, popular sovereignty, rights, liberty and equality, became the foundations of modern democratic government. Later generations built upon them. The Revolution bequeathed its ideals to the future. Modern democracy drew deeply from 1789.

The French Revolution therefore powerfully influenced the rise of political consciousness and democracy in Europe by proclaiming the sovereignty of the people, asserting the rights of man, establishing liberty and equality, giving birth to constitutional government, awakening the common people, inspiring reform across Europe and providing the ideals of modern democracy. Its principles became the foundation of the democratic age.

Question 19

Twice in a single generation the thrones of Europe trembled as the peoples rose in the name of liberty and nation.

Examine the revolutions of 1830 and 1848 as threats to peace in Europe.

Model Answer

The revolutions of 1830 and 1848 shook the governments of Europe and threatened the peace established after Napoleon. These risings were a serious challenge to the settled order of the age. The revolutions of 1830 and 1848 as threats to peace in Europe may be examined as follows.

They sprang from the demand for liberty and reform. The peoples rose against the restored monarchies in demand of liberty, constitutions and reform. They would no longer submit to the old order restored after Napoleon. The cry for freedom shook the thrones. Demand for reform lay at the heart of the risings.

They were inspired by the French Revolution. The ideas of the French Revolution lived on and inspired the risings of 1830 and 1848. Liberty, equality and the rights of the nation were their watchwords. The Revolution's spirit stirred a new generation. Liberty, equality and the nation were their watchwords. Its example lit the fires of revolt.

The revolutions of 1830. In 1830 revolution broke out in France and spread to other lands, and Belgium won its independence from Holland. Thrones were shaken across Europe. The settled order was disturbed. Belgium won its independence from Holland in that year. The risings of 1830 showed the peoples' unrest.

The revolutions of 1848. In 1848 a great wave of revolution, the Springtime of Nations, swept across France, Germany, Italy, Austria and beyond. Rulers were driven out and reforms demanded everywhere. Europe was convulsed from end to end. The year 1848 shook the whole continent.

They were driven by nationalism. The risings were fired by nationalism, as peoples sought to form or free their own nations. The subject peoples of Austria and the divided peoples of Germany and Italy stirred. National feeling drove the revolts. Nationalism threatened the old multinational order.

They threatened the balance of power. The revolutions challenged the settlement made at Vienna and the balance of power it upheld. They threatened to redraw the map of Europe. The powers feared for the whole order. They threatened to redraw the map fixed at Vienna. The risings endangered the peace of the continent.

They were crushed but left a legacy. Most of the revolutions were put down by the armies of the monarchies, and the old order was restored. Yet their ideas of liberty and nation survived to triumph later. Defeat did not kill their cause. Their ideas of liberty and nation survived to triumph later. The risings left a legacy that shaped the future.

The revolutions of 1830 and 1848 therefore threatened the peace of Europe by their demand for liberty and reform, their inspiration from the French Revolution, the spread of revolt in 1830 and the great wave of 1848, their driving nationalism, and their challenge to the balance of power. Though crushed, they left a legacy of liberty and nationhood that would in time remake Europe.

Question 20

Two peoples long divided into a patchwork of states were forged into great nations by the twin powers of nationalism and war.

Examine the factors for the unification of Germany and Italy.

Model Answer

In the nineteenth century the divided peoples of Germany and Italy were united into two great nations, Italy by 1870 and Germany in 1871. Several common factors brought about their unification. The factors for the unification of Germany and Italy may be examined as follows.

The rise of nationalism. A powerful nationalism grew among the Germans and the Italians, who longed to be united into single nations. This national feeling was the driving force of unification. The peoples yearned to be one. Germans and Italians alike longed to be joined in one nation. Nationalism was the soul of both movements.

The influence of the French Revolution and Napoleon. The French Revolution and Napoleon had stirred national feeling and shown the strength that unity could bring. Napoleon's reordering of Germany and Italy pointed the way. His example inspired the nationalists. The Revolution sowed the seeds of unification.

The leadership of great statesmen. Both movements were led by able statesmen, Bismarck in Germany and Cavour in Italy. Their skill in diplomacy and war guided the work of unification. Strong leadership was essential to success. Bismarck led Germany while Cavour led Italy. Great men shaped both nations.

The role of a leading state. In each case a strong state led the way, Prussia in Germany and Piedmont-Sardinia in Italy. These states provided the power and the direction for unity. Around them the smaller states gathered. Prussia led the Germans and Piedmont led the Italians. A leading state was the core of each nation.

The use of war and diplomacy. Unification was achieved by war and cunning diplomacy, the policy Bismarck called blood and iron. Wars against Austria and France welded the German states together. Force and statecraft made the nations. Bismarck called his method one of blood and iron. Realpolitik was the method of unification.

Economic factors. In Germany the customs union, the Zollverein, drew the states together in trade before they were joined in politics. Economic union prepared the way for political union. Common trade fostered common feeling. The German customs union, the Zollverein, bound the states in trade. Economic ties helped to bind the nations.

The weakness of the opponents. The unification of both nations was aided by the weakness and defeat of Austria, the chief obstacle in their path. Austria was beaten in war and pushed aside. The decline of the old powers cleared the way. Austria, the chief obstacle, was defeated and pushed aside. Weak opponents eased the road to unity.

The work of patriots and revolutionaries. In Italy the patriots Mazzini and Garibaldi roused the people and won territory for the cause. Their devotion and daring advanced the national movement. Popular heroes inspired the nation. Mazzini and Garibaldi roused the people to the cause. The work of patriots helped to make Italy.

The unification of Germany and Italy therefore sprang from the rise of nationalism, the influence of the French Revolution and Napoleon, the leadership of statesmen such as Bismarck and Cavour, the role of leading states, the use of war and diplomacy, economic union, the weakness of Austria and the work of patriots. By these means two divided peoples were forged into great nations.

Question 21

The birth of a united Germany in the heart of Europe shattered the old balance and set the powers on a new and dangerous course.

Examine how Europe was affected by the unification of Germany and Italy.

Model Answer

The unification of Italy by 1870 and of Germany in 1871 changed the face of Europe. Their effects upon the continent were far-reaching. How Europe was affected by the unification of Germany and Italy may be examined as follows.

Two new great powers were born. The unification of Germany and Italy added two new great powers to the map of Europe. Germany in particular became a mighty state. The company of the great powers was enlarged. Germany above all became a mighty state. Europe had to reckon with two new nations.

The balance of power was overturned. The rise of a united and powerful Germany overturned the old balance of power in Europe. Germany replaced France as the dominant continental state. The whole order of power was shifted. Germany replaced France as the leading continental power. The unification upset the balance of the continent.

France was weakened and embittered. France was defeated in the making of Germany and lost the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. She was left weakened and burning for revenge. French power and pride were wounded. She lost Alsace and Lorraine and burned for revenge. Unification left France an embittered enemy.

Austria was weakened and excluded. Austria was shut out of both the new Germany and the new Italy and lost much of her old influence. Her power in Central Europe declined. She was pushed to the margin. She was shut out of both the new Germany and the new Italy. Unification diminished the Habsburg state.

Nationalism was strengthened across Europe. The success of German and Italian nationalism inspired other peoples, especially the subject nations of the Balkans and of Austria-Hungary. The example of unity stirred fresh national movements. Nationalism grew bolder everywhere. Their triumph fired the hopes of other peoples.

It led to a system of alliances. To secure his new empire, Bismarck built a web of alliances among the powers. Europe began to divide into armed camps. The alliance system took shape. Bismarck wove a web of alliances to guard his empire. Unification set the powers to grouping for safety.

It heightened rivalry and the risk of war. The rise of Germany, the enmity of France and the growth of alliances all sharpened the rivalry of the powers. The risk of a great war grew. Europe became more dangerous and divided. The rise of Germany and the enmity of France divided Europe. Unification pointed towards the conflicts to come.

Europe was therefore affected by the unification of Germany and Italy through the birth of two new great powers, the overturning of the balance of power, the weakening and embitterment of France, the exclusion of Austria, the strengthening of nationalism, the growth of alliances and the heightening of rivalry and the risk of war. The making of these nations reshaped the whole order of Europe.

Imperialism and the scramble for colonies

Question 22

As the factories of Europe roared, the powers turned their eyes to Africa and Asia, and the race for colonies set them at one another's throats.

Examine the reasons for the European rivalries in the scramble for colonies.

Model Answer

In the later nineteenth century the European powers competed fiercely for colonies, above all in Africa, in what is called the scramble. This rivalry was a grave threat to world peace. The reasons for the European rivalries in the scramble for colonies may be examined as follows.

The need for raw materials. The industries of Europe needed ever greater supplies of raw materials such as rubber, cotton and minerals. Colonies were seized to secure these materials. The hunger of industry drove the powers abroad. Rubber, cotton and minerals were sought for the factories. The search for raw materials set them in rivalry.

The search for markets. The factories of Europe produced more goods than their home markets could absorb. Colonies were wanted as markets in which to sell these goods. The powers competed for these outlets. The powers wanted colonies in which to sell their goods. The quest for markets sharpened their rivalry.

The search for fields of investment. The surplus capital of the industrial nations sought profitable outlets abroad, as Lenin observed. Colonies offered fields for the export of capital. The powers competed to secure them. Surplus capital sought high profits in the colonies abroad. The drive to invest abroad bred imperial rivalry.

National prestige and rivalry. Colonies came to be seen as a mark of national greatness, and no power would be left behind. Each state sought empire to match its rivals. Pride and jealousy drove the scramble. No power would be left behind in the race for empire. Prestige made colonies a matter of honour.

Strategic considerations. The powers seized territories and bases to guard their trade routes and their existing empires, as Britain guarded the route to India through Suez. Strategy drove much of the scramble. Colonies were taken for security as well as gain. Rivalry over strategic points was fierce.

The rise of new powers. The entry of newly united Germany and Italy into the race for colonies sharpened the rivalry. Coming late, they pressed hard for their share. The competition grew more intense. Germany and Italy pressed hard for their share of colonies. New claimants made the scramble more dangerous.

The pretext of the civilising mission. The powers justified their conquests as a mission to civilise and Christianise the peoples of Africa and Asia. This pretext cloaked the pursuit of gain. It was used to excuse the scramble. Conquest was excused as a mission to civilise and convert. The civilising mission masked the rivalry beneath.

The pressure of surplus population. Some powers sought colonies as lands in which to settle their growing populations. Emigration and settlement drove the demand for territory. The pressure of population added to the scramble. Colonies were wanted as lands in which to settle the people. It gave a further motive for empire.

The European rivalries in the scramble for colonies therefore sprang from the need for raw materials and markets, the search for fields of investment, national prestige, strategic considerations, the rise of new powers, the pretext of the civilising mission and the pressure of surplus population. This scramble for empire set the powers in bitter rivalry and gravely threatened the peace of the world.

Question 23

Capitalism, Lenin argued, had entered a new and final stage, in which giant monopolies and the hunger for empire drove the world towards war.

Explain the transition from competitive to monopoly capitalism and the features of imperialism.

Model Answer

In the later nineteenth century, competitive capitalism gave way to monopoly capitalism, which Lenin identified as the stage of imperialism. This transformation was a deep source of international conflict. The transition from competitive to monopoly capitalism and the features of imperialism may be explained as follows.

The transition from competition to monopoly. In early capitalism many small firms competed freely in the market. In time the stronger firms swallowed the weaker, until great monopolies came to dominate whole industries. Free competition gave way to monopoly. This change marked a new stage of capitalism.

The concentration of production and capital. Production and capital became concentrated in a few great firms and trusts. Vast enterprises controlled the output of whole industries. Wealth gathered into ever fewer hands. Vast trusts came to control whole industries. Concentration was a mark of the new capitalism.

The rise of finance capital. Banking capital and industrial capital merged to form finance capital, controlled by a small circle of financiers. The banks came to dominate industry, directing it through their loans and their shareholdings. A small financial oligarchy arose to command the whole economy. Industry now danced to the tune of the great banks. Finance capital ruled the economy.

The export of capital. Where old capitalism had exported goods, the new capitalism exported capital itself to be invested abroad. Surplus capital sought higher profits in the colonies and weaker lands. The export of capital became central. Surplus capital was sent abroad in search of higher profit. It drove the powers to seek empire.

The division of the world among monopolies. The great monopolies and trusts divided the markets of the world among themselves. International combines carved up whole industries. The world economy was partitioned. Great combines carved up the markets of the world. Monopoly reached across the globe.

The territorial division of the world. The powers completed the division of the world by seizing colonies until little remained unclaimed. The scramble for Africa was part of this partition. The globe was shared out among the empires. The scramble for Africa was part of this partition. Territorial division crowned the age of imperialism.

It bred rivalry and war. As Lenin argued, imperialism was the highest stage of capitalism and carried within it the seeds of war. The powers, having divided the world, fought to redivide it. Rivalry among the empires bred conflict. The powers fought to redivide a world already shared out. Imperialism drove the world towards war.

The transition from competitive to monopoly capitalism therefore brought the concentration of production and capital, the rise of finance capital, the export of capital, the division of the world among monopolies and the territorial partition of the globe. In these features, which Lenin called the highest stage of capitalism, imperialism bred the rivalry and war that threatened the peace of the world.

Question 24

Empire was sold to the peoples of Europe as glory and destiny, but its true harvest was rivalry, conquest and the seeds of war.

Examine how imperialism and the scramble for colonies threatened world peace.

Model Answer

The imperialism of the later nineteenth century, and the scramble for colonies it produced, was among the gravest threats to world peace. It bred rivalry, conquest and war across the globe. The ways in which imperialism threatened world peace may be examined as follows.

It bred rivalry among the great powers. The competition for colonies set the great powers in fierce rivalry with one another. Each sought to seize territory before its rivals. This rivalry was a constant source of tension. Each sought to seize territory before its rivals could. Imperialism turned the powers into competitors for the world.

It brought the powers to the brink of war. Quarrels over colonial claims repeatedly brought the powers to the brink of war. Crises over territory in Africa and elsewhere threatened to break the peace. War was often narrowly avoided. Crises over colonial claims repeatedly threatened war. Colonial disputes endangered the peace of Europe.

It fuelled the arms race and militarism. The defence of empires demanded great armies and navies, driving the powers to arm ever more heavily. Military and naval competition grew fierce. Imperialism fed

the arms race. Empires demanded ever larger armies and navies. The scramble for colonies made the powers more warlike.

It drove the formation of alliances. To protect their colonial interests, the powers bound themselves together in alliances. Europe divided into rival groupings. The alliance system took shape around imperial rivalry. The powers bound themselves together to guard their colonies. Imperialism helped to split the powers into armed camps.

It brought wars of conquest against colonised peoples. The scramble was carried through by wars of conquest against the peoples of Africa and Asia. Vast bloodshed accompanied the seizure of colonies. Whole peoples were subdued by force. Whole peoples in Africa and Asia were subdued by force. Imperialism brought war to the colonised world.

It sharpened nationalism and chauvinism. Imperialism fed a boastful nationalism, as each people gloried in the size of its empire. This chauvinism made nations proud and aggressive. National pride grew dangerous. Each people gloried in the size of its empire. Imperial ambition inflamed the passions of the powers.

It sowed the seeds of world war. The rivalry, arms race and alliances bred by imperialism all pointed towards a general war. Colonial competition was among the deep causes of the First World War. Imperialism prepared the ground for world conflict. The scramble for empire helped to bring on the great war of 1914.

Imperialism and the scramble for colonies therefore threatened world peace by breeding rivalry among the great powers, bringing them to the brink of war, fuelling the arms race, driving the formation of alliances, bringing wars of conquest upon the colonised, sharpening nationalism and sowing the seeds of world war. In the pursuit of empire the powers laid the train for the conflicts of the twentieth century.

The European balance of power

Question 25

The peace of the nineteenth century rested on a simple and precarious idea, that no single power should ever be allowed to dominate the rest.

Explain the concept of the balance of power in nineteenth-century Europe.

Model Answer

The balance of power was the principle that guided the diplomacy of nineteenth-century Europe. It sought to keep any one state from dominating the continent. The concept of the balance of power in nineteenth-century Europe may be explained as follows.

It means preventing the dominance of any one power. The balance of power is the principle that no single state should be allowed to grow strong enough to dominate all the others. Power was to be kept in equilibrium among the great states. Dominance by one was the danger to be prevented. Balance, not mastery, was the aim.

It rests on counter-balancing alliances. The balance was kept by combining the weaker states against any power that grew too strong. When one state rose, the others drew together to check it. Alliances were formed to preserve the equilibrium. When one state rose, the others drew together against it. Power was balanced against power.

It was founded at the Congress of Vienna. The system of the balance of power was firmly established at the Congress of Vienna in 1815, after the defeat of Napoleon. The powers arranged Europe so that none should dominate. Vienna laid the foundation of the system. The balance was the work of the settlement.

It was upheld by the Concert of Europe. The great powers agreed to consult and cooperate to manage the affairs of Europe, forming the Concert of Europe. Together they upheld the balance and the peace. The Concert was the guardian of the system. Cooperation preserved the equilibrium.

It relied on shifting alliances. To keep the balance, states were ready to change their partners as circumstances required. A power might ally today with the very state it had opposed before. Flexibility kept the equilibrium. A power might ally today with the very state it had opposed. Shifting alliances were the tool of the balance.

It aimed to preserve peace. The purpose of the balance of power was to keep the peace by preventing any state from dominating. Where power was balanced, aggression was deterred. Equilibrium was thought to secure peace. Where power was balanced, aggression was deterred. The balance was a device for keeping the peace.

It was maintained by the threat of war. In the last resort the balance rested on the readiness of the powers to go to war against an aggressor. Any state that upset the balance faced a hostile coalition. The threat of war held the system together. Any state that upset the balance faced a hostile coalition. Peace was kept by the readiness to fight.

The balance of power in nineteenth-century Europe therefore meant the prevention of dominance by any one state, upheld by counter-balancing and shifting alliances, founded at the Congress of Vienna, guarded by the Concert of Europe, and maintained in the last resort by the threat of war. It was the guiding principle by which Europe sought to keep its peace.

Question 26

With Napoleon beaten, the statesmen of Europe gathered at Vienna to put the old world back together and to guard against another such storm.

Examine the work of the Congress of Vienna of 1814 to 1815.

Model Answer

The Congress of Vienna met in 1814 and 1815 to settle Europe after the defeat of Napoleon. Its work reshaped the continent and sought to secure a lasting peace. The work of the Congress of Vienna may be examined as follows.

It sought to restore order after Napoleon. The Congress met to bring order to a Europe convulsed by a generation of revolution and war. Its first aim was to undo the disorder Napoleon had caused. Stability was its guiding purpose. A generation of revolution and war had to be undone. The Congress set out to restore a shattered continent.

The principle of legitimacy. The Congress restored the old ruling houses that the Revolution and Napoleon had overthrown. This principle of legitimacy returned the Bourbons to France and other kings to their thrones. The old order was put back in place. Legitimacy guided the resettlement of Europe.

The redrawing of the map of Europe. The Congress redrew the boundaries of Europe, dividing lands and peoples among the powers. Territories were exchanged to suit the victors. The map was reshaped by the great powers. Lands and peoples were divided among the victorious powers. New borders were fixed across the continent.

The containment of France. The Congress sought to guard against a fresh outburst from France by surrounding her with strong states. Buffer states, such as a strengthened Netherlands, were set on her borders. France was to be hemmed in. Buffer states such as a strengthened Netherlands hemmed her in. Containment of France was a chief aim.

The restoration of the balance of power. The Congress arranged Europe so that no single power should dominate as France had done. Power was balanced among the great states. The equilibrium of Europe was restored. Europe was arranged so that no one power should dominate. The balance of power was the heart of the settlement.

The leadership of Metternich. The Congress was dominated by the Austrian chancellor Metternich, the leading statesman of the age. His conservative vision shaped the settlement. He sought to uphold monarchy and order. The Austrian chancellor was the leading statesman of the age. Metternich guided the work of Vienna.

The creation of the Concert of Europe. The powers agreed to meet and cooperate to preserve the settlement and the peace, forming the Concert of Europe. This system of consultation was to manage the affairs of the continent. The Congress gave birth to the Concert. Cooperation was built into the settlement.

Its results and weaknesses. The settlement gave Europe a long period of relative peace, but it ignored the rising forces of nationalism and liberalism. By restoring the old order it stored up trouble for the future. Its peace was bought at the price of reaction. The settlement was durable but flawed.

The work of the Congress of Vienna therefore lay in restoring order after Napoleon, upholding the principle of legitimacy, redrawing the map of Europe, containing France, restoring the balance of power under the leadership of Metternich, and creating the Concert of Europe. It gave the continent a long peace, though by ignoring nationalism and liberalism it sowed the seeds of later revolt.

Question 27

To keep the peace they had won, the powers of Europe built a whole machinery of congresses, alliances and armies, all turned to holding the balance.

Examine the methods by which the balance of power was maintained in nineteenth-century Europe.

Model Answer

After 1815 the powers of Europe used a range of methods to maintain the balance of power and to preserve the peace. These methods held Europe in a fragile equilibrium for much of the century. The methods by which the balance of power was maintained may be examined as follows.

The Congress System. The powers met in a series of congresses, such as those of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818 and Verona in 1822, to settle their affairs together. These meetings allowed the powers to manage crises by agreement. The Congress System was a tool of the balance. Diplomacy by congress kept the peace.

The Concert of Europe. The great powers acted together as the Concert of Europe to uphold the settlement and to manage the continent. They consulted on the great questions of the day. Cooperation preserved the balance. The powers consulted together on the great questions of the day. The Concert was the guardian of the peace.

Alliances and counter-alliances. The powers formed alliances, such as the Holy Alliance and the Quadruple Alliance, to check one another and to uphold the order. Alliances were balanced against alliances. Combinations of power preserved the equilibrium. The balance rested on a web of alliances.

Territorial adjustments and buffer states. The powers redrew borders and set up buffer states to keep any one power from growing too strong. A strengthened Netherlands, for example, was placed on the border of France. Territory was arranged to preserve the balance. Buffer states guarded the equilibrium.

The suppression of revolutions. The powers, above all Austria and Russia, crushed revolutions that threatened the settled order. Risings in Italy, Germany and eastern Europe were put down. Suppression kept the old order in place. Austria and Russia crushed the risings that threatened the order. The balance was guarded against revolt.

Diplomacy and skilled statesmen. The balance was maintained by the skill of great statesmen such as Metternich of Austria and Castlereagh of Britain. Their diplomacy managed the rivalries of the powers. Statecraft held the system together. Metternich of Austria and Castlereagh of Britain led the way. Skilled diplomacy preserved the peace.

Military deterrence. The powers kept armies ready to check any state that threatened the balance. The readiness to fight deterred aggression. Military strength backed the diplomacy of the age. Armies stood ready to check any state that threatened the balance. Deterrence guarded the equilibrium.

British naval supremacy. Britain, secure behind her fleet, acted as the offshore balancer of Europe, throwing her weight against any power that grew too strong. Her naval supremacy allowed her to hold the balance. Britain guarded the equilibrium from the sea. Her fleet was a pillar of the system.

The balance of power in nineteenth-century Europe was therefore maintained by the Congress System, the Concert of Europe, alliances and counter-alliances, territorial adjustments and buffer states, the suppression of revolutions, skilled diplomacy, military deterrence and British naval supremacy. By these means the powers held Europe in a fragile equilibrium for much of the century.

Question 28

As the Ottoman Empire crumbled, the powers circled the dying giant, each grasping for its lands and each fearing the others' gain.

Examine the Eastern Question and the decline of the Ottoman Empire as a threat to peace.

Model Answer

The Eastern Question was the problem posed by the decline of the Ottoman Empire and the rivalry of the powers over its lands. It was a persistent threat to the peace of nineteenth-century Europe. The Eastern Question and the decline of the Ottoman Empire as a threat to peace may be examined as follows.

The meaning of the Eastern Question. The Eastern Question was the problem of what should become of the lands of the declining Ottoman Empire. The powers could neither save the empire nor agree on how to divide it. This unsettled problem hung over Europe. The Eastern Question was a standing danger to peace.

The decline of the Ottoman Empire. The once-mighty Ottoman Empire had grown weak and was called the sick man of Europe. Its decay tempted the powers to seize its territories. The weakness of the empire invited rivalry. The empire was mockingly called the sick man of Europe. Its decline was the root of the Eastern Question.

The rivalry of the powers over its lands. Russia, Austria, Britain and France all had interests in the Ottoman lands and competed for advantage. Each feared that another might gain too much. Their rivalry made the question dangerous. Russia, Austria, Britain and France all had interests at stake. The powers watched one another with suspicion.

Russian ambitions. Russia sought to expand southward at the expense of the Ottomans, towards the Balkans and the Straits leading to the Mediterranean. Her ambitions alarmed the other powers, above all Britain. Russian expansion was the sharpest edge of the question. Fear of Russia drove much of the rivalry.

The rise of Balkan nationalism. The subject peoples of the Balkans rose in the name of nationalism to win their freedom from Ottoman rule. Their risings drew in the great powers. Nationalism made the region a tinderbox. The subject peoples rose to win their freedom from Ottoman rule. The Balkans became a source of conflict.

The Crimean War of 1853 to 1856. The rivalry over the Ottoman lands led to the Crimean War, in which Britain, France and Sardinia fought Russia to check her advance. The war broke the unity of the powers. It showed how dangerous the question had become. The Crimean War sprang from the Eastern Question.

The Congress of Berlin of 1878. The powers met at the Congress of Berlin in 1878 to settle the affairs of the Balkans and to curb Russian gains. The settlement was a patchwork that satisfied no one fully. It calmed the question only for a time. The powers met to settle the Balkans and to curb Russia. Berlin left the Balkans still unstable.

It remained a danger to peace. The Eastern Question was never truly settled, and the Balkans remained a powder keg. The rivalry over the Ottoman lands rumbled on towards the twentieth century. The question would help to spark the First World War. It remained a lasting threat to peace.

The Eastern Question and the decline of the Ottoman Empire therefore threatened peace through the rivalry of the powers over the Ottoman lands, Russian ambitions, the rise of Balkan nationalism, the Crimean War of 1853 to 1856 and the uneasy settlement at the Congress of Berlin of 1878. Never truly resolved, the question left the Balkans a powder keg that would help to ignite the First World War.

Question 29

The careful balance struck at Vienna was worn away war by war, until the rise of Germany tipped Europe towards the abyss.

Account for the shift in the European balance of power during the nineteenth century.

Model Answer

The balance of power established at Vienna in 1815 did not remain fixed but shifted through the nineteenth century until it finally broke down. A series of wars and changes overturned it. The shift in the European balance of power during the nineteenth century may be accounted for as follows.

The stability of the Concert of Europe after 1815. For a time after 1815 the Concert of Europe held the balance firm and kept the general peace. The powers cooperated to manage their affairs. This was the age of stability. The Concert of Europe kept the general peace for a time. The settlement held in its early decades.

The revolutions of 1830 and 1848. The revolutions of 1830 and 1848 shook the settlement and the balance it upheld. They stirred nationalism and challenged the old order. The equilibrium was disturbed. They stirred nationalism and shook the old order. The risings began to loosen the settlement.

The Crimean War of 1853 to 1856. The Crimean War broke the unity of the great powers and ended the long cooperation of the Concert. Russia was checked, and the powers fell into rivalry. The war was the first great break in the balance. Britain and France fought Russia to check her advance. It opened an age of conflict.

The unification of Italy. The unification of Italy between 1859 and 1861 created a new state and disturbed the old order in the south. A new power arose in the Mediterranean. The map of Europe began to change. A new state arose in the Mediterranean between 1859 and 1861. Italian unity shifted the balance.

The unification of Germany in 1871. The unification of Germany in 1871, after the defeat of France, was the decisive shift in the balance. A powerful new empire arose at the centre of Europe. Germany replaced France as the dominant power. The balance was overturned by German unity.

The decline of Austria. Austria was defeated by Prussia in 1866 and reduced to the dual monarchy of Austria-Hungary in 1867. Her old influence in Germany and Italy was lost. A great power declined. She was beaten by Prussia in 1866 and reduced in 1867. The fall of Austria altered the balance.

Colonial expansion and imperial rivalry. The scramble for colonies extended the rivalry of the powers across the whole globe. Imperial competition added a new dimension to their quarrels. The balance became a worldwide contest. The scramble for colonies extended the rivalry across the globe. Colonial rivalry strained the equilibrium.

The division into rival blocs. Towards the end of the century the powers began to group themselves into opposing alliances. Europe divided into armed camps. The flexible balance gave way to rigid blocs. Europe divided into opposing alliances and armed camps. The equilibrium of Vienna finally collapsed before the First World War.

The shift in the European balance of power during the nineteenth century may therefore be accounted for by the early stability of the Concert, the revolutions of 1830 and 1848, the Crimean War, the unification of Italy and Germany, the decline of Austria, colonial rivalry and the final division of Europe into rival blocs. The careful balance of Vienna was worn away until it collapsed on the eve of the First World War.

The consequences of the threats to world peace

Question 30

Three centuries of war, revolution and empire left behind a transformed world, and a Europe armed, divided and drifting towards catastrophe.

Examine the overall consequences of the threats to world peace in the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries.

Model Answer

The threats to world peace between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries left deep and lasting consequences for Europe and the world. They reshaped states, ideas and the whole international order. The overall consequences of these threats may be examined as follows.

Great loss of life and destruction. The wars of these centuries, from the Thirty Years' War to the Napoleonic Wars, brought terrible slaughter and ruin. Whole lands were laid waste and millions perished. The human cost was immense. The Thirty Years' and Napoleonic wars killed many millions. War left a trail of death and destruction.

The redrawing of the map of Europe. The wars and their settlements repeatedly redrew the boundaries of Europe, at Vienna in 1815 and at Frankfurt in 1871. Lands and peoples were shifted among the powers. The map was made and remade. Europe was reshaped by war and treaty.

The rise of nationalism and new nations. The threats of the age gave birth to a powerful nationalism and to new nations, above all a united Germany and Italy. Peoples were forged into nation-states. Nationalism became a ruling force. A united Germany and Italy took their place on the map. New nations changed the face of Europe.

The birth of the modern state system. The Peace of Westphalia established the sovereignty of states and gave birth to the modern international order. States became the masters of their own affairs. A system of independent states was born. Modern international relations began in this age.

The balance-of-power system and alliances. The age produced the balance-of-power system and, in time, the rigid alliances that divided Europe. These arrangements shaped the diplomacy of the continent. They also pointed towards the First World War. The balance of power was a lasting legacy.

The growth of militarism and the arms race. The rivalries of the age drove the powers to build great armies and navies and to compete in arms. Militarism took deep root in European life. The arms race grew ever more intense. The powers built great armies and navies and raced to arm. War was made more likely and more terrible.

Modern diplomacy and international law. The age gave rise to modern diplomacy, permanent embassies and the beginnings of international law. From Westphalia and the Concert of Europe came new ways of managing relations between states. Diplomacy was modernised. International law took its first shape.

The spread of revolutionary and liberal ideas. The French Revolution and the wars spread the ideas of liberty, equality and democracy across Europe. These ideas reshaped politics and inspired reform. The old order was undermined in men's minds. Liberal ideas became a lasting force.

The underdevelopment of Africa. The slave trade and the imperialism of the age drained and devastated Africa. The continent was depopulated, distorted and at last conquered. Africa was left underdeveloped and colonised. The slave trade and imperialism drained and devastated the continent. The threats to peace fell heaviest upon Africa.

The overall consequences of the threats to world peace in the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries were therefore great loss of life, the redrawing of the map of Europe, the rise of nationalism and new nations, the birth of the modern state system, the balance-of-power system and alliances, the growth of militarism, the rise of modern diplomacy and international law, the spread of revolutionary and liberal ideas, and the underdevelopment of Africa. These centuries reshaped the world and set the stage for the conflicts to come.

Question 31

The nineteenth century called itself an age of peace and progress, yet in its rivalries and ambitions lay hidden the causes of the bloodiest century to come.

"The seeds of twentieth-century conflict were sown in the rivalries of the nineteenth century." Discuss.

Model Answer

The claim that the seeds of twentieth-century conflict were sown in the rivalries of the nineteenth century holds that the wars of the new century grew from the quarrels of the old. The claim carries much force, as may be shown by considering those rivalries. This may be discussed as follows.

The rise of Germany upset the balance. The unification of Germany in 1871 created a powerful new state that overturned the old balance of power. Its neighbours feared its strength and ambition. The rise of Germany unsettled Europe. This was a deep source of the conflicts to come.

Franco-German hostility. The defeat of France and the loss of Alsace-Lorraine left a lasting enmity between France and Germany. France burned for revenge, and Germany feared her revanche. This hostility poisoned European relations. France burned for revenge after the loss of Alsace-Lorraine. It was a standing cause of future war.

Imperial rivalry over colonies. The scramble for colonies set the powers in bitter rivalry across the globe. Quarrels over empire brought them repeatedly to the brink of war. Imperial competition sharpened their hostility. Quarrels over colonies brought the powers to the brink of war. Colonial rivalry helped to prepare the great war.

The system of alliances. The powers bound themselves into opposing alliances that divided Europe into armed camps. A quarrel between two states could now draw in many. The alliance system made a general war more likely. Europe divided into two opposing camps of allies. It turned local disputes into continental dangers.

Militarism and the arms race. The powers built ever greater armies and navies and competed fiercely in arms. This militarism made war both more likely and more terrible. The nations stood armed and ready. The powers armed themselves ever more heavily for war. The arms race pointed towards catastrophe.

Aggressive nationalism. The nationalism of the age made peoples proud, ambitious and hostile to their rivals. National passions inflamed the quarrels of states. Chauvinism made compromise harder. National pride made peoples proud, ambitious and hostile. Aggressive nationalism drove Europe towards war.

The Balkan powder keg. The unresolved Eastern Question left the Balkans a tinderbox of rival nationalisms and great-power ambitions. It was here that the spark of the First World War would fall. The Balkans remained a source of danger. The unresolved Eastern Question left the Balkans a tinderbox. The powder keg awaited only a spark.

On balance the claim is valid. Weighing all this, the rivalries of the nineteenth century did indeed sow the seeds of the conflicts of the twentieth. The rise of Germany, the alliances, the arms race and the Balkan question all pointed towards war. The claim is therefore largely valid. The nineteenth century prepared the tragedies of the twentieth.

The seeds of twentieth-century conflict were therefore very largely sown in the rivalries of the nineteenth century, in the rise of Germany, the hostility of France and Germany, imperial rivalry, the system of alliances, militarism, aggressive nationalism and the unresolved Balkan question. Though the final crisis lay in the new century, its roots ran deep into the old, so that the claim is, on balance, valid.

Chapter 2

WARS AND CONFLICTS FROM THE LATE 19TH CENTURY TO THE 1940S

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 partition of Africa

Question 1

In little more than twenty years the powers of Europe carved up almost an entire continent, driven by the hunger of their factories and the pride of their flags.

Examine the causes of the scramble for and partition of Africa.

Model Answer

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century the European powers competed to seize and divide almost the whole of Africa, a process known as the scramble and partition. Several forces drove this sudden rush for colonies. The causes of the scramble for and partition of Africa may be examined as follows.

The need for raw materials. The Industrial Revolution had made the factories of Europe hungry for raw materials such as rubber, cotton, palm oil, minerals and ivory. Africa was rich in these materials, and the powers seized colonies to secure a supply of them. The hunger of industry drove the powers to Africa. The search for raw materials was a leading cause of the scramble.

The search for markets. The factories of Europe produced far more goods than their home markets could absorb. The powers wanted colonies in Africa as markets in which to sell their surplus manufactures. Each sought to close these markets to its rivals. The quest for markets drove the partition of Africa.

The need to invest surplus capital. The wealthy nations of Europe had accumulated surplus capital that sought profitable outlets abroad, as Lenin observed of the age of imperialism. Africa offered fields for the investment of this capital in mines, plantations and railways. The export of capital drove the scramble. Surplus wealth sought new lands to enrich itself.

National prestige and rivalry. Colonies came to be seen as a mark of national greatness, and no power would be left behind. The rise of a united Germany after 1871, seeking colonies to match Britain and France, sharpened the rivalry. Pride and jealousy drove the powers on. Prestige made the seizure of Africa a matter of honour.

Strategic considerations. The powers seized African territories to guard their trade routes and their existing empires. The opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 made Egypt and the route to India vital to Britain. Naval bases and coaling stations were wanted along the coasts. Strategy drove much of the partition of Africa.

The desire to spread Christianity and civilisation. The powers justified their conquests as a mission to spread Christianity and Western civilisation to Africa. Missionaries and explorers went before and prepared the way for the flag. This civilising mission cloaked the pursuit of gain. It gave a moral pretext for the scramble.

The pressure of surplus population. The growing populations of Europe were held to need new lands for settlement. Some powers sought colonies in Africa in which to settle their surplus people. Emigration added to the demand for territory. Population pressure helped to drive the scramble.

Advances in technology and medicine. New inventions made the conquest of Africa possible where it had once been too dangerous. Steamships, the telegraph, the quinine that guarded against malaria, and the Maxim gun gave the Europeans a decisive advantage. Technology opened the interior to conquest. The tools of the age made the scramble possible.

The Berlin Conference and the rush for claims. The Berlin Conference of 1884 to 1885 set rules for the partition and touched off a rush for territory. Fearing to be left behind, each power hurried to stake its claims. The conference accelerated the scramble. It turned rivalry into a headlong race for Africa.

The scramble for and partition of Africa therefore sprang from the need for raw materials, markets and fields for surplus capital, from national prestige and rivalry, strategic considerations, the desire to spread Christianity and civilisation, the pressure of surplus population, advances in technology and medicine, and the rush for claims set off by the Berlin Conference. Driven by the forces of industrial capitalism and imperial rivalry, the powers divided a whole continent among themselves.

Question 2

Around a table in Berlin, and without a single African present, the statesmen of Europe drew their pens across a continent and shared it out among themselves.

Examine the aims and agreements of the Berlin Conference of 1884 to 1885.

Model Answer

The Berlin Conference, held from 1884 to 1885, was called to regulate the European partition of Africa and to prevent war among the powers over it. Its aims and agreements shaped the colonial map of the continent. The aims and agreements of the Berlin Conference may be examined as follows.

It was called to regulate the partition. The conference was summoned by the German chancellor Bismarck to set rules for the European seizure of Africa. Its chief aim was to prevent war among the powers as they divided the continent. It sought to bring order to the scramble. The conference was to regulate the partition peacefully.

It was attended by the European powers alone. Fourteen European powers, including Britain, France, Germany, Portugal and Belgium, took part in the conference. No African ruler or representative was present at the table. Africa was divided without its peoples being consulted. The fate of the continent was decided by strangers.

The principle of effective occupation. The conference laid down that a power could claim African territory only by showing that it effectively occupied and controlled it. This principle of effective occupation forced the powers to send soldiers and officials into the interior. Paper claims alone were no longer enough. Occupation became the test of possession.

The recognition of the Congo Free State. The conference recognised the vast Congo Free State as the personal possession of King Leopold the Second of Belgium. This placed a huge region of central Africa under his private rule. The Congo passed into cruel and greedy hands. Leopold's rule there became a byword for exploitation.

Free trade and navigation on the great rivers. The conference declared free trade and free navigation for all powers on the Congo and the Niger rivers. The great waterways were opened to the commerce of every nation. Trade was to flow freely along them. The rivers became open highways of European commerce.

The drawing of arbitrary borders. The conference and the partition that followed drew borders across Africa with no regard for its peoples. Ethnic, cultural and linguistic realities were ignored as lines were drawn on the map. Peoples were divided and rivals thrown together. These arbitrary borders would trouble Africa for generations.

The declaration of colonial claims. The conference provided for the powers to declare their claims to African territory and to notify one another. Britain and France gained the largest shares, with Germany, Italy, Belgium and Portugal taking their portions. The map of colonial Africa began to take shape. The powers formally shared out the continent.

A declaration against the slave trade. The General Act of the conference included a declaration against the slave trade in Africa. This was held up as one of its humane purposes. Yet it did little to check the exploitation that followed. It forbade the slave trade in the lands the powers had seized. The pledge against slavery masked the conquest to come.

The Berlin Conference of 1884 to 1885 therefore aimed to regulate the partition of Africa among the European powers, and it agreed on the principle of effective occupation, recognised the Congo Free State

of Leopold the Second, declared free trade on the Congo and Niger, drew arbitrary borders, provided for the declaration of colonial claims, and condemned the slave trade. Without a single African voice, it set the framework for the conquest and division of a continent.

Question 3

The lines drawn in Berlin outlived the empires that drew them, leaving Africa a continent of borders that fitted no one and wounds that would not heal.

Examine the effects of the partition of Africa.

Model Answer

The partition of Africa among the European powers in the late nineteenth century had deep and lasting effects upon the continent. It reshaped Africa's politics, economy and society. The effects of the partition of Africa may be examined as follows.

The establishment of colonial rule. The partition brought almost the whole of Africa under European colonial rule. African states and peoples lost their independence to foreign powers. The continent was divided into colonies governed from Europe. Colonialism was fastened firmly upon Africa.

The drawing of artificial borders. The partition divided Africa by borders drawn for European convenience, without regard for its peoples. Rival peoples were thrown together and single peoples split apart. These artificial borders became a lasting source of conflict. They would trouble Africa long after independence.

The loss of sovereignty amid resistance. African rulers and peoples lost their sovereignty, and many resisted the conquest by force of arms. Risings such as the Maji Maji war in German East Africa were crushed with great bloodshed. Resistance was met with ruthless force. The partition was carried through against fierce African opposition.

Economic exploitation. The colonies were exploited for the benefit of the European powers, their land, labour and resources turned to the metropole's profit. Forced labour, as in Leopold's Congo, brought terrible suffering. Africa's wealth flowed out to Europe. The partition opened the continent to plunder.

The disruption of African societies. The partition broke up old kingdoms and disrupted the trade, politics and life of African societies. Traditional authorities were overthrown or bent to colonial ends. African life was thrown into disorder. Old kingdoms were broken up and their rulers overthrown or subdued. The conquest tore apart the fabric of society.

The imposition of a colonial economy. The powers turned their colonies into producers of raw materials for European industry. Africans were made to grow cash crops and to work in mines for the metropole. A one-sided colonial economy was imposed. Africa was bound to serve the needs of Europe.

Cultural and social change. Colonial rule brought European languages, religion and education, and undermined African cultures. Christianity and Western ways spread through the missions and the schools. African customs and beliefs were disparaged. The partition wrought deep cultural change.

The sowing of future nationalism. By subjecting Africans to foreign rule and exploitation, the partition sowed the grievances from which nationalism would later grow. The struggle against colonial rule was born of the conquest. Resistance would in time become the demand for independence. The partition planted the seeds of its own undoing.

The effects of the partition of Africa were therefore the establishment of colonial rule, the drawing of artificial borders, the loss of sovereignty amid fierce resistance, economic exploitation, the disruption of African societies, the imposition of a colonial economy, deep cultural change, and the sowing of future nationalism. The partition subjected the continent to foreign rule and left it a legacy of borders and grievances that endure to this day.

Alliances and militarism before 1914

Question 4

In the decades before 1914 the powers of Europe bound themselves into two great armed camps, until a quarrel between any two threatened to become a war of all.

Examine the alliance systems of Europe before 1914.

Model Answer

In the years before the First World War, the great powers of Europe divided into two rival alliance systems. These alliances turned local quarrels into the danger of a general war. The alliance systems of Europe before 1914 may be examined as follows.

The purpose of the alliances. The powers formed alliances to guard themselves against their rivals and to gain support in case of war. Each sought safety in numbers and in binding pledges of aid. The alliances were meant to deter attack. Yet they also bound their members to one another's quarrels.

The Triple Alliance. In 1882 Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy formed the Triple Alliance, a league against France and Russia. It bound its members to support one another in war. Bismarck built it to secure the new German Empire. Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy pledged to aid one another in war. The Triple Alliance was one of the two great camps.

The Triple Entente. Against this, Britain, France and Russia drew together in the Triple Entente, completed in 1907. Fear of Germany brought these former rivals into agreement. The Entente balanced the Triple Alliance. Fear of a powerful Germany drove these former rivals together. Europe was now divided into two opposing groups.

The division of Europe into two camps. The two alliances split the great powers into two hostile blocs that faced one another across the continent. Each watched the other with suspicion and prepared for war. Europe was divided into armed camps. The continent was split down the middle.

Alliances turned local disputes into general dangers. Because each power was bound to its allies, a quarrel between any two threatened to draw in all. A local dispute could set off a chain reaction of war. The alliances made a general war more likely. They linked the fate of every power to the rest.

The alliances bred fear and rivalry. The existence of the two blocs deepened the fear and rivalry among the powers. Each alliance armed itself against the other. Suspicion grew on both sides of the divide. Each bloc armed itself steadily against the other. The alliance system poisoned the relations of Europe.

The alliances helped to cause the First World War. When the crisis came in 1914, the alliances turned a quarrel in the Balkans into a war of all the great powers. The chain of obligations dragged the powers into war one by one. The alliance system was a leading cause of the First World War. It made a local spark into a general fire.

The alliance systems of Europe before 1914 therefore divided the great powers into the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente, two armed camps bound to support one another in war. By turning local disputes into general dangers and by breeding fear and rivalry, the alliances helped to make the quarrel of 1914 into the First World War.

Question 5

Convinced that the next war was coming, the powers of Europe armed themselves as never before, until the very weight of their weapons helped to pull them into it.

Examine militarism and the arms race as threats to peace before 1914.

Model Answer

In the years before the First World War, the great powers built up their armies and navies in a great arms race, and military values came to dominate their societies. This militarism was a leading threat to peace. Militarism and the arms race before 1914 may be examined as follows.

The meaning of militarism. Militarism is the belief in military strength and the readiness to use it, and the domination of a society by military values. The powers of Europe glorified their armies and prepared eagerly for war. War came to be seen as noble and inevitable. Militarism gripped the nations of the continent.

The build-up of great armies. The powers built up huge armies through conscription, calling millions of men to serve under arms. Germany, France, Russia and Austria-Hungary all raised mass armies. The continent bristled with soldiers. France and Germany could each put millions of trained men into the field. The growth of armies made war more likely.

The naval arms race. Britain and Germany competed fiercely to build the greatest navy, above all in the great battleships called dreadnoughts. Germany's challenge to British sea power alarmed and angered Britain. The naval race sharpened their rivalry. It was among the bitterest contests of the age.

The influence of the generals. As the powers armed, their military leaders gained great influence over policy. War plans, once made, pressed the powers towards war in a crisis. The generals' rigid timetables left little room for peace. Once mobilisation began, their rigid plans could not easily be halted. Militarism gave the soldiers a dangerous power.

The competition in weapons. The powers competed to build ever more and better weapons, from heavy artillery to machine guns. Each sought to outmatch its rivals in arms. The arms race grew without end. Artillery, machine guns and shells were produced in ever greater quantities. Europe armed itself steadily for a great war.

It bred fear and suspicion. The arms race deepened the fear and suspicion among the powers, as each armed against the others. Every increase by one led to increases by the rest. Distrust grew with every new gun. Each new warship or regiment was answered by the rival powers. Militarism poisoned the peace of Europe.

It made war more likely and more terrible. The vast armies and weapons made war both more likely to come and more dreadful when it came. Nations armed to the teeth stood ready to fight. The arms race helped to bring on the First World War. It ensured that the war, when it came, would be terrible.

Militarism and the arms race before 1914 therefore filled Europe with great armies and navies, set Britain and Germany in a bitter naval race, gave the generals a dangerous influence over policy, and bred fear and suspicion among the powers. By making war both more likely and more terrible, militarism was among the deepest causes of the First World War.

The First World War

Question 6

A single shot fired in a Balkan street in the summer of 1914 set off a chain of alliances, ambitions and fears that plunged the whole world into war.

Examine the causes of the First World War.

Model Answer

The First World War, which broke out in 1914, was one of the most destructive wars in history. It sprang from a combination of long-standing rivalries and an immediate trigger. The causes of the First World War may be examined as follows.

Militarism and the arms race. The powers of Europe had built up great armies and navies and glorified military strength. The naval race between Britain and Germany was especially bitter. This militarism made war more likely. The naval race between Britain and Germany was especially bitter. Armed to the teeth, the nations stood ready to fight.

The system of alliances. Europe was divided into two armed camps, the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente. These alliances bound the powers to support one another in war. A quarrel between two of them could draw in all. The alliance system threatened to turn a local dispute into a general war.

Imperialism and colonial rivalry. The powers competed fiercely for colonies and markets across Africa and Asia. Germany, coming late to empire, resented the great colonial holdings of Britain and France. This imperial rivalry bred hostility. The scramble for empire sharpened the tensions of Europe.

Nationalism. A fierce nationalism set the peoples of Europe against one another, as France longed to recover Alsace-Lorraine and Germany gloried in its new power. National passions inflamed the quarrels of states. Pride made compromise harder. Nationalism drove Europe towards war.

Slav nationalism in the Balkans. The Slav peoples of the Balkans, backed by Serbia and Russia, sought freedom from Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire. This Slav nationalism threatened to break up Austria-Hungary. Serbia and Austria-Hungary were bitter enemies. Balkan nationalism was a dangerous force.

The Balkan crises. The Balkans, called the powder keg of Europe, were shaken by repeated crises and by the wars of 1912 and 1913. Rivalry there set Austria-Hungary and Russia against one another. The region was ready to explode. The Balkan crises brought the powers to the edge of war.

The decline of the Ottoman Empire. The slow collapse of the Ottoman Empire left a dangerous vacuum in the Balkans over which the powers competed. Austria-Hungary and Russia both sought advantage there. The Eastern Question remained unsettled. Ottoman decline fed the instability of the region.

The assassination at Sarajevo. On the twenty-eighth of June 1914 the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir to Austria-Hungary, was assassinated at Sarajevo by the Bosnian Serb Gavrilo Princip. Austria-Hungary blamed Serbia for the murder. The assassination was the immediate trigger of the war. A single shot lit the fuse.

The July crisis and the failure of diplomacy. After the assassination, Austria-Hungary presented harsh demands to Serbia, and the alliances drew the powers in one by one. Diplomacy failed to halt the slide to war. The crisis ran out of all control. One by one the powers mobilised and declared war. In a few short weeks Europe was at war.

The chain reaction of war. Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia, Russia mobilised in support, Germany declared war on Russia and France, and Britain joined against Germany. The alliances turned a local war into a world war. The powers were dragged in one after another. The chain reaction engulfed the whole of Europe.

The First World War therefore sprang from militarism and the arms race, the system of alliances, imperialism, nationalism and Slav nationalism, the Balkan crises and the decline of the Ottoman Empire, and it was triggered by the assassination at Sarajevo and the failure of diplomacy in the July crisis, which set off a chain reaction of war. Long-laid rivalries and a single spark together plunged the world into war.

Question 7

Men called the Balkans the powder keg of Europe, and in 1914 the spark that fell there set the whole continent ablaze.

Explain why the Balkans became the "powder keg of Europe" before 1914.

Model Answer

The Balkan peninsula was called the powder keg of Europe because it was the most unstable and dangerous region of the continent before 1914. Several forces made it so explosive. The reasons why the Balkans became the powder keg of Europe may be explained as follows.

The decline of the Ottoman Empire. The retreat of the Ottoman Empire from the Balkans left a power vacuum and a scramble for its former lands. Rival peoples and powers competed for the spoils. The decline of the empire unsettled the whole region. Rival peoples and powers rushed to seize the abandoned lands. It left the Balkans in turmoil.

The rise of Balkan nationalism. The peoples of the Balkans, Serbs, Bulgarians, Greeks and others, sought to form and enlarge their own nations. Their rival ambitions set them against one another. Nationalism made the region a cauldron of conflict. Each people pressed its claims by force.

The ambitions of Serbia. Serbia sought to unite the South Slavs under its leadership, which threatened to break up Austria-Hungary. Serbian ambition alarmed and angered Vienna. The two states were bitter enemies. Vienna resolved to crush the Serbian threat once and for all. Serbia was a focus of Balkan unrest.

The rivalry of Austria-Hungary and Russia. Austria-Hungary and Russia competed for influence in the Balkans, Austria to check Slav nationalism and Russia to champion it. Their rivalry made every Balkan quarrel a great-power quarrel. The two powers faced one another across the region. Their competition was highly dangerous.

The Balkan Wars. In 1912 and 1913 the Balkan states fought two wars, first against the Ottomans and then among themselves. These wars left bitterness, ambition and instability behind them. They showed how ready the region was for conflict. The Balkan Wars kept the powder keg smouldering.

The involvement of the great powers. Because the powers had interests and allies in the Balkans, any conflict there threatened to draw them in. The region became the meeting-point of great-power rivalries. A local war could swiftly become a general one. The Balkans linked local strife to great-power war.

It became the flashpoint of 1914. It was in the Balkans, at Sarajevo, that the spark of the First World War at last fell. The assassination of the Archduke there set off the final crisis. The powder keg exploded in 1914. The assassination of the Archduke set off the final crisis. The Balkans lit the fuse of the world war.

The Balkans became the powder keg of Europe because the decline of the Ottoman Empire, the rise of Balkan nationalism, the ambitions of Serbia, the rivalry of Austria-Hungary and Russia, the Balkan Wars and the involvement of the great powers all combined to make the region dangerously unstable. It was here, at Sarajevo in 1914, that the spark fell which set the whole continent ablaze.

Question 8

The soldiers who marched off in 1914 expecting a short and glorious war found instead four years of mud, machine guns and mass death in the trenches.

Examine the course and main features of the First World War.

Model Answer

The First World War, fought from 1914 to 1918, was a new and terrible kind of war. Its course and features marked it as the first great total war of the modern age. The course and main features of the First World War may be examined as follows.

It began with a war of movement. The war opened in 1914 with Germany's attempt to defeat France swiftly by marching through Belgium. The German advance was halted at the Battle of the Marne. The war of movement then bogged down. The German advance was halted at the Battle of the Marne in 1914. A quick victory eluded both sides.

It became a war of the trenches. On the Western Front the armies dug long lines of trenches from which neither side could advance. The war became a deadlock of trench warfare. Soldiers lived and died in the mud and the wire. Long lines of trenches stretched from the sea to Switzerland. The trenches came to symbolise the whole war.

It was a war of attrition. Unable to break through, the armies sought to wear one another down in great battles such as the Somme and Verdun in 1916. These battles cost hundreds of thousands of lives for little gain. The war became a slaughter of attrition. Men were fed into the mincing-machine of battle.

It was fought on many fronts. The war was fought not only in the west but on the Eastern Front against Russia, in Italy, in the Middle East and in the colonies. It spread across the world. Fighting reached even Africa and Asia. Fighting raged in Russia, Italy, the Middle East and the colonies. It was truly a world war.

It saw new and terrible weapons. The war brought new weapons of mass killing, the machine gun, poison gas, the tank, the submarine and the aeroplane. These made the war more deadly than any before it. Science was turned to slaughter. The machine gun, poison gas, the tank and the submarine were used. Modern weapons multiplied the carnage.

It was a total war. The whole resources of the nations were turned to the war, their industry, their people and their wealth. Civilians laboured for the war effort and suffered its hardships. The war engulfed whole societies. Whole nations turned their industry and their people to the war. It was a total war of peoples, not merely of armies.

The entry of the United States. In 1917 the United States entered the war on the side of the Allies, its fresh strength tipping the balance. American men and materials strengthened the Allied cause. The entry of the United States proved decisive. It helped to turn the tide against Germany.

The defeat of Germany and the armistice. Exhausted and facing defeat, Germany sought an armistice, and the war ended on the eleventh of November 1918. The German Empire collapsed in defeat and revolution. The guns fell silent after four years. The war ended in the defeat of Germany and her allies.

The course and main features of the First World War were therefore a swift descent from a war of movement into the deadlock of trench warfare, a terrible war of attrition fought on many fronts with new and deadly weapons, waged as a total war of whole nations, turned at last by the entry of the United States, and ended by the defeat of Germany and the armistice of 1918. It was the first great total war of the modern age.

Question 9

The guns of 1918 fell silent over a Europe transformed, four empires gone, a generation dead, and the old mastery of the continent broken forever.

Examine the effects of the First World War.

Model Answer

The First World War ended in 1918, but its effects reshaped Europe and the world. It brought vast destruction and sweeping political change. The effects of the First World War may be examined as follows.

The collapse of four empires. The war brought down four great empires, the German, the Austro-Hungarian, the Ottoman and the Russian. Out of their ruins arose new states such as Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. The old order of Europe was swept away. The map of the continent was remade.

Enormous loss of life. The war killed over sixteen million people and left millions more wounded and maimed. A whole generation of young men was cut down. Europe mourned its lost generation. More than sixteen million perished before the guns fell silent. The human cost of the war was staggering.

The Treaty of Versailles and a harsh peace. The war was followed by the harsh peace of the Treaty of Versailles, which blamed Germany and burdened her with reparations. This punitive settlement bred deep resentment. The peace sowed the seeds of a future war. A vengeful treaty poisoned the peace.

Economic devastation. The war ruined the economies of Europe and left the powers deep in debt, above all to the United States. Germany suffered a catastrophic hyperinflation in the early 1920s. Trade and industry were shattered. Germany suffered a ruinous hyperinflation in the early 1920s. Europe emerged from the war impoverished.

The rise of the United States. The war raised the United States to the position of the leading financial and industrial power in the world. Europe now owed her vast debts. Wealth and power shifted across the Atlantic. The nations of Europe now owed her enormous debts. The war made America the world's creditor.

The Russian Revolution and the spread of communism. The strains of the war brought the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in 1917 and the birth of the first socialist state. Communism now stood as a rival to the capitalist order. A new force had entered the world. The war gave birth to the Soviet Union.

The rise of political extremism. The bitterness and ruin of the war fed the growth of extremism, of fascism and later of Nazism. Mussolini rose in Italy in the war's aftermath. Extreme movements fed on the wreckage of the old order. Mussolini seized power in Italy soon after the war. The war bred the dictators of the age.

The creation of the League of Nations. Out of the horror of the war came the League of Nations, founded in 1920 to keep the peace of the world. It was the first great attempt at collective security. The nations sought to prevent another such war. It was the first great attempt at collective security. The war gave rise to the League.

Social change and the role of women. The war drew women into the workplace to replace the men at the front, and afterward they won the vote in Britain, the United States and Germany. The old social order was shaken. Women gained a new place in society. The war advanced the cause of women.

The effects of the First World War were therefore the collapse of four empires, enormous loss of life, the harsh peace of Versailles, economic devastation, the rise of the United States, the Russian Revolution, the growth of political extremism, the creation of the League of Nations, and lasting social change. The war broke the old order of Europe and set the stage for the conflicts to come.

Question 10

Some blame the war on the tangle of alliances and others on the ambitions of nations, but it was not one thread but the whole knot that dragged the world into war.

"The alliance system was the main cause of the First World War." How valid is this claim?

Model Answer

The claim that the alliance system was the main cause of the First World War points to the way the two armed camps turned a local quarrel into a general war. The claim has much force, but the war had other deep causes too. Its validity may be assessed as follows.

The alliances turned a local war into a world war. The alliance system bound the powers so that a quarrel between two of them drew in all the rest. A local dispute in the Balkans became a war of all the great powers. This chain reaction was the work of the alliances. In this the claim has great force.

They bound the powers to one another's quarrels. Each power was pledged to support its allies, so that none could stand aside from a war involving them. The obligations of alliance left little freedom of choice. The powers were dragged in by their pledges. The alliances tied their fates together.

They divided Europe into two hostile camps. The alliances split Europe into the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente, each arming against the other. This division bred fear and made war more likely. The camps faced one another in armed suspicion. The alliances hardened the hostility of the powers.

Yet militarism and the arms race were also to blame. The great armies and the naval race between Britain and Germany had made the powers ready and eager for war. Militarism was a deep cause in its own right. The alliances were not the only danger. The naval race and the great armies had readied the powers for war. War had many roots.

Yet imperialism bred deep hostility. The rivalry of the powers for colonies and markets had poisoned their relations for decades. Germany's resentment of the empires of Britain and France ran deep. Imperialism was a cause apart from the alliances. Colonial greed helped to bring on the war.

Yet nationalism inflamed the peoples. A fierce nationalism set the peoples of Europe against one another and made them long for war. French desire for revenge and Slav nationalism in the Balkans were powerful forces. Nationalism worked independently of the alliances. National passion drove the powers to war.

Yet the Balkan crisis and the assassination were the triggers. The immediate cause of the war lay in the Balkans and in the assassination at Sarajevo in 1914. Without this spark the alliances might never have been set off. The trigger lay outside the alliance system. The occasion of war came from the Balkans.

On balance the alliances were a major but not the sole cause. Weighing all this, the alliance system was indeed a leading cause, for it turned a local war into a world war. Yet it worked together with militarism, imperialism, nationalism and the Balkan crisis. The claim is therefore only partly valid. The alliances were one great cause among several.

The claim that the alliance system was the main cause of the First World War is therefore only partly valid. The alliances did turn a local quarrel into a general war and bound the powers to one another's fate, yet they worked together with militarism, imperialism, nationalism and the Balkan crisis that triggered the war. The alliance system was a leading cause, but by no means the only one.

The peace settlement after the First World War

Question 11

The peacemakers who gathered at Versailles in 1919 meant to make Germany pay, and the treaty they wrote would feed a German bitterness that led straight to another war.

Examine the terms of the Treaty of Versailles of 1919.

Model Answer

The Treaty of Versailles, signed in 1919, was the peace settlement imposed upon Germany after the First World War. Its terms were harsh and far-reaching. The terms of the Treaty of Versailles may be examined as follows.

The war guilt clause. By the war guilt clause, Article 231 of the treaty, Germany was forced to accept the whole blame for causing the war. This clause deeply wounded German pride. It was the ground on which the other penalties rested. Germans bitterly resented being branded the sole guilty party.

Heavy reparations. Germany was ordered to pay vast reparations, fixed at 132 billion gold marks, to the victorious Allies. These payments were meant to make good the damage of the war. They crippled the German economy. The sum was fixed at 132 billion gold marks. The burden of reparations bred lasting resentment.

The loss of overseas colonies. Germany was stripped of all her overseas colonies, which were placed under Allied control as mandates of the League of Nations. Her empire was taken from her. The colonies passed to Britain, France and others. Germany lost her place among the imperial powers.

Territorial losses in Europe. Germany lost territory in Europe, giving Alsace-Lorraine to France and lands to the new Poland, including the Polish Corridor. The port of Danzig was made a free city under the League. The Saar coalfield was placed under League control. Germany was reduced in size and split apart.

The demilitarisation of the Rhineland. The Rhineland, the German territory bordering France, was to be demilitarised and kept free of German troops. This was to protect France against future attack. Germany could not fortify her own frontier. The demilitarised Rhineland was a standing humiliation.

The disarmament of Germany. Germany's armed forces were drastically reduced, her army capped at a hundred thousand men and conscription forbidden. Her navy was limited, and she was allowed no submarines, air force or tanks. Germany was made almost defenceless. Disarmament left her weak and resentful.

The ban on union with Austria. The treaty forbade the union, or Anschluss, of Germany with Austria. The two German-speaking states were to be kept apart. This denied the Germans the unity they desired. The two German-speaking states were forbidden to unite. The ban was another grievance against the treaty.

The creation of the League of Nations. The Covenant of the League of Nations was made part of the Treaty of Versailles. The League was to keep the peace that the treaty had made. It was the one hopeful part of the settlement. Its Covenant formed the opening part of the treaty. From the treaty came the League of Nations.

The terms of the Treaty of Versailles therefore included the war guilt clause, heavy reparations, the loss of Germany's colonies, territorial losses in Europe, the demilitarisation of the Rhineland, the disarmament of Germany, the ban on union with Austria, and the creation of the League of Nations. Harsh and humiliating, the treaty bred a German bitterness that would help to bring on the Second World War.

Question 12

The Treaty of Versailles was meant to end all wars, but by humiliating Germany it planted the grievance on which Hitler would rise.

Examine the effects of the Treaty of Versailles.

Model Answer

The Treaty of Versailles of 1919 had profound effects upon Germany and upon the peace of Europe. Far from securing peace, it helped to prepare a second war. The effects of the Treaty of Versailles may be examined as follows.

It bred deep German resentment. The Germans regarded the treaty as a harsh and unjust dictated peace forced upon them. Its war guilt clause and reparations wounded them deeply. Resentment of the treaty ran through German life. Germans denounced it as a dictated peace forced upon them. This bitterness would poison the peace.

It gave rise to the stab-in-the-back myth. Many Germans refused to believe their army had been defeated and blamed the politicians who signed the treaty. This stab-in-the-back myth discredited the new Weimar Republic. The signers were branded traitors. The myth fed the enemies of democracy.

It ruined the German economy. The burden of reparations helped to bring on the catastrophic hyperinflation that ruined Germany in the early 1920s. Savings were wiped out and hardship spread. Economic ruin bred desperation. Reparations helped to bring on the hyperinflation of 1923. The treaty deepened Germany's misery.

It fed extreme nationalism and the rise of Nazism. Hitler and the Nazis rose by promising to overturn the hated treaty and to restore Germany's greatness. The grievance of Versailles was their most powerful weapon. Extreme nationalism fed on the treaty. Versailles helped to raise up the Nazis.

The United States rejected the treaty. The Senate of the United States refused to ratify the treaty, and America never joined the League of Nations. The absence of the United States weakened the whole settlement. The League was crippled from the start. The treaty was undermined by American withdrawal.

It satisfied no one. The French thought the treaty too soft to hold Germany down, while the British came to feel it too harsh. Neither victor was content with the settlement. The treaty pleased neither side. France found it too soft and Britain too harsh. It was a compromise that satisfied nobody.

It created new but unstable states. The treaty and its fellows created new states and borders that left many minorities discontented, as in the Polish Corridor. These arrangements were fragile and disputed. New grievances were built into the map. Millions of Germans were left under Polish and Czech rule. The settlement was unstable from the outset.

It led towards the Second World War. By embittering Germany, weakening the League and leaving unstable borders, the treaty helped to prepare the way for the Second World War. Its failures pointed towards a new conflict. The peace of Versailles did not last. It carried within it the seeds of war.

The effects of the Treaty of Versailles were therefore deep German resentment, the stab-in-the-back myth, the ruin of the German economy, the rise of extreme nationalism and Nazism, the withdrawal of the United States, the discontent of the victors, the creation of unstable states, and the drift towards the Second World War. Meant to secure peace, the treaty instead helped to prepare a second and greater war.

Question 13

When the war ended, four ancient empires lay in ruins, and out of their wreckage arose a crowd of new nations, drawn on the map by the victors.

Examine the collapse of empires and the redrawing of the map of Europe after the First World War.

Model Answer

The First World War brought down four great empires and led to the redrawing of the map of Europe. New nations arose from the ruins of the old order. The collapse of empires and the redrawing of Europe may be examined as follows.

The fall of the German Empire. The defeat of Germany brought down the empire of the Kaiser, who abdicated in 1918. In its place arose the democratic Weimar Republic. The German monarchy was swept away. The Kaiser abdicated and fled into exile in 1918. The empire gave way to a troubled republic.

The fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The Austro-Hungarian Empire broke apart into a number of new states at the war's end. Its many peoples went their separate ways. The old Habsburg realm dissolved. Its many peoples broke away into states of their own. A great empire vanished from the map.

The fall of the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman Empire was defeated and dismembered, its Arab lands placed under Allied mandate. Out of its Turkish heartland arose modern Turkey. The old empire of the sultans ended. Its Arab provinces were placed under Allied mandate. Its lands were shared among the victors.

The fall of the Russian Empire. The Russian Empire collapsed in the Revolution of 1917, and from its ruins arose the Soviet Union. The rule of the Tsars was ended. A new socialist state took its place. The Revolution of 1917 swept away the rule of the Tsars. The war destroyed the empire of the Romanovs.

The birth of new nation-states. From the ruins of the fallen empires arose new nations such as Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. The map of central and eastern Europe was wholly redrawn. New states filled the space of the old empires. Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia appeared on the map. Europe gained a crowd of new nations.

The principle of self-determination. The peace was guided in part by the principle of national self-determination set out in Wilson's Fourteen Points. Peoples were to have their own states. This principle shaped the new map. Wilson's Fourteen Points proclaimed the right of peoples to rule themselves. Self-determination was the watchword of the settlement.

New borders left minorities and grievances. The new borders could not match every people to a state, and many minorities were left discontented. Germans, Hungarians and others found themselves under foreign rule. These grievances made the settlement unstable. The new map carried within it the seeds of conflict.

The First World War therefore brought down the German, Austro-Hungarian, Ottoman and Russian empires, and led to the birth of new nation-states such as Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia under the principle of self-determination. Yet the new borders left many minorities discontented, so that the redrawing of Europe, while giving many peoples their freedom, also sowed fresh grievances.

The League of Nations

Question 14

Out of the ashes of the Great War rose a bold new idea, a league of all nations meeting in council to settle their quarrels by talk instead of by the sword.

Examine the aims and structure of the League of Nations.

Model Answer

The League of Nations, founded in 1920, was the first great attempt to keep world peace through an organisation of nations. Its aims and structure were set out in its Covenant. The aims and structure of the League of Nations may be examined as follows.

It grew from Wilson's Fourteen Points. The League was born of the ideas of the American president Woodrow Wilson, set out in his Fourteen Points. Its Covenant was made part of the Treaty of Versailles. The League came into existence on the tenth of January 1920. It was the great hope of the peacemakers.

To prevent war and keep the peace. The first aim of the League was to prevent war and to keep the peace of the world. Members pledged to settle their disputes peacefully and to defend one another against aggression. This was the principle of collective security. Peace was the League's chief purpose.

To promote disarmament. The League aimed to reduce the arms that had helped to bring on the war. It sought to persuade the nations to disarm together. Disarmament was to make war less likely. It sought to persuade the nations to reduce their arms together. The League worked for a more peaceful world.

To promote international cooperation. The League sought to bring the nations together in cooperation over health, labour, trade and other common concerns. It fostered work that no nation could do alone. Cooperation was one of its aims. The League joined the nations in common tasks.

To carry on humanitarian work. The League undertook humanitarian work for refugees, against slavery and against disease. It sought to relieve suffering across the world. This work touched millions of lives. It aided refugees and fought slavery and disease. Humanitarian service was part of its mission.

The Assembly. The Assembly was the general body of the League, in which every member state had a seat and one vote. It met once a year to debate the affairs of the world. It was the parliament of the League. It met once a year to debate the affairs of the world. All members gathered in the Assembly.

The Council. The Council was the smaller executive body, with permanent members, Britain, France, Italy and Japan, and other elected members. It dealt with the gravest matters of peace and security. It was the heart of the League's power. Its permanent members were Britain, France, Italy and Japan. The Council guided the League's action.

The Secretariat, the Court and the agencies. The League was served by a Secretariat that ran its affairs, a Permanent Court of International Justice, and agencies such as the International Labour Organization and the Health Organization. These carried on its daily and its specialised work. They gave the League its machinery. Through them the League did much of its good.

The aims and structure of the League of Nations were therefore to prevent war, promote disarmament and international cooperation and carry on humanitarian work, all through an Assembly of all members, a Council of the great powers, a Secretariat, a Court of Justice and specialised agencies such as the International Labour Organization. Born of Wilson's vision, the League was the first great experiment in collective security.

Question 15

The League could settle a quarrel between small states, but when the dictators marched, it could only wring its hands and pass resolutions no one obeyed.

Assess the successes and failures of the League of Nations.

Model Answer

The League of Nations, founded in 1920, had some real successes but ended in failure, unable to prevent the Second World War. Its record was deeply mixed. The successes and failures of the League of Nations may be assessed as follows.

It settled some disputes between small states. The League succeeded in settling several quarrels between smaller states, such as the dispute over the Aland Islands in 1921 and that between Greece and Bulgaria in 1925. In these it kept the peace. Small disputes were resolved by its work. Here the League proved its worth.

It carried on valuable humanitarian work. The League did much good in aiding refugees, fighting slavery and combating disease through its Health Organization. It relieved suffering across the world. This humanitarian work was a real success. It aided refugees and fought disease through its Health Organization. The League served humanity in many ways.

It improved labour conditions. Through the International Labour Organization, the League worked to improve the conditions of workers and to limit child labour. It set standards for labour across nations. This

was a lasting achievement. The International Labour Organization set standards for workers. The League bettered the lot of the worker.

It gave the world its first forum for cooperation. The League gave the nations their first permanent forum in which to meet and cooperate. It was a bold new experiment in international order. The idea of collective security was born. For the first time the nations had a permanent place to meet. In this the League pointed the way to the future.

It had no army to enforce its decisions. The League had no armed force of its own and could only urge or impose sanctions. When these were ignored, it was powerless. It could not compel an aggressor to obey. It could only urge or impose sanctions that were often ignored. Its lack of force was a fatal weakness.

It was weakened by the absence of the United States. The United States never joined the League, for its Senate rejected the treaty. The absence of the world's greatest power crippled the League from the start. It lacked the strength of America. The Senate rejected the treaty and America never joined. This weakness ran through its whole life.

It failed against Japan in Manchuria. When Japan seized Manchuria in 1931, the League condemned the act but could do nothing to reverse it. Japan simply left the League and kept its conquest. The League was exposed as powerless. Japan seized the province in 1931 and then left the League. Manchuria was its first great failure.

It failed against Italy in Abyssinia. When Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935 and 1936, the League imposed weak sanctions that failed to stop the conquest. Mussolini defied the League and won. Its authority was shattered. Weak sanctions failed to halt Mussolini's conquest in 1936. Abyssinia proved the League could not stop aggression.

It could not stop the drift to war. The League stood by helpless as Germany rearmed, reoccupied the Rhineland in 1936 and annexed Austria in 1938. It could not check the aggression that led to the Second World War. The League had failed in its chief purpose. It was replaced by the United Nations in 1945.

The League of Nations therefore had real successes, settling disputes between small states, carrying on humanitarian and labour work, and giving the world its first forum for cooperation, yet it failed in its chief purpose, for it had no army, lacked the United States, and could not stop the aggression of Japan, Italy and Germany. Its failure to prevent the drift to war led to its replacement by the United Nations.

The rise of dictatorships between the wars

Question 16

In the years between the wars, Japan turned from the parliament to the sword, as soldiers seized the state and set it on the road to conquest.

Examine the factors for the rise of dictatorship in Japan between the wars.

Model Answer

In the years between the two World Wars, Japan fell under the control of a military dictatorship bent on expansion. Several factors brought about this rise of dictatorship. The factors for the rise of dictatorship in Japan may be examined as follows.

The weakness of Japanese democracy. Japan's parliamentary democracy was young and shallow and had not struck deep roots. Its parties were divided and often corrupt. Democracy failed to command the loyalty of the people. Its parties were young, divided and often corrupt. Its weakness left the way open to the military.

The effects of the Great Depression. The Great Depression struck Japan hard, throwing men out of work and ruining trade. The economic crisis discredited the civilian government. Hardship turned the people towards strong rule. The slump ruined trade and threw many men out of work. The Depression prepared the way for dictatorship.

The power and prestige of the military. The army and navy of Japan were powerful and greatly admired, and stood largely beyond civilian control. The military commanded deep respect and loyalty. Its prestige gave it political weight. The army and navy stood largely beyond civilian control. The armed forces overshadowed the government.

Extreme nationalism and militarism. A fierce nationalism and militarism gripped Japan, glorifying the emperor, the army and the destiny of the nation. War and conquest were held to be noble. These passions drove the country towards dictatorship. Militarism became the creed of the state.

The desire for empire and raw materials. Japan was poor in the raw materials her industries needed and looked to conquest to secure them. The hunger for empire drove her towards war and military rule. Expansion was seen as the path to greatness. The desire for empire strengthened the militarists.

The appeal of expansion abroad. The seizure of Manchuria in 1931 brought the army prestige and stirred the nation. Success abroad strengthened the militarists at home. Conquest fed the appetite for more. The seizure of Manchuria in 1931 brought the army prestige. Expansion advanced the rise of dictatorship.

The assassination of civilian leaders. The militarists used violence and assassination to silence those who opposed them, murdering ministers and statesmen. Terror cowed the civilian leaders. Opposition was struck down. Militarists murdered ministers who stood in their way. Violence cleared the path to military rule.

The weakness of civilian government. The civilian government proved unable to control the army, which often acted on its own in China and beyond. The politicians could not restrain the soldiers. Power slipped from their hands. The army often acted on its own in China and beyond. The weakness of the government let the militarists rule.

The rise of dictatorship in Japan between the wars therefore sprang from the weakness of Japanese democracy, the effects of the Great Depression, the power and prestige of the military, extreme nationalism and militarism, the desire for empire and raw materials, the appeal of expansion, the assassination of civilian leaders, and the weakness of civilian government. By these means Japan fell under a military rule that set it on the road to war.

Question 17

Three dictatorships, in Rome, Berlin and Tokyo, tore up the treaties, defied the League, and set out by conquest to build their empires.

Examine the aggressive foreign policies of Italy, Germany and Japan between the two World Wars.

Model Answer

Between the two World Wars, the dictatorships of Italy, Germany and Japan pursued aggressive policies of expansion that overthrew the peace settlement and led towards the Second World War. These aggressive foreign policies may be examined as follows.

They rejected the peace settlement. The three dictatorships rejected the peace settlement made after the First World War and set out to overthrow it. Germany especially sought to tear up the hated Treaty of Versailles. They would not accept the order the victors had made. Defiance of the settlement was the root of their policies.

They pursued expansion and empire. Each of the dictatorships sought to build an empire by conquest, Germany seeking living space in the east, Italy a new Roman empire, and Japan an empire in Asia. Expansion was the heart of their foreign policy. They meant to grow at their neighbours' expense. The hunger for empire drove them all.

Japan seized Manchuria. In 1931 Japan seized the Chinese province of Manchuria, setting up the puppet state of Manchukuo in 1932. This was the first great act of aggression of the age. Japan defied the League and kept its conquest. The puppet state of Manchukuo was set up in 1932. Manchuria opened the road to war.

Italy invaded Abyssinia. In 1935 and 1936 Mussolini's Italy invaded and conquered Abyssinia, defying the League of Nations. The weak sanctions of the League failed to stop him. Italy won its African empire by force. The weak sanctions of the League failed to stop him. Abyssinia showed the dictators that aggression paid.

Germany rearmed in defiance of Versailles. Hitler openly rearmed Germany, building up the army, navy and air force that the treaty had forbidden. He cast off the disarmament terms of Versailles. Germany grew strong once more. He cast off the disarmament terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Rearmament prepared Germany for war.

Germany remilitarised the Rhineland. In 1936 Hitler sent his troops into the demilitarised Rhineland, breaking the treaty once again. Britain and France did nothing to stop him. The gamble succeeded and emboldened Hitler. Britain and France did nothing to stop him. The Rhineland was reoccupied without a fight.

Germany annexed Austria. In 1938 Hitler carried out the Anschluss, the union of Germany with Austria, forbidden by the treaty. Austria was absorbed into the German Reich. Another barrier of Versailles was thrown down. The union forbidden by the treaty was carried through in 1938. The annexation went unopposed.

Germany seized Czechoslovakia. In 1938 Hitler took the Sudetenland of Czechoslovakia by the Munich Agreement, and in 1939 he seized the rest of the country. Appeasement had failed to satisfy him. His appetite only grew with feeding. He took the Sudetenland at Munich and the rest in 1939. Czechoslovakia was devoured.

They formed the Axis. Germany, Italy and Japan drew together in the alliance known as the Axis, the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo grouping. Bound together, the dictators pursued their conquests. The Axis faced the democracies and the Soviet Union. Their alliance divided the world into armed camps.

The aggressive foreign policies of Italy, Germany and Japan between the wars therefore rejected the peace settlement and pursued expansion, through Japan's seizure of Manchuria, Italy's conquest of Abyssinia, Germany's rearmament, the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, the annexation of Austria and the seizure of Czechoslovakia, and the forming of the Axis. By these acts the dictators overthrew the peace and led the world towards the Second World War.

Question 18

Hitler promised the German people work and bread, and by rearmament, public works and iron control he pulled the nation out of the slump, but only towards war.

Examine the strategies used by the Nazi government to improve the German economy in the 1930s.

Model Answer

When Hitler came to power in 1933, he set out to lift Germany from the depths of the Great Depression. The Nazi government used a range of strategies to revive the German economy. The strategies used by the Nazi government to improve the German economy in the 1930s may be examined as follows.

Great programmes of public works. The Nazis undertook great public works, building motorways, public buildings and other projects to create employment. These works put millions of the jobless back to work. Public spending revived the economy. The public works were a pillar of Nazi recovery.

Rearmament. The Nazi government rearmed Germany on a vast scale, building up the army and the arms industry. Rearmament created work in the factories and shipyards. It drove the recovery of German industry. The army and the arms factories gave work to millions. Weapons and war brought back employment.

State direction of the economy. The Nazis brought the economy under the direction of the state, guiding it through plans such as the Four-Year Plan. The state decided what should be produced and how. Government took command of economic life. Plans such as the Four-Year Plan guided production. Central direction shaped the recovery.

The drive for self-sufficiency. The Nazis sought to make Germany self-sufficient, or autarkic, so as to depend less on imports. They developed substitutes for foreign goods and raw materials. Self-sufficiency was to prepare Germany for war. Substitutes were developed for scarce foreign goods. Autarky guided their economic policy.

The control of labour. The Nazis abolished the free trade unions and organised the workers in the German Labour Front under state control. Wages and conditions were fixed by the state. Labour was disciplined and controlled. The free trade unions were abolished and replaced by the Labour Front. The workers were bound to the Nazi economy.

Public spending and job creation. Through public works, rearmament and state spending, the Nazis sharply reduced the mass unemployment of the Depression. Millions were put back to work within a few years. The fall in unemployment won the regime support. Job creation was its proudest boast.

The gearing of the economy to war. Beneath the recovery, the whole economy was being geared to rearmament and the coming war. Production was turned towards weapons and preparation for conquest. Recovery served the ends of war. Production was turned steadily towards weapons and conquest. The Nazi economy was built for battle.

The strategies used by the Nazi government to improve the German economy in the 1930s therefore included great public works, rearmament, state direction of the economy, the drive for self-sufficiency, the control of labour, and heavy public spending that cut unemployment. Yet beneath the recovery the whole economy was geared to war, so that the Nazi revival was a preparation for the conquests to come.

Question 19

Twice the dictators tested the League, in Manchuria and in Abyssinia, and twice it was found wanting, until the world learned that its word meant nothing.

Examine the Manchurian and Abyssinian crises and their effect on the League of Nations.

Model Answer

The crises over Manchuria and Abyssinia in the 1930s exposed the weakness of the League of Nations and destroyed its authority. These crises marked the failure of collective security. The Manchurian and Abyssinian crises and their effect on the League of Nations may be examined as follows.

The Japanese seizure of Manchuria. In 1931 Japan invaded and seized the Chinese province of Manchuria, using the Mukden Incident as its pretext. The rich province was turned into the puppet state of Manchukuo. Japan had defied the peace of the world. The seizure challenged the whole League system.

The feeble response of the League. The League condemned the Japanese action and sent a commission, but it took no effective step to reverse it. It had no army and would not use force. Its condemnation was empty. It condemned Japan but would not use force. The League proved powerless in the face of Japan.

Japan left the League. Rather than give up its conquest, Japan simply walked out of the League in 1933 and kept Manchuria. The League could do nothing to stop it. Its authority was openly defied. It kept Manchuria and openly defied the world. Japan's departure exposed the League's weakness.

The Italian invasion of Abyssinia. In 1935 Mussolini's Italy invaded Abyssinia, one of the few free states of Africa. The Emperor Haile Selassie appealed to the League for help. Italy pressed on with its brutal conquest. The Emperor Haile Selassie appealed to the League in vain. The invasion was a direct challenge to the League.

The weakness of the sanctions. The League imposed economic sanctions on Italy, but these were weak and did not include oil. The sanctions failed to stop the conquest. The great powers would not act firmly against Mussolini. The sanctions did not even include oil. The half-hearted sanctions came to nothing.

Italy's defiance and conquest. Italy defied the League and completed the conquest of Abyssinia in 1936. Mussolini won his empire in spite of the League. Aggression had triumphed once again. Mussolini completed the conquest of Abyssinia in 1936. The conquest showed that the League could not protect its members.

The destruction of the League's authority. The two crises destroyed the authority of the League and its principle of collective security. The dictators saw that aggression went unpunished. The League was exposed as helpless. Its failure encouraged the aggression that led to the Second World War.

The Manchurian and Abyssinian crises therefore exposed the weakness of the League of Nations, for it could neither reverse Japan's seizure of Manchuria nor stop Italy's conquest of Abyssinia. Its feeble response and weak sanctions destroyed its authority and its principle of collective security, and by showing that aggression went unpunished, the crises encouraged the dictators on the road to the Second World War.

The Second World War

Question 20

Barely twenty years after the war to end all wars, the world plunged again into conflict, driven by a vengeful Germany, greedy dictators and a peace that had failed.

Examine the causes of the Second World War.

Model Answer

The Second World War, which broke out in 1939, was the most destructive war in history. It sprang from the failures of the peace and the ambitions of the dictators. The causes of the Second World War may be examined as follows.

The Treaty of Versailles. The harsh Treaty of Versailles left Germany humiliated and resentful, and Hitler rose by vowing to overturn it. The grievance of the treaty was his most powerful weapon. Versailles bred the bitterness that led to war. The unjust peace helped to cause the new conflict.

The rise of dictatorships. The rise of the dictators Hitler, Mussolini and the militarists of Japan brought to power men bent on conquest. Their expansionism threatened the peace of the world. Dictatorship and aggression went together. Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese militarists all sought conquest. The dictators drove the world towards war.

The Great Depression. The Great Depression brought misery and despair that helped the dictators to power, above all Hitler in Germany. Economic ruin discredited democracy and fed extremism. The slump prepared the way for war. The Depression was a deep cause of the conflict.

The failure of the League of Nations. The League proved unable to stop the aggression of Japan, Italy and Germany. Its failure showed the dictators that they could act unpunished. Collective security had broken down. It could not stop Japan, Italy or Germany. The weakness of the League opened the road to war.

The policy of appeasement. Britain and France gave way to Hitler's demands in the hope of avoiding war, above all at Munich in 1938. Appeasement only fed his appetite for more. Weakness emboldened the dictator. Britain and France gave way to Hitler at Munich in 1938. The failure to stand firm hastened the war.

The expansion of Nazi Germany. Hitler seized the Rhineland in 1936, Austria in 1938 and Czechoslovakia in 1939 in his drive for living space. Each conquest emboldened him to the next. His aggression grew ever bolder. He seized the Rhineland, Austria and Czechoslovakia in turn. The expansion of Germany led directly to war.

Extreme nationalism and militarism. The Axis powers glorified war, conquest and the destiny of their nations. Their aggressive nationalism made war almost certain. They sought greatness through the sword. They sought greatness for their nations through the sword. Militarism drove them towards conflict.

The formation of rival alliances. The world divided into the Axis of Germany, Italy and Japan against the Allies. As in 1914, the alliances threatened to widen any war. The powers grouped for the coming struggle. Germany, Italy and Japan formed the Axis against the Allies. Rival alliances prepared the ground for a world war.

The invasion of Poland. On the first of September 1939 Germany invaded Poland, and Britain and France declared war two days later. This was the immediate cause of the war. Hitler's aggression had at last gone too far. Germany struck on the first of September 1939. The invasion of Poland set off the Second World War.

The Second World War therefore sprang from the Treaty of Versailles, the rise of the dictators, the Great Depression, the failure of the League of Nations, the policy of appeasement, the expansion of Nazi Germany, extreme nationalism and the formation of rival alliances, and it was set off by the invasion of Poland in 1939. The failures of the peace and the ambitions of the dictators together plunged the world once more into war.

Question 21

At Munich in 1938 Britain and France handed Hitler a piece of Czechoslovakia and called it peace, but they had only fed his appetite and hastened the war.

Examine the policy of appeasement and its part in causing the Second World War.

Model Answer

Appeasement was the policy by which Britain and France gave way to the demands of the dictators in the hope of avoiding war. Far from keeping the peace, it helped to bring on the Second World War. The policy of appeasement and its part in causing the war may be examined as follows.

The meaning of appeasement. Appeasement was the policy of giving in to the demands of the dictators in order to avoid war. Britain and France hoped to satisfy Hitler by concession. They believed his demands could be bought off. Appeasement was a policy of peace at almost any price.

The reasons for it. The powers appeased the dictators out of a horror of another great war, a sense of their own weakness, and a fear of communism. Many also felt that Versailles had been unjust to Germany. These reasons made them yield. Many also believed that Versailles had wronged Germany. Appeasement seemed the path of prudence.

The acceptance of German rearmament. Britain and France allowed Hitler to rearm Germany in defiance of the treaty. They took no firm step to stop him. Germany grew strong while they looked on. They took no firm step to halt the growth of German arms. Their inaction emboldened the dictator.

The remilitarisation of the Rhineland. When Hitler marched into the demilitarised Rhineland in 1936, Britain and France did nothing. The gamble succeeded because no one opposed it. Hitler learned that the powers would not fight. Hitler learned that the powers would not fight. Their weakness invited further aggression.

The acceptance of the Anschluss. When Hitler annexed Austria in 1938, the powers again stood aside. The union forbidden by the treaty was allowed to pass. Appeasement let Germany grow. Austria was absorbed into the Reich in 1938. The democracies watched in silence as one more barrier fell. Each concession fed Hitler's confidence.

The Munich Agreement. At Munich in 1938, Britain and France gave Hitler the Sudetenland of Czechoslovakia in return for a promise of peace. Chamberlain proclaimed peace for our time. In truth they had sacrificed Czechoslovakia. Chamberlain proclaimed peace for our time. Munich was the height of appeasement.

It emboldened the dictators and led to war. Appeasement only convinced Hitler that the powers would never fight, and so he seized the rest of Czechoslovakia and then Poland. His appetite grew with every concession. Appeasement hastened rather than prevented the war. It taught the dictator that aggression paid.

The policy of appeasement therefore gave way to the dictators at every turn, accepting German rearmament, the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, the Anschluss and, at Munich, the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia. Meant to preserve peace, it only emboldened Hitler and convinced him that the powers would never fight, so that appeasement helped to bring on the very war it sought to avoid.

Question 22

Some trace the whole disaster of 1939 to the harsh peace of 1919, but the treaty was only one of many roads that led to the Second World War.

"The Treaty of Versailles was the main cause of the Second World War." How valid is this claim?

Model Answer

The claim that the Treaty of Versailles was the main cause of the Second World War points to the German resentment that Hitler exploited. The claim has real force, but the war had other important causes. Its validity may be assessed as follows.

The treaty bred the resentment Hitler used. The harsh terms of Versailles left Germany humiliated and bitter, and this resentment was Hitler's most powerful weapon. He rose to power by promising to overturn the treaty. In this the claim has real force. Versailles gave Hitler his cause.

Its terms gave Hitler his programme. Hitler's foreign policy was largely the undoing of Versailles, the rearmament, the Rhineland, the Anschluss and the recovery of lost lands. The treaty marked out the path of his aggression. Each step tore up a clause of Versailles. The treaty shaped his very aims.

It ruined the economy and bred extremism. The reparations and the ruin they helped to cause fed the extremism on which Hitler rose. Economic misery drove Germans towards the Nazis. The treaty thus helped to bring Hitler to power. Economic misery drove many Germans towards the Nazis. Its consequences reached far.

Yet the Great Depression brought Hitler to power. Against this, it was the Great Depression that gave Hitler his mass following and carried him to power in 1933. Without the slump he might never have ruled. The Depression was a cause in its own right. The treaty alone did not raise him up.

Yet the failure of the League allowed aggression. The weakness of the League of Nations allowed the dictators to act unpunished. Its failure was a distinct cause of the war. Collective security had broken down. Its weakness let the dictators act unpunished. The League's collapse was not the fault of Versailles alone.

Yet appeasement emboldened the dictators. The policy of appeasement fed Hitler's confidence and let his aggression grow. The weakness of Britain and France was a cause apart from the treaty. Their concessions hastened the war. The concessions of Britain and France fed his confidence. Appeasement bears its own share of blame.

Yet Hitler's own ambition drove the war. Above all, it was Hitler's boundless ambition and his hunger for conquest that drove the world to war. His designs went far beyond the mere undoing of Versailles. The dictator's will was a cause in itself. His hunger for conquest reached far beyond the lost lands. The war was in great part his own making.

On balance the treaty was a major but not the sole cause. Weighing all this, Versailles was indeed a leading cause, for it bred the resentment Hitler used, yet it worked together with the Depression, the failure of the League, appeasement and Hitler's ambition. The claim is therefore only partly valid. The treaty was one great cause among several.

The claim that the Treaty of Versailles was the main cause of the Second World War is therefore only partly valid. The treaty did breed the resentment Hitler exploited and shaped his programme of aggression, yet the war owed as much to the Great Depression, the failure of the League, the policy of appeasement and Hitler's own ambition. Versailles was a leading cause, but not the only one.

Question 23

From the blitzkrieg that overran Poland to the atomic fire that consumed Hiroshima, the Second World War was fought on a scale and with a savagery the world had never seen.

Examine the course and main features of the Second World War.

Model Answer

The Second World War, fought from 1939 to 1945, was the largest and most destructive war in history. Its course and features spanned the whole globe. The course and main features of the Second World War may be examined as follows.

It began with the invasion of Poland. The war began in September 1939 when Germany invaded Poland with a swift and overwhelming blitzkrieg. Britain and France declared war two days later. The lightning war crushed Poland in weeks. The lightning war crushed Poland in a matter of weeks. The conflict had begun.

The German conquest of Europe. In 1940 Germany overran much of Europe, defeating France and driving Britain from the continent. The blitzkrieg swept all before it. Country after country fell to Hitler. France fell to the blitzkrieg in 1940. Norway, Denmark and the Low Countries were overwhelmed too. Germany dominated Europe.

The war became worldwide. The war spread far beyond Europe, into North Africa, the Middle East, Asia and the Pacific. It was fought on land, at sea and in the air across the globe. No continent was untouched. It was fought in Europe, Africa, Asia and the Pacific. It was a truly world war.

The entry of the Soviet Union and the United States. In 1941 Germany invaded the Soviet Union, and Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor brought the United States into the war. These two great powers joined the Allies. The balance of the war began to turn. Germany invaded the Soviet Union and Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. Their entry changed everything.

It was a total war. The whole resources of the nations were thrown into the war, their industry, their people and their science. Civilians laboured and suffered on a vast scale. Whole societies were mobilised for war. Industry, science and whole peoples were thrown into the struggle. It was total war carried to its extreme.

New and terrible weapons. The war saw the use of new and fearful weapons, tanks, aircraft, submarines and rockets. Cities were bombed from the air on a huge scale. Science was harnessed to destruction. Tanks, aircraft, submarines and rockets ranged across the world. Modern weapons made the war terrible.

The turning of the tide. The tide turned against the Axis at Stalingrad and in North Africa, and the Allied landings in Normandy in 1944 opened the road to victory. Germany was crushed between east and west and surrendered in May 1945. The Axis was defeated in Europe. Victory came after long struggle.

The atomic bombs and the end of the war. In August 1945 the United States dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and Japan surrendered soon after. The war ended in a blinding new terror. The atomic age had begun. Japan surrendered soon after the bombing in August 1945. The Second World War was over.

The course and main features of the Second World War were therefore its opening with the blitzkrieg on Poland, the German conquest of Europe, its spread across the world, the entry of the Soviet Union and the United States, its character as a total war fought with terrible new weapons, the turning of the tide at Stalingrad and Normandy, and its ending with the atomic bombs on Japan in 1945. It was the largest and most destructive war the world had ever known.

Question 24

The war left cities in ashes and millions dead, and from its ruins rose two superpowers, a divided world, and a new order of nations.

Examine the effects of the Second World War.

Model Answer

The Second World War ended in 1945, but its effects transformed the world. It brought unparalleled destruction and reshaped the whole international order. The effects of the Second World War may be examined as follows.

Massive loss of life. The war killed over seventy million people, soldiers and civilians alike, the greatest slaughter in history. Whole cities and populations were destroyed. The human cost was beyond reckoning. More than seventy million people perished in the war. The world was stunned by the scale of death.

The Holocaust and genocide. The Nazis murdered some six million Jews in the Holocaust, together with Roma, the disabled and political opponents. This genocide was a crime without parallel. The world recoiled in horror. Some six million Jews were murdered by the Nazis. The Holocaust stained the century forever.

The devastation of Europe and Asia. The war left the cities and economies of Europe and Asia in ruins. Whole nations had to be rebuilt from the rubble. Industry, trade and homes were destroyed. Great cities such as Warsaw, Berlin and Tokyo were laid in ruins. Millions were left homeless and hungry amid the wreckage. Vast regions lay in devastation.

The rise of the superpowers. The war raised the United States and the Soviet Union to the rank of superpowers, towering above all others. Power passed from the old states of Europe to these two giants. They now dominated the world. The United States and the Soviet Union towered above all others. A new order of power had arisen.

The beginning of the Cold War. The rivalry of the United States and the Soviet Union, capitalist and communist, gave rise to the Cold War. The world was divided into two hostile camps. This rivalry would shape the decades to come. Capitalist and communist blocs faced one another in hostility. The war ended in a new and tense division.

The decline of Europe and the old empires. The war shattered the strength of the old European powers and their hold on their colonies. Weakened and impoverished, they could no longer keep their empires. European dominance was ended. The old European powers could no longer hold their colonies. The old imperial order began to crumble.

The formation of the United Nations. Out of the war came the United Nations, founded in 1945 to keep the peace of the world. It replaced the failed League of Nations. The nations tried once more to prevent war. It was founded in 1945 to replace the failed League. The United Nations was the war's great hope.

The wave of decolonisation. The weakening of Europe and the rise of nationalism brought a wave of decolonisation, beginning with India in 1947 and reaching Africa in the following decades. Colony after colony won its freedom. The empires were dissolved. The war hastened the end of colonial rule.

The coming of the atomic age. The atomic bombs dropped on Japan opened the age of nuclear weapons. A single bomb could now destroy a city. The world lived under a new and dreadful shadow. Humanity now held in its hands the power to destroy itself. The nations lived in fear of a war that might end the world. The atomic age had begun.

Great social and economic change. The war brought vast rebuilding, aided by the American Marshall Plan, and deep social change, including the growth of the welfare state and the further advance of women. Societies were remade after the war. New economic orders arose. The war reshaped the lives of ordinary people.

The effects of the Second World War were therefore massive loss of life, the horror of the Holocaust, the devastation of Europe and Asia, the rise of the United States and the Soviet Union as superpowers, the beginning of the Cold War, the decline of the old empires, the formation of the United Nations, the wave of decolonisation, the coming of the atomic age, and deep social and economic change. The war transformed the world and ended the long mastery of Europe.

The United Nations

Question 25

Determined never to repeat the failure of the League, the victors of the Second World War built a new and stronger body to keep the peace of the world.

Examine the formation and aims of the United Nations.

Model Answer

The United Nations was founded in 1945, at the end of the Second World War, to keep the peace and to succeed where the League of Nations had failed. Its formation and aims may be examined as follows.

It grew out of the wartime alliance. The United Nations grew out of the alliance of the powers that fought the Axis in the Second World War. Its ideas were foreshadowed in the Atlantic Charter of 1941 agreed by Roosevelt and Churchill. The wartime allies planned it as they fought. The victors built it from their union.

It was drawn up at San Francisco. The Charter of the United Nations was drawn up at the San Francisco Conference of 1945, attended by fifty nations. It was signed on the twenty-sixth of June 1945 and came into force on the twenty-fourth of October. The organisation was born at the war's end. San Francisco gave the world the United Nations.

To maintain international peace and security. The first and chief aim of the United Nations was to maintain international peace and security. It was to prevent war and to settle disputes among nations. This purpose lay at the heart of the Charter. It was to prevent war and to settle disputes among nations. Peace was the reason for its being.

To develop friendly relations among nations. The United Nations sought to develop friendly relations among the nations, founded on the equal rights and self-determination of peoples. It aimed to foster cooperation and goodwill. Nations were to live together in peace. Friendship among peoples was one of its aims.

To promote human rights. The United Nations set out to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all. The dignity of the individual was to be upheld across the world. This was a new and noble purpose. The dignity of the individual was to be upheld everywhere. The protection of human rights became its concern.

To promote social and economic development. The United Nations aimed to promote social progress and better standards of life throughout the world. It sought to fight poverty, disease and ignorance. Development was to serve the peoples of the earth. Economic and social advance was among its aims.

To uphold international law and cooperation. The United Nations sought to uphold international law and to be a centre for harmonising the actions of nations. It was to bring the nations together in common tasks. Cooperation under law was its guiding principle. The United Nations became the meeting-place of the world.

The formation and aims of the United Nations therefore lay in the wartime alliance and the San Francisco Conference of 1945, and in its purposes of maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations, promoting human rights and social and economic development, and upholding international law and cooperation. Built to succeed where the League had failed, it became the great instrument of the modern search for peace.

Question 26

The United Nations rests on six great organs, from the assembly of all nations to the council where the strong hold the power of the veto.

Examine the principal organs of the United Nations.

Model Answer

The United Nations carries on its work through six principal organs, each with its own role and function. Together they make up the machinery of the organisation. The principal organs of the United Nations may be examined as follows.

The General Assembly. The General Assembly is the great debating body of the United Nations, in which every member state has a seat and one vote. It discusses the affairs of the world and passes resolutions and recommendations. It is the parliament of the nations. All members meet as equals in the Assembly.

The Security Council. The Security Council bears the chief responsibility for peace and security, and it alone can order sanctions or the use of force. It has fifteen members, of whom five are permanent, the United States, the Soviet Union, China, France and Britain, each holding the power of veto. The Council is the heart of the United Nations. Real power rests with its permanent members.

The International Court of Justice. The International Court of Justice, sitting at The Hague, settles legal disputes between states according to international law. It gives judgements and advisory opinions. It is the judicial organ of the United Nations. The Court upholds the law among nations.

The Secretariat. The Secretariat carries on the daily administration of the United Nations, headed by the Secretary-General. It serves the other organs and carries out their decisions. It is the civil service of the organisation. It carries out the decisions of the other organs. The Secretary-General is its chief officer and spokesman.

The Economic and Social Council. The Economic and Social Council, or ECOSOC, directs the economic, social and humanitarian work of the United Nations. It coordinates the specialised agencies that serve health, education and labour. It carries on much of the organisation's practical work. ECOSOC advances the welfare of the peoples.

The Trusteeship Council. The Trusteeship Council was set up to oversee the trust territories and to guide them towards self-government. It watched over lands not yet independent. As these territories gained their freedom, its work was completed. It guided the trust territories towards self-government. The Council is now largely inactive.

The principal organs of the United Nations are therefore the General Assembly, the Security Council, the International Court of Justice, the Secretariat, the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council. Through these six organs, chief among them the Security Council with its permanent members, the United Nations carries on its work for the peace and welfare of the world.

Question 27

The United Nations was the child of the League's failure, built stronger where the old body had been weak, yet haunted still by some of the same flaws.

Compare the League of Nations and the United Nations.

Model Answer

The United Nations was founded to succeed where the League of Nations had failed, and the two bodies may be usefully compared. Both sought world peace, but they differed in important ways. The League of Nations and the United Nations may be compared as follows.

Both were founded to keep world peace. Both the League and the United Nations were founded after a great world war to prevent another. Each sought to keep the peace through collective security. Their central purpose was the same. Each was founded after a great world war to prevent another. Both were born of the longing for peace.

Both rest on an assembly and a council. Both bodies were built upon a general assembly of all members and a smaller council of the great powers. Their structures were broadly alike. The United Nations followed the pattern of the League. The United Nations followed the broad pattern of the League. In form the two resembled one another.

They followed different wars. The League of Nations followed the First World War, while the United Nations followed the Second. Each was the fruit of a different catastrophe. The one gave way to the other. The League followed the First World War and the United Nations the Second. The United Nations replaced the failed League.

The United Nations included the great powers. The League was fatally weakened by the absence of the United States, but the United Nations included all the great powers from the start. The United States joined and led the new body. This gave the United Nations far greater strength. Its membership was more complete.

The United Nations has enforcement power. The League had no army and could not enforce its decisions, but the United Nations can authorise sanctions and the use of force through its Security Council. It can act where the League could only urge. This power made it stronger. The United Nations can put force behind its word.

The United Nations is wider in its work. The United Nations does far more than the League, working for development, human rights and health through its many agencies. Its work reaches into every corner of life. It is a broader body than the League. The United Nations serves the world in many ways.

The United Nations has proved more durable. The League failed within twenty years and was dissolved, but the United Nations has survived and grown for many decades. It has weathered crises that would have broken the League. Its endurance is itself an achievement. The United Nations has lasted where the League fell.

The League of Nations and the United Nations were therefore alike in their purpose of keeping world peace and in their basic structure of assembly and council, yet they differed in that the United Nations included the great powers, held real enforcement power, undertook far wider work, and has proved much more durable. Learning from the failures of the League, the United Nations became a stronger instrument of peace.

The impact of the World Wars on Africa

Question 28

Though the great wars were fought in Europe, Africa was drawn into them as a source of soldiers, labour and wealth, and emerged forever changed.

Examine how the two World Wars affected Africa.

Model Answer

Although the two World Wars were fought chiefly in Europe and Asia, they had deep effects upon Africa. The continent was drawn into the wars and changed by them. How the two World Wars affected Africa may be examined as follows.

Africans were recruited to fight. The colonial powers recruited great numbers of Africans to fight in their armies, such as the King's African Rifles. Africans served and died in both wars, in Africa and overseas. They were drawn into Europe's quarrels. The wars carried Africans far from home.

Africa supplied labour and raw materials. Africa was made to supply labour, food and raw materials for the war effort of the colonial powers. Its resources were poured into the wars. The continent laboured for its masters. Food, minerals and men were poured into the war effort. Africa's wealth fed the fighting.

It brought economic hardship. The wars brought hardship to Africa through higher taxes, forced production and rising prices. Africans were made to give more for less. The demands of war fell heavily upon them. Higher taxes and forced production fell upon the people. Hardship spread across the colonies.

African colonies became battlegrounds. Parts of Africa themselves became battlegrounds, as in East Africa in the First World War and North Africa in the Second. The fighting reached African soil. Campaigns were waged across the continent. East Africa and North Africa saw hard-fought campaigns. War came home to Africa.

Africans were exposed to new ideas. The wars carried Africans abroad and exposed them to new lands, peoples and ideas. They saw the wider world and heard talk of freedom. New horizons opened before them. Africans saw distant lands and heard talk of freedom. The wars widened the African mind.

The myth of European superiority was shattered. In the wars Africans saw Europeans fight, suffer and die like other men. The image of the all-powerful white master was broken. Europeans were shown to be mortal and fallible. Africans saw Europeans fight, suffer and die like other men. The myth of their superiority was shattered.

The wars weakened the colonial powers. The two wars exhausted and impoverished the European powers and weakened their hold on their colonies. They could no longer rule as easily as before. Their strength was drained. Exhausted and poorer, they could no longer rule as before. The wars loosened the grip of empire.

They stimulated the growth of nationalism. The grievances, ideas and experiences of the wars stirred the growth of African nationalism. Africans began to demand their freedom. The struggle for independence gathered strength. Grievances and new ideas fed the demand for freedom. The wars helped to awaken the nationalist movements.

The two World Wars therefore affected Africa deeply, drawing Africans into the fighting, taking their labour and resources, bringing economic hardship, turning parts of the continent into battlegrounds, exposing Africans to new ideas, shattering the myth of European superiority, weakening the colonial powers and stimulating the growth of nationalism. Though fought far away, the wars helped to set Africa on the road to independence.

Question 29

The soldiers who returned from fighting fascism abroad came home to find themselves still ruled as subjects, and their anger became the fuel of the independence movements.

Examine how the Second World War stimulated the growth of African nationalism.

Model Answer

The Second World War gave a powerful stimulus to the growth of African nationalism and hastened the end of colonial rule. Several ways may be traced in which it did so. How the Second World War stimulated the growth of African nationalism may be examined as follows.

The return of the ex-servicemen. The African soldiers who had fought in the war returned home changed and discontented. They had seen the world and lost their awe of the colonial masters. Their experience made them eager for change. The returning ex-servicemen swelled the ranks of the nationalists.

The shattering of the myth of European superiority. In the war Africans had seen Europeans fight, flee and die like other men. The image of the invincible white master was broken. Europeans no longer seemed all-powerful. Africans had seen Europeans flee and die like other men. This shattered myth emboldened the nationalists.

Exposure to anti-colonial ideas. The war brought Africans into contact with other colonised peoples and with ideas of freedom and self-rule. They learned that others too were struggling against empire. New ideas took root among them. They met Indians and others who sought their own freedom. The war spread the gospel of liberty.

The hypocrisy of fighting for freedom. Africans had fought in a war proclaimed as a struggle for freedom against fascism, yet they returned to be ruled as subjects. The Atlantic Charter had promised self-determination. This hypocrisy stirred deep resentment. Africans demanded the freedom they had fought for.

The weakening of the colonial powers. The war left Britain and France exhausted and impoverished, less able to hold down their colonies. The strength of the empires was broken. The powers could no longer resist as before. Britain and France emerged exhausted and impoverished. Their weakness gave the nationalists their chance.

The rise of the anti-colonial superpowers. The war raised up the United States and the Soviet Union, both of which opposed the old colonialism. Their influence pressed upon the empires. The new masters of the world favoured self-rule. The superpowers strengthened the cause of freedom.

The influence of the United Nations. The new United Nations upheld the principle of the self-determination of peoples. Its Charter gave the nationalists a powerful argument. The world body lent weight to their demands. Its Charter upheld the self-determination of peoples. The United Nations encouraged the end of empire.

The Pan-African Congress at Manchester. In 1945 the fifth Pan-African Congress met at Manchester, attended by leaders such as Nyerere, Nkrumah and Kenyatta. There they planned the strategy of decolonisation. The Congress gave the movement direction and unity. Manchester marked a turning-point for African nationalism.

Economic hardship and unfulfilled promises. The war brought hardship, and the ex-servicemen returned to unemployment and broken promises. Their disillusion turned them against colonial rule. Discontent fed the nationalist cause. The ex-servicemen returned to unemployment and broken promises. Hardship swelled the demand for change.

The Second World War therefore stimulated the growth of African nationalism through the return of the discontented ex-servicemen, the shattering of the myth of European superiority, the exposure to anti-colonial ideas, the hypocrisy of a war for freedom, the weakening of the colonial powers, the rise of the anti-colonial superpowers, the influence of the United Nations, the Pan-African Congress at Manchester in 1945, and economic hardship. Together these forces set Africa firmly on the road to independence.

Question 30

They had crossed the seas and faced death for the empire, and when they came home the ex-servicemen would not go back to being mere subjects.

Examine the contribution of ex-servicemen to the growth of African nationalism.

Model Answer

The African soldiers who served in the Second World War, the ex-servicemen, made an important contribution to the growth of nationalism on their return home. Their part in the awakening of Africa may be examined as follows.

They had gained a wider experience of the world. The ex-servicemen had travelled far beyond their homes and seen distant lands and peoples. This wide experience broadened their minds and their ambitions. They returned with new horizons. Their travels changed how they saw the world.

They had lost their awe of the white man. Having fought alongside and against Europeans, the ex-servicemen no longer held them in awe. They had seen the white man frightened, wounded and killed. The old respect for the master was gone. They had seen the white man frightened, wounded and killed. This loss of awe emboldened them.

They met other colonised peoples and their ideas. In the war the ex-servicemen met soldiers from India and other colonies who sought their own freedom. They shared in the ideas of anti-colonial struggle. New ideas of liberty took hold of them. They shared in the anti-colonial ideas of their fellow soldiers. They brought these ideas home to Africa.

They faced unemployment and broken promises. On their return the ex-servicemen found unemployment and the breaking of the promises made to them. They had risked their lives yet gained nothing. This bitter disappointment turned them against colonial rule. Their grievances made them nationalists.

They brought military training and discipline. The ex-servicemen had gained military training, discipline and organisation in the war. These skills were useful to the nationalist movements. Some would later serve in the struggle for freedom. Some would later put these skills to use in the struggle. Their training strengthened the cause.

They spread nationalist ideas. The ex-servicemen spread ideas of freedom and self-rule among their people, in speech and in writing. They stirred discontent with colonial rule. Their voices carried weight in their communities. They wrote and spoke against colonial rule among their people. They became messengers of nationalism.

They joined and led political movements. Many ex-servicemen joined the nationalist parties and some rose to lead them. They swelled the ranks of the independence movements. Their energy and grievance drove the cause forward. The ex-servicemen became soldiers of the nationalist struggle.

The ex-servicemen therefore contributed greatly to the growth of African nationalism, for they had gained a wider experience of the world, lost their awe of the white man, met other colonised peoples, faced unemployment and broken promises, brought military training, spread nationalist ideas and joined and led political movements. Their return turned the discontent bred by the war into a force for African freedom.

The significance of the wars and conflicts

Question 31

The two World Wars were fought to decide the mastery of Europe, but their deepest result was to end Europe's mastery of the world.

"The two World Wars ended Europe's mastery of the world." Discuss.

Model Answer

The claim that the two World Wars ended Europe's mastery of the world holds that the great conflicts of the twentieth century destroyed the dominance the European powers had long enjoyed. The claim has much force, as may be shown by considering their effects. This may be discussed as follows.

The wars devastated Europe. The two World Wars twice ruined the cities, economies and peoples of Europe. The continent that had ruled the world lay in ruins. Its wealth and strength were consumed in war. Twice its cities and economies were reduced to ruins. Devastation broke the power of Europe.

They exhausted the old powers. The wars exhausted the old great powers, Britain, France and Germany alike. Drained of men and money, they could no longer dominate as before. Their strength was spent in the struggle. Britain, France and Germany were drained of men and money. The wars left the old powers weakened.

They raised up the non-European superpowers. The wars raised the United States and the Soviet Union above all the states of Europe. Power passed from the old continent to these two giants. The centre of the world shifted away from Europe. The United States and the Soviet Union rose above them all. New masters arose outside it.

They shattered the prestige of Europe. The spectacle of Europeans slaughtering one another and suffering defeat shattered the prestige on which their rule had rested. The myth of European superiority was broken. Colonised peoples lost their awe of the powers. Europe's moral authority was destroyed.

They weakened the hold on the colonies. The wars so weakened the European powers that they could no longer hold down their colonies against the rising tide of nationalism. Their grip on empire loosened. They lacked the strength to resist. They could no longer resist the rising tide of nationalism. The wars undid the hold of empire.

They brought the wave of decolonisation. In the years after the Second World War, colony after colony won its freedom, from India in 1947 to the nations of Africa. The great empires were dissolved. The age of European empire came to an end. India won its freedom in 1947 and Africa soon followed. Decolonisation swept the world.

They gave rise to a new world order. The wars gave birth to a new order of superpowers, the United Nations and the Cold War. The world was reshaped around new centres of power. The old European order was gone. The United Nations and the Cold War shaped the new age. A new age had begun.

On balance the claim is valid. Weighing all this, the two World Wars did indeed end Europe's mastery of the world, for they exhausted the old powers, raised up new ones and dissolved the empires. Europe never regained its former dominance. The claim is therefore largely valid. The wars closed the age of European supremacy.

The two World Wars did therefore end Europe's mastery of the world, for they devastated and exhausted the old powers, raised the United States and the Soviet Union to supremacy, shattered European prestige, loosened the hold on the colonies and brought the great wave of decolonisation. Out of the wars arose a

new world order of superpowers and a United Nations, in which the long dominance of Europe was finally ended.

Question 32

Beneath the flags and the ideologies, the wars and conflicts of this age were driven by a single engine, the restless rivalry of the capitalist powers for the wealth of the world.

"The wars and conflicts from the late nineteenth century to the 1940s sprang above all from the rivalry of the capitalist powers." How valid is this claim?

Model Answer

The claim that the wars and conflicts of this period sprang above all from the rivalry of the capitalist powers sees imperialism and the competition for markets and colonies as the root of the age's conflicts. The claim has much force, though other causes also played their part. This may be discussed as follows.

Imperial rivalry drove the partition of Africa. The scramble for and partition of Africa sprang directly from the rivalry of the capitalist powers for raw materials, markets and fields for their surplus capital. The factories and financiers of Europe drove the seizure of the continent. Capitalist competition carved up Africa. Here the claim is plainly borne out.

Capitalist competition underlay the First World War. The rivalry of the powers for colonies and markets was among the deepest causes of the First World War. Germany's challenge to the empires of Britain and France sprang from economic ambition. The war grew in part from the struggle for the world's wealth. Capitalist rivalry helped to bring it on.

The search for empire drove the aggression of the 1930s. The aggression of Japan, Italy and Germany in the 1930s was driven in large part by the hunger for raw materials, markets and living space. Poor in resources, they sought empire by conquest. Economic want drove their expansion. The rivalry for wealth underlay the road to the Second World War.

The Great Depression, a crisis of capitalism, bred war. The Great Depression, a crisis of the capitalist system itself, raised up the dictators and drove the world towards the Second World War. Economic collapse bred the extremism that ended in war. The failure of capitalism prepared the conflict. In this too the claim holds good.

Lenin traced war to the highest stage of capitalism. Lenin argued that imperialism was the highest stage of capitalism and that the powers, having divided the world, must fight to redivide it. On this view the wars of the age were the inevitable fruit of capitalist rivalry. This interpretation lends weight to the claim. It sees war as rooted in the system itself.

Yet nationalism was a powerful cause in its own right. Against this, a fierce nationalism, not reducible to economics alone, inflamed the peoples and drove them to war. National pride and hatred had a force of their own. The claim must be qualified by the power of nationalism. Not every cause was economic.

Yet the ambitions of the dictators drove the second war. The Second World War owed much to the personal ambition and racial ideology of Hitler, which went beyond mere economic rivalry. Individual will and belief shaped the course of events. The dictators' designs were a cause apart. The claim cannot explain everything.

On balance the claim is largely valid. Weighing all this, the rivalry of the capitalist powers was indeed the deepest root of the conflicts of the age, from the partition of Africa to the Second World War. Yet it worked together with nationalism and the ambitions of individual men. The claim is therefore largely, though not wholly, valid. Capitalist rivalry was the deepest root, but not the only cause.

The claim that the wars and conflicts of this period sprang above all from the rivalry of the capitalist powers is therefore largely valid, for imperial and economic rivalry drove the partition of Africa, underlay the First World War, fuelled the aggression of the 1930s, and, through the Great Depression, helped to bring on the Second World War. Yet the claim must be qualified by the independent force of nationalism and the

ambitions of individual dictators, so that capitalist rivalry was the deepest root of the age's conflicts, though not their only cause.

Question 33

The two World Wars were fought to decide the mastery of Europe, but their deepest result was to end Europe's mastery of the world.

"The two World Wars ended Europe's mastery of the world." Discuss.

Model Answer

The claim that the two World Wars ended Europe's mastery of the world holds that the great conflicts of the twentieth century destroyed the dominance the European powers had long enjoyed. The claim has much force, as may be shown by considering their effects. This may be discussed as follows.

The wars devastated Europe. The two World Wars twice ruined the cities, economies and peoples of Europe. The continent that had ruled the world lay in ruins. Its wealth and strength were consumed in war. Twice its cities and economies were reduced to ruins. Devastation broke the power of Europe.

They exhausted the old powers. The wars exhausted the old great powers, Britain, France and Germany alike. Drained of men and money, they could no longer dominate as before. Their strength was spent in the struggle. Britain, France and Germany were drained of men and money. The wars left the old powers weakened.

They raised up the non-European superpowers. The wars raised the United States and the Soviet Union above all the states of Europe. Power passed from the old continent to these two giants. The centre of the world shifted away from Europe. The United States and the Soviet Union rose above them all. New masters arose outside it.

They shattered the prestige of Europe. The spectacle of Europeans slaughtering one another and suffering defeat shattered the prestige on which their rule had rested. The myth of European superiority was broken. Colonised peoples lost their awe of the powers. Europe's moral authority was destroyed.

They weakened the hold on the colonies. The wars so weakened the European powers that they could no longer hold down their colonies against the rising tide of nationalism. Their grip on empire loosened. They lacked the strength to resist. They could no longer resist the rising tide of nationalism. The wars undid the hold of empire.

They brought the wave of decolonisation. In the years after the Second World War, colony after colony won its freedom, from India in 1947 to the nations of Africa. The great empires were dissolved. The age of European empire came to an end. India won its freedom in 1947 and Africa soon followed. Decolonisation swept the world.

They gave rise to a new world order. The wars gave birth to a new order of superpowers, the United Nations and the Cold War. The world was reshaped around new centres of power. The old European order was gone. The United Nations and the Cold War shaped the new age. A new age had begun.

On balance the claim is valid. Weighing all this, the two World Wars did indeed end Europe's mastery of the world, for they exhausted the old powers, raised up new ones and dissolved the empires. Europe never regained its former dominance. The claim is therefore largely valid. The wars closed the age of European supremacy.

The two World Wars did therefore end Europe's mastery of the world, for they devastated and exhausted the old powers, raised the United States and the Soviet Union to supremacy, shattered European prestige, loosened the hold on the colonies and brought the great wave of decolonisation. Out of the wars arose a new world order of superpowers and a United Nations, in which the long dominance of Europe was finally ended.

Chapter 3

COLD WAR POLITICS AND THE ARMS RACE

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 origins of the Cold War

Question 1

The two victors of the Second World War never fired a shot at one another, yet for more than forty years they held the whole world in the grip of their enmity.

Explain the meaning and main features of the Cold War.

Model Answer

The Cold War was the state of tension, hostility and rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, and their allies, that lasted from the end of the Second World War in 1945 until about 1991, without direct fighting between the two powers. It showed itself in every field short of open war between them. The meaning and main features of the Cold War may be explained as follows.

It was a war without direct fighting. The Cold War was a conflict in which the two superpowers never fought each other directly with their own armies. Instead they struggled by every other means, political, economic, propagandist and military. The peace between them was an armed and hostile one, watched over by vast forces that were never unleashed against each other. It was a war in everything but open battle, and for that reason it was called cold rather than hot.

It was a rivalry of two superpowers. At its heart stood the United States and the Soviet Union, the two giants that emerged from the Second World War far stronger than any other state. Each led a great bloc of allied and dependent nations, and each sought to weaken and outdo the other. The world was divided between them and their quarrels. The Cold War was above all their contest for the mastery of the globe.

It was a clash of ideologies. The struggle set capitalism and liberal democracy, led by the United States, against communism, led by the Soviet Union. Each side believed that its system was the better and must in the end triumph over the other. This gave the rivalry the bitterness of a crusade rather than a mere quarrel of states. The Cold War was a war of two opposed ways of life.

It divided the world into two blocs. The powers gathered their allies into two hostile camps, the Western bloc and the Eastern bloc, separated by what Churchill called the iron curtain. Europe above all was split in two, its eastern half communist and its western half capitalist. Each bloc armed, traded and organised against the other. The division of the world into two camps was a chief feature of the Cold War.

It was waged by propaganda and espionage. Each side used propaganda, spying and subversion to win support and to undermine the other. Radio, film, the press and the schools were turned into weapons, and secret services such as the American CIA and the Soviet KGB worked across the world. Each painted the other as the enemy of mankind. The Cold War was fought in the mind as much as on the map.

It produced a costly arms race. The rivalry drove the powers into a race to build ever more and deadlier weapons, above all nuclear bombs and the missiles to carry them. Each strove to outmatch the other, until between them they held enough weapons to destroy the world many times over. The world lived under the shadow of the bomb. The arms race was among the most dangerous features of the Cold War.

It was fought through proxy wars. Unable to fight each other directly without risking nuclear ruin, the powers backed opposing sides in wars across the world, from Korea and Vietnam to Angola and Afghanistan. These proxy wars carried the Cold War into Asia, Africa and Latin America. Local conflicts became battlegrounds of the superpowers. The Cold War was global in its reach, though its centre lay in Europe.

The Cold War was therefore a war without direct fighting, a rivalry of two superpowers, a clash of ideologies that divided the world into two hostile blocs, waged by propaganda and espionage, driven by an

arms race, and fought through proxy wars across the globe. It was the defining conflict of the second half of the twentieth century, holding the world in fear of a war that never quite came.

Question 2

The war that ruined the old powers of Europe left two new giants standing astride the world, each strong enough to challenge all the rest.

Account for the rise of the United States and the Soviet Union as superpowers after the Second World War.

Model Answer

After the Second World War the United States and the Soviet Union emerged as superpowers, states of such military and economic strength that they overshadowed all others. Several developments raised them to this position. The reasons for the rise of the United States and the Soviet Union as superpowers may be accounted for as follows.

The decline of the old European powers. The war had exhausted and all but ruined Britain, France and Germany, the powers that had once ruled much of the world. Their economies were shattered, their cities in rubble, and their empires beginning to crumble under the strain. Into the space they left stepped the two new giants. The fall of the old powers opened the way for the rise of the superpowers.

The industrial strength of the United States. The United States came out of the war with by far the strongest economy in the world, its industry swollen by war production and its homeland untouched by any fighting. It alone possessed the atomic bomb and produced almost half of the world's manufactures. This vast wealth and industry underpinned its power. Economic might made the United States the foremost superpower.

The great military power of both states. Both powers ended the war with huge armed forces and immense military strength. The United States held the atomic bomb and a mighty navy and air force, while the Soviet Union commanded the largest army in the world, its soldiers spread across Eastern Europe. Their arms dwarfed those of every other state. Military strength raised the two far above all rivals.

The territorial expansion of the Soviet Union. The Red Army had driven the Germans back across Eastern Europe and occupied it as the war ended in 1945. The Soviet Union thus controlled a broad belt of states from the Baltic to the Balkans, which it bound to itself as satellites. This great expansion added much to its strength. Control of Eastern Europe made the Soviet Union a superpower.

The command of new weapons and science. Both powers commanded advanced science and the deadliest weapons of the age. The United States led in atomic arms from 1945, and the Soviet Union built and tested its own bomb by 1949. Each poured its wealth into rockets, aircraft and research. Mastery of modern weapons and science set the two apart and marked them as superpowers.

The leadership of two rival blocs. Each power gathered allied and dependent states around it, the United States leading the West and the Soviet Union the East. Leading these great blocs, and binding them by aid, trade and arms, multiplied the strength and reach of each. Each now spoke for half the world. Bloc leadership confirmed their standing as superpowers.

The vacuum left by a shattered world. The collapse of Germany and Japan, and the exhaustion of the other victors, left a vacuum in world affairs that only the two giants could fill. They alone had the strength and the wealth to shape the post-war order. The nations looked to one or the other to lead and protect them. The general weakness of others raised the two to supremacy.

The United States and the Soviet Union therefore rose to be superpowers through the decline of the old European powers, the industrial strength of the United States, the great military power of both, the territorial expansion of the Soviet Union, their command of new weapons and science, their leadership of rival blocs, and the vacuum left by a shattered world. Two powers now stood above all others, and their rivalry would shape the age.

Question 3

Even before the guns of the Second World War fell silent, the alliance that had won it was already breaking apart into suspicion and fear.

Examine the causes of the Cold War.

Model Answer

The Cold War, the hostility between the United States and the Soviet Union that followed the Second World War, sprang from a combination of deep differences and immediate quarrels. Several causes brought it about. The causes of the Cold War may be examined as follows.

The clash of ideologies. The two powers held opposed and hostile beliefs, the United States championing capitalism and democracy and the Soviet Union communism and one-party rule. Each regarded the other's system as a threat that must be resisted and, in time, overcome. This deep ideological gulf divided them from the very start. The clash of ideologies lay at the root of the Cold War.

The wartime alliance was one of convenience. The United States and the Soviet Union had joined together only to defeat Hitler, not out of any true friendship or shared purpose. They had been enemies before the war, and their old distrust returned as soon as the common foe was gone. The alliance had covered their differences but never healed them. Its collapse in 1945 laid bare the rivalry beneath.

Soviet expansion in Eastern Europe. As the war ended, the Red Army occupied Eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union installed communist governments from Poland to Bulgaria. The West saw this as an aggressive expansion that broke the wartime promise of free elections made at Yalta. Soviet control of the region alarmed and angered the West. This expansion was a leading cause of the Cold War.

The mutual fear and suspicion of the powers. Each side deeply distrusted the aims of the other, and read every move as a threat. The Soviet Union feared encirclement and invasion by the capitalist West, as had happened before, while the West feared the spread of communism across Europe and beyond. This mutual suspicion poisoned every dealing between them. Fear drove the two powers steadily apart.

The atomic bomb. The United States built and used the atomic bomb against Japan in 1945 without sharing its secret with its Soviet ally. The Soviet Union saw this as a threat meant to overawe it, and raced to build a bomb of its own, which it tested in 1949. The bomb bred fear and a deadly new rivalry. Atomic weapons deepened the hostility between the powers.

The disputes at Yalta and Potsdam. At the wartime conferences of Yalta and Potsdam in 1945 the powers quarrelled over the future of Germany and of Eastern Europe. Promises made there were soon broken, above all the pledge of free elections in Poland. What had been agreed in words fell apart in practice. The failure of the conferences helped to bring on the Cold War.

The question of Germany. The powers could not agree on what to do with defeated Germany, which lay divided among their armies. The West wished to rebuild it as a barrier against communism, while the Soviet Union wished to keep it weak and to draw heavy reparations from it. Germany became a bitter bone of contention. The German question was a major cause of the Cold War.

The Truman Doctrine and containment. In 1947 President Truman declared that the United States would help any nation resisting communism, beginning with Greece and Turkey. This policy of containment set American power squarely against Soviet expansion. The Soviet Union saw it as open hostility and a challenge. The Truman Doctrine hardened the division of the world and marked the open beginning of the Cold War.

The division of Europe by the iron curtain. Europe was divided by what Churchill in 1946 called an iron curtain, drawn between the free West and the communist East. The two halves became hostile camps that faced each other in arms across the continent. This division was both a cause and a symbol of the rivalry. A divided Europe set the powers against one another.

The hostility of leaders and propaganda. The suspicion of leaders such as Stalin, Truman and Churchill, and the hostile propaganda of both sides, deepened the quarrel. Each government portrayed the other as an

enemy bent on the ruin of mankind. Distrust was fed daily by word and image across the divide. The leaders and their propaganda helped to bring on the Cold War.

The Cold War therefore sprang from the clash of ideologies, the hollowness of the wartime alliance, Soviet expansion in Eastern Europe, mutual fear and suspicion, the atomic bomb, the disputes at Yalta and Potsdam, the question of Germany, the Truman Doctrine of containment, the division of Europe by the iron curtain, and the hostility of the leaders and their propaganda. Deep differences and bitter quarrels together turned the victors of one war into the rivals of the next.

Question 4

Some call the Cold War a quarrel of beliefs and others a mere struggle for power, yet the two can hardly be pulled apart.

"The Cold War was caused above all by ideological differences." How far do you agree with this statement?

Model Answer

The statement holds that the deepest cause of the Cold War was the clash between capitalism and communism. It is partly true, for ideology divided the powers profoundly, yet other causes, above all the struggle for power and security, were equally important. How far the Cold War was caused by ideological differences may be examined as follows.

Ideology divided the two powers to the root. Capitalism and communism were wholly opposed systems, each claiming to hold the future of mankind. The United States stood for private property, free markets and democracy, the Soviet Union for common ownership and one-party rule. Each saw the other's creed as a mortal threat to be resisted. This clash of beliefs shaped the whole rivalry, so that ideology was indeed a deep cause of the Cold War.

Ideology shaped the policies of both sides. Communism preached world revolution and the overthrow of capitalism, which frightened the West, while the Western defence of capitalism and democracy alarmed the Soviet Union. The actions of each side flowed from its beliefs, and containment itself was aimed squarely at an ideology. Belief drove policy on both sides. Ideology gave the Cold War its aims as well as its bitterness.

Ideology made compromise difficult. Because each side believed that its system was right and must finally prevail, neither could easily settle or share the world with the other. The quarrel became a matter of faith and principle, not merely of interest, which left little room for bargaining. This hardened and prolonged the conflict. Ideological conviction helped to make the Cold War so lasting.

Yet the struggle for power was equally important. The two states were rival great powers who would have competed whatever their beliefs, as great powers had always done throughout history. Each sought security and mastery in the vacuum left by the war, filling the space that Germany and Japan had left. Power, and not only principle, drove them on. The Cold War was also a plain contest for supremacy.

Fears for security drove the rivalry. The Soviet Union sought a belt of friendly states in Eastern Europe to guard against another invasion from the West, having twice been invaded through it. The West in turn feared Soviet expansion across a weakened Europe. These fears owed as much to security as to ideology. Self-defence was a powerful motive, so security was a leading cause of the Cold War.

Particular disputes sharpened the quarrel. Concrete quarrels over Germany, Poland, reparations and the atomic bomb set the powers openly at odds after 1945. These were disputes of interest and advantage as much as of belief. Each unsettled question became a fresh cause of anger between them. They turned a general rivalry into open hostility, so that real quarrels, and not ideas alone, brought on the Cold War.

Ideology and power cannot be separated. In truth the two were bound together, for each power's ideology defined its interests, and each interest was clothed in the language of ideology. To ask which came first is to divide what was really one thing. The Cold War was a struggle of power and principle at once. Belief and interest worked together throughout the conflict.

The Cold War was therefore caused in large measure by ideological differences, which divided the powers, shaped their policies and made compromise hard, yet the struggle for power, the fears for security, and the concrete disputes over Germany and Eastern Europe were equally important. Since ideology and interest were bound together, it is truest to say that the Cold War arose from both, and that ideology was a leading cause rather than the only one.

Question 5

The two giants that divided the world were opposites in almost everything, in what they believed, in how they ruled, and in the world each hoped to build.

Compare the aims and ideologies of the United States and the Soviet Union in the Cold War.

Model Answer

The Cold War was, at its heart, a contest between the opposed aims and ideologies of the United States and the Soviet Union. To understand the rivalry, one must set the two powers side by side. The aims and ideologies of the United States and the Soviet Union may be compared as follows.

Capitalism against communism. The United States stood for capitalism, in which property and business are held privately, while the Soviet Union stood for communism, in which the state owns all. This was the deepest of all their differences. Each held its own system to be the future of mankind. Capitalism against communism was the very heart of the contest.

Democracy against one-party rule. The United States upheld democracy, with many parties and free elections, while the Soviet Union held to the rule of a single communist party. The one prized political freedom, the other order and unity. Their systems of government were wholly opposed. Democracy against one-party rule divided the two powers.

Freedom against equality. The United States prized individual freedom above all, while the Soviet Union prized equality and the common good. Each accused the other of neglecting what it most valued. Their highest ideals stood in opposition. Freedom against equality set the two powers apart.

Different aims in the world. The United States sought to spread capitalism and democracy and to contain communism, while the Soviet Union sought to spread communism and to guard itself against the West. Each aimed at a world made in its own image. Their aims in the world were directly opposed. Different aims drove the whole rivalry.

Different economic systems. The American economy was one of free markets and private enterprise, while the Soviet economy was centrally planned by the state. Each pointed to its own as the surer road to prosperity. Their economies rested on opposite principles. Different economic systems marked the two powers apart.

Both sought security and supremacy. Yet both powers were alike in seeking security and supremacy in the world. Each feared the other and armed itself against it. In this ambition the two were much the same. Both sought security and supremacy, however different their creeds.

Both led great blocs. Both powers were alike in leading great blocs of allied states, the West and the East. Each bound its allies to itself by aid, trade and arms. In this role the two mirrored one another. Both led and spoke for great blocs of nations.

Both believed their system must prevail. Both powers were alike in believing that their own system must in the end prevail over the other. Each saw the struggle as one that only one of them could win. This shared conviction made the rivalry bitter and long. Both believed that their system must finally triumph.

The aims and ideologies of the United States and the Soviet Union were therefore opposed in their systems, capitalism against communism, democracy against one-party rule, freedom against equality, and in their aims and economies, yet the two were alike in seeking security and supremacy, in leading great blocs, and in believing that their own system must prevail. The two giants were opposites in almost everything, and it was this deep opposition, joined to their common ambition, that drove the Cold War.

The manifestations of the Cold War

Question 6

The Cold War could not be seen on any single battlefield, yet its signs were written across the whole face of the world.

Examine the main manifestations of the Cold War.

Model Answer

The manifestations of the Cold War were the many ways in which the hostility between the two superpowers showed itself, short of direct war between them. These signs appeared in politics, in economics and in arms across the world. The main manifestations of the Cold War may be examined as follows.

The division of the world into two blocs. The world split into a Western bloc led by the United States and an Eastern bloc led by the Soviet Union, and many nations were pressed to choose between them. Each bloc gathered allies and clients around it, and Europe was divided by the iron curtain. The globe was thus split into two hostile camps. This division was the clearest sign of the Cold War.

The policy of containment. The United States sought to contain communism and to stop its spread beyond where it already existed, above all through the Truman Doctrine of 1947. It pledged aid and, where needed, force to any nation resisting communist advance, from Greece and Turkey to Korea and Vietnam. Containment shaped Western policy for four decades. It was a leading manifestation of the Cold War.

The use of economic weapons. The United States poured aid into Western Europe through the Marshall Plan of 1947, while the Soviet Union bound Eastern Europe to itself through Comecon. Economic aid, trade and loans became tools of rivalry, used to hold each bloc and to win new friends. Each side used its wealth as a weapon. Economics was a battlefield of the Cold War.

Rival military alliances. The powers built opposing military alliances, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation in 1949 and the Warsaw Pact in 1955. Each bound its members to common defence and set great armies facing one another across the iron curtain. The two blocs stood armed and ready for war throughout the conflict. These alliances embodied the armed division of the world.

The arms race. The powers raced to build ever more and deadlier weapons, above all nuclear bombs and the missiles to carry them across the world. Each strove to outmatch the other, until between them they could destroy the world many times over. The world lived under the constant threat of the bomb. The arms race was among the most dangerous manifestations of the Cold War.

The space race. The rivalry spread even to the heavens, as the powers competed to be first in the conquest of space. The Soviet Union launched the satellite Sputnik in 1957 and put the first man in space in 1961, and the United States landed men on the moon in 1969. Space became a stage for the contest. The space race displayed the Cold War to the whole world.

Propaganda and espionage. Each side waged a ceaseless war of propaganda and spied endlessly on the other. Radio, film and the press spread each side's message and blackened the other, while spy services such as the CIA and the KGB worked across the globe. Each sought to win minds and to steal secrets. Propaganda and espionage were constant signs of the Cold War.

Proxy wars across the world. The powers backed opposing sides in wars far from their own soil, in Korea, Vietnam, the Middle East and Africa. These proxy wars let them struggle without facing each other directly and risking nuclear war. Local conflicts became Cold War battlegrounds, fed by foreign arms and money. Proxy wars carried the rivalry across the globe.

Crises that threatened open war. The Cold War threw up crises that brought the world to the very edge of war, above all the Berlin blockade of 1948 and the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. Each crisis tested the nerve of the powers and the strength of the balance of terror. The world held its breath as the two giants faced each other. These crises were the sharpest manifestations of the Cold War.

The manifestations of the Cold War were therefore the division of the world into two blocs, the policy of containment, the use of economic weapons such as the Marshall Plan and Comecon, rival military alliances, the arms race and the space race, propaganda and espionage, proxy wars, and crises that brought the world to the brink of war. In all these ways the hostility of the superpowers made itself felt without their ever meeting in open battle.

Question 7

Faced with a creed it believed was bent on conquering the world, the United States resolved not to defeat communism by arms but to pen it in.

Examine the American policy of containment.

Model Answer

Containment was the American policy of preventing the spread of communism beyond where it already existed, adopted at the beginning of the Cold War. It guided the United States for much of the conflict. The American policy of containment may be examined as follows.

The meaning of containment. Containment was the policy of holding communism within its existing bounds and preventing it from spreading any further. The United States would resist communist advance wherever it threatened, by aid, by alliances or by arms. It aimed not to destroy communism by war but to confine it until it weakened. Containment was the guiding idea of American Cold War policy.

Its origin in the ideas of George Kennan. The policy grew from the writings of the American diplomat George Kennan, who in 1947 urged a firm and patient resistance to Soviet expansion. He argued that communism, if contained and denied fresh conquests, would in time weaken and change from within. His ideas shaped official thinking in Washington. Kennan gave containment its reasoning and its name.

The Truman Doctrine of 1947. President Truman declared in 1947 that the United States would help any free people resisting communism, beginning with aid to Greece and Turkey. This Truman Doctrine put containment into action and committed American power and money against communist advance. It marked a decisive turn in American policy. The doctrine was the foundation of containment.

The Marshall Plan. Through the Marshall Plan of 1947, the United States gave billions of dollars to rebuild the shattered economies of Western Europe and to shield them from communism. A prosperous Europe, it was held, would resist the appeal of communism far better than a hungry one. Aid thus became a weapon of containment. The plan strengthened the West against the Soviet Union.

Military alliances. Containment was backed by military alliances, above all the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation of 1949, which bound the United States and its allies together. These alliances pledged their members to resist any communist attack with their combined strength. Arms and treaties reinforced the policy. Alliances gave containment its military teeth across Europe and beyond.

Its application across the world. Containment was applied far beyond Europe, in Korea, Vietnam, the Middle East and elsewhere, wherever communism seemed to advance. The United States fought long and costly wars in its name, and armed friendly governments across the Third World. The policy grew ever more global in its reach. Containment drew America into conflicts across the whole world.

Its successes. Containment helped to hold Western Europe, Greece, Turkey, Japan and South Korea out of communist hands. Communism was kept from spreading further in these regions, which prospered under Western protection. These lands remained free and prosperous allies of the United States. The policy secured much of the world for the West, and in this it largely succeeded.

Its costs and failures. Containment also drew the United States into costly and unpopular wars, above all in Vietnam, where after years of fighting it failed. It strained American wealth, unity and prestige, and at times led it to prop up cruel dictators merely because they were anti-communist. Not every application succeeded. Containment won much, but at a heavy price.

The American policy of containment therefore aimed to confine communism within its existing bounds, drawing on the ideas of George Kennan and expressed through the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan

and military alliances, and applied across the world from Europe to Asia. It secured much of the world for the West, yet drew the United States into costly wars such as Vietnam, so that it succeeded greatly but at a heavy price.

Question 8

With Europe in ruins and hunger breeding despair, the United States spent a fortune to rebuild the West, and bound it to itself in the doing.

Assess the aims and effects of the Marshall Plan.

Model Answer

The Marshall Plan, or European Recovery Programme, was the great scheme of American aid announced in 1947 to rebuild the shattered economies of Western Europe after the Second World War. It served both generous and strategic aims. The aims and effects of the Marshall Plan may be assessed as follows.

To rebuild the war-torn economies of Europe. The chief aim was to restore the economies of Western Europe, which lay ruined and impoverished after the war. Some thirteen billion dollars were given to rebuild industry, farming, trade and transport. A prosperous and stable Europe was the goal. Recovery from the ruin of war was the first purpose of the Marshall Plan.

To halt the spread of communism. The United States feared that poverty, hunger and despair would drive the peoples of Europe towards communism, as strong communist parties already existed in France and Italy. By restoring prosperity, the plan aimed to remove the very soil in which communism grew. It was thus a weapon of containment. Checking the spread of communism was a central aim.

To create markets for American goods. A rebuilt and prosperous Europe would be able to buy American manufactures, machinery and food, which served the interests of American trade and industry. Much of the aid was in fact spent on American goods, so that it returned home as orders. The plan opened wide markets for the United States. Economic gain for America was among its aims.

To bind Western Europe to the United States. By making Europe depend on American aid and goodwill, the plan drew the Western nations firmly into the American camp. It tied their recovery and their future to the United States in the Cold War. It thus helped to build a bloc under American leadership. Winning political influence over Western Europe was an aim of the plan.

It brought the swift recovery of Western Europe. The plan revived the economies of Western Europe, which recovered swiftly through the late 1940s and the 1950s. Industry and trade flourished again, production climbed above pre-war levels, and living standards rose. Western Europe was restored to health and confidence within a few years. This swift recovery was the plan's greatest effect.

It strengthened the West against communism. By restoring prosperity and hope, the plan weakened the appeal of communism in Western Europe, and the communist parties there lost ground and support. The Western nations grew stable, contented and firmly anti-communist. The West was thus held securely for the American bloc. The plan checked the spread of communism, exactly as intended.

It deepened the division of Europe. The Soviet Union forbade the states of Eastern Europe to take Marshall aid, and set up Comecon in reply to bind them to itself. Europe was thus split more sharply into two separate economic camps, a prosperous West and a controlled East. The plan hardened the iron curtain. It deepened the division of the Cold War.

It confirmed American leadership of the West. The plan made the United States the leader, paymaster and protector of Western Europe. American influence over the affairs of the West was secured for a generation to come, and gratitude bound the nations to Washington. It cemented the bloc under American leadership. The Marshall Plan confirmed the United States as the head of the Western world.

The Marshall Plan therefore aimed to rebuild the economies of Western Europe, to halt the spread of communism, to create markets for American goods and to bind Europe to the United States, and its effects were the swift recovery of the West, the checking of communism, the deepening of Europe's division, and

the confirming of American leadership. It was at once an act of generosity and a masterstroke of Cold War strategy, and it largely achieved both its humane and its political aims.

Question 9

For every move the West made in Europe, the Soviet Union answered with one of its own, until the continent stood locked in two hostile camps.

Examine the Soviet response to American policy in Europe.

Model Answer

To the American policies of containment, the Marshall Plan and Western alliance, the Soviet Union answered with measures of its own to bind Eastern Europe to itself and to resist the West. These responses hardened the division of the continent. The Soviet response to American policy in Europe may be examined as follows.

The tightening of control over Eastern Europe. The Soviet Union fastened its grip on the states of Eastern Europe, installing loyal communist governments from Poland to Bulgaria after the war. These became satellite states, obedient to Moscow in policy and in arms. Eastern Europe was welded into a single Soviet bloc behind the iron curtain. This control was the foundation of the whole Soviet response.

The founding of Cominform in 1947. The Soviet Union set up the Communist Information Bureau, or Cominform, in 1947 to bind together the communist parties of Europe under its direction. It coordinated their policies and enforced obedience to Moscow's line. It was the Soviet answer to the Western drive, tightening the communist ranks. Cominform united the Eastern bloc politically and ideologically.

The founding of Comecon in 1949. In direct reply to the Marshall Plan, the Soviet Union created the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, or Comecon, in 1949. It bound the economies of Eastern Europe to the Soviet Union and to one another, and shut them off from Western aid. It was the Eastern answer to Western wealth. Comecon tied the bloc together economically.

The Berlin blockade of 1948. When the West moved to unite and rebuild its zones of Germany, the Soviet Union blockaded West Berlin in 1948, cutting off its supplies by road and rail. It sought to force the Western powers out of the city, which lay deep inside the Soviet zone. The blockade was a direct and daring challenge to Western policy. It was among the boldest of the Soviet responses.

The building of the Warsaw Pact in 1955. When West Germany was rearmed and admitted to the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation in 1955, the Soviet Union answered by forming the Warsaw Pact that same year. This bound the Soviet Union and the communist states of Eastern Europe into a single military alliance. The two blocs now faced each other in arms. The Warsaw Pact was the Eastern answer to NATO.

The crushing of revolts within the bloc. The Soviet Union put down risings against its control by force, sending in its tanks to crush the Hungarian revolt of 1956 and the Czechoslovak reform movement of 1968. It would not allow any satellite to break away or to soften communism. Force held the Eastern bloc together. This showed the Soviet resolve to keep its hold on Eastern Europe.

The building of the Berlin Wall in 1961. To stop the flight of its people to the West through Berlin, the Soviet Union and East Germany built the Berlin Wall in 1961. It sealed off West Berlin behind concrete and wire and stemmed the great drain of refugees. The wall became the very symbol of the divided world. It was a stark answer to the westward pull of freedom.

The Soviet response to American policy in Europe therefore lay in tightening control over Eastern Europe, founding Cominform and Comecon, blockading Berlin in 1948, building the Warsaw Pact in 1955, crushing revolts in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, and raising the Berlin Wall in 1961. Move for move, the Soviet Union answered the West, and in doing so fastened the division of Europe into two armed and hostile camps.

Question 10

Two great alliances rose face to face across the iron curtain, and between them they armed the whole of Europe for a war they hoped would never come.

Examine the formation and roles of NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

Model Answer

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation and the Warsaw Pact were the two great military alliances of the Cold War, the one led by the United States and the other by the Soviet Union. They embodied the armed division of the world. The formation and roles of NATO and the Warsaw Pact may be examined as follows.

The formation of NATO in 1949. The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation was formed in 1949 by the United States, Canada and ten Western European states. It was created to defend the West against the growing power of the Soviet Union, in the shadow of the Berlin blockade. It bound its twelve members to their common defence. NATO was the military shield of the Western bloc.

The principle of collective defence. NATO rested on the principle that an attack upon one member was to be treated as an attack upon all. Its members pledged to come to one another's aid against any aggression. This bound the West together in a single system of defence and committed American power to Europe. Collective defence was the very heart of the alliance.

The role of the United States in NATO. Through NATO the United States committed its power, including its nuclear arms, to the defence of Western Europe. American troops, aircraft and weapons were stationed across the continent as a shield against Soviet attack. The alliance tied America firmly to Europe's fate. It made the United States the leader of the Western bloc.

The formation of the Warsaw Pact in 1955. The Soviet Union formed the Warsaw Pact in 1955, joining itself and the communist states of Eastern Europe into a single alliance. It was created in answer to NATO and to the rearming and admission of West Germany. It bound the Eastern bloc to common defence under Moscow. The pact was the military shield of the East.

The Warsaw Pact as an instrument of Soviet control. The Warsaw Pact served not only to face NATO but to keep the satellite states firmly under Soviet control. Its forces were used to crush the Czechoslovak rising of 1968, when reform there threatened Moscow's grip. It thus bound the bloc to the Soviet Union by arms. The pact was a tool of Soviet dominance as well as of defence.

The two alliances divided Europe. NATO and the Warsaw Pact split Europe into two great armed camps, facing each other across the iron curtain. Each stood ready for war with the other, their armies and missiles massed in central Europe. The division of the continent was thus set hard in arms. The alliances embodied the split of the Cold War.

They fuelled the arms race. Each alliance armed itself steadily against the other, adding to the arms race year by year. Both gathered vast conventional forces and nuclear weapons in Europe, matching every increase of the other. The two blocs bristled with arms from end to end. The alliances drove the costly competition in weapons ever onward.

They kept an armed and uneasy peace. Yet by balancing each other, the two alliances also helped to keep Europe from open war, for neither dared to attack the other. The balance of forces held an uneasy peace for over forty years. War was deterred by the very danger of it. The alliances both divided Europe and, by their balance, kept it from war.

NATO and the Warsaw Pact therefore arose in 1949 and 1955 as the military alliances of the two blocs, resting on collective defence, binding the United States and the Soviet Union to the defence of their camps, dividing Europe into two armed halves, fuelling the arms race, and yet keeping an uneasy peace by their very balance. In them the division of the Cold War took its clearest and most dangerous form.

Question 11

A defeated nation and its ruined capital, both cut in two, became the place where the two blocs stood closest and the Cold War burned hottest.

Explain how Germany and Berlin became a focus of the Cold War.

Model Answer

Defeated Germany, and its capital Berlin, lay at the meeting point of the two blocs after 1945 and became a chief focus of the Cold War. Their division, and the crises over them, marked the conflict for forty years. The reasons why Germany and Berlin became a focus of the Cold War may be explained as follows.

The division of Germany after the war. At the end of the war Germany was divided into four zones of occupation, held by the United States, Britain, France and the Soviet Union. The three Western zones and the Soviet zone soon drew apart in policy and purpose. Germany thus became the very frontier of the two blocs. Its division set the stage for the conflict to come.

The disagreement over Germany's future. The powers could not agree what to do with Germany, the West wishing to rebuild it and the Soviet Union to keep it weak and to draw reparations. This quarrel set them sharply at odds and could not be resolved. Germany became a bitter bone of contention between them. Disagreement over its future made it a focus of the Cold War.

The division of Berlin. The capital, Berlin, lay deep within the Soviet zone but was itself divided among the four powers. West Berlin thus became an island of the West inside communist territory, over a hundred miles behind the iron curtain. This made it a point of constant danger and provocation. Divided Berlin was a focus of the whole rivalry.

The Berlin blockade of 1948 to 1949. When the West moved to unite and rebuild its zones, the Soviet Union blockaded West Berlin in 1948, cutting all its land routes. The West answered with a great airlift that flew in food and fuel until the blockade was lifted in 1949. The crisis brought the powers to the very brink of war. It made Berlin the first great focus of the Cold War.

The creation of two German states in 1949. In 1949 the division was made formal as the Western zones became the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet zone the German Democratic Republic. Two hostile German states now faced each other across the divide. The country was split in two, one capitalist and one communist. This division deepened the Cold War in the heart of Europe.

The flight of refugees to the West. Through the open border in Berlin, some three million East Germans fled to the freer and more prosperous West in the years up to 1961. This great drain of people, many of them young and skilled, embarrassed and weakened the communist state. It became a crisis the East could not ignore. The flight of refugees made Berlin a focus of tension.

The building of the Berlin Wall in 1961. To stop the flight, East Germany built the Berlin Wall in 1961, sealing off West Berlin behind concrete, wire and armed guards. Families were divided and the city cut in two, and those who tried to flee were shot. The wall became the very symbol of the divided world. It fixed Berlin at the heart of the Cold War.

Berlin as the symbol of the Cold War. For forty years Berlin stood as the place where the two blocs met face to face, and its wall was the emblem of a divided Europe. When at last the wall was opened in 1989, it marked the end of the Cold War itself. No place showed the conflict more sharply from beginning to end. Berlin was the very symbol of the Cold War.

Germany and Berlin therefore became a focus of the Cold War through the division of the country into occupation zones, the quarrel over its future, the division of Berlin, the blockade of 1948, the creation of two German states in 1949, the flight of refugees, and the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961. There, at the meeting point of the blocs, the Cold War burned hottest, and there at last, with the fall of the wall in 1989, it would come to an end.

Question 12

When Stalin tried to starve the West out of Berlin, the Allies answered not with tanks but with an endless stream of aeroplanes, and won the first battle of the Cold War without firing a shot.

Examine the causes, course and effects of the Berlin Blockade and Airlift of 1948 to 1949.

Model Answer

The Berlin Blockade of 1948 to 1949 was the first great crisis of the Cold War, in which the Soviet Union cut off West Berlin and the Western powers answered with a great airlift. It brought the powers to the very brink of war. The causes, course and effects of the Berlin Blockade and Airlift may be examined as follows.

The division of Germany and Berlin. The blockade sprang from the division of Germany and of Berlin among the four powers after the war. West Berlin lay as an island of the West deep inside the Soviet zone, over a hundred miles behind the line. This made it a point of great danger and provocation. The division of Germany and Berlin was the deepest root of the crisis.

The Western move to rebuild Germany. The Western powers moved to unite their zones and to bring in a new currency, the Deutsche Mark, in 1948. The Soviet Union saw this as a threat and a breach of the wartime agreements. It resolved to resist the rebuilding of a strong Western Germany. The Western move to rebuild Germany triggered the blockade.

The Soviet blockade of West Berlin. In June 1948 the Soviet Union blockaded West Berlin, cutting off all its road, rail and canal links with the West. It sought to force the Western powers to abandon the city. It hoped to drive them out by hunger and cold. The Soviet blockade of West Berlin opened the crisis.

The Western airlift. Rather than abandon Berlin or fight, the Western powers supplied the city by a great airlift, flying in food, coal and goods by day and night. For nearly a year the aeroplanes kept over two million people alive. It was a triumph of will and organisation. The airlift was the Western answer to the blockade.

The lifting of the blockade in 1949. Faced with the success of the airlift, the Soviet Union lifted the blockade in May 1949, having gained nothing by it. The West had held the city and won a great victory of prestige. The Soviet plan had wholly failed. The lifting of the blockade ended the first great crisis of the Cold War.

It deepened the division of Germany. The crisis hardened the division of Germany, and in 1949 two German states were created, one Western and one communist. Germany was split in two for forty years to come. The blockade set this division firmly in place. The deepening of Germany's division was a chief effect of the crisis.

It led to the founding of NATO. The crisis alarmed the West and hastened the founding of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation in 1949. The Western powers bound themselves together for common defence against the Soviet Union. The blockade drove them into a firm alliance. The founding of NATO was a great effect of the crisis.

It was a great victory for the West. The airlift was a triumph of Western resolve and won the admiration of the world. The West had faced down the Soviet Union without going to war. It showed the powers that firmness could prevail over threats. The victory of the West was a lasting effect of the crisis.

The Berlin Blockade and Airlift of 1948 to 1949 therefore sprang from the division of Germany and the Western move to rebuild it, ran through the Soviet blockade and the great Western airlift to the lifting of the blockade in 1949, and had the effects of deepening Germany's division, hastening the founding of NATO, and winning a great victory for the West. It was the first trial of strength of the Cold War, and the West won it without ever firing a shot.

The arms race and the space race

Question 13

In the shadow of Hiroshima the two great powers set out to build weapons of such number and power that they could destroy the world many times over.

Examine the causes and course of the nuclear arms race.

Model Answer

The arms race was the contest between the United States and the Soviet Union to build ever greater numbers of ever more powerful weapons, above all nuclear arms, during the Cold War. It arose from their rivalry and fear. The causes and course of the nuclear arms race may be examined as follows.

The mutual fear and suspicion of the powers. Each power feared attack by the other and armed itself to be ready for it. Neither dared to fall behind, lest it be left at the mercy of its rival, so every new weapon on one side was answered at once by the other. Fear drove each to build more and deadlier arms. Mutual suspicion was the root of the whole arms race.

The desire for security through strength. Each side believed that only overwhelming strength could keep it safe from the other. To be strong in arms was to be secure, and so each built its weapons without end. Weakness, it was feared, would only invite attack. The endless search for security through strength drove the race onward without limit.

The American atomic monopoly and the Soviet reply. The United States alone held the atomic bomb from 1945, when it used it against Japan. The Soviet Union, unwilling to be left at so great a disadvantage, raced to break this monopoly and tested its own bomb in 1949. The race was now truly joined between the two. The Soviet bomb set the powers level and the contest began in earnest.

The building of the hydrogen bomb. The powers went on to build the hydrogen bomb, many times more terrible than the first atomic bombs. The United States tested it in 1952 and the Soviet Union followed within a year. Each fresh advance by one side was quickly matched by the other. The hydrogen bomb raised the arms race to a far deadlier level.

The race in missiles. The powers built long-range missiles able to carry nuclear warheads across the world in a matter of minutes. These intercontinental ballistic missiles made every city on earth a possible target, and left almost no time to prepare. The race spread from bombs to rockets and to submarines. Missiles made the arms race faster and more dangerous still.

The logic of deterrence. Each side built enough weapons to destroy the other even after being struck first, so that neither could hope to win a war. This was deterrence, the threat of certain retaliation that kept either from attacking. It came to be called the balance of terror. Deterrence became the strange guiding logic of the whole arms race.

The vast cost of the race. The powers spent enormous sums on weapons, straining their economies year after year. Wealth that might have fed, housed and healed the people was poured instead into arms. The cost of the race was crushing, and grew heavier as the weapons multiplied. It weighed most heavily of all upon the poorer Soviet Union.

The spread of nuclear weapons. Other states, Britain, France and China, built their own nuclear arms and joined the race in the years that followed. The deadly danger thus spread beyond the two superpowers to more and more hands. More fingers now rested on the nuclear trigger. The arms race came to threaten the whole world, not the two powers alone.

The nuclear arms race therefore arose from the mutual fear of the powers and their search for security, and it ran from the American atomic monopoly through the Soviet bomb of 1949, the hydrogen bomb, the race in missiles, the logic of deterrence, and the vast cost and spread of nuclear arms. It filled the world with weapons enough to destroy it, and held mankind under the shadow of the bomb.

Question 14

The peace of the Cold War rested on a strange foundation, that each side could destroy the other, and so neither dared to strike.

Explain the concept of the balance of terror in the Cold War.

Model Answer

The balance of terror was the state in which the United States and the Soviet Union each held enough nuclear weapons to destroy the other, so that neither dared to make war. It rested on the idea of deterrence. The concept of the balance of terror may be explained as follows.

The meaning of deterrence. Deterrence was the policy of preventing attack by the threat of overwhelming retaliation. Each side warned that any attack upon it would be answered at once by utter destruction. The threat itself, though never carried out, kept the peace between them. Resting on fear rather than trust, deterrence was the very core of the balance of terror.

Mutually assured destruction. Each power built and kept enough weapons to destroy the other even after suffering a first strike. This was called mutually assured destruction, for both would surely perish in any war between them. Neither side could hope to survive, let alone to win. The certainty of common ruin deterred either from ever attacking the other.

The second-strike capacity. Each side made sure that it could strike back even after being hit, by hiding its weapons on submarines and in deep, hardened silos. This second-strike power made a surprise attack useless, for the attacker too would then be destroyed. There was thus no safety to be had in striking first. Second-strike capacity underpinned the whole balance.

The rough balance of forces. The two powers held roughly equal nuclear strength, so that neither could gain a decisive advantage over the other. This rough equality, or parity, steadied the balance between them. Neither dared to upset it by a sudden move. The rough balance of forces kept the terror in a fearful equilibrium for decades.

It kept an uneasy peace. Because a war would surely destroy both sides, the powers avoided direct war throughout the whole Cold War. The balance of terror held them back from the brink again and again. An uneasy and fearful peace was thus kept between them. Terror, strangely, preserved the very peace it seemed to threaten.

Its constant dangers. The balance rested wholly on fear, and might have failed through accident, miscalculation or the madness of a single leader. A false alarm or a rash act could have brought catastrophe, as the Cuban crisis of 1962 nearly did. The world lived always on the edge of ruin. The balance of terror was forever perilous.

It drove the arms race onward. To keep the balance, each side had to match every advance of the other, and so the arms race was fed without end. The terror could never be allowed to tip in the other's favour. So the weapons multiplied far beyond all need. The balance of terror fuelled the very race it was meant to steady.

The balance of terror therefore rested on deterrence and on mutually assured destruction, on the second-strike power and the rough parity of the two forces, and it kept an uneasy peace by the certainty that any war would destroy both sides. Yet it was always perilous, resting on fear and driving the arms race ever onward, so that the peace of the Cold War hung by a thread.

Question 15

The rivalry of the two powers reached beyond the earth itself, until the moon became the highest prize in the contest of the Cold War.

Examine the space race as part of the Cold War.

Model Answer

The space race was the competition between the United States and the Soviet Union to lead in the exploration and conquest of space during the Cold War. It was a contest of prestige, science and power. The space race as part of the Cold War may be examined as follows.

It was a contest of prestige. Each power sought to prove the superiority of its system by winning triumphs in space before the eyes of the world. A lead in space seemed to show which way of life was the greater and more advanced. Prestige was thus a chief prize of the contest. The space race was a battle for the admiration and respect of the world.

The launch of Sputnik in 1957. The Soviet Union stunned the world by launching Sputnik, the first artificial satellite, in 1957. It showed that the Soviet Union led in rockets and in science, and could reach across the earth. The United States was alarmed and spurred to reply in haste. Sputnik opened the space race and shook American confidence.

The first man in space in 1961. The Soviet Union again led the way as Yuri Gagarin became the first man in space in 1961. This was a great triumph for the Soviet Union and its system, watched by the whole world. It deepened the American resolve to catch up and surpass its rival. The feat carried the Cold War into the heavens.

The American drive to the moon. Stung by these Soviet triumphs, the United States resolved to land a man on the moon before its rival could. It poured vast resources and effort into its space programme through the 1960s. The moon became the great goal of the race. American pride demanded a triumph of its own to answer Sputnik.

The moon landing of 1969. In 1969 the United States landed the first men on the moon, a triumph watched by hundreds of millions across the world. It won for America the greatest prize of the space race and restored its prestige. The lead in space now passed to the United States. The moon landing was the crowning height of the whole contest.

Its link to the arms race. The rockets that launched satellites and men into space could also carry nuclear warheads across the world. The space race was thus bound up with the race in missiles, and each advanced the other. Progress in space meant progress in arms. The two races ran forward together, the peaceful and the deadly.

It advanced science and technology. The space race drove great advances in science, rockets, computing and technology on both sides. Much of this knowledge later served peaceful uses, from weather satellites to worldwide communications. The bitter contest thus bore fruit beyond the Cold War itself. It carried human knowledge forward by great strides.

The space race was therefore a contest of prestige, science and power, running from the Soviet launch of Sputnik in 1957 and Gagarin's flight in 1961 to the American moon landing of 1969, bound up with the race in missiles and driving great advances in science. It carried the Cold War beyond the earth itself, and made even the heavens a stage for the rivalry of the two powers.

Question 16

The weapons built to keep the powers safe came in time to threaten the very survival of mankind.

Examine the effects and dangers of the arms race.

Model Answer

The arms race of the Cold War, the contest to build ever more and deadlier weapons, had grave effects and dangers for the powers and for the world. Its consequences reached far beyond the two rivals. The effects and dangers of the arms race may be examined as follows.

It threatened mankind with destruction. The powers built weapons enough to destroy the world many times over, far beyond any need of defence. A single great war between them might have ended human life altogether, for never before had men held such power to destroy. Mankind lived under the shadow of its own annihilation. The arms race threatened the very survival of the world.

It bred fear across the world. The constant threat of nuclear war filled the whole world with a deep and lasting fear. People everywhere lived in dread of the bomb, and children were taught to shelter from it. The danger hung over every crisis of the Cold War. Fear was among the chief and cruellest effects of the arms race.

It consumed vast wealth. The powers spent enormous sums on weapons, wealth that might have fed, housed, healed and taught their people. Resources beyond counting were poured into arms rather than into welfare and development. The cost of the race was crushing on both sides. The arms race wasted the wealth of nations on the means of destruction.

It strained the Soviet economy. The effort to keep pace with the far richer United States strained the Soviet economy to breaking point. The heavy burden of arms starved its industry and its people, and helped to ruin it in the end. It simply could not bear the cost for ever. The arms race weakened the Soviet Union fatally and hastened its fall.

It fed crises and the risk of war. The race made the great crises of the Cold War, above all Cuba in 1962, far more dangerous than they need have been. A single miscalculation among so many weapons might have set off a nuclear war. The world came close to catastrophe more than once. The arms race sharpened the ever present danger of war.

It spread nuclear weapons. Other states built their own nuclear arms, so that the deadly danger spread far beyond the two superpowers. More and more nations came to hold the power to destroy whole cities. The threat grew ever wider and harder to control. The spread of nuclear weapons endangered the whole world for generations to come.

It drove efforts at arms control. The very danger of the race at last drove the powers to seek to limit their arms, in treaties such as the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. Fear of destruction bred a search for control and restraint. The race thus gave rise to its own limits and remedies. Efforts at disarmament grew out of the very danger the arms race had created.

It advanced science and technology. The race drove great advances in science, rockets, computing and industry, some of which later served peaceful ends. Even so terrible and wasteful a contest bore some fruit for mankind. Knowledge and invention were carried forward by the rivalry. This was among the very few benefits to set against its many harms.

The effects and dangers of the arms race were therefore the threat of destruction to mankind, the breeding of fear, the waste of vast wealth, the fatal strain upon the Soviet economy, the sharpening of crises and the risk of war, the spread of nuclear weapons, and, in reply, the drive towards arms control, together with some advance in science. It held the world under the shadow of the bomb, and its burden helped in the end to bring down the Soviet Union.

Proxy wars and regional conflicts

Question 17

Unable to strike at each other without ending the world, the two powers fought instead through the quarrels of smaller nations.

Explain why the superpowers fought proxy wars during the Cold War.

Model Answer

A proxy war is one in which rival powers support opposing sides in the war of another country instead of fighting each other directly. During the Cold War the superpowers fought many such wars across the world. The reasons why the superpowers fought proxy wars may be explained as follows.

The fear of direct war. Direct war between the superpowers might have brought nuclear destruction upon both, and upon the world. Neither dared to fight the other openly and to risk that ruin. Proxy wars let them struggle for advantage without that deadly danger. Fear of mutual destruction drove them to fight through others rather than face to face.

The wish to extend their influence. Each power sought to spread its system and its influence across the world, and to win new allies. By backing friendly sides in local wars, each hoped to gain fresh ground for its bloc. Proxy wars were thus a means of expansion by other hands. Each sought to enlarge its bloc through the wars of others.

To contain or to spread communism. The United States backed sides that would resist communism, while the Soviet Union backed those that would advance it. Local wars thus became battles over ideology, fought out between the two systems. Each power fought for its creed through the arms of others. Proxy wars served the great aims of both sides at once.

To gain strategic advantage. The powers sought bases, allies, ports and resources in the different regions of the world. By supporting one side in a conflict, each hoped to gain a lasting foothold there. Strategy and advantage guided their choices of whom to back. Proxy wars were fought for position and advantage across the globe.

They turned local conflicts to their own ends. The powers seized upon quarrels that already existed within and between nations, and turned them to their own purposes. A civil war or a border dispute became a Cold War battleground overnight. Each simply backed the side that best served its interest. Local disputes were thus drawn into the wider global rivalry.

They gave aid rather than sent armies. In most proxy wars the powers gave money, weapons and advisers rather than sending their own soldiers to fight. This kept down both the cost and the risk to themselves. They armed and paid their friends and let them do the fighting. Proxy wars were thus fought at one remove from the powers themselves.

They spread the Cold War across the world. Through proxy wars the rivalry reached Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Middle East, far from its origins in Europe. The Cold War became a truly global conflict, fought in many lands at once. No region was left wholly untouched by it. Proxy wars carried the Cold War across the whole world.

The superpowers therefore fought proxy wars because they feared the destruction that direct war would bring, and wished instead to extend their influence, to contain or spread communism, to gain strategic advantage, and to turn local conflicts to their own ends, giving aid rather than sending their own armies. In this way the Cold War was carried across the world, and small nations bled in the quarrels of the great.

Question 18

In a land divided by the powers, the first great shooting war of the Cold War left millions dead and the border almost where it had begun.

Examine the causes and effects of the Korean War of 1950 to 1953.

Model Answer

The Korean War, fought from 1950 to 1953, was the first great armed conflict of the Cold War, in which the rival powers backed opposing Korean states. It sprang from the division of Korea and the wider rivalry. The causes and effects of the Korean War may be examined as follows.

The division of Korea. After the Second World War Korea was divided at the thirty-eighth parallel, the north under Soviet influence and the south under American. Two hostile Korean states arose, each claiming to rule the whole country. The division left the peninsula unstable and dangerous. The division of Korea was the deepest root of the war.

The rivalry of the two blocs. Korea became a meeting point of the Cold War rivalry between the communist and the Western blocs. Each backed and armed its own Korean state against the other. The wider global conflict was thus fought out on Korean soil. Bloc rivalry between the superpowers helped greatly to cause and to widen the war.

The northern invasion of the south. In June 1950 communist North Korea invaded the south, seeking to unite the whole country by force of arms. This sudden invasion began the war and shocked the West. South

Korea at once appealed for help against the attack. The invasion of the south by the north set off the whole conflict.

The intervention of the United Nations and the United States. The United Nations, led by the United States, sent forces to defend South Korea against the invasion. American and allied troops drove the invaders back across the parallel. The war thus became a contest of the two blocs in open arms. The intervention widened the war and made it a Cold War battle.

The intervention of communist China. When the United Nations forces neared its border, communist China entered the war on the side of the north. Great Chinese armies drove the United Nations forces back down the peninsula. The war became a longer and far bloodier struggle. China's entry deepened the conflict and turned near victory into stalemate.

The great loss of life. The war cost the lives of millions of Koreans, Chinese and others, and laid much of Korea waste. Whole cities were reduced to rubble by bombing and battle, and millions more were left homeless. It was a terrible and destructive conflict for so small a land. The Korean War brought vast suffering to the Korean people.

The confirming of Korea's division. The war ended in 1953 with an armistice near the old border at the thirty-eighth parallel. Korea remained divided into two hostile states, much as before the fighting began. Nothing had been gained by all the bloodshed and ruin. The division of Korea was fixed and hardened for generations to come.

The spread and hardening of the Cold War. The war spread the Cold War to Asia and hardened the rivalry of the two blocs. It showed that the powers would fight, if through others, to stop the advance of communism. The Cold War grew wider and more dangerous after Korea. The war deepened the global conflict and the arms race alike.

The Korean War therefore sprang from the division of Korea, the rivalry of the two blocs, and the northern invasion of the south, and it drew in the United Nations, the United States and communist China, ending in 1953 with vast loss of life, the confirming of Korea's division, and the hardening and spread of the Cold War. It was the first great shooting war of the Cold War, and it left Korea divided as it remains to this day.

Question 19

For thirteen days in the autumn of 1962 the world stood closer to nuclear war than it had ever been, over a scattering of missiles on a Caribbean island.

Examine the causes, course and results of the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962.

Model Answer

The Cuban missile crisis of 1962 was the confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union over Soviet nuclear missiles placed in Cuba. It brought the world to the very brink of nuclear war. The causes, course and results of the Cuban missile crisis may be examined as follows.

The Cuban revolution and its turn to the Soviet Union. In 1959 Fidel Castro seized power in Cuba by revolution and, faced with American hostility, turned to the Soviet Union for support. Cuba thus became a communist state at America's very doorstep, only ninety miles from Florida. This deeply alarmed the United States. The turn of Cuba to the Soviet Union set the scene for the crisis.

The failed Bay of Pigs invasion. In 1961 the United States backed an invasion of Cuba by exiles at the Bay of Pigs, which ended in failure. Its collapse humiliated the United States and drove Castro closer still to the Soviet Union. Fearing another attack, Cuba sought Soviet protection. The failed invasion helped to bring on the missile crisis.

The placing of Soviet missiles in Cuba. In 1962 the Soviet Union secretly placed nuclear missiles in Cuba, within easy reach of American cities. It sought to defend Cuba and to match the American missiles stationed near its own borders. The missiles were a grave and sudden threat to the United States. Their placing was the immediate cause of the crisis.

The American discovery and blockade. American spy planes discovered the missiles being built, and President Kennedy ordered a naval blockade of Cuba to stop more from arriving. He demanded publicly that the missiles already there be removed. The two powers now stood face to face over Cuba. The blockade opened the most dangerous confrontation of the Cold War.

The world at the brink of nuclear war. For thirteen days in October 1962 the whole world waited in dread as the two powers faced each other. A single misstep or a rash order might have set off a nuclear war. Mankind stood at the very edge of catastrophe. The crisis was the most dangerous moment of the entire Cold War.

The settlement of the crisis. At last the Soviet Union agreed to remove its missiles from Cuba, and the United States pledged not to invade the island and quietly to withdraw its own missiles from Turkey. War was thus avoided by a bargain on both sides. Both powers drew back from the brink. The crisis was settled by agreement rather than by arms.

It revealed the danger of the arms race. The crisis showed the whole world how close the arms race had brought it to destruction, for the balance of terror had very nearly failed. The deadly danger was laid bare for all to see. It shocked and sobered the leaders of both powers. It taught them the true peril of their unchecked rivalry.

It led to steps to reduce the danger. After the crisis the powers set up a direct telephone link, the hot line, between Washington and Moscow. They signed a treaty in 1963 banning tests of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere. Fear of another such crisis bred restraint on both sides. The crisis led to the first real steps of arms control.

It marked a turning towards détente. Shaken by how near they had come to war, the powers began to seek an easing of tension between them. The crisis opened the way to the later policy of détente. The rivalry grew a little more cautious and wary thereafter. It was a turning point in the whole course of the Cold War.

The Cuban missile crisis therefore sprang from the Cuban revolution and its turn to the Soviet Union, the failed Bay of Pigs invasion, and the placing of Soviet missiles in Cuba, and it ran through the American blockade and thirteen days at the brink of nuclear war to a settlement by agreement, with the results that it revealed the danger of the arms race, led to the hot line and the test-ban treaty, and turned the powers towards détente. It was the moment at which the Cold War came closest to destroying the world, and the fright of it made both powers more cautious thereafter.

Question 20

In the jungles of Vietnam the mightiest power on earth poured out its strength for years, and could not defeat a determined people fighting for their own land.

Examine the causes and effects of the Vietnam War.

Model Answer

The Vietnam War was the long conflict in which the United States fought to prevent the communist unification of Vietnam, from the 1950s until 1975. It was among the greatest of the Cold War proxy wars. The causes and effects of the Vietnam War may be examined as follows.

The struggle against colonial rule. Vietnam had long fought to free itself from French colonial rule, and the communist-led forces of Ho Chi Minh led that long struggle. When the French were defeated and withdrew in 1954, the country was left divided. The fight for independence lay behind the whole war. Colonial struggle was the first root of the conflict.

The division of Vietnam. Vietnam was divided in 1954 into a communist north under Ho Chi Minh and a Western-backed south. The two hostile states each claimed to rule the whole country. The division set the stage for a long and bitter war. A divided Vietnam bred the conflict, much as a divided Korea had done.

The American policy of containment. The United States feared that if Vietnam fell to communism its neighbours would follow one by one, the so-called domino theory. It resolved to defend the south at almost

any cost. Containment thus drew America deep into the war. The fear of spreading communism was a chief cause of American involvement.

The American escalation of the war. From the mid 1960s the United States sent great armies and vast firepower to fight in Vietnam, until at its height half a million American troops were there. It bombed the north heavily and fought the communist forces across the south. The war grew ever larger and more destructive. American escalation deepened and widened the conflict.

The strength of the communist resistance. The communist forces of the north and the Vietcong in the south fought a long guerrilla war that the Americans could not defeat. They endured terrible bombing and heavy losses, and yet fought on. Their determination slowly wore down the will of the United States. The resistance proved in the end unbreakable.

The great destruction and loss of life. The war cost the lives of some millions of Vietnamese and tens of thousands of Americans, and laid waste much of the land. Bombing, fire and chemicals such as Agent Orange ruined the country. The suffering of the people was immense. The Vietnam War brought terrible destruction to the whole of Vietnam.

The defeat and withdrawal of the United States. Weary at last of a costly and unwinnable war, the United States withdrew its forces by 1973. In 1975 the north conquered the south and united Vietnam under communism. America had wholly failed in its aim. The long war ended in a clear American defeat, the first great defeat in its history.

Its effects on America and the world. The war deeply divided American society, damaged American prestige, and made the United States wary of foreign wars for years afterward. It was a heavy blow to American power and confidence. The defeat shook the whole Western bloc. The Vietnam War left deep and lasting scars on America and beyond.

The Vietnam War therefore sprang from the struggle against colonial rule, the division of Vietnam, and the American policy of containment, and it ran through the American escalation and the stubborn communist resistance to vast destruction, the defeat and withdrawal of the United States, and the uniting of Vietnam under communism in 1975. It was the greatest defeat of the United States in the Cold War, and it showed that even the mightiest power could not master a people determined to be free.

Question 21

No sooner had Africa thrown off colonial rule than the two great powers reached into the continent, and turned its new nations into battlegrounds of their rivalry.

Assess the impact of Cold War rivalry on the Congo and Angola.

Model Answer

The Cold War rivalry of the superpowers reached deep into Africa, and above all into the Congo and Angola, where the powers backed opposing sides in bitter conflicts. Their intervention brought suffering and instability. The impact of Cold War rivalry on the Congo and Angola may be assessed as follows.

The superpowers reached into newly free Africa. As the African colonies won their independence around 1960, the superpowers competed for influence over the new and weak states. These young nations became prizes in the wider Cold War rivalry. The two powers reached deep into the continent. Africa was thus drawn into a Cold War it had not made.

The crisis in the Congo. The Congo won independence from Belgium in 1960 and at once fell into crisis, with mutiny, rebellion and the breaking away of the rich province of Katanga. The superpowers and Belgium backed rival factions in the chaos. The country was torn apart within weeks of its freedom. The Congo became an early African battleground of the Cold War.

The fall of Lumumba. The Congo's first prime minister, Patrice Lumumba, turned to the Soviet Union for help and was overthrown and killed in 1961. His fall was bound up with the Cold War rivalry and with Western fears of a communist Congo. The young nation lost its first leader to the conflict. The Congo crisis showed the reach of the Cold War into Africa.

The long dictatorship that followed. Out of the Congo crisis rose the Western-backed dictatorship of Mobutu, who ruled the country for over thirty years. The Cold War thus left the Congo under a corrupt and lasting tyranny. Its people gained neither peace nor freedom from their independence. The rivalry of the powers blighted the country's whole future.

The civil war in Angola. Angola won independence from Portugal in 1975 and fell at once into a civil war among rival liberation movements. The superpowers backed opposing sides in the long struggle for power. The war became a Cold War proxy conflict on African soil. Angola was torn apart by the rivalry of the great powers.

The involvement of Cuba and South Africa. In Angola, thousands of Cuban troops fought for the Soviet-backed government, while apartheid South Africa intervened on the other side. Foreign powers thus fought out the Cold War on Angolan soil. The war became an international as well as a civil one. Outside intervention deepened and prolonged Angola's agony.

The prolonging and worsening of the conflicts. The flood of foreign arms, money and troops made the wars in the Congo and Angola longer and bloodier than they need have been. The rivalry of the powers fed and sustained the fighting. Any hope of peace was pushed ever further away. Cold War intervention gravely worsened Africa's own conflicts.

The lasting harm to Africa. The rivalry left the Congo and Angola scarred by war, dictatorship, poverty and ruin long after the Cold War had ended. The deep wounds were slow to heal. Development was set back by decades in both lands. The Cold War did lasting harm to Africa that outlived the conflict itself.

The impact of Cold War rivalry on the Congo and Angola was therefore deeply harmful, as the superpowers reached into newly free Africa, fed the Congo crisis and the fall of Lumumba, propped up the long dictatorship of Mobutu, backed opposing sides in the Angolan civil war, drew in Cuba and South Africa, and prolonged and worsened the conflicts. The rivalry of the great powers turned Africa's new nations into battlegrounds, and left wounds that outlasted the Cold War itself.

Question 22

The Soviet Union marched into Afghanistan expecting a swift victory, and found instead its own long and bleeding war, a wound that helped to hasten its fall.

Examine the causes and effects of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan of 1979.

Model Answer

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 was a major event of the later Cold War, in which Soviet forces entered Afghanistan to prop up a failing communist government. It became a long and costly war for the Soviet Union. The causes and effects of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan may be examined as follows.

To save the communist government. The Soviet Union invaded to save the failing communist government of Afghanistan, which faced a growing revolt. It feared the fall of a friendly state on its own southern border. It sent its army to hold the government up by force. The saving of the communist government was the chief cause of the invasion.

To guard Soviet security and influence. The Soviet Union sought to guard its own security and influence in a neighbouring land. It would not see Afghanistan fall to its enemies or to disorder. It acted to keep the country within its sphere. The guarding of Soviet security was a cause of the invasion.

The resistance of the mujahideen. The invasion met fierce resistance from the Afghan fighters, the mujahideen, who waged a long guerrilla war in the mountains. They struck the Soviet army and melted away again. They would not be subdued for all the Soviet strength. The resistance of the mujahideen shaped the whole course of the war.

American and Western support for the resistance. The United States and its allies armed and funded the mujahideen against the Soviet Union. Afghanistan thus became a proxy battleground of the Cold War. The West fought the Soviet Union through the Afghan fighters. Western support for the resistance was a key feature of the war.

It broke the détente. The invasion shattered the détente of the 1970s and plunged relations back into hostility. The West condemned it and many nations boycotted the Moscow Olympic Games of 1980. The Cold War froze hard once more. The breaking of the détente was a chief effect of the invasion.

It became the Soviet Union's Vietnam. The war became a long, costly and unwinnable quagmire, likened to the American war in Vietnam. It drained the Soviet Union of men, money and morale for a decade. It could not be won by any means. The war became the Soviet Union's own Vietnam.

The Soviet withdrawal in 1989. Worn down at last, the Soviet Union withdrew its forces from Afghanistan in 1989, having wholly failed in its aim. The long war had gained it nothing but loss. It left in defeat and exhaustion. The Soviet withdrawal marked the failure of the whole venture.

It helped to bring down the Soviet Union. The cost and the failure of the war weakened the Soviet Union and shook its confidence in itself. It added to the many strains that would soon bring the Soviet state down. The wound would not heal. The invasion helped to hasten the fall of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan of 1979 therefore sprang from the wish to save the communist government and to guard Soviet security, met the fierce resistance of the Western-backed mujahideen, and had the effects of breaking the détente, becoming the Soviet Union's own Vietnam, ending in a humiliating withdrawal in 1989, and helping to bring down the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union marched in expecting a swift victory, and found instead a wound that helped to hasten its fall.

The Cold War and Africa

Question 23

Africa did not make the Cold War, yet the quarrel of the great powers reached into every corner of the continent and helped to shape its fate.

Examine the effects of the Cold War on Africa.

Model Answer

Though the Cold War was a quarrel of the great powers, its effects reached deep into Africa, above all as the continent won its independence. The rivalry shaped Africa's politics, its wars and its development. The effects of the Cold War on Africa may be examined as follows.

It made Africa a battleground of the powers. The superpowers competed for influence across Africa, backing rival states, parties and movements. The continent became an arena of their global rivalry, courted and fought over by both sides. Its own quarrels were drawn into the wider Cold War. Africa was made a battleground of powers who ruled it from afar.

It fuelled proxy wars and civil wars. The rivalry fed proxy and civil wars in the Congo, Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia and Somalia. Foreign arms, money and troops prolonged and worsened the fighting in each. Africa bled again and again in the quarrels of the powers. The Cold War fuelled war across much of the continent for decades.

It shaped the choice of development paths. African states were drawn to choose between capitalism and socialism, between the Western and the Eastern models of development. Some, such as Tanzania under Nyerere, took a socialist path, while others leaned to the West. The Cold War thus shaped their economic choices. It divided Africa over the very road to development.

It brought foreign aid and investment. Both powers gave aid, loans and investment to win African friends and clients. Roads, dams, schools and factories were built with Cold War money on both sides. Africa gained some real benefit from the rivalry between them. Aid flowed freely as each power courted the continent for its favour.

It propped up dictators and unstable regimes. Each power supported friendly rulers, however corrupt or cruel, so long as they served its side in the Cold War. Dictators such as Mobutu of the Congo were kept in power by their patrons. The Cold War thus fastened tyranny upon parts of Africa. It sacrificed good government to the demands of the rivalry.

It gave rise to the Non-Aligned Movement. To avoid being drawn into either bloc, many African and Asian states joined the Non-Aligned Movement. Africa thus sought a path of its own between the two great powers. Non-alignment became Africa's own answer to the Cold War. The rivalry gave rise to a whole movement raised against it and its dangers.

It affected the struggle against colonialism and apartheid. The Cold War shaped the struggles for independence and against apartheid, as liberation movements sought help where they could find it. The Soviet bloc armed and aided many of them against Western-backed regimes. The rivalry thus touched the whole freedom struggle. It affected the fight against colonial and racist rule across Africa.

It flooded Africa with weapons. The rivalry poured guns and weapons into Africa, which fed its many wars and outlived the Cold War itself. Arms spread across the continent and into countless hands. Conflicts grew deadlier and harder to end for the flood of weapons. The Cold War left Africa awash with arms for a generation.

It hindered African unity and development. By dividing Africa between the two blocs, the Cold War weakened its unity and slowed its development. Rivalry and foreign meddling set African states against one another. Resources went to war and to arms rather than to progress. The Cold War hindered the growth and the unity of the whole continent.

The effects of the Cold War on Africa were therefore that it made the continent a battleground of the powers, fuelled proxy and civil wars, shaped the choice of development paths, brought foreign aid, propped up dictators, gave rise to the Non-Aligned Movement, touched the struggle against colonialism and apartheid, flooded Africa with weapons, and hindered its unity and development. Though Africa had not made the quarrel of the great powers, it paid a heavy price for it.

Question 24

As the empires fell and scores of new nations were born, the two great powers hastened to win them, each fearing to leave the field to the other.

Explain how the superpowers competed for influence in the newly independent states of the Third World.

Model Answer

As the colonies of Asia and Africa won their independence, the two superpowers competed to draw the new states of the Third World into their camps. They used many means to win influence over them. The ways in which the superpowers competed for influence in the Third World may be explained as follows.

They gave economic aid and loans. Each power offered aid, loans and investment to win the friendship of the new states. Money was given to build roads, dams, factories and schools across the Third World. Aid thus became a chief tool of influence. Each side sought to buy friendship and gratitude with its wealth.

They gave military aid and arms. The powers supplied weapons, training and military advisers to friendly governments and movements. Arms bound the new states to their givers and to their side in the Cold War. Military aid thus won and held allies. Each power armed its friends across the Third World against its rivals.

They supported friendly governments and movements. Each power backed rulers, parties and liberation movements that leaned towards its side. It helped them to power by money and arms, and then kept them there against their rivals. Friendly regimes served as allies and as footholds. Support of this kind won influence across the whole Third World.

They used propaganda and ideology. Each power spread its ideology and praised its way of life to win the minds of the new nations. The West preached capitalism, freedom and democracy, while the East preached socialism and equality. Ideas were thus weapons of the contest. Propaganda sought to win the Third World to one side or the other.

They offered rival models of development. The powers held up their own systems as the surest road to progress for poor nations. Some new states followed the capitalist model of the West, others the socialist

model of the East. Development itself thus became a field of rivalry. Each power offered its own path as the better one for the poor.

They intervened in local conflicts. The powers took sides in the wars and quarrels of the new states, backing their friends by money, arms and sometimes force. Local conflicts thus became proxy struggles between the blocs. Intervention won or held influence for the powers. Each fought for advantage in the Third World through the arms of others.

They competed through trade and diplomacy. The powers sought trade agreements, alliances and diplomatic ties with the new states. Embassies, treaties, visits and votes at the United Nations bound the Third World to one side or the other. Diplomacy carried the contest quietly forward. Each power courted the new nations steadily for their friendship.

The superpowers therefore competed for influence in the newly independent states of the Third World by giving economic and military aid, supporting friendly governments and movements, spreading propaganda and ideology, offering rival models of development, intervening in local conflicts, and courting the new nations through trade and diplomacy. In this contest the Third World became a great prize of the Cold War, and its new nations learned to weigh one power against the other.

Question 25

Even on the shores of the Indian Ocean, far from Washington and Moscow, the long shadow of the Cold War fell across the new nations of East Africa.

Examine the impact of the Cold War on East Africa.

Model Answer

The Cold War reached into East Africa, as the superpowers competed for the friendship of its newly independent states. The rivalry shaped the politics, the economy and the choices of the region. The impact of the Cold War on East Africa may be examined as follows.

The superpowers competed for influence. Both the United States and the Soviet Union sought the friendship of the new East African states. Each offered aid, arms and support to win them to its side. The region became a field of their global rivalry. The competition of the powers for influence was felt across East Africa.

It shaped the choice of development paths. The Cold War drew the East African states to choose between capitalism and socialism. Tanzania under Nyerere took a socialist path, while Kenya leaned firmly towards the West. The rivalry thus shaped their economies. The shaping of development paths was an impact of the Cold War.

Tanzania's socialism and non-alignment. Tanzania followed a socialist path and a firm non-alignment, refusing to join either bloc. It took aid from both East and West but bound itself to neither. It guarded its own independence jealously. Tanzania's socialism and non-alignment were shaped by the Cold War.

It brought foreign aid and investment. Both powers gave aid, loans and projects to the East African states to win their favour. Roads, factories and schools were built with Cold War money on both sides. The region gained some real benefit. The bringing of foreign aid was an impact of the Cold War.

It touched the liberation struggles. The Cold War touched the liberation struggles of southern Africa, which East Africa strongly supported. Tanzania hosted the fighters at Dar es Salaam, and the Soviet bloc armed many of them. The rivalry reached the freedom struggle. The touching of the liberation struggles was an impact of the Cold War.

It fed suspicion among neighbours. The differing paths of the East African states, some socialist and some capitalist, fed suspicion among them. This strained the East African Community, which broke up in 1977. The rivalry divided neighbours from one another. The feeding of regional suspicion was an impact of the Cold War.

It flooded the region with arms. The rivalry and its conflicts brought arms into East Africa, some of which fed later violence. Guns spread through the region and outlived the Cold War. The rivalry left its weapons behind it. The flooding of the region with arms was an impact of the Cold War.

It shaped the region's foreign policy. The Cold War shaped the foreign policies of the East African states, above all their non-alignment and their solidarity with the South. They sought a path of their own between the blocs. The rivalry framed their place in the world. The shaping of foreign policy was an impact of the Cold War.

The impact of the Cold War on East Africa was therefore that the superpowers competed for its friendship, that it shaped the choice of development paths, gave rise to Tanzania's socialism and non-alignment, brought foreign aid, touched the liberation struggles, fed suspicion among neighbours, flooded the region with arms, and shaped its foreign policy. Even on the shores of the Indian Ocean, far from Washington and Moscow, the long shadow of the Cold War fell across the new nations of East Africa.

The Non-Aligned Movement

Question 26

Caught between two giants and wishing to belong to neither, the new nations of Asia and Africa banded together to keep their freedom in a divided world.

Account for the formation of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Model Answer

The Non-Aligned Movement was the grouping of states, mostly newly independent, that refused to join either bloc in the Cold War. It was formed at the height of the rivalry to guard the freedom of its members. The formation of the Non-Aligned Movement may be accounted for as follows.

The desire to avoid the two blocs. The new states wished to belong to neither the Western nor the Eastern bloc in the Cold War. They feared being made pawns and battlegrounds in the quarrel of the powers. Non-alignment let them stand apart from both camps. The wish to avoid the two blocs gave rise to the whole movement.

The danger of the Cold War. The rivalry of the powers, with its arms race and its many wars, threatened the peace of the whole world. The new states wished to lessen this danger and to keep it far from their own lands. They sought safety outside the great quarrel. The peril of the Cold War drove them together for protection.

The wish to protect their new independence. Having only just won freedom from colonial rule, the new states wished above all to guard it. To join a bloc seemed a new kind of dependence upon a great power. Non-alignment protected their hard-won sovereignty. The defence of independence was a chief cause of the movement.

The struggle against colonialism and imperialism. Many members wished to complete the freeing of Africa and Asia from the last of colonial rule. The movement gave them a common voice and a platform against imperialism in all its forms. It stood firmly for the liberation of the colonised peoples. Anti-colonialism bound the members closely together.

The Bandung Conference of 1955. The Afro-Asian conference at Bandung in Indonesia in 1955 gathered the new nations and laid the ground for non-alignment. It proclaimed principles of peace, sovereignty and independence among nations. Bandung was the seed from which the movement grew. From that gathering the Non-Aligned Movement took its first rise.

The leadership of great statesmen. Leaders such as Nehru of India, Tito of Yugoslavia, Nasser of Egypt, Nkrumah of Ghana and Sukarno of Indonesia founded and guided the movement. Their vision, prestige and energy gave it strength and standing in the world. Great leaders built and led the movement. Their leadership brought the Non-Aligned Movement into being.

The Belgrade Conference of 1961. The first summit of the Non-Aligned Movement was held at Belgrade in Yugoslavia in 1961, where the movement was formally founded. Twenty-five nations gathered there to declare their non-alignment to the world. Belgrade gave the movement its birth and its form. There the Non-Aligned Movement properly took shape.

The wish for a common voice in the world. The new and weaker states wished to speak together and to be heard among the great powers. United, they could press far more strongly for peace, justice and development. The movement gave the many small nations one voice. The desire to be heard in the world helped to form it.

The Non-Aligned Movement therefore arose from the desire of the new states to avoid the two blocs, the danger of the Cold War, the wish to protect their new independence, the struggle against colonialism, the Bandung Conference of 1955, the leadership of statesmen such as Nehru, Tito, Nasser and Nkrumah, the Belgrade Conference of 1961, and the wish for a common voice in the world. Out of the fear and the hope of the new nations, a third force was born between the two great blocs.

Question 27

The movement asked only that the new nations be allowed to choose their own path, to keep the peace, and to be masters in their own house.

Examine the aims and objectives of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Model Answer

The Non-Aligned Movement was founded on a set of clear aims and objectives, drawn from the needs of the newly independent nations in a world divided by the Cold War. These aims guided its work. The aims and objectives of the Non-Aligned Movement may be examined as follows.

To stay out of the Cold War blocs. The first aim was to keep its members out of both the Western and the Eastern blocs. They would join neither military camp nor take sides in the rivalry. Non-alignment in the Cold War was the very heart of the movement. To stand apart from the two blocs was its first and chief aim.

To defend the independence and sovereignty of members. The movement sought to guard the freedom of its members from any domination, whether old colonial or new. It upheld the right of every nation to rule itself and to choose its own path. Sovereignty was to be protected against all comers. The defence of independence was a central aim of the movement.

To oppose colonialism and imperialism. The movement aimed to complete the freeing of the world from colonial and imperial rule. It supported by voice and vote the peoples still fighting for their freedom. It pressed this cause hard at the United Nations. Anti-colonialism was a leading objective of the whole movement.

To oppose racism and apartheid. The movement aimed to fight racism, and above all the apartheid system of white rule in South Africa. It stood firmly for the equality of all peoples and races. It condemned racial oppression wherever in the world it was found. Opposition to racism and apartheid was among its highest aims.

To promote world peace and disarmament. The movement sought to reduce the danger of war and to press for the disarmament of the powers. It called again and again on the superpowers to end the arms race. Peace among nations was one of its very highest aims. It worked steadily to keep the world from another great war.

To promote peaceful coexistence. The movement upheld the peaceful coexistence of states of different systems and beliefs. Nations should live together in peace, it held, whatever their politics or creed. It preached settlement by talk and negotiation, not by arms. Peaceful coexistence among nations was a guiding aim of the movement.

To advance the economic development of members. The movement aimed to lift its members out of poverty and to build a fairer world economy. It pressed the rich nations for better terms of trade, fair prices

and more aid. The development of the poorer nations was a chief objective. It sought real progress and justice for the developing world.

To give the weaker nations a common voice. The movement aimed to unite the weaker nations so that they might be heard among the great powers. Together, and in numbers, they could press their common case in the world. Unity gave the many small nations real strength. A common voice for the many was among its central aims.

The aims and objectives of the Non-Aligned Movement were therefore to stay out of the Cold War blocs, to defend the independence and sovereignty of its members, to oppose colonialism, imperialism and racism, to promote world peace, disarmament and peaceful coexistence, to advance the economic development of its members, and to give the weaker nations a common voice. In these aims the movement sought to make a place for the many small nations in a world dominated by two great powers.

Question 28

The movement gave the small nations a voice they had never had, yet found that a voice is more easily raised than heeded.

Assess the achievements and problems of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Model Answer

The Non-Aligned Movement won real achievements for the newly independent nations, yet it also faced serious problems and limits. Its record was thus a mixed one. The achievements and problems of the Non-Aligned Movement may be assessed as follows.

It kept many nations out of the Cold War. The movement helped many nations to stay out of the two blocs and to keep their independence. It gave them a path of their own between the two great powers. Millions of people were thus spared the worst of the rivalry. This was a real and lasting achievement of the whole movement.

It gave the weaker nations a voice. The movement united the smaller and weaker nations and gave them a common voice in world affairs, above all at the United Nations. Together they could press their case and be heard among the great. The many small nations were no longer simply ignored. This was among the chief achievements of the movement.

It aided the struggle against colonialism and apartheid. The movement pressed hard for the freeing of the remaining colonies and against the apartheid of South Africa. It lent its support, its voice and its votes to the liberation struggles. It helped to speed the end of colonial and racist rule. This was a great and worthy achievement of the movement.

It pressed for peace and a fairer world economy. The movement called for disarmament, for peace, and for better terms of trade for the poor nations. It raised the cause of the developing world before the powers. It kept these great questions steadily before the world. This pressure for peace and justice was a real achievement.

It was weakened by disunity. The members differed widely in their systems, their interests and their friends, and often could not agree among themselves. This disunity weakened the movement's voice and its power to act. It could not always speak or act as one. Division was a chief problem that beset the movement throughout.

Many members were not truly non-aligned. Some members leaned openly towards one bloc or the other, taking its aid, its arms and its guidance. Their claim to non-alignment was thus in serious doubt. The movement's guiding principle was often broken in practice. This false non-alignment weakened and discredited it.

It lacked the power to enforce its aims. The movement could pass resolutions and make declarations, but it could not compel the great powers to heed them. Its voice, however loud, was often simply ignored. It had many words but little real power. This weakness in action was a serious and lasting problem.

It lost its purpose after the Cold War. When the Cold War ended around 1991, the movement lost the very rivalry it had been formed to stand apart from. Its members began to ask what it was now for. Its role and its purpose grew uncertain. The end of the Cold War left the movement searching for a reason to endure.

The Non-Aligned Movement therefore achieved much, keeping many nations out of the Cold War, giving the weaker nations a voice, aiding the struggle against colonialism and apartheid, and pressing for peace and a fairer economy, yet it was weakened by disunity, by members who were not truly non-aligned, by its lack of power to enforce its aims, and by the loss of its purpose after the Cold War. Its record was thus a mixed one, of a noble cause more easily proclaimed than achieved.

Question 29

From a young and poor nation on the shores of the Indian Ocean, Julius Nyerere spoke for the conscience of the non-aligned world.

Examine the role of Tanzania and Nyerere in the Non-Aligned Movement.

Model Answer

Tanzania, under the leadership of Julius Nyerere, was among the most active members of the Non-Aligned Movement, and gave it strong and principled leadership. The country made non-alignment a pillar of its foreign policy. The role of Tanzania and Nyerere in the Non-Aligned Movement may be examined as follows.

Tanzania made non-alignment a pillar of its policy. Tanzania refused to join either bloc and made non-alignment a foundation stone of its foreign policy. It would take aid from both East and West but bind itself to neither. It guarded jealously its own independence of action. Non-alignment was a settled and principled pillar of Tanzanian policy.

Nyerere was a leading voice of the movement. Julius Nyerere was among the most respected leaders of the non-aligned world. His voice and his moral authority carried weight far beyond the size of his young country. He spoke often and clearly for the principles of the movement. Nyerere gave the Non-Aligned Movement much of its moral leadership.

Tanzania championed the liberation of Africa. Tanzania made itself a base and a champion for the liberation movements of southern Africa. From Dar es Salaam it hosted, sheltered and aided fighters against colonial and apartheid rule. It pressed the cause of African freedom within the movement. Liberation was Tanzania's great and abiding cause.

It stood firmly against colonialism and apartheid. Tanzania and Nyerere condemned colonialism and the apartheid of South Africa without compromise or retreat. They pressed the movement to support the oppressed peoples of the continent. They lent Tanzania's clear voice to the freedom struggle. Firm opposition to racism and colonialism marked their whole role.

It worked for the unity of the developing world. Nyerere called on the poorer nations to stand together against domination and unfair trade. He worked tirelessly for the unity and solidarity of the South. He linked non-alignment closely to the cause of development. Tanzania thus promoted the unity of the weaker nations of the whole world.

It pressed for a fairer world economy. Nyerere was a powerful and respected voice for a new and fairer economic order between rich and poor nations. He spoke out against the exploitation of the developing world by the strong. He carried this cause of economic justice into the movement. Tanzania pressed hard for fairness between rich and poor.

It defended the true principles of non-alignment. Tanzania insisted that non-alignment must mean real independence, not a quiet lean towards either side. It criticised members who strayed from the true principle. It sought always to keep the movement faithful to its own aims. Tanzania was in this a guardian of genuine non-alignment among nations.

The role of Tanzania and Nyerere in the Non-Aligned Movement was therefore to make non-alignment a pillar of national policy, to give the movement a leading and respected voice, to champion the liberation of Africa, to stand firmly against colonialism and apartheid, to work for the unity of the developing world, to press for a fairer world economy, and to defend the true principles of non-alignment. From a small and poor nation, Nyerere made Tanzania a conscience of the non-aligned world.

Efforts to overcome the threats of the Cold War

Question 30

Having brought the world to the edge of ruin, the two powers slowly learned to step back, and to seek safety in talk rather than in arms.

Examine the measures taken to reduce the threats and tensions of the Cold War.

Model Answer

The threats and tensions of the Cold War, above all the danger of nuclear war, drove the powers and the world to seek ways to reduce them. Several measures were taken over the years to ease the rivalry. The measures taken to reduce the threats and tensions of the Cold War may be examined as follows.

The policy of peaceful coexistence. After the death of Stalin in 1953, the Soviet Union under Khrushchev proclaimed a policy of peaceful coexistence with the West. The two rival systems would compete with one another, but without going to war. This eased the sharp tension of the early Cold War. Peaceful coexistence was an early and important step towards safety.

Summit meetings between the leaders. The leaders of the powers met from time to time at summits to talk over their differences face to face. These meetings, though often difficult and sometimes fruitless, kept the two powers in contact. Talk and negotiation replaced open threats for a time. Summit diplomacy helped to reduce the tension between them.

The hot line between Washington and Moscow. After the Cuban crisis of 1962, a direct telephone link, the hot line, was set up between the two capitals. It let the leaders speak to each other at once in any sudden crisis. It thus lessened the danger of a war begun by accident or panic. The hot line reduced the risk of a sudden and unintended war.

The banning of nuclear tests. In 1963 the powers signed a treaty banning the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere. It slowed the arms race a little and lessened the poison it spread. It was the first real step in the control of nuclear arms. The test-ban treaty reduced both the danger and the harm of the race.

The policy of détente. In the 1970s the powers pursued détente, a deliberate easing of tension and a search for agreement. They increased their trade, met at summits and signed treaties limiting their arms. Relations between them grew markedly warmer for a decade. Détente was a great and sustained effort to reduce the tensions of the Cold War.

The arms-limitation agreements. In the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks the powers agreed to limit the numbers of their nuclear weapons, signing the first treaty in 1972. Later agreements went further and cut the arms deeper still. The powers thus sought to check and slow the race. Arms control agreements lessened the danger of nuclear war.

The work of the United Nations. The United Nations gave the powers a place to meet, to talk and to settle their disputes short of war. It worked to keep the peace in many quarrels around the world. It softened the sharpest edges of the rivalry. The United Nations helped in many ways to reduce the tensions of the Cold War.

The pressure of the Non-Aligned Movement. The Non-Aligned Movement pressed the powers steadily to end the arms race and to keep the peace. It gave a strong voice to the many nations that stood outside the rivalry. It urged restraint and reason upon the great powers. The movement worked to reduce the dangers of the Cold War for all.

The reforms of Gorbachev. In the 1980s the Soviet leader Gorbachev sought openly to end the Cold War, cutting arms and easing tension. He signed treaties to remove whole classes of nuclear weapons from Europe. His reforms brought the long rivalry towards its close. Gorbachev's efforts did most of all to reduce the tensions of the Cold War.

The measures taken to reduce the threats and tensions of the Cold War were therefore peaceful coexistence, summit meetings, the hot line, the banning of nuclear tests, the policy of détente, the arms-limitation agreements, the work of the United Nations, the pressure of the Non-Aligned Movement, and at last the reforms of Gorbachev. Step by step, having looked into the abyss, the powers drew back, until the rivalry was brought to an end.

Question 31

For a decade the two powers laid down a little of their enmity, and tried the unfamiliar arts of trust.

Explain the policy of détente and the arms-limitation agreements.

Model Answer

Détente was the easing of tension between the United States and the Soviet Union, above all in the 1970s, when the powers sought agreement in place of confrontation. It was marked by talks and treaties to limit their arms. The policy of détente and the arms-limitation agreements may be explained as follows.

The meaning of détente. Détente was a relaxing of the tension between the two powers, a turning from confrontation towards agreement and contact. The powers sought to live more easily and safely with one another. It did not end the rivalry itself, but softened and steadied it. Détente was, in short, an easing of the Cold War.

Its causes in the fear of nuclear war. The fright of the Cuban crisis and the terror of the growing arms race drove the powers to seek détente. Both feared the utter ruin that a nuclear war would bring upon them. Fear thus pushed the rivals towards agreement and restraint. The danger of nuclear war gave rise to the policy of détente.

The wish to slow the costly arms race. The vast cost of the arms race weighed heavily on both powers, and above all on the poorer Soviet Union. Both wished to slow the race and to save some of their wealth. Détente promised relief from an ever heavier burden. The crushing cost of arms drove the powers to talk and to bargain.

The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. In the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks the powers agreed to limit their nuclear weapons, signing a first treaty in 1972 and a second in 1979. These set agreed ceilings on the numbers of their arms. They marked the very height of the policy of détente. The talks were the heart of Cold War arms control.

The growth of trade and contact. Under détente the powers increased their trade and their many contacts, and their leaders met at friendly summits. Grain, goods, visits and agreements passed between the two worlds. The rival blocs drew a little closer together. Growing trade and contact were among the chief fruits of détente.

The Helsinki agreement of 1975. At Helsinki in 1975 the powers and the states of Europe agreed to accept the existing borders of Europe and to respect human rights. This eased the tension across the continent. It was a landmark and a high point of détente. Helsinki marked the easing of the Cold War in the heart of Europe.

The limits and breakdown of détente. Détente never ended the rivalry, and deep mistrust remained on both sides throughout. It broke down at the end of the 1970s, above all when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in 1979. The old tension quickly returned between them. Détente proved to be only a pause, not an end, in the Cold War.

The later arms agreements. After a fresh freeze in the early 1980s, arms control revived when the powers agreed to remove whole classes of missiles from Europe in 1987. These deeper cuts helped at last to end

the Cold War. Arms control thus came again, and went much further than before. The later agreements carried the work of détente to its end.

Détente was therefore an easing of the tension between the powers, driven by the fear of nuclear war and the cost of the arms race, and marked by the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, the growth of trade and contact, and the Helsinki agreement of 1975, though it broke down at the end of the 1970s over Afghanistan. Arms control revived in the 1980s and went deeper still, so that the search for agreement begun in détente helped at last to bring the Cold War to an end.

The thawing and freezing of the Cold War

Question 32

The Cold War did not burn at one steady heat, but ran hot and cold by turns, thawing into calm and freezing again into fear.

Explain the thawing and freezing of the Cold War.

Model Answer

The Cold War did not run at an even temper but passed through times of easing, called the thaw, and times of renewed tension, called the freeze. These turns marked the whole course of the rivalry. The thawing and freezing of the Cold War may be explained as follows.

The meaning of thawing and freezing. Thawing was the easing of the tension between the powers, and freezing its return and its sharpening. The Cold War moved back and forth between these two states over its long course. It grew warmer and then colder again by turns. Thawing and freezing were the very rhythm of the whole rivalry.

The early freeze after the war. The years just after 1945 were a hard freeze, as the wartime alliance broke down and the two blocs formed. The Berlin blockade of 1948 and the Korean War of 1950 brought high and dangerous tension. The rivalry in these years was bitter and cold. This was the first great freeze of the Cold War.

The first thaw after Stalin. After the death of Stalin in 1953 the tension eased, as the Soviet Union began to seek peaceful coexistence with the West. The powers began to talk to one another once more, and the rivalry grew a little warmer. It brought the first real easing since the war. This was an early thaw in the long Cold War.

The freeze of the great crises. The rivalry froze hard again in the crises over Berlin and Cuba around 1961 and 1962. The world was brought to the very brink of nuclear war, and the earlier thaw was quickly reversed. Tension between the powers rose once more to its height. These dangerous crises were a sharp and sudden freeze.

The thaw of détente. In the 1970s came the great thaw of détente, as the powers signed arms treaties and increased their trade. Tension fell markedly and agreement grew between them. The Cold War warmed for the better part of a decade. Détente was the deepest and longest thaw of the whole rivalry.

The second Cold War. At the end of the 1970s the rivalry froze once again, above all after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979. Arms and hostility grew afresh in the early 1980s under Reagan. This new and dangerous freeze was called the second Cold War. The rivalry had hardened sharply once more.

The final thaw under Gorbachev. In the later 1980s came the last and greatest thaw, as Gorbachev sought openly to end the rivalry. Arms were cut on both sides and the tension fell rapidly away. The Cold War warmed steadily towards its close. This final thaw led on directly to the end of the Cold War.

The pattern of the whole rivalry. The Cold War thus ran hot and cold through its whole length, freezing and thawing by turns. Each thaw eased the danger for a time, and each freeze renewed it. The rivalry never held one steady temper for long. This alternating pattern shaped the entire course of the Cold War.

The thawing and freezing of the Cold War therefore ran from the hard freeze after 1945, through the thaw that followed Stalin's death, the freeze of the Berlin and Cuban crises, the great thaw of détente, the freeze

of the second Cold War, and the final thaw under Gorbachev. The rivalry warmed and cooled by turns until, in the last thaw, it came to an end.

Question 33

The rivalry that had frozen the world for forty years melted away in a few short years, and the mightier-seeming of the two powers simply ceased to be.

Account for the end of the Cold War.

Model Answer

The Cold War came to an end between the late 1980s and 1991, as the tension between the powers fell away and the Soviet bloc collapsed. Several causes brought about this sudden end. The end of the Cold War may be accounted for as follows.

The reforms of Gorbachev. The Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, who came to power in 1985, sought to reform the Soviet Union and to end the Cold War. His new policies changed the whole course of the rivalry. He reached out to the West in friendship rather than in fear. Gorbachev's reforms were the chief cause of the end of the Cold War.

The policies of glasnost and perestroika. Gorbachev's policies of glasnost, or openness, and perestroika, or restructuring, sought to renew the failing Soviet Union. But they loosened its iron grip and let long-held grievances burst into the open. They shook the whole Soviet system to its roots. These reforms hastened the end of the Cold War.

The weakness of the Soviet economy. The Soviet economy was failing badly under the burden of arms and the faults of its central planning. It could no longer bear the enormous cost of the rivalry with the West. Its deep weakness forced the Soviet Union to seek peace. Economic ruin drove the Soviet Union to end the Cold War.

The crushing cost of the arms race. The long effort to match the far richer United States in arms had exhausted the Soviet Union. It simply could no longer keep pace in the costly race. The burden of arms had broken its strength at last. The crushing cost of the arms race helped greatly to end the Cold War.

The arms-reduction agreements. Gorbachev and the Western powers agreed to cut their arms, removing whole classes of missiles from Europe in 1987. These agreements eased the tension and slowly built trust between the sides. The dangerous arms race was at last wound down. Arms reduction helped to bring the Cold War to an end.

The revolutions in Eastern Europe. In 1989 the peoples of Eastern Europe rose and threw off their communist governments one after another. Gorbachev, unlike his forebears, did not send in the Soviet tanks to stop them. The whole Soviet bloc thus fell apart. These revolutions of 1989 marked the end of the Cold War.

The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. In November 1989 the Berlin Wall, the very symbol of the divided world, was thrown open and torn down. Germany at once began to move towards reunion. The iron curtain across Europe fell away. The fall of the Berlin Wall signalled the end of the Cold War to the world.

The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. In 1991 the Soviet Union itself broke apart into its fifteen separate republics and ceased to exist. One of the two great superpowers was simply gone. The rivalry could not outlive one of its two rivals. The collapse of the Soviet Union brought the Cold War to its final end.

The triumph of the Western model. The Western system, richer and freer, had outlasted and outmatched the Soviet one over forty years. Its strength and its wide appeal helped to bring down its exhausted rival. The West had won the long contest of the Cold War. The triumph of the Western model completed the end of the Cold War.

The Cold War therefore ended through the reforms of Gorbachev and his policies of glasnost and perestroika, the weakness of the Soviet economy, the crushing cost of the arms race, the arms-reduction agreements, the revolutions in Eastern Europe, the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the collapse of the Soviet

Union in 1991, and the triumph of the Western model. The rivalry that had gripped the world for forty years melted away, and one of the two great powers passed into history.

The significance of the Cold War

Question 34

For nearly half a century the shadow of the Cold War lay across the whole world, and when it lifted at last, it left the world remade.

Examine the effects and significance of the Cold War on the world.

Model Answer

The Cold War, the long rivalry of the United States and the Soviet Union, shaped the whole world for nearly half a century, and its effects outlived it. Its significance was felt in every quarter of the globe. The effects and significance of the Cold War on the world may be examined as follows.

It divided the world into two hostile blocs. The Cold War split the world into a Western and an Eastern bloc, and most nations were pressed to choose between them. The globe was thus divided by the long rivalry of the powers. This division shaped world affairs for over forty years. It was the great and ruling fact of the age.

It threatened the world with nuclear destruction. The arms race filled the world with weapons enough to destroy it many times over, and the danger of their use was never far away. Mankind was held for decades under the very shadow of the bomb. The world lived in constant dread of a nuclear war. The Cold War endangered the very survival of the world itself.

It caused wars across the globe. The rivalry set off proxy and regional wars in Korea, Vietnam, the Middle East and Africa. Millions of people died in these quarrels of the great powers. The Cold War thus carried war and ruin across the world. It brought terrible suffering to many lands far from its origins in Europe.

It shaped the fate of the newly independent nations. The Cold War drew the new nations of Africa and Asia into its rivalry and shaped their politics and development. Some chose the Western path, some the Eastern, and some neither. The Third World was deeply marked by the conflict. It shaped the very fate of the young nations.

It gave rise to the Non-Aligned Movement. In answer to the rivalry, the states that wished to belong to neither bloc formed the Non-Aligned Movement. A third force thus arose between the two great powers. The many small nations found through it a common voice. This was a notable and lasting result of the whole Cold War.

It drove great advances in science and technology. The rivalry drove both the arms race and the space race, and with them great advances in science. Rockets, computers, satellites and much else sprang from the fierce contest. Even so grim a rivalry thus bore some fruit for mankind. The Cold War carried human knowledge forward by great strides.

It ended in the triumph of the Western model. The Cold War ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the victory of the Western system of capitalism and democracy. The Western model then spread across much of the world. Its great communist rival was gone. This triumph of one system reshaped the post-war world.

It left a single superpower. With the fall of the Soviet Union, the United States was left as the one remaining superpower, and the old balance of two was overturned. The world became for a time unipolar, dominated by American power. That power now stood without a serious rival. The Cold War left one power supreme over the globe.

It left lasting scars and dangers. The Cold War left behind divided nations, such as Korea, a world awash with weapons, and many old wounds still unhealed. Its dangers and its debris long outlived the rivalry itself. The world still bears the marks of the conflict today. The Cold War left a heavy and lasting legacy behind it.

The effects and significance of the Cold War were therefore that it divided the world into two hostile blocs, threatened it with nuclear destruction, caused wars across the globe, shaped the fate of the new nations, gave rise to the Non-Aligned Movement, drove great advances in science, ended in the triumph of the Western model, left a single superpower, and left lasting scars and dangers behind it. For nearly half a century it was the ruling fact of world affairs, and its ending remade the world in which we live.

Question 35

For forty years the two most heavily armed powers in history stood face to face, and yet they never once went to war, held apart by the very weapons that threatened the world.

Account for the fact that the Cold War never became a direct war between the superpowers.

Model Answer

Though the United States and the Soviet Union were bitter rivals for over forty years, they never fought each other directly in a hot war. Several reasons held them back from the brink. The reasons why the Cold War never became a direct war between the superpowers may be examined as follows.

The fear of nuclear destruction. The chief reason was the fear of nuclear war, which would have destroyed both powers and the world with them. Neither dared to start a war that neither could survive. The bomb held them both back from the brink. The fear of nuclear destruction kept the Cold War cold.

The balance of terror. The rough balance of nuclear forces, the balance of terror, meant that neither power could hope to win a war. Each could destroy the other even after being struck first. War promised only common ruin. The balance of terror deterred any direct war.

They fought through proxy wars instead. Rather than fight each other directly, the powers fought through proxy wars in Korea, Vietnam and elsewhere. These let them struggle for advantage without ever facing each other. They loosed their anger through others. Fighting through proxies spared them a direct war.

The role of diplomacy and the hot line. Diplomacy, summit meetings and the hot line let the powers talk and settle crises before they became war. In the Cuban crisis of 1962 they drew back through negotiation. Talk replaced battle at the vital moment. Diplomacy helped to keep the peace between them.

The efforts at arms control and détente. Arms-control treaties and the détente of the 1970s eased tensions and built a measure of trust. The powers agreed to limit their arms and to soften their rivalry. These efforts lowered the danger of war. Arms control and détente helped to prevent a hot war.

The role of the United Nations. The United Nations gave the powers a place to meet and to settle their disputes short of war. It worked to keep the peace in many quarrels around the world. It softened the edges of the rivalry. The United Nations helped to prevent a direct war.

Both powers grew cautious after Cuba. After the Cuban crisis of 1962 had brought the world to the very brink, both powers grew more cautious and careful. They had looked into the abyss and drawn back in fright. Fear taught them a lasting restraint. The caution of both powers helped to keep the Cold War cold.

Neither power sought total war. In truth neither power wanted a total war that would destroy all that it had built. Each preferred to struggle by every other means. Such a war was in the interest of neither. That neither sought total war helped to keep the peace.

The Cold War never became a direct war between the superpowers therefore because of the fear of nuclear destruction and the balance of terror, because the powers fought through proxy wars instead, because diplomacy, the hot line, arms control, détente and the United Nations eased their quarrels, and because both grew cautious after Cuba and neither sought total war. For forty years the two most heavily armed powers in history stood face to face and never fought, held apart by the very weapons that threatened the world.

Chapter 4

NEW THREATS TO WORLD PEACE AND SECURITY

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 new threats to world peace and security

Question 1

The wars of the old world were fought by armies across borders, but the new dangers wear no uniform and respect no frontier.

Explain the meaning and main features of the new threats to world peace and security.

Model Answer

The new threats to world peace and security are the non-military and cross-border dangers that have risen to prominence since the end of the Cold War, such as terrorism, organised crime, disease and environmental destruction. They differ sharply from the traditional threat of war between states. The meaning and main features of the new threats to world peace and security may be explained as follows.

They are largely non-military in nature. Unlike the old threat of war between states, the new threats are often non-military, such as disease, poverty and environmental harm. They endanger the safety and welfare of ordinary people rather than merely the power of the state. They cannot be met by armies or by battle, for a soldier cannot shoot a virus or a famine. Their non-military character is a chief feature of the new threats.

They cross national borders. The new threats pay no heed to borders, spreading from one country to many at once. Terrorism, trafficking, disease and pollution flow freely across frontiers, carried by trade, travel and the winds. No state can shut them out by guarding its own borders alone. Their cross-border and transnational character clearly marks the new threats.

They often come from non-state actors. Many new threats come not from states but from non-state actors, such as terrorist groups, criminal networks and pirates. These shadowy groups are hard to find and harder still to fight, for they hide among the people. They answer to no government and wear no uniform. The rise of non-state actors is a feature of the new threats.

They threaten human security, not only the state. The new threats endanger the health, livelihood and safety of ordinary people, not only the power of states. They reach into the daily life of the individual, into the home, the market and the workplace. Human security has thus become as important as national security. This focus on human security marks the new threats.

They are complex and interconnected. The new threats are tangled together, one feeding another, as terrorism, crime, poverty and weak states reinforce one another. They cannot be understood or solved in isolation from the rest. Their web of connections makes them hard to unravel and to master. Complexity and interconnection are chief features of the new threats.

They are global in reach. The new threats affect the whole world, rich and poor nations alike, and spread with the speed of modern travel and communication. A disease or a cyber attack can circle the globe in a matter of days. No nation, however strong, is wholly safe from them. Their global reach is a chief feature of the new threats.

They require international cooperation to combat. Because they cross borders, the new threats cannot be defeated by any one state acting alone, however powerful it may be. They demand cooperation among nations and the work of regional and world bodies. Only united and sustained action can hope to meet them. The need for cooperation is a feature of the new threats.

They are difficult to predict and to prevent. The new threats often strike without warning, from unexpected quarters, and are hard to foresee or to stop. A terrorist attack or a new disease may come at any

time and in any place. They keep the whole world in constant watchfulness and unease. Their unpredictability is a feature of the new threats.

The new threats to world peace and security are therefore the non-military, cross-border dangers of the post-Cold War world, marked by their non-military nature, their disregard for borders, their rise from non-state actors, their focus on human security, their complexity, their global reach, their need for international cooperation, and their unpredictability. They have made the securing of peace a wider and harder task than the mere prevention of war between states.

Question 2

Where once the danger to peace wore the uniform of a rival state, today it hides in a crowd, a computer or a changing climate.

Distinguish between the traditional and the new threats to world peace and security.

Model Answer

The traditional threats to world peace were the military dangers of war between states, while the new threats are the non-military, cross-border dangers that have risen since the Cold War. The two differ in their nature, their sources and their remedies. The differences between the traditional and the new threats to world peace and security may be examined as follows.

Their nature: military against non-military. The traditional threats were military, above all war between states, while the new threats are often non-military, such as disease, crime and poverty. The one is fought with armies and weapons, the other cannot be. This difference in their very nature is the first between them. The old threat was war, but the new threat is far wider.

Their source: states against non-state actors. The traditional threats came from states and their armies, while the new threats often come from non-state actors such as terrorists and criminals. The old enemy wore a uniform and carried a flag, but the new one does not. This difference in source sets them sharply apart. States have given way to shadowy groups.

Their reach: contained against cross-border. The traditional threats were largely contained within borders and battlefields, while the new threats cross borders freely. War was fought between two lands, but terrorism and disease spread everywhere at once. This difference in reach divides them sharply. The new threats know no frontier and respect no border.

Their target: the state against the individual. The traditional threats endangered the state and its territory, while the new threats endanger the security of ordinary people. The old danger was to national security, the new to human security and daily life. This difference in target marks them clearly apart. The new threats reach into the home itself.

Their visibility: open against hidden. The traditional threats were open and visible, declared in war between states, while the new threats are hidden and hard to see. An army could be seen coming from afar, but a terrorist or a hacker cannot. This difference in visibility divides them. The new threats strike from the shadows without warning.

Their remedy: arms against cooperation. The traditional threats were met by armies, alliances and defence, while the new threats need international cooperation, policing and development. Force alone can never defeat the new dangers of the age. This difference in remedy sets them apart. The new threats demand wholly new tools.

Their predictability: foreseeable against sudden. The traditional threats often gave warning, as tensions built slowly towards war, while the new threats strike suddenly and without notice. A war between states could be foreseen, but a terror attack cannot. This difference in predictability divides them. The new threats come unlooked for and unannounced.

Their scope: local against global. The traditional threats were often local or regional, while the new threats are global, affecting the whole world at once. A disease or a cyber attack can spread worldwide

within a few days. This difference in scope marks them clearly apart. The new threats are truly global in their spread.

The traditional and the new threats to world peace therefore differ in their nature, being military against non-military, in their source, states against non-state actors, in their reach, contained against cross-border, in their target, the state against the individual, and in their visibility, their remedy, their predictability and their scope. The world has passed from an age of open war between states to one of hidden, global and many-sided dangers to the security of all.

Question 3

The same forces that knit the world together, its open borders and its swift machines, also opened new roads for its enemies.

Examine the causes of the rise of the new threats to world peace and security.

Model Answer

The new threats to world peace and security rose to prominence in the years after the Cold War, driven by great changes in the world's politics, economy and technology. Several forces gave rise to them. The causes of the rise of the new threats to world peace and security may be examined as follows.

The end of the Cold War. The end of the Cold War in 1991 removed the old order of two blocs and left many conflicts and weapons loose in the world. New dangers rushed to fill the space left by the superpower rivalry. Old certainties gave way to a new and shifting disorder. The end of the Cold War helped greatly to bring on the new threats.

Globalisation. The growing closeness of the world, its open borders, trade and travel, let threats spread as never before. What helped goods and people to move also helped terrorists, criminals and diseases to move with them. Globalisation thus opened new roads for danger. It was a leading cause of the rise of the new threats.

Advances in technology. Modern technology, from the aeroplane to the internet, gave new tools and new reach to the enemies of peace. Terrorists, criminals and hackers used it to plan, to spread and to strike across the world. Technology in this way armed the new threats. Its rapid advance was a cause of their rise.

Poverty and inequality. The wide gulf between rich and poor bred anger, desperation and crime across the world. Poverty drove many people into terrorism, trafficking and conflict for want of any better hope. Inequality gave the new threats their recruits and their causes. Poverty was a deep cause of the new threats.

Weak and failed states. States too weak to govern their own lands became havens for terrorists, pirates and criminals. Where government failed and collapsed, as in Somalia, the new threats flourished unchecked. Ungoverned spaces bred danger for the whole world. Weak and failed states were a leading cause of the new threats.

Religious and ethnic extremism. The spread of extreme religious and ethnic ideas drove terrorism and violence across the world. Fanaticism turned belief and identity into weapons of hatred against others. Extremism fed, inspired and justified the new threats. Its rise was a cause of their growth.

The spread of weapons. The flood of small arms and other weapons across the world armed terrorists, criminals and rebels alike. Cheap and plentiful guns fed conflict and crime in every corner of the earth. The spread of arms made the new threats far deadlier. It was a cause of their rise.

Environmental change. The degrading of the environment and the changing of the climate bred new dangers, from disaster to conflict over shrinking resources. Drought and flood drove desperate people to migration and to war. Environmental change thus gave rise to new threats. It was among the deeper causes of them.

Porous borders and weak international control. Open and poorly guarded borders, and the weakness of international control, let threats move freely between nations. Criminals and terrorists slipped across frontiers with little to stop them. The very openness of the world was hard to police. Porous borders were a cause of the new threats.

The new threats to world peace and security therefore rose from the end of the Cold War, globalisation, advances in technology, poverty and inequality, weak and failed states, religious and ethnic extremism, the spread of weapons, environmental change, and porous borders. The very forces that made the modern world so closely joined also opened it to new and many-sided dangers.

Question 4

The old wars killed by the million, yet the new threats, quieter and slower, may in the end prove no less deadly.

"The new threats to world peace are more dangerous than the traditional ones." How far do you agree with this statement?

Model Answer

The statement sets the hidden, cross-border dangers of today against the open wars of the past, and claims that the new threats are the more dangerous. The claim holds much truth, yet the traditional threat of war, above all nuclear war, remains grave. How far the new threats are more dangerous than the traditional ones may be examined as follows.

The new threats are harder to see and to fight. The new threats are hidden and come from shadowy non-state actors, unlike the open armies of old. They strike without warning and cannot be easily found, reached or deterred. This makes them far harder to guard against than a marching army. In this they are indeed more dangerous than the traditional threats.

They cross borders and reach everywhere. The new threats spread across the whole world, ignoring borders and defences alike. Terrorism, disease and cyber attack can reach any nation at any time. No wall, army or ocean can keep them wholly out. Their global reach makes them dangerous in a wholly new way.

They endanger the daily life of all people. The new threats touch the health, wealth and safety of ordinary people everywhere, not only soldiers on a battlefield. Disease, crime and terror reach into every home and market. They threaten the human security of all mankind. In this great breadth they are gravely dangerous.

They are many, complex and constant. The new threats are many and tangled, and they never cease, unlike wars that begin and end. The world must guard against them always and on every side at once. Their number and their persistence steadily wear down defences. This makes them a dangerous and lasting burden upon the world.

Yet war between states remains the gravest threat. The traditional threat of war between states has not vanished, and remains able to kill on a vast scale. Great wars still threaten whole regions and peoples with ruin. War remains the most destructive of all dangers. In this the traditional threat is still the graver of the two.

Nuclear weapons could destroy the world. The traditional threat now includes nuclear weapons able to destroy mankind in a single afternoon. No new threat, however grave, can match this power to annihilate whole nations. The bomb remains the ultimate danger to the world. In this the traditional threat is by far the more deadly.

The new threats often flow from the old. Many new threats grow out of traditional ones, as wars breed refugees, loose weapons and failed states. The two are bound together and cannot be wholly separated from each other. Old and new dangers feed and worsen one another. It is thus hard to weigh either wholly above the other.

The weight of the argument. The new threats are more constant, more widespread and harder to fight, yet the traditional threat of great and nuclear war remains the most destructive of all. Each is dangerous in its own way and cannot be safely ignored. Neither the old nor the new may be neglected. The truth lies in holding both firmly in view.

The new threats to world peace are therefore more dangerous in some ways, being hidden, cross-border, constant and reaching into the life of all, yet the traditional threat of war between states, and above all of nuclear war, remains the most destructive danger of all. Since the two are bound together and each is grave,

it is truest to say that the world now faces both the old dangers and the new, and can afford to neglect neither.

Terrorism

Question 5

Terror seeks not to defeat an army but to break a people's will, striking the innocent to frighten the many.

Explain the concept of terrorism and its main features.

Model Answer

Terrorism is the use of violence and fear against innocent people to force political, religious or ideological ends. It has become one of the gravest of the new threats to world peace and security. The concept of terrorism and its main features may be explained as follows.

The meaning of terrorism. Terrorism is the deliberate use of violence and fear against civilians to advance a political, religious or ideological cause. It seeks to force change through terror rather than through open war or reasoned argument. It strikes the innocent in order to move and frighten the powerful. This is the essential meaning of terrorism.

It targets innocent civilians. Terrorism strikes not armies but innocent people, in markets, trains, offices and places of worship. It spares neither women, children nor the old, but kills without mercy. The deliberate killing of the innocent is its very method. The targeting of civilians is a chief feature of terrorism.

It seeks to spread fear. The true aim of terrorism is to spread fear far beyond its actual victims. By a single dreadful attack it seeks to frighten a whole nation or people into submission. Terror, and not the number killed, is its real purpose. The spreading of fear is a defining feature of terrorism.

It has political or ideological aims. Terrorism is used to force political, religious or ideological ends, such as the seizing of power or the founding of a state. It is violence deliberately turned to serve a cause. It is not mere crime but crime with a settled purpose. Its political aim marks it out from ordinary violence.

It is carried out by non-state groups. Terrorism is chiefly the weapon of non-state groups, such as Al-Qaeda, the Islamic State and Boko Haram, rather than of states. These shadowy networks hide among the people and strike from within. They wear no uniform and hold no fixed ground. The use of non-state groups is a feature of terrorism.

It uses surprise and secrecy. Terrorists strike by surprise and in secret, choosing themselves the time and place of their attack. They cannot be met in open battle like a regular army. Their stealth and cunning make them very hard to stop. Surprise and secrecy are chief features of terrorism.

It is international in its reach. Modern terrorism reaches across the world, striking many nations and joining hands across borders. Groups plan in one land and strike in another far away. It has thus become a truly global danger to peace. Its international reach is a chief feature of modern terrorism.

Terrorism is therefore the deliberate use of violence and fear against innocent civilians to advance political, religious or ideological aims, marked by its targeting of the innocent, its spreading of fear, its political purpose, its use by non-state groups, its surprise and secrecy, and its international reach. It has become one of the most feared of the new threats to the peace and security of the world.

Question 6

No one is born a terrorist; the bomb and the gun are the bitter fruit of grievances, real and imagined, left too long to fester.

Examine the causes of terrorism in the modern world.

Model Answer

Terrorism, the use of violence and fear against the innocent for political ends, has many roots in the modern world. Its causes lie in politics, religion, poverty and the conditions of the age. The causes of terrorism in the modern world may be examined as follows.

Religious extremism and fanaticism. Much modern terrorism springs from extreme and fanatical religious belief, which turns faith into a weapon. Groups such as the Islamic State claim to kill and to conquer in the name of religion. Fanaticism blinds its followers to the value of human life. Religious extremism is a leading cause of terrorism.

Political grievances and oppression. Terrorism often grows from political grievances, oppression and the denial of rights. Those who feel wronged and unheard may in the end turn to violence. Injustice, whether real or only felt, breeds the terrorist. Political grievance is a chief cause of terrorism.

Poverty and unemployment. Poverty, joblessness and hopelessness drive many, above all the young, into the arms of terrorist groups. Those with nothing to lose are easily recruited to the cause. Terror offers them purpose, belonging and pay together. Poverty is a deep cause of terrorism.

Ethnic and national conflicts. Terrorism often arises from ethnic and national struggles, as peoples fight for freedom or for a state of their own. Such bitter conflicts breed groups that use terror as their weapon. National grievance readily turns to violence. Ethnic and national conflict is a cause of terrorism.

Foreign interference and occupation. The interference of foreign powers, and the occupation of lands, breed anger that turns to terrorism. Those who resent foreign domination may strike at it by terror. Occupation and intervention feed and inflame the terrorist's cause. Foreign interference is a cause of terrorism.

The influence of ideology and propaganda. Terrorist groups spread their ideas by propaganda, above all through the internet, and win recruits to their cause. They teach hatred and glorify violence and martyrdom to the young. Ideology gives terrorism its foot soldiers. The spread of extremist propaganda is a cause of terrorism.

Weak states and ungoverned spaces. Weak and failed states, such as Somalia and Afghanistan, give terrorists room to gather, train and hide. Where government is absent, terror takes root and grows unchecked. Ungoverned spaces become the breeding grounds of terrorism. Weak states are a cause of its rise.

The availability of weapons and funding. Terrorism is fed by the easy supply of weapons and by money from crime, donation and trafficking. Armed and funded, terrorist groups can strike hard, often and far. Guns and money together make terror possible. Their easy availability is a cause of terrorism.

The causes of terrorism in the modern world are therefore religious extremism, political grievances and oppression, poverty and unemployment, ethnic and national conflicts, foreign interference, the influence of ideology and propaganda, weak and failed states, and the easy supply of weapons and funding. Terrorism springs not from a single root but from a tangle of grievance, belief and opportunity, which the world must understand if it is ever to be overcome.

Question 7

A single hour of terror can undo years of peace, sowing fear, hatred and ruin that long outlast the smoke.

Examine the effects of terrorism on world peace and security.

Model Answer

Terrorism, the use of violence and fear against the innocent, has grave effects on the peace and security of the world. Its harm reaches far beyond its immediate victims. The effects of terrorism on world peace and security may be examined as follows.

Loss of life and injury. Terrorism kills and maims great numbers of innocent people, as in the attacks of the eleventh of September 2001, which killed nearly three thousand. Whole families are destroyed in a single moment of violence. The loss of so many innocent lives is terrible. This is the first and cruellest effect of terrorism.

The spread of fear and insecurity. Terrorism fills whole nations with fear, so that people dread crowded places, travel and even daily life. A single attack can frighten many millions who were far from it. Fear

becomes a constant companion of the people. The spreading of fear and insecurity is a chief effect of terrorism.

Destruction of property and infrastructure. Terrorist attacks destroy buildings, transport and other property, causing great material loss. Bombs wreck in a single moment what took years of labour to build. Cities and vital services are damaged and disrupted. The destruction of property is a serious effect of terrorism.

Damage to the economy. Terrorism harms trade, tourism and investment, as fear drives away visitors and business. Whole economies suffer, above all those that depend upon tourism. Much money must be diverted from progress to security. Economic damage is a heavy effect of terrorism.

Disruption of peace and stability. Terrorism disturbs the peace and stability of nations and regions, sometimes tipping them into wider conflict. It undermines governments and the public order they keep. Peace itself is broken by the fear and the violence. The disruption of stability is an effect of terrorism.

Strained relations between peoples. Terrorism sows suspicion and hatred between nations, religions and communities. It can set peoples against one another and breed harsh reprisals. Trust between them is deeply poisoned. The straining of relations between peoples is an effect of terrorism.

The rise of harsh security measures. In answer to terrorism, states impose harsh security measures that may curb the freedoms of ordinary people. Rights are narrowed and privacy lost in the name of safety. Liberty is often the price paid for security. This tightening of control is an effect of terrorism.

It can provoke war. Terrorism can draw states into war, as the attacks of 2001 led to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. A single act of terror can set off a far wider and longer conflict. War and further ruin follow in its train. The provoking of war is among the gravest effects of terrorism.

The effects of terrorism on world peace and security are therefore the loss of life and injury, the spread of fear and insecurity, the destruction of property, the damage to economies, the disruption of peace and stability, the straining of relations between peoples, the rise of harsh security measures, and even the provoking of war. By a single act of violence, terrorism can sow fear and ruin across the whole world.

Question 8

From the ruins of the Twin Towers to a kidnapped schoolroom in Nigeria, a handful of terrorist groups have written their names in the world's fear.

Examine the major terrorist organisations of the modern world and their effects.

Model Answer

The modern world has been troubled by a number of major terrorist organisations, whose attacks have spread death and fear across many nations. Their rise and their deeds have made terrorism a leading threat to world peace. The major terrorist organisations of the modern world and their effects may be examined as follows.

Al-Qaeda. Al-Qaeda, led by Osama bin Laden, is the terrorist network that carried out the attacks of the eleventh of September 2001 on the United States. It sought to drive Western power and influence from the Muslim world. It made terrorism a global danger and a household fear. Al-Qaeda is the most infamous of the modern terrorist groups.

The attacks of the eleventh of September 2001. Al-Qaeda's attacks of 2001, which destroyed the Twin Towers in New York and killed nearly three thousand people, shocked the whole world. They showed to all the reach and the horror of modern terrorism. They led directly to the global war on terror. These attacks were a turning point in the history of terrorism.

The Islamic State. The Islamic State, also called ISIS, seized much of Syria and Iraq and declared a caliphate in 2014. It killed, enslaved and terrorised on a vast scale, and inspired attacks across the world. Its cruelty and its beheadings appalled all mankind. The Islamic State became a great threat to world peace.

Boko Haram. Boko Haram is the terrorist group of northern Nigeria, which fights against Western education and government. It has killed many thousands and, in 2014, kidnapped hundreds of schoolgirls at Chibok. It has spread terror and ruin across West Africa. Boko Haram is among the deadliest of terrorist groups.

Al-Shabaab. Al-Shabaab is the terrorist group based in Somalia, which seeks to impose its harsh rule by force. It has struck across East Africa, including the Westgate attack in Nairobi in 2013 and the Garissa University attack in 2015. It threatens the whole region, Tanzania among it. Al-Shabaab is a grave threat to East Africa.

The embassy bombings of 1998. In 1998 Al-Qaeda bombed the United States embassies in Dar es Salaam and Nairobi, killing hundreds and wounding many thousands. This brought the terror of Al-Qaeda directly to the soil of East Africa. It showed that no region was safe from its reach. The embassy bombings struck Tanzania itself.

Their common effects. These groups have together killed many thousands, spread fear across the world, and drawn states into war. They have poisoned relations between peoples and religions everywhere. Their deeds have made terrorism a leading threat to peace. Their effects have been felt across the whole globe.

Their use of religion and propaganda. These groups cloak their violence in the language of religion and spread their message by propaganda and the internet. They win recruits and spread fear far beyond their own lands and borders. They turn faith itself into a weapon of terror. Their use of religion and propaganda marks them all.

The major terrorist organisations of the modern world therefore include Al-Qaeda, the Islamic State, Boko Haram and Al-Shabaab, whose deeds, from the attacks of 2001 and the embassy bombings of 1998 to the horrors in Syria, Nigeria and East Africa, have spread death and fear across the world. Cloaking their violence in religion and spread by propaganda, these groups have made terrorism one of the gravest threats to the peace and security of mankind.

Question 9

To fight an enemy without a face or a flag, the nations of the world have had to learn wholly new arts of war and of peace.

Assess the measures taken to combat terrorism.

Model Answer

The rise of terrorism has driven the nations of the world to take many measures, at home and abroad, to combat it. These measures range from force to cooperation and to the tackling of the roots of terror. The measures taken to combat terrorism may be assessed as follows.

Strengthening security and intelligence. States have strengthened their police, armies and intelligence services to detect and stop terrorist attacks. Airports, borders and public places are now closely watched and guarded. Better intelligence can foil deadly plots before they strike. Strengthening security and intelligence is a chief measure against terrorism.

International cooperation. Because terrorism crosses borders, nations have joined together to share intelligence and to hunt terrorists across the world. Bodies such as the United Nations and Interpol help to coordinate the effort. No single state can fight the terror alone. International cooperation is a leading measure against terrorism.

Military action against terrorist groups. States have used military force against terrorist groups and their bases, as in Afghanistan after 2001 and against Al-Shabaab in Somalia. Such action can destroy their camps, leaders and strongholds. Force undoubtedly has its place in the fight. Military action is a measure against terrorism.

Cutting off terrorist financing. Nations have worked to cut off the money that funds terrorism, by tracking and freezing its funds. Without money, terrorists cannot arm, train, travel or act. Attacking their finances greatly weakens them. Cutting off funding is an important measure against terrorism.

Laws against terrorism. States have passed strict laws to outlaw terrorism, to punish its supporters, and to prevent attacks. These laws give the authorities the power to act firmly and swiftly. They set the whole force of the state against terror. Anti-terrorism laws are a measure against terrorism.

Tackling the roots of terrorism. Wiser efforts seek to tackle the roots of terror, such as poverty, injustice and grievance. By removing the causes, they hope to dry up the very supply of recruits. Force alone can never end terrorism. Tackling its roots is a vital measure against it.

Countering extremist ideology. States and communities work to counter the extremist ideas that feed terrorism, above all among the young. They challenge the propaganda and offer a better and more hopeful way. Ideas must in the end be fought with ideas. Countering extremist ideology is a measure against terrorism.

Their limits and difficulties. These measures have had real success, yet terrorism has not been ended, and harsh measures may breed fresh grievances. The fight against terror is long, costly and difficult. Force may create as many enemies as it destroys. The measures against terrorism, though needful, have their limits.

The measures taken to combat terrorism therefore include the strengthening of security and intelligence, international cooperation, military action, the cutting off of financing, anti-terrorism laws, the tackling of the roots of terror, and the countering of extremist ideology, though these have not ended terrorism and may sometimes breed fresh grievances. The world has learned that terrorism can be checked only by joining force with justice, and arms with the removal of its causes.

Transnational organised crime

Question 10

Beyond the reach of any single nation's law, vast criminal empires trade in drugs, guns and human beings across the borders of the world.

Explain the concept of transnational organised crime and its main forms.

Model Answer

Transnational organised crime is serious crime carried out by organised groups across the borders of nations for profit. It has become one of the leading new threats to world peace and security. The concept of transnational organised crime and its main forms may be explained as follows.

The meaning of transnational organised crime. Transnational organised crime is crime carried out by organised groups that operate across national borders for profit. It is planned, lasting and run much like a great business. It reaches from one country into many others at once. This is the essential meaning of transnational organised crime.

Drug trafficking. Among its chief forms is the trafficking of illegal drugs, such as cocaine and heroin, across the world. Criminal networks grow, move and sell these drugs for vast and easy profit. Drug trafficking ruins lives and funds much further crime. It is a leading form of transnational organised crime.

Human trafficking and smuggling. Another form is the trafficking and smuggling of human beings, for forced labour, prostitution and servitude. People are bought, sold and moved across borders like mere goods. It is nothing less than a modern form of slavery. Human trafficking is a grave form of organised crime.

Arms trafficking. Organised crime also trades in illegal weapons, arming rebels, terrorists and criminals across the world. The illegal arms trade feeds war, crime and violence everywhere it reaches. Guns flow freely to those who should never have them. Arms trafficking is a dangerous form of organised crime.

Money laundering. Criminals hide the source of their illegal money by laundering it through banks and businesses. This turns their dirty money into clean and lets crime pay. It corrupts the economy and the law alike. Money laundering is a key form of organised crime.

Smuggling and illegal trade. Organised crime smuggles goods of every kind, from minerals and ivory to counterfeit products, avoiding tax and law. It plunders the resources of nations and cheats the state of its

revenue. Illegal trade robs whole countries of their wealth. Smuggling is a common form of organised crime.

Its organised and profit-seeking nature. All these forms are run by organised groups for profit, using violence, bribery and secrecy. They are like dark businesses that span the whole world. Profit is their only god and crime their trade. This organised, profit-seeking nature marks transnational crime.

Transnational organised crime is therefore serious crime carried out by organised groups across borders for profit, taking such forms as drug trafficking, human trafficking, arms trafficking, money laundering and the smuggling of goods. Run like dark businesses that span the world, these criminal networks undermine the security, the wealth and the law of nations, and rank among the gravest of the new threats.

Question 11

The trade in drugs turns misery into gold, poisoning the young of every nation and funding the enemies of order.

Examine the causes and effects of drug trafficking.

Model Answer

Drug trafficking is the illegal growing, moving and selling of narcotic drugs across the world for profit. It is a leading form of transnational organised crime and a grave threat to security. The causes and effects of drug trafficking may be examined as follows.

The great profits to be made. Drug trafficking is driven above all by the vast profits it brings, for drugs sell at very high prices. The lure of quick and enormous wealth draws criminals into the trade. Profit is the true engine of the whole business. The great profits to be made are a chief cause of drug trafficking.

The high demand for drugs. There is a large and constant demand for drugs among users across the world. So long as people will buy them, criminals will supply them. Demand keeps the whole trade alive and ever growing. The high demand for drugs is a leading cause of trafficking.

Poverty and unemployment. Poverty and joblessness drive many to grow, carry or sell drugs for a living. Those with few other choices take the risk for the money. Sheer want pushes people into the dangerous trade. Poverty is a cause of drug trafficking.

Weak laws and corruption. Weak laws, poor policing and corruption let the drug trade flourish unchecked. Bribed officials look the other way, and borders go unguarded. Where the law is weak, the drugs flow freely across it. Corruption and weak law are causes of trafficking.

The ruin of health and lives. Drugs ruin the health and lives of those who use them, breeding addiction, disease and early death. The young above all are destroyed by them. Families and whole communities are broken by the trade. The ruin of health and lives is a grave effect of drug trafficking.

The funding of crime and terror. The huge profits of the drug trade fund other crime, and even terrorism, in what is called narco-terrorism. Drug money arms and enriches the enemies of order. It makes both crime and terror far stronger. The funding of crime and terror is an effect of trafficking.

Crime, violence and corruption. Drug trafficking breeds violence, gang warfare and the corruption of officials and states. Whole regions are terrorised by the ruthless drug gangs. Public order breaks down before their power. Violence and corruption are grave effects of drug trafficking.

Harm to the economy and society. Drug trafficking harms the economy and society, wasting lives, spreading disease and undermining the law. It corrupts the youth and drains the nation's strength and future. Society is weakened at its very roots. Harm to the economy and society is an effect of trafficking.

Drug trafficking therefore springs from the great profits to be made, the high demand for drugs, poverty and unemployment, and weak laws and corruption, and it brings the ruin of health and lives, the funding of crime and terror, violence and corruption, and harm to the economy and society. It poisons the young of every nation and enriches the enemies of order, and so ranks among the gravest of the new threats to security.

Question 12

In an age that boasts of freedom, millions are still bought and sold, a slavery that hides in the shadows of the modern world.

Examine the causes and effects of human trafficking.

Model Answer

Human trafficking is the illegal trade in human beings, who are bought, sold and moved for forced labour, prostitution and servitude. It is a modern form of slavery and a grave new threat to security. The causes and effects of human trafficking may be examined as follows.

Poverty and unemployment. Poverty and the lack of work drive many to seek a better life elsewhere, and so into the hands of the traffickers. The desperate are easily deceived and trapped by false hope. Their very want makes them easy prey. Poverty is a chief cause of human trafficking.

The demand for cheap labour and prostitution. There is a demand for cheap, forced labour and for prostitution, which the traffickers supply with human beings. This dark demand drives the whole cruel trade. People are seized and sold to meet it. The demand for cheap labour and sex is a cause of trafficking.

The lure of false promises. Traffickers deceive their victims with false promises of work, marriage or a better life abroad. The hopeful are lured step by step into a cruel trap. Deceit is the trafficker's chief and favoured tool. False promises are a cause of human trafficking.

Weak laws and corruption. Weak laws, poor policing and corruption let traffickers ply their trade across borders. Bribed officials and open frontiers help them at every turn. Where the law is weak, the trade thrives freely. Weak law and corruption are causes of trafficking.

The suffering of the victims. The victims of trafficking suffer terribly, in forced labour, prostitution, abuse and servitude. Their freedom, their dignity and their health are all destroyed. Many never escape their captors alive. The suffering of the victims is the cruellest effect of human trafficking.

A modern form of slavery. Human trafficking is a modern slavery, in which people are owned, bought and sold as property. It denies the most basic of all human rights. It shames the conscience of the whole world. This revival of slavery is a grave effect of trafficking.

The spread of disease and crime. Trafficking, above all for prostitution, spreads disease such as HIV and AIDS, and feeds other crime. It harms the health of whole communities and nations. Crime grows fat upon its cruel profits. The spread of disease and crime is an effect of trafficking.

Harm to society and to nations. Human trafficking harms society, breaks families, and robs nations of their people and their honour. It corrupts officials and weakens the rule of law. It is a deep and shameful wound in the body of society. Harm to society and to nations is an effect of trafficking.

Human trafficking therefore springs from poverty and unemployment, the demand for cheap labour and prostitution, the lure of false promises, and weak laws and corruption, and it brings the terrible suffering of its victims, a revival of slavery, the spread of disease and crime, and harm to society and to nations. It is a slavery that hides in the shadows of the modern world, and one of the most shameful of the new threats to human security.

Question 13

It is not the great bombs but the cheap rifle, passed from hand to hand, that has done most of the killing in the wars of our age.

Examine the proliferation of small arms and light weapons as a threat to world peace.

Model Answer

The proliferation of small arms and light weapons is the uncontrolled spread of guns and light weapons across the world, above all into the hands of rebels, criminals and terrorists. It has become a grave new

threat to peace and security. The proliferation of small arms and light weapons as a threat may be examined as follows.

The meaning of the proliferation of small arms. The proliferation of small arms is the widespread and uncontrolled spread of guns and light weapons across the world. These cheap and easily carried weapons pass readily from hand to hand and from war to war. They reach those who should never bear them at all. This is the essential meaning of the threat.

It fuels wars and conflicts. Small arms fuel the many wars and conflicts of the modern world, above all in Africa. Cheap and plentiful guns keep the fighting going year after year. They arm rebels, militias and warlords for a whole generation. The fuelling of war is a chief danger of small arms.

It arms terrorists and criminals. Small arms flow into the hands of terrorists, criminals and gangs, who use them to kill and to terrorise. Guns make these groups deadly, bold and hard to resist. Without such arms, they would be far weaker and fewer. The arming of terrorists and criminals is a danger of proliferation.

It prolongs conflicts. The endless supply of cheap weapons prolongs wars that might otherwise soon end. Fighters can always find more guns to carry on the struggle. Peace is pushed ever further away by the flood of arms. The prolonging of conflict is a serious danger of small arms.

It causes great loss of life. Small arms are the weapons that do most of the killing in modern conflict, taking many thousands of lives. They kill soldiers and civilians alike, without distinction or mercy. Most war deaths now come from these very weapons. The great loss of life is a danger of proliferation.

It breeds crime and insecurity. Where guns are cheap and plentiful, crime and insecurity flourish, for criminals are easily armed. Robbery, murder and gang violence increase across the land. People come to live in daily fear of the gun. Crime and insecurity are effects of small arms proliferation.

It hinders development. By fuelling war and crime, the spread of small arms hinders the development of nations. It drives away investment and destroys what has been built. Peace and progress alike are made impossible. The hindering of development is a danger of proliferation.

It is hard to control. Small arms are easy to hide, to carry and to trade, and so are very hard to control. They cross borders in secret and pass from one war to the next. Once loose in the world, they are hard ever to gather up. The difficulty of control makes the threat a lasting one.

The proliferation of small arms and light weapons is therefore the uncontrolled spread of guns across the world, which fuels wars, arms terrorists and criminals, prolongs conflicts, causes great loss of life, breeds crime and insecurity, hinders development, and is very hard to control. It is the cheap rifle, more than the great bomb, that has done most of the killing in the wars of our age, and so ranks among the gravest of the new threats.

Question 14

Crime cannot spend its gains in the open, and so it washes its dirty money clean, and buys with it the very order it destroys.

Examine money laundering as a threat to world peace and security.

Model Answer

Money laundering is the hiding of the illegal source of money, so that the profits of crime may be used as if they were clean. It is a leading form of transnational organised crime and a threat to security. Money laundering as a threat to world peace and security may be examined as follows.

The meaning of money laundering. Money laundering is the process by which criminals hide the illegal source of their money and make it appear clean. Dirty money is passed through banks and businesses until its true origin is lost. It can then be freely and safely spent. This is the essential meaning of money laundering.

It lets crime pay. By laundering their money, criminals enjoy the profits of their crimes without fear of the law. Crime becomes safe, easy and well worth the risk. The whole reward of crime is thereby secured to them. Letting crime pay is a chief danger of money laundering.

It funds other crime and terror. Laundered money funds further crime, and even terrorism, giving them the means to grow. Clean money quietly buys arms, bribes and recruits. It strengthens the enemies of order and the law. The funding of crime and terror is a danger of money laundering.

It corrupts banks and businesses. Money laundering draws banks, businesses and officials into crime, corrupting them all. Honest institutions are used, knowingly or not, to hide dirty money. The line between clean and criminal is blurred. The corruption of banks and business is a danger of laundering.

It harms the economy. Money laundering distorts and harms the economy, as vast sums of criminal money flow through it. It undermines honest trade and drives up prices for all. The economy is poisoned at its very heart. Harm to the economy is a danger of money laundering.

It weakens the state and the law. By enriching criminals and corrupting officials, money laundering weakens the state and the rule of law. Criminals grow powerful enough to defy the government itself. Order is undermined slowly from within. The weakening of the state is a danger of laundering.

It is hard to detect and control. Money laundering is hidden, complex and spread across many countries, and so is very hard to detect and control. Criminals use clever schemes and secret accounts to conceal it. It slips easily through the gaps between nations. The difficulty of control makes it a lasting threat.

Money laundering is therefore the hiding of the illegal source of money so that the profits of crime may be freely used, and it lets crime pay, funds other crime and terror, corrupts banks and businesses, harms the economy, weakens the state and the law, and is very hard to detect and control. It is the means by which crime washes its gains clean and buys the very order it destroys, and so ranks among the new threats to the security of nations.

Question 15

In the forests and savannahs of Africa, an armed and lawless trade slaughters the elephant and the rhino, and turns the continent's living treasure into blood and money.

Examine poaching and the illegal wildlife trade as a threat to peace and security.

Model Answer

Poaching and the illegal wildlife trade are the unlawful killing of wild animals and the smuggling of their products, such as ivory and rhino horn, for profit. They have become a serious form of transnational organised crime and a threat to security. Poaching and the illegal wildlife trade as a threat may be examined as follows.

The meaning of the threat. Poaching is the unlawful killing of protected wild animals, and the illegal wildlife trade the smuggling and sale of their products across borders. It is driven by the demand for ivory, rhino horn and skins in distant markets. It is run by organised criminal networks. This is the meaning of the threat.

It is driven by great profits. The trade is driven by the high prices that ivory, rhino horn and other products fetch, above all in Asia. The lure of great profit draws criminals into the slaughter. Money is the true engine of the whole trade. The great profits to be made drive poaching and smuggling.

It destroys wildlife. Poaching has slaughtered elephants, rhinos and other animals in great numbers, driving some towards extinction. Africa's wildlife has been ravaged and thinned by it. A living heritage is being destroyed for profit. The destruction of wildlife is a chief effect of poaching.

It funds crime, militias and terror. The profits of the wildlife trade fund organised crime, armed militias and even terrorist groups. Ivory has paid for guns and war in parts of Africa. The trade arms the very enemies of peace. The funding of crime and terror is a grave danger of poaching.

It is run by organised criminal networks. The wildlife trade is run by organised criminal networks that span continents, from the poacher in the bush to the distant buyer. It is a global business in death and plunder. It reaches far beyond Africa itself. Its organised, transnational nature makes it a grave threat.

It corrupts officials and weakens the state. Poaching thrives on the corruption of rangers, officials and borders, weakening the state and the law. Bribery lets the trade flourish unchecked. Order is quietly undermined by it. The corruption of officials is a danger of the wildlife trade.

It harms the economy and tourism. By destroying wildlife, poaching harms the tourism on which many African nations, including Tanzania, depend. It robs them of a great and lasting source of wealth. Fewer animals mean fewer visitors. Harm to the economy and tourism is an effect of poaching.

It demands national and international action. Because the trade crosses borders, it demands the cooperation of many nations to stop it. Tanzania and others have fought it with anti-poaching laws and patrols. No one state can end it alone. The need for common action shows the gravity of the threat.

Poaching and the illegal wildlife trade are therefore the unlawful killing of wild animals and the smuggling of their products for profit, which destroy wildlife, fund crime, militias and terror, are run by organised criminal networks, corrupt officials, harm the economy and tourism, and demand national and international action. In the forests and savannahs of Africa, this armed and lawless trade turns the continent's living treasure into blood and money, and so ranks among the new threats to its peace and security.

Piracy, cyber-crime and the spread of weapons

Question 16

The pirate, long thought a figure of old tales, returned in our own day to the waters off Somalia, seizing ships and holding the sea to ransom.

Examine maritime piracy as a threat to world peace and security.

Model Answer

Maritime piracy is the robbery, seizure and ransom of ships and their crews on the high seas, which has revived in our own age, above all off the coast of Somalia. It has become a grave new threat to world peace and security. Maritime piracy as a threat may be examined as follows.

The meaning of maritime piracy. Maritime piracy is the attack, robbery and seizure of ships and their crews at sea for profit or ransom. Pirates seize the vessels and hold both them and their sailors hostage. It is, in plain truth, robbery upon the high seas. This is the meaning of maritime piracy.

Its revival off Somalia. Piracy revived in our own day off the coast of Somalia and in the Gulf of Aden, where armed pirates seized many ships. The collapse of the Somali state had left the coast wholly lawless. Piracy flourished in the disorder and want. Its revival off Somalia alarmed the whole world.

It disrupts world trade and shipping. Piracy threatens the ships that carry the world's trade along its busiest sea lanes. It endangers the flow of goods and oil between the continents. Trade is thereby disrupted, made costly and slowed. The disruption of world trade is a chief danger of piracy.

It seizes crews and demands ransom. Pirates seize the crews of ships and hold them hostage for great ransoms. Sailors are held for many months in fear of their lives. Huge sums must be paid to secure their freedom. The seizing of crews for ransom is a cruel danger of piracy.

It raises the cost of shipping. Piracy raises the cost of shipping, as vessels must take longer routes, hire armed guards and pay heavy insurance. These added costs are passed on in the end to all. Trade grows dearer for the whole world. The raising of shipping costs is an effect of piracy.

It springs from lawlessness and poverty. Piracy springs from the lawlessness of failed states and the poverty of coastal peoples. Where the state has collapsed, as in Somalia, piracy quickly takes root. Poor men turn pirate for want of any other work. Lawlessness and poverty are the roots of piracy.

It threatens regional security. Piracy threatens the security of whole regions, including East Africa and its waters. It can fund other crime and even terrorism with its ransoms. It makes the seas unsafe for all who must use them. The threat to regional security is a grave danger of piracy.

It demands international action. Because it strikes the ships of many nations, piracy has drawn navies from across the world to patrol the seas together. No one nation can master the pirates alone. It demands united international action. This need for common action shows the gravity of the threat.

Maritime piracy is therefore the robbery, seizure and ransom of ships at sea, revived above all off Somalia, which disrupts world trade, seizes crews for ransom, raises the cost of shipping, springs from lawlessness and poverty, threatens regional security, and demands international action. The pirate, long thought a figure of old tales, has returned to hold the sea lanes of the modern world to ransom, and so ranks among the new threats to its peace.

Question 17

In a world run by computers, the enemy need never cross a border nor fire a shot, but can strike from the far side of the earth with a keystroke.

Examine cyber-crime as a new threat to world peace and security.

Model Answer

Cyber-crime is crime carried out through computers and the internet, such as hacking, fraud, theft and attacks upon computer systems. It has become one of the newest and fastest-growing threats to world peace and security. Cyber-crime as a new threat may be examined as follows.

The meaning of cyber-crime. Cyber-crime is crime committed by means of computers and the internet, from theft and fraud to attacks upon computer systems. It strikes in the digital world rather than the physical one. It needs no army, crosses no border and fires no shot. This is the essential meaning of cyber-crime.

It steals money and information. Cyber criminals steal money, secrets and personal information from individuals, businesses and governments. Banks and companies are robbed without a single shot being fired. Vast sums of money can vanish in an instant. The theft of money and information is a chief form of cyber-crime.

It attacks vital systems. Cyber-attacks can strike the vital systems on which modern life depends, such as power, water, banking and defence. A single attack can darken a whole city or halt a great bank. Nations can be crippled from the far side of the world. The attacking of vital systems is a grave danger of cyber-crime.

It threatens national security. States use cyber-attacks to spy upon and to harm their rivals, stealing secrets and sabotaging their systems. War itself is now partly waged in the digital world. National defences can be pierced silently from a distance. The threat to national security is a danger of cyber-crime.

It spreads across borders. Cyber-crime crosses borders with ease, as the criminal may strike from the far side of the earth. It is very hard to trace back and to reach. No frontier or wall can keep it out. Its cross-border reach makes it a truly global threat.

It is hard to detect and to punish. Cyber criminals hide behind screens and false names, and so are very hard to find and to punish. They strike in secret and vanish without a trace. The law struggles to catch up with them. The difficulty of detection is a danger of cyber-crime.

It grows with technology. As the world comes to depend ever more on computers, cyber-crime grows with it, finding always new targets. The more we rely upon the digital world, the more it can harm us. The threat swells greater year by year. Its growth with technology makes it a rising danger.

It causes great economic loss. Cyber-crime costs the world vast sums each year, in money stolen, systems repaired and defences built. Businesses and whole nations lose great wealth to it. The economy is made poorer and far less safe. Great economic loss is an effect of cyber-crime.

Cyber-crime is therefore crime carried out through computers and the internet, which steals money and information, attacks vital systems, threatens national security, spreads across borders, is hard to detect and to punish, grows with technology, and causes great economic loss. In a world run by computers, the enemy can strike from the far side of the earth with a keystroke, and so cyber-crime has become one of the newest and most dangerous of the new threats.

Question 18

The deadliest weapons ever made were once held by two powers alone, but now the world lives in dread of the day they fall into many hands.

Examine the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction as a threat to world peace.

Model Answer

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is the spread of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons to more and more states and groups. It is among the gravest of the threats to world peace and security. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction as a threat may be examined as follows.

The meaning of weapons of mass destruction. Weapons of mass destruction are nuclear, chemical and biological weapons able to kill great numbers of people at once. Their proliferation is the spread of these weapons to ever more states and groups. They can destroy whole cities in a single moment. This is the essential meaning of the threat.

The spread of nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons have spread beyond the first powers to states such as India, Pakistan and North Korea, and others still seek them. Each new nuclear state adds greatly to the danger of the world. The bomb is no longer held by only a few. The spread of nuclear weapons is a grave threat.

The danger of chemical and biological weapons. Chemical and biological weapons, cheaper and easier to make, can also kill on a vast scale. They have been made and used, as in the Syrian war. They are the poor state's weapon of mass destruction. Their spread is a serious and growing danger.

The threat of terrorists gaining such weapons. The greatest fear is that terrorists might obtain weapons of mass destruction and use them without restraint. A single such attack could kill many thousands at once. Terror armed with the bomb is the darkest of all dangers. This threat drives the fight against proliferation.

It could cause destruction on a vast scale. If ever used, these weapons could kill great numbers and lay waste whole regions. Their power to destroy is far beyond that of any ordinary war. Mankind itself could in the end be endangered. The danger of vast destruction is the heart of the threat.

It breeds fear and arms races. The spread of such weapons breeds fear among nations and drives them to arm in turn. One state's bomb leads its wary neighbours to seek their own. Fear itself thus feeds further proliferation. The breeding of fear and arms races is a danger of proliferation.

It is hard to control. Weapons of mass destruction are hard to control, for the knowledge and the materials spread despite all efforts. Treaties are broken and secrets stolen or sold. The genie cannot easily be put back in the bottle. The difficulty of control makes the threat a lasting one.

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is therefore the spread of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons to more states and groups, which threatens destruction on a vast scale, raises the fear of terrorists gaining such weapons, breeds fear and arms races, and is very hard to control. The deadliest weapons ever made are no longer held by a few, and the world lives in dread of the day they fall into the wrong hands, so that their proliferation ranks among the gravest of the new threats.

Question 19

The terrorist and the criminal, once strangers, have become partners, the one selling drugs and guns to fund the other's bombs.

Explain the links between terrorism and transnational organised crime.

Model Answer

In the modern world, terrorism and transnational organised crime have grown closely linked, feeding and strengthening one another. This union, sometimes called narco-terrorism, has made both threats far more dangerous. The links between terrorism and transnational organised crime may be explained as follows.

Crime funds terrorism. Terrorist groups fund themselves through crime, above all the drug trade, in what is called narco-terrorism. The huge profits of crime pay for their weapons and their attacks. Crime has thus become the very purse of terror. The funding of terror by crime is a chief link between them.

They share the same routes and networks. Terrorists and criminals use the same smuggling routes and secret networks to move drugs, guns, money and men. What carries the one will readily carry the other. Their paths run together across the borders of the world. The sharing of routes is a link between them.

They both thrive in weak states. Both terrorism and organised crime take root in weak and failed states, where government is absent. There they gather, hide, train and grow side by side. Lawless lands give ready shelter to both. Their common home in weak states links them.

They trade in arms together. Terrorists and criminals both deal in illegal weapons, buying and selling arms to one another. The arms trade binds them together in a common and profitable business. Guns pass freely between the two of them. The trade in arms is a link between terror and crime.

They use the same methods. Both use violence, secrecy, bribery and fear to achieve their ends. Their methods are much alike, though their final aims may differ. Each learns its dark craft from the other. The sharing of methods links terrorism and crime.

Crime spreads where terror rules. Where terrorists hold sway, crime flourishes under their protection, and where crime rules, terror finds a ready home. The two spread together and reinforce one another. Each opens the door wide to the other. Their mutual spread is a link between them.

Their union makes both more dangerous. By joining hands, terrorism and organised crime become far stronger and harder to defeat. The one funds and arms the other without cease. Together they are a far greater threat than either apart. Their union deepens the danger of both.

The links between terrorism and transnational organised crime are therefore that crime funds terrorism, that the two share the same routes and networks, that both thrive in weak states, that they trade in arms together, use the same methods, and spread together, so that their union makes both far more dangerous. The terrorist and the criminal have become partners in the modern world, and their alliance is among the darkest of the new threats to its security.

Question 20

The terrorist of the future may need neither bomb nor gun, but only a computer, to darken a city or bring a nation to its knees.

Examine cyber-terrorism as a new threat to world peace and security.

Model Answer

Cyber-terrorism is the use of computers and the internet by terrorists to attack, to spread fear, and to further their cause. As the world comes to depend upon the digital realm, it has become one of the newest and most alarming of the new threats. Cyber-terrorism as a threat may be examined as follows.

The meaning of cyber-terrorism. Cyber-terrorism is the use of computers and the internet by terrorists to attack systems, to spread fear and to advance their cause. It carries terror into the digital world. It needs neither bomb nor gun to do great harm. This is the meaning of cyber-terrorism.

It can attack vital systems. Cyber-terrorists can attack the vital systems on which modern life depends, such as power, water, banking and transport. A single attack could darken a city or halt a nation. The damage could be immense and sudden. The attacking of vital systems is a chief danger of cyber-terrorism.

It spreads fear far and wide. Like all terrorism, cyber-terrorism seeks to spread fear, and the digital world lets it reach millions at once. An attack on the systems people trust breeds deep alarm. Fear itself is its true weapon. The spreading of fear is a danger of cyber-terrorism.

It is used to spread propaganda and to recruit. Terrorists use the internet to spread their propaganda, to recruit followers and to plan their attacks. Groups such as the Islamic State have mastered this dark art. The web is at once their weapon and their pulpit. The spread of propaganda and recruiting is a danger of cyber-terrorism.

It strikes from anywhere. The cyber-terrorist can strike from anywhere in the world, hidden behind a screen and a false name. He crosses no border and shows no face to his victims. He is very hard to find and to reach. Striking from anywhere makes cyber-terrorism a global danger.

It is cheap and hard to trace. Cyber-terrorism needs little money and leaves few traces, making it cheap to wage and hard to punish. A single skilled attacker can do great harm alone. It slips silently through defences. Its cheapness and stealth are dangers of cyber-terrorism.

It grows with the digital world. As the world comes to depend ever more on computers, the reach and danger of cyber-terrorism grow with it. Each new system becomes a new target. The threat swells greater year by year. Its growth with the digital world makes it a rising danger.

It is hard to defend against. Cyber-terrorism is hard to defend against, for the attacker need find only one weakness while the defender must guard all. New attacks appear faster than the defences against them. The advantage lies with the attacker. The difficulty of defence makes cyber-terrorism a grave threat.

Cyber-terrorism is therefore the use of computers and the internet by terrorists to attack vital systems, to spread fear, and to spread propaganda and recruit, striking from anywhere, cheaply and hard to trace, growing with the digital world and hard to defend against. The terrorist of the future may need neither bomb nor gun, but only a computer, to darken a city or bring a nation to its knees, and so cyber-terrorism ranks among the newest and most alarming of the new threats.

Environmental and health threats

Question 21

The slow heating of the earth may in the end prove a mightier enemy of peace than any army, drowning coasts and setting nations at war over bread and water.

Examine environmental degradation and climate change as a threat to world peace and security.

Model Answer

Environmental degradation and climate change are the harming of the natural world and the warming of the earth's climate by human action. They have come to be seen as among the gravest of the new threats to world peace and security. Environmental degradation and climate change as a threat may be examined as follows.

The meaning of the threat. Environmental degradation is the harming of the natural world, and climate change the warming of the earth by human action. Together they endanger the very conditions of human life on the planet. They threaten the whole world, and not one nation alone. This is the meaning of the threat.

It causes natural disasters. Climate change brings more frequent and more terrible disasters, such as floods, droughts, storms and heatwaves. These destroy homes, crops and lives without number. Whole regions are laid waste in a season. The causing of natural disasters is a chief danger of climate change.

It breeds conflict over resources. As land, water and food grow scarce, peoples and nations fight over what little remains. Drought and desert drive herders and farmers to war, as in the Sahel. Scarcity readily breeds conflict and bloodshed. The breeding of resource conflict is a danger of environmental change.

It creates refugees. Environmental disaster and the loss of land drive people from their homes, creating environmental refugees. Rising seas and spreading deserts make whole regions unlivable. Millions are forced to flee in search of safety. The creating of refugees is a danger of climate change.

It threatens food and water. Climate change harms farming and dries up water, threatening the food and water on which all life depends. Harvests fail and wells run dry across the land. Hunger and thirst spread among the people. The threat to food and water is a grave danger of environmental change.

It endangers health. A changing climate spreads disease, heat and hunger, endangering the health of millions. New sicknesses follow in the wake of the warming world. The weak and the poor suffer most of all. The endangering of health is a danger of climate change.

It harms the economy. Environmental disaster and change destroy crops, industry and infrastructure, harming the economy of nations. The cost of the damage is vast and ever rising. Development is set back by many years. Harm to the economy is a danger of environmental change.

It threatens the whole world. Unlike a war between two states, climate change threatens the whole earth and every nation upon it. No country, rich or poor, can escape its slow reach. It is a danger to all mankind alike. Its global threat is the deepest danger of climate change.

It demands global cooperation. Because it threatens all, climate change can be met only by the nations of the world acting together. No one state can halt it by its own efforts alone. It calls for a common and sustained effort of all. The need for global cooperation shows the gravity of the threat.

Environmental degradation and climate change are therefore the harming of the natural world and the warming of the earth, which cause natural disasters, breed conflict over resources, create refugees, threaten food and water, endanger health, harm the economy, threaten the whole world, and demand global cooperation. The slow heating of the earth may in the end prove a mightier enemy of peace than any army, and so ranks among the gravest of the new threats to the security of mankind.

Question 22

A germ too small to see may kill more than any war, and in our own day a single virus brought the whole world to a standstill.

Examine diseases and pandemics as a threat to world peace and security.

Model Answer

Diseases and pandemics are the outbreak and spread of deadly sicknesses across the world, such as HIV and AIDS, Ebola and the coronavirus. They have come to be seen as a grave new threat to world peace and security. Diseases and pandemics as a threat may be examined as follows.

The meaning of the threat. A pandemic is the spread of a deadly disease across many countries and the whole world. Such diseases kill great numbers and disrupt whole societies. They threaten human life and security everywhere they reach. This is the essential meaning of the threat.

They kill great numbers of people. Diseases and pandemics kill great numbers, as HIV and AIDS have killed many millions, above all in Africa. Whole generations have been cut down by them before their time. The loss of so much life is terrible. The killing of great numbers is the first danger of pandemics.

They spread across the whole world. Modern travel lets diseases spread across the world in a matter of days, as the coronavirus did. No border, however guarded, can keep them out. A sickness in one land soon reaches all the others. Their global spread makes pandemics a threat to all.

They harm the economy. Pandemics harm the economy, closing businesses, halting trade and travel, and throwing millions out of work. The coronavirus brought the whole world economy to a sudden halt. Great wealth is lost in a single season. Harm to the economy is a heavy danger of pandemics.

They overwhelm health systems. A great outbreak overwhelms hospitals and health services, so that the sick can no longer be cared for. Doctors, beds and medicines all run short at once. The whole system breaks under the sudden strain. The overwhelming of health systems is a danger of pandemics.

They cause fear and disorder. Pandemics spread fear, panic and disorder, as people dread the sickness and flee or hoard. Society is disrupted and deeply strained by them. Fear can be almost as harmful as the disease itself. The causing of fear and disorder is a danger of pandemics.

They hit the poor hardest. Diseases and pandemics fall hardest upon the poor nations and peoples, who lack the means to fight them. Africa has suffered most of all from HIV and AIDS. The weak are struck down first and hardest. The hitting of the poor hardest is a cruel effect of pandemics.

They demand global cooperation. Because they cross all borders, pandemics can be fought only by the nations of the world working together, sharing medicine and knowledge. No one state can defeat them by itself alone. They call for a common and united effort. The need for cooperation shows the gravity of the threat.

Diseases and pandemics are therefore the spread of deadly sicknesses across the world, which kill great numbers, spread across all borders, harm the economy, overwhelm health systems, cause fear and disorder, hit the poor hardest, and demand global cooperation. A germ too small to see may kill more than any war, as the coronavirus showed when it brought the whole world to a standstill, and so disease has become one of the gravest of the new threats to security.

Question 23

Driven from their homes by war and want, millions wander the earth in search of safety, a tide of human misery that no border can wholly hold back.

Examine refugees and forced migration as a threat to world peace and security.

Model Answer

Refugees and forced migration are the flight of great numbers of people from their homes, driven by war, persecution, poverty and disaster. The movement of such multitudes has become a new threat to world peace and security. Refugees and forced migration as a threat may be examined as follows.

The meaning of the threat. Refugees are people forced to flee their homes and countries by war, persecution or disaster. Forced migration is the movement of such multitudes across the borders of nations. It is a desperate flight from danger, death and want. This is the essential meaning of the threat.

Its causes in war and persecution. Refugees are created above all by war and persecution, as in Syria, South Sudan and the Great Lakes region. People flee their homes to save their very lives. War drives them out before it like a flood. War and persecution are the chief causes of forced migration.

It strains the host countries. The flood of refugees strains the countries that receive them, burdening their land, food and services. Poorer nations such as Tanzania have hosted very many for years. Their resources are stretched thin by the burden. The straining of host countries is a danger of forced migration.

It can breed conflict and tension. The coming of many refugees can breed tension and conflict with the host people, over land, work and aid. Resentment may in time turn to open violence. Camps may even harbour fighters and arms. The breeding of conflict is a danger of forced migration.

It causes great human suffering. Refugees suffer terribly, losing their homes, their livelihoods and often their families. They live in camps in want, sickness and fear. Their misery is immense and long-drawn. The great human suffering is the cruellest effect of forced migration.

It can spread instability across borders. The flight of refugees can carry conflict and instability from one country into its neighbours. War spills across borders with the very people who flee it. A local crisis thus becomes a regional one. The spread of instability is a danger of forced migration.

It burdens the world community. The care of the world's many refugees burdens the whole international community, which must feed and shelter them. The task is vast, costly and seemingly unending. It falls upon all the nations alike. The burdening of the world is an effect of forced migration.

It demands international cooperation. Because refugees cross borders, their care and the ending of their plight demand the cooperation of many nations and of world bodies. No one state can manage the great

burden alone. Common and lasting effort is needed. The need for cooperation shows the gravity of the threat.

Refugees and forced migration are therefore the flight of great numbers from their homes by war, persecution and disaster, which strains the host countries, breeds conflict and tension, causes great human suffering, spreads instability across borders, burdens the world community, and demands international cooperation. This tide of human misery, which no border can wholly hold back, has become one of the gravest of the new threats to the peace and security of the world.

Question 24

Hunger is among the oldest of mankind's enemies, and in a world of plenty its return to whole nations is a threat to peace as grave as any army.

Examine food insecurity and famine as a threat to world peace and security.

Model Answer

Food insecurity and famine are the want of enough safe food to live, suffered by whole peoples and nations. In a world that produces enough for all, their persistence has come to be seen as a serious threat to peace and security. Food insecurity and famine as a threat may be examined as follows.

The meaning of the threat. Food insecurity is the lack of reliable access to enough safe and nourishing food, and famine its extreme, a widespread and deadly hunger. Together they leave whole peoples weak and starving. They threaten life itself. This is the meaning of the threat.

Its causes in war, drought and poverty. Food insecurity springs from war, drought, poverty and the failure of harvests. War drives people from their fields, and drought withers their crops in the ground. Want does the rest of the harm. War, drought and poverty are the chief causes of famine.

It causes death and suffering. Famine kills great numbers by starvation and the diseases that follow in its wake. Whole regions have been laid low by it, as in the Horn of Africa. The suffering of the people is terrible. The causing of death and suffering is the first danger of famine.

It breeds conflict. The want of food breeds conflict, as hungry peoples fight over what little remains. Famine can spark riots, revolt and war. The empty stomach readily takes up arms. The breeding of conflict is a danger of food insecurity.

It drives migration. Hunger drives people from their homes in search of food, swelling the tide of refugees and migrants. Whole peoples flee the famine before it. They carry their want into other lands. The driving of migration is a danger of famine.

It weakens nations. Food insecurity weakens whole nations, for a hungry people cannot work, learn or defend itself. It saps the very strength of the state. A starving nation is a weak and unstable one. The weakening of nations is a danger of food insecurity.

It hits the poor and Africa hardest. Food insecurity and famine fall hardest upon the poor nations, and above all upon Africa. The Horn of Africa and the Sahel have suffered greatly from them. The weak are struck first and hardest. The hitting of the poor hardest is an effect of the threat.

It demands cooperation and development. Famine can be overcome only by aid, cooperation and development, by feeding the hungry and helping nations to feed themselves. No one nation can end it alone. It calls for a common and lasting effort. The need for cooperation shows the gravity of the threat.

Food insecurity and famine are therefore the want of enough safe food to live, springing from war, drought and poverty, which cause death and suffering, breed conflict, drive migration, weaken nations, and fall hardest upon the poor and upon Africa, and which demand cooperation and development to overcome. In a world of plenty, the return of hunger to whole nations is a threat to peace as grave as any army, and so ranks among the new threats to security.

Socio-economic and ideological threats

Question 25

Where men go hungry and hopeless, peace has shallow roots, for the empty stomach is easily armed against the order that fails it.

Examine poverty and underdevelopment as a threat to world peace and security.

Model Answer

Poverty and underdevelopment are the want, hunger and backwardness in which much of the world still lives. Far from being a mere misfortune, they have come to be seen as a root of many of the new threats to peace and security. Poverty and underdevelopment as a threat may be examined as follows.

The meaning of the threat. Poverty is the want of the means of a decent life, and underdevelopment the backwardness of nations in wealth and welfare. Together they leave millions in hunger and hopelessness. They breed the very conditions in which conflict grows. This is the essential meaning of the threat.

It breeds conflict and war. Poverty and want breed anger, envy and desperation, which readily turn to conflict and war. The poor may fight over scarce resources or rise up against their rulers. Want lights the fire of war and rebellion. The breeding of conflict is a chief danger of poverty.

It feeds terrorism and crime. Poverty drives the desperate, above all the young, into terrorism and crime. Those with nothing to lose are easily recruited to either path. Want supplies the foot soldiers of terror and of crime. The feeding of terrorism and crime is a danger of poverty.

It drives migration. Poverty drives people to leave their homes in search of a better life, swelling the tide of migration. The poor flee from want as others flee from war. Whole peoples are thus set on the move. The driving of migration is a danger of poverty.

It weakens states. Poor nations are often weak nations, unable to govern, defend or provide for their people. Weak states in turn become havens for crime and terror. Poverty saps the very strength of the state. The weakening of states is a danger of poverty.

It causes disease and suffering. Poverty breeds hunger, disease and suffering, for the poor cannot feed or heal themselves. Sickness spreads freely where there is want and squalor. Millions live and die in needless misery. The causing of disease and suffering is an effect of poverty.

It breeds instability. Poverty and its discontents breed instability, unrest and the fall of governments. Hungry and hopeless peoples are easily stirred to revolt. Public order is undermined by widespread want. The breeding of instability is a danger of poverty.

It is a root of many other threats. Poverty lies at the root of many of the new threats, from terrorism and crime to migration and disease. To fight the new threats, the world must fight poverty itself. It is the very soil in which they grow. Being the root of other threats makes poverty a grave danger.

Poverty and underdevelopment are therefore the want and backwardness in which much of the world lives, which breed conflict and war, feed terrorism and crime, drive migration, weaken states, cause disease and suffering, breed instability, and lie at the root of many other threats. Where men go hungry and hopeless, peace has shallow roots, and so the poverty of nations has become one of the deepest of the new threats to the security of the world.

Question 26

Faith that should bring peace has too often been twisted into a sword, and in the name of God men have brought terror upon their fellows.

Examine religious extremism and fundamentalism as a threat to world peace and security.

Model Answer

Religious extremism and fundamentalism are the holding of extreme religious beliefs and the readiness to force them upon others, often by violence. They have become a leading root of terrorism and conflict, and

a grave new threat to world peace. Religious extremism and fundamentalism as a threat may be examined as follows.

The meaning of the threat. Religious extremism is the holding of extreme and intolerant religious beliefs, and fundamentalism the strict and rigid following of them. At their worst they seek to force belief upon others by violence and fear. They turn faith into a fanaticism that hates. This is the essential meaning of the threat.

It breeds terrorism. Religious extremism breeds much of the world's terrorism, as groups such as the Islamic State kill in the name of religion. Fanatics turn their faith into a licence to murder the innocent. Terror is thus done in the very name of God. The breeding of terrorism is a chief danger of extremism.

It breeds intolerance and hatred. Extremism breeds intolerance and hatred of those of other faiths or of none. It divides all mankind into the saved and the damned. Hatred takes the place of charity and mercy. The breeding of intolerance and hatred is a danger of extremism.

It causes conflict and war. Religious extremism causes conflict and war between faiths and within them. Holy war is preached and then eagerly waged. Whole regions are set aflame in the name of religion. The causing of conflict and war is a danger of extremism.

It divides societies. Extremism divides societies along the lines of religion, setting neighbour against neighbour. Communities that once lived together in peace are torn apart. Trust gives way to suspicion and fear. The dividing of societies is a danger of religious extremism.

It oppresses the people. Where extremists gain power, they oppress the people, above all women and those of other faiths, forcing their harsh rule upon all. Freedom is crushed everywhere in the name of God. Life is made narrow, fearful and joyless. The oppression of the people is a danger of extremism.

It spreads by propaganda. Extremism spreads its ideas by preaching and propaganda, above all through the internet, winning recruits across the world. It poisons minds far from its own home and land. Its message travels swiftly and widely. The spread by propaganda is a danger of extremism.

It is hard to combat. Religious extremism is hard to combat, for it lives in the mind and the heart and cannot be defeated by arms alone. Ideas must in the end be met with better ideas. It springs up wherever grievance and fanaticism meet. The difficulty of combating it makes the threat lasting.

Religious extremism and fundamentalism are therefore the holding and forcing of extreme religious beliefs, often by violence, which breed terrorism, intolerance and hatred, cause conflict and war, divide societies, oppress the people, spread by propaganda, and are hard to combat. Faith that should bring peace has too often been twisted into a sword, and so religious extremism has become one of the gravest of the new threats to the peace and security of the world.

Question 27

Africa, still struggling to build after colonial rule, has found the new threats of the age falling most heavily upon its unready shoulders.

Assess the impact of the new threats on Africa.

Model Answer

The new threats to world peace and security have fallen with particular weight upon Africa, which is least able to withstand them. Terrorism, crime, disease and disorder have all left their mark upon the continent. The impact of the new threats on Africa may be assessed as follows.

Terrorism has struck the continent. Africa has suffered greatly from terrorism, from the embassy bombings of 1998 to the attacks of Boko Haram and Al-Shabaab. Whole regions now live in daily fear of the terrorist. Many thousands of Africans have been killed. Terrorism has struck the continent hard.

Organised crime has spread. Transnational organised crime, in drugs, humans, arms and wildlife, has spread across Africa. Criminal networks plunder the continent's people and its wealth. The trade in ivory, drugs and people flourishes. Organised crime has taken deep root in Africa.

Piracy has troubled its waters. Piracy off the coast of Somalia has troubled the waters of East Africa and its trade. The lawless Somali coast bred a great wave of piracy and ransom. The whole region was endangered by it for years. Piracy has been a grave threat to eastern Africa.

Disease has ravaged its peoples. Africa has suffered most of all from disease, above all HIV and AIDS, and from outbreaks such as Ebola. Millions have died and whole societies been gravely weakened. The poor continent bears the heaviest burden of all. Disease has ravaged the peoples of Africa.

Climate change threatens its livelihoods. Climate change threatens Africa, whose peoples depend on farming and herding for their bread. Drought, flood and the spread of desert destroy crops and cattle. Hunger and conflict follow close in their wake. Climate change is a grave threat to African livelihoods.

It has created many refugees. War, persecution and disaster have made Africa a continent of refugees, as in South Sudan, Somalia and the Great Lakes. Millions have been driven from their homes and lands. Nations such as Tanzania have long borne the burden. Forced migration has troubled much of Africa.

Small arms have fuelled its wars. The flood of small arms into Africa has fuelled and prolonged its many wars and conflicts. Cheap and plentiful guns keep the fighting alive for years. The whole continent is awash with weapons. Small arms have deepened Africa's conflicts.

It has hindered development. By fuelling war, crime and disease, the new threats have gravely hindered the development of Africa. Its scarce resources go to war rather than to progress. Investment and hope are driven away. The hindering of development is a heavy impact upon Africa.

It has strained weak states. The new threats have strained the weak states of Africa, which lack the means to withstand them. Where government is weak, the threats flourish unchecked and unpunished. The continent is least able to resist them. The straining of weak states is an impact of the new threats.

The impact of the new threats on Africa has therefore been grave, as terrorism, organised crime, piracy, disease, climate change, forced migration and the flood of small arms have all fallen heavily upon the continent, hindering its development and straining its weak states. Africa, still struggling to build after colonial rule, has found the new threats of the age falling most heavily upon its unready shoulders, and so has the greatest need of all for the world's help in overcoming them.

Question 28

Corruption is a quiet enemy that fires no shot, yet it hollows out the state from within and opens the gate to every other threat.

Examine corruption as a threat to world peace and security.

Model Answer

Corruption is the abuse of public power for private gain, through bribery, theft and dishonesty. Far from being a mere vice, it has come to be seen as a serious threat to peace and security, for it weakens states and feeds other dangers. Corruption as a threat to world peace and security may be examined as follows.

The meaning of corruption. Corruption is the abuse of entrusted power for private gain, through bribery, embezzlement, fraud and favouritism. It turns public office into a means of private profit. It rots the honesty on which the state depends.

It weakens the state and the law. Corruption weakens the state and the rule of law, as officials are bought and justice is sold. Where corruption reigns, the law can no longer be trusted. The state is hollowed out from within. The weakening of the state is a chief danger of corruption.

It breeds poverty and inequality. Corruption steals the wealth of nations, so that money meant for schools, roads and hospitals is stolen away. It keeps the many poor while the few grow rich. It deepens the divide between them. The breeding of poverty and inequality is a danger of corruption.

It feeds other threats. Corruption opens the gate to other threats, for bribed officials let through terrorists, criminals, drugs and arms. It lets the wildlife and drug trades flourish unchecked. It is the ally of every crime. The feeding of other threats is a grave danger of corruption.

It breeds anger and unrest. Corruption breeds anger, resentment and unrest among the people, who see the powerful grow rich by theft. This anger can turn to protest and revolt. It can bring down whole governments. The breeding of anger and unrest is a danger of corruption.

It undermines development. Corruption undermines the development of nations, driving away investment and wasting resources. It cripples the economy and betrays the future. Progress is stolen along with the money. The undermining of development is a danger of corruption.

It destroys trust in government. Corruption destroys the people's trust in their government and their leaders. Where all is for sale, faith in the state slowly dies. The bond between ruler and ruled is broken. The destroying of trust is a danger of corruption.

It is hard to root out. Corruption is hard to root out, for it hides in secret and reaches into the highest places. Those who should fight it are often part of it themselves. It clings stubbornly to power. The difficulty of rooting it out makes corruption a lasting threat.

Corruption is therefore the abuse of public power for private gain, which weakens the state and the law, breeds poverty and inequality, feeds other threats, breeds anger and unrest, undermines development, destroys trust in government, and is hard to root out. It is a quiet enemy that fires no shot, yet it hollows out the state from within and opens the gate to every other threat, and so ranks among the new threats to peace and security.

Strategies to overcome the new threats

Question 29

The first line of defence against the new dangers is drawn not at the border but within the nation itself.

Examine the national measures taken to overcome the new threats to world peace and security.

Model Answer

Though the new threats cross borders, each nation must still take measures of its own to guard against them at home. These national measures are the first line of defence against the new dangers. The national measures taken to overcome the new threats to world peace and security may be examined as follows.

Strengthening security forces. Each nation strengthens its police, army and intelligence services to guard against terrorism, crime and disorder. Well-trained and equipped forces can detect and stop the threats before they strike. Security at home is the very first defence. Strengthening the security forces is a chief national measure.

Passing strong laws. Nations pass strong laws against terrorism, trafficking, money laundering and the other new threats. These laws give the state the power to act firmly and to punish. They set the whole force of the law against the threats. Passing strong laws is a national measure.

Guarding the borders. Each nation guards its borders, ports and airports to keep out terrorists, criminals, drugs and arms. Tight control at the frontier stops many threats from ever entering. Watchfulness at the border is truly vital. Guarding the borders is a national measure.

Fighting poverty and unemployment. Wise nations fight the poverty and joblessness that feed the new threats, by promoting development and creating work. By removing the causes, they dry up the very supply of recruits. Prosperity is itself a strong defence. Fighting poverty is a national measure.

Educating and warning the people. Nations educate and warn their people about the new threats, so that all may help to resist them. An alert and united people is very hard to attack. Knowledge is a shield for the whole nation. Educating the people is a national measure.

Improving health and disaster systems. Nations build up their health and disaster services to withstand pandemics and environmental disaster. Good hospitals and ready plans can save very many lives. Preparedness greatly lessens the harm done. Improving health and disaster systems is a national measure.

Controlling weapons and finance. Nations control the flow of arms and money within their borders, to keep them from terrorists and criminals. Registering guns and watching the banks starves the threats. Control at home steadily weakens them. Controlling weapons and finance is a national measure.

Building strong and just government. Above all, nations build strong, just and honest government, which leaves no room for the threats to grow. Where the state is strong and fair, terror and crime find little foothold. Good government is the deepest defence of all. Building strong government is a national measure.

The national measures taken to overcome the new threats to world peace and security are therefore the strengthening of security forces, the passing of strong laws, the guarding of borders, the fighting of poverty and unemployment, the educating of the people, the improving of health and disaster systems, the controlling of weapons and finance, and the building of strong and just government. The first line of defence against the new dangers is drawn within the nation itself, and no cooperation abroad can succeed without it.

Question 30

No African nation can face the new threats alone, and so the peoples of the continent have joined hands through the bodies of their own making.

Examine the regional efforts of Africa to combat the new threats to world peace and security.

Model Answer

Because the new threats cross borders, the nations of Africa have joined together in regional bodies, such as the African Union, to combat them. These regional efforts bind the continent in a common defence. The regional efforts of Africa to combat the new threats may be examined as follows.

The role of the African Union. The African Union, the body of all African states, leads the continent's fight against the new threats. It coordinates action against terrorism, conflict and disease across Africa. It speaks and acts for the whole continent as one. The role of the African Union is central to the regional effort.

Peacekeeping missions. African bodies send peacekeeping forces to trouble spots, as the African Union has done in Somalia against Al-Shabaab. These forces fight terror and keep the fragile peace. African soldiers thus guard the African peace. Peacekeeping is a chief regional effort.

The work of the regional communities. Regional communities such as the East African Community and the Southern African Development Community work to combat the new threats within their regions. They coordinate security, trade and development among their members. Neighbours act together against common dangers. The work of the regional communities is a regional effort.

Sharing intelligence and policing. African nations share intelligence and coordinate their police and armies against terrorists and criminals. What one nation learns, its neighbours may quickly know. Cooperation makes them collectively far stronger. The sharing of intelligence is a regional effort.

Cooperating against crime and trafficking. African bodies cooperate against transnational crime, drug and human trafficking, and the trade in arms and wildlife. Together they close the routes and hunt the criminals down. United, they are much harder to evade. Cooperation against crime is a regional effort.

Combating disease together. African nations, through such bodies as the Africa Centres for Disease Control, combat disease and pandemics together. They share medicine, knowledge and aid across their borders. Disease is thus fought by the continent as one. Combating disease together is a regional effort.

Promoting development and integration. Regional bodies promote the development and integration of Africa, to remove the poverty that feeds the threats. By growing richer and closer together, the nations grow stronger. Prosperity becomes a shared shield. Promoting development is a regional effort.

Their difficulties and weaknesses. These regional efforts are weakened by the poverty of the states, their divisions, and their want of means. Africa's bodies are often short of both money and unity. The great task outruns their present strength. Their difficulties limit the regional effort.

The regional efforts of Africa to combat the new threats therefore include the leadership of the African Union, peacekeeping missions, the work of the regional communities, the sharing of intelligence, cooperation against crime and disease, and the promoting of development and integration, though these are weakened by poverty and division. No African nation can face the new threats alone, and so the peoples of the continent have joined hands through the bodies of their own making, even as they struggle to give those bodies the strength their task demands.

Question 31

The new threats belong to no nation and respect no border, and so only the united strength of all the nations can hope to master them.

Examine the international measures taken to overcome the new threats to world peace and security.

Model Answer

Because the new threats are global, the nations of the world have joined together, above all through the United Nations, to combat them. These international measures bind the whole world in a common defence. The international measures taken to overcome the new threats may be examined as follows.

The role of the United Nations. The United Nations leads the world's fight against the new threats, through its Security Council and its many agencies. It coordinates action against terrorism, crime, disease and disaster across the globe. It speaks and acts for the whole world. The role of the United Nations is central to the international effort.

International conventions and laws. The nations of the world make conventions and laws against terrorism, trafficking, money laundering and the spread of weapons. These bind the nations to a common standard of conduct. They set the law of the world itself against the threats. International conventions are a chief measure.

Sharing intelligence and policing. Nations share intelligence and cooperate in policing across the world, through bodies such as Interpol. What one nation learns, others may act upon at once. The criminal thus finds no safe corner anywhere. The sharing of intelligence is an international measure.

Peacekeeping and military cooperation. The world community sends peacekeepers and cooperates in arms against terror and disorder, as navies of many nations have patrolled together against piracy. United forces guard the common peace of all. Many flags fly side by side. Peacekeeping and military cooperation are international measures.

Controlling weapons and finance. The world works to control the spread of weapons and to cut off the finance of terror and crime, through treaties and watchdog bodies. Choking off their arms and their money weakens the threats. Global rules come in time to bind all. Controlling weapons and finance is an international measure.

Fighting disease together. Through the World Health Organisation and other bodies, the nations combat disease and pandemics together, sharing medicine, knowledge and aid. A sickness anywhere is now a danger everywhere. The world thus unites against it. Fighting disease together is an international measure.

Promoting development and tackling causes. The world community promotes development and seeks to remove the poverty and injustice that feed the threats. By lifting the poor, it dries up the very sources of danger. Aid thus becomes a weapon of peace. Promoting development is an international measure.

Their limits and difficulties. These international measures are weakened by the divisions and self-interest of nations, which do not always act as one. The world is often slow to agree and slower still to act. Sovereignty itself hinders the common effort. Their limits temper the international effort.

The international measures taken to overcome the new threats therefore include the leadership of the United Nations, international conventions and laws, the sharing of intelligence and policing, peacekeeping and military cooperation, the controlling of weapons and finance, the fighting of disease, and the promoting of development, though these are weakened by the divisions and self-interest of nations. The new threats

belong to no nation and respect no border, and so only the united strength of all can master them, however hard that unity may be to achieve.

Question 32

The nations know their enemy and their duty, yet find the new threats slip like water through the fingers of every effort to grasp them.

Assess the challenges of combating the new threats to world peace and security.

Model Answer

Though the nations of the world strive to combat the new threats, they meet many challenges and obstacles that make the task hard. These challenges arise from the nature of the threats and of the world itself. The challenges of combating the new threats to world peace and security may be assessed as follows.

The threats cross borders. The new threats cross borders freely, while the nations that fight them are divided by frontiers and laws. The threat is global, but the response is stubbornly national. This deep mismatch hampers the whole fight. The crossing of borders is a chief challenge to combating the threats.

The divisions of nations. The nations of the world are divided by rivalry, distrust and self-interest, and do not always act as one. Some will not cooperate, and some even shelter the threats. Disunity greatly weakens the common effort. The divisions of nations are a challenge to the fight.

The threats are hidden and hard to find. The new threats are hidden, coming from shadowy groups that wear no uniform and hold no ground. They are hard to find, to reach and to strike a blow at. They melt away and return again at will. Their hidden nature is a challenge to combating them.

The want of means. Many nations, above all the poor, lack the money, forces and skill to fight the new threats. The great task far outruns their slender means. The weak are the very least able to resist. The want of means is a serious challenge to combating the threats.

The roots run deep. The new threats spring from deep roots, such as poverty, injustice and grievance, which are hard and slow to remove. Force can strike the threat but never its cause. The roots simply grow back again. The depth of the roots is a challenge to the fight.

Weak and failed states. Weak and failed states give the threats a haven where none can reach them. Where government is absent, terror and crime flourish unchecked. These lawless lands are very hard to master. Weak states are a challenge to combating the threats.

The pace of technology. The new threats use ever-changing technology, which outpaces the efforts made to stop them. As soon as one door is shut, another quietly opens. The threats adapt and renew themselves without cease. The pace of technology is a challenge to the fight.

The cost to freedom. Harsh measures against the threats may curb the freedoms of the innocent and breed new grievances. To fight the threat without harming the people is very hard. Security and liberty pull against one another. This cost to freedom is a challenge to combating the threats.

The challenges of combating the new threats to world peace and security are therefore that the threats cross borders while nations are divided, that the threats are hidden and hard to find, that many nations want the means to fight, that the roots run deep, that weak states give the threats a haven, that technology outpaces the response, and that harsh measures may cost the innocent their freedom. The nations know their enemy and their duty, yet find the new threats slip like water through the fingers of every effort to grasp them.

Question 33

The fight against the new threats is not for governments alone; it is waged also by the aid worker, the journalist and the ordinary citizen.

Examine the role of non-governmental organisations, the media and civil society in combating the new threats to world peace and security.

Model Answer

The new threats are fought not by governments alone but also by non-governmental organisations, the media and civil society. These play a vital part in meeting dangers that reach into every corner of life. The role of non-governmental organisations, the media and civil society in combating the new threats may be examined as follows.

Non-governmental organisations give aid and relief. Non-governmental organisations, such as the Red Cross, give aid and relief to the victims of disaster, disease, famine and war. They feed the hungry and heal the sick where governments cannot reach. They save countless lives each year. The giving of aid and relief is a chief role of these bodies.

They fight poverty and disease. Non-governmental organisations work to fight the poverty and disease that feed the new threats, through development and health work. They dig wells, build clinics and teach the people. They attack the threats at their very roots. The fighting of poverty and disease is a role of these bodies.

The media inform and warn the people. The media inform and warn the people about the new threats, from terrorism to disease to disaster. They spread the knowledge that helps people to guard themselves and one another. An informed people is a safer one. The informing of the people is a chief role of the media.

The media expose wrongdoing. The media expose corruption, crime and abuse, bringing them into the light where they can be fought. The journalist is a watchman against the threats. Exposure is a powerful weapon against wrongdoing. The exposing of wrongdoing is a role of the media.

Civil society builds peace and tolerance. Civil society, through churches, mosques, schools and community groups, builds peace, tolerance and understanding among peoples. It counters the hatred that feeds terror and conflict. It knits divided communities together. The building of peace and tolerance is a role of civil society.

They counter extremist ideas. Non-governmental groups and civil society counter the extremist ideas that feed terrorism, above all among the young. They offer a better way and challenge the propaganda of hatred. Ideas must be fought with ideas. The countering of extremist ideas is a role of civil society.

They press governments to act. Non-governmental organisations and civil society press governments to act against the new threats and to keep their promises. They speak for the people and hold power to account. They give the weak and voiceless a voice. The pressing of governments to act is a role of these bodies.

They reach where governments cannot. Non-governmental organisations and civil society reach into places and peoples that governments cannot, in war zones, camps and remote lands. They work where the state is weak or absent. They fill the gaps in the common fight. Reaching where governments cannot is a vital role of these bodies.

The role of non-governmental organisations, the media and civil society in combating the new threats is therefore to give aid and relief, to fight poverty and disease, to inform and warn the people, to expose wrongdoing, to build peace and tolerance, to counter extremist ideas, to press governments to act, and to reach where governments cannot. The fight against the new threats is not for governments alone, but is waged also by the aid worker, the journalist and the ordinary citizen, and their part in it is a vital one.

The effects and significance of the new threats

Question 34

The new threats have remade the world we live in, filling it with fear and walls, and turning the securing of peace into a task that never ends.

Examine the effects of the new threats on the modern world.

Model Answer

The new threats to world peace and security have had deep effects on the modern world, changing its politics, its economy and its way of life. Their mark is felt in every land. The effects of the new threats on the modern world may be examined as follows.

They have spread fear and insecurity. The new threats have filled the world with fear and insecurity, as people dread terror, crime and disease. Fear has become a constant of everyday modern life. No place any longer feels wholly safe. The spreading of fear and insecurity is a chief effect of the new threats.

They have cost many lives. The new threats have cost countless lives, through terror, crime, disease and disaster. Millions have died before their time and in vain. The dreadful toll is beyond all counting. The great loss of life is a heavy effect of the new threats.

They have harmed the world economy. The new threats have harmed the world economy, disrupting trade, travel and investment, and diverting wealth to security. Whole economies have suffered greatly from them. Much wealth has been lost or wasted. Harm to the world economy is an effect of the new threats.

They have tightened security everywhere. In answer to the threats, security has been tightened across the world, at borders, airports and public places. The freedoms of ordinary people have been narrowed. Life has grown more watched and controlled. The tightening of security is an effect of the new threats.

They have driven international cooperation. The new threats, being global, have driven the nations to cooperate as never before against common dangers. Old enemies have joined hands to face them. The world has been drawn a little closer. The driving of cooperation is an effect of the new threats.

They have strained relations between peoples. The new threats have strained relations between nations, religions and peoples, breeding suspicion and division. Terror and migration have set communities against one another. Trust between them has been poisoned. The straining of relations is an effect of the new threats.

They have burdened the poor nations. The new threats have fallen hardest upon the poor nations, which can least bear them, deepening their poverty and disorder. The weak have suffered most of all from them. The gap between rich and poor has widened. The burdening of the poor is an effect of the new threats.

They have changed the meaning of security. The new threats have widened the very meaning of security, from the defence of the state to the safety of the individual. Security now means health, food and freedom from fear as well as defence. The idea itself has been changed. This change in the meaning of security is an effect of the new threats.

The effects of the new threats on the modern world are therefore the spreading of fear and insecurity, the cost of many lives, the harming of the world economy, the tightening of security everywhere, the driving of international cooperation, the straining of relations between peoples, the burdening of the poor nations, and the changing of the very meaning of security. The new threats have remade the world we live in, and turned the securing of peace into a task that never ends.

Question 35

The old world feared the march of armies; the new world must fear the germ, the bomb in the market, the flood, and the enemy who wears no flag.

Assess the significance of the new threats to world peace and security in the modern world.

Model Answer

The new threats to world peace and security, which rose to prominence after the Cold War, have come to shape the modern world and its fears. Their significance lies in how deeply they have changed the nature of danger and of security. The significance of the new threats to world peace and security may be assessed as follows.

They have changed the nature of the threat to peace. The new threats have changed the danger to peace from war between states to hidden, cross-border dangers such as terror, crime and disease. The enemy no

longer wears a uniform or holds a border. The very nature of the threat has been transformed. This change is the first significance of the new threats.

They have widened the meaning of security. The new threats have widened security from the defence of the state to the safety of the individual, or human security. Security now includes health, food and freedom from fear. The idea itself has grown far broader than before. This widening is a significance of the new threats.

They have made peace harder to secure. Because the new threats are many, hidden and constant, they have made the securing of peace a harder and endless task. There is no single enemy to defeat once and for all. The world must now guard on every side at once. This has made peace far harder to keep.

They have bound the nations together. Being global, the new threats have bound the nations together in a common defence, for none can face them alone. They have driven cooperation among nations as never before. The world is now joined by its shared danger. This binding of nations is a significance of the new threats.

They have fallen hardest on the weak. The new threats have fallen hardest upon the poor and weak nations, above all in Africa, deepening the divide between rich and poor. The weak suffer most and can resist the least. This has widened the inequalities of the world. The burden on the weak is a significance of the new threats.

They have shown the dark side of globalisation. The new threats have shown that the same forces that joined the world together, its openness and its machines, also opened it to danger. Globalisation has its own dark shadow. Progress itself has bred new perils. This is a significance of the new threats.

They demand new tools and thinking. The new threats cannot be met by armies alone, but demand new tools, cooperation, development and the tackling of root causes. The old ways of war no longer serve against them. New thinking is required of all nations. This demand for new tools is a significance of the new threats.

They keep the world in constant watchfulness. The new threats, striking without warning and never ceasing, keep the whole world in constant watchfulness and fear. Peace can never again be taken for granted. The guard is never wholly lowered. This constant watchfulness is a significance of the new threats.

They are the defining danger of the age. The new threats have become the defining danger of the post-Cold War age, as war between the great powers was of the age before. They shape the fears and the policies of all nations. They are the very mark of our time. Being the defining danger is their deepest significance.

The significance of the new threats to world peace and security is therefore that they have changed the nature of the threat to peace, widened the meaning of security, made peace harder to secure, bound the nations together, fallen hardest on the weak, shown the dark side of globalisation, demanded new tools and thinking, and kept the world in constant watchfulness, so that they have become the defining danger of the age. The old world feared the march of armies, but the new world must fear the germ, the bomb in the market, the flood, and the enemy who wears no flag, and in this lies the deep significance of the new threats to the peace and security of mankind.

Chapter 5

CIVIL AND ETHNIC WARS IN THE 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 nature of civil and ethnic wars

Question 1

The cruellest of all wars is that in which a nation turns its weapons upon itself, and brother takes up arms against brother.

Explain the meaning and main features of a civil war.

Model Answer

A civil war is a war fought between organised groups within the same country or state, for control of the government, the land or the way of life. It has become one of the commonest and most terrible conflicts of the modern world. The meaning and main features of a civil war may be explained as follows.

The meaning of a civil war. A civil war is an armed conflict fought between organised groups within a single country or state. It is a war of a people against itself, rather than against a foreign enemy. It is fought for the control of the government, the land or the very future of the nation.

It is fought within one country. Unlike a war between states, a civil war is fought within the borders of a single country, among its own people. The battlefield is the homeland, and the enemy is the neighbour. It divides one nation into warring camps. Being fought within one country is a chief feature of a civil war.

It is fought between organised groups. A civil war is fought between organised armed groups, such as a government and rebels, or two rival factions. It is not mere riot or disorder but organised armed conflict. Each side has its own leaders, soldiers and arms. Being fought between organised groups is a feature of a civil war.

It is often fought for power or self-rule. Civil wars are commonly fought for the control of the government, or for the right of a region or people to rule itself. One side seeks to seize or hold power, the other to overthrow it or to break away. The struggle for power or self-rule drives the war. This aim is a chief feature of civil war.

It brings great suffering to civilians. Because it is fought among the people, a civil war brings terrible suffering to ordinary civilians, not only to soldiers. Homes, villages and towns become battlefields overnight. The people are killed, driven out and starved. Great suffering to civilians is a chief feature of a civil war.

It divides and destroys the nation. A civil war tears a nation apart, setting its people against one another and destroying its unity. It ruins the economy and the whole fabric of society. The wounds it leaves are deep and slow to heal. The dividing and destroying of the nation is a feature of civil war.

It is often long and hard to end. Civil wars are often long, bitter and hard to bring to an end, for the enemies must go on living together in one land. Old hatreds outlast the fighting itself. Peace is difficult both to make and to keep. Being long and hard to end is a feature of a civil war.

A civil war is therefore an armed conflict fought between organised groups within a single country, for the control of the government or the right to self-rule, marked by its being fought within one country and among its own people, its great suffering to civilians, its dividing and destroying of the nation, and its being long and hard to end. It is the cruellest of wars, in which a nation turns its weapons upon itself.

Question 2

When men come to see their neighbours not as fellow citizens but as strangers of another blood, the ground is laid for the bloodiest of conflicts.

Explain the meaning and main features of an ethnic war.

Model Answer

An ethnic war, or ethnic conflict, is a war fought between different ethnic or tribal groups within a country, out of hatred, fear or rivalry. It has become one of the gravest threats to peace in the modern world, above all in Africa. The meaning and main features of an ethnic war may be explained as follows.

The meaning of an ethnic war. An ethnic war is an armed conflict fought between different ethnic, tribal or racial groups, chiefly over identity, land, power or grievance. It sets one people against another on the ground of blood and belonging. It is, in plain terms, a war of tribe against tribe.

It is fought along ethnic lines. An ethnic war is fought along the lines of ethnic or tribal identity, so that men take sides by their birth rather than their belief. Neighbour turns against neighbour because of his tribe. The dividing line between the enemies is one of blood. Being fought along ethnic lines is a chief feature of the ethnic war.

It springs from ethnic hatred and fear. Ethnic wars spring from the hatred, fear and suspicion of one group towards another, often fed by history and by leaders. Old grievances and rivalries are stirred up into violence. Fear of the other drives men to kill. Springing from ethnic hatred and fear is a feature of the ethnic war.

It is often marked by great cruelty. Ethnic wars are often marked by terrible cruelty, as each group seeks to destroy the other. Massacres, ethnic cleansing and even genocide may follow. The aim is not merely to defeat a foe but to remove a whole people. Great cruelty is a chief and dreadful feature of ethnic war.

It targets civilians by their identity. In an ethnic war, ordinary civilians are killed simply for belonging to the wrong group, not for anything they have done. Whole villages are slaughtered for their blood alone. The innocent are its chief victims. The targeting of civilians by their identity is a feature of ethnic war.

It can lead to genocide. At its most terrible, an ethnic war can lead to genocide, the deliberate attempt to destroy a whole people, as in Rwanda in 1994. Hatred is carried to the very point of extermination. A people is marked out for death. The danger of genocide is a grave feature of ethnic war.

It leaves deep and lasting wounds. Ethnic wars leave deep wounds of hatred and mistrust that outlast the fighting by generations. The peoples must still live together, but now in fear and bitterness. Reconciliation between them is very hard. Leaving deep and lasting wounds is a feature of the ethnic war.

An ethnic war is therefore an armed conflict fought between different ethnic or tribal groups over identity, land, power and grievance, marked by its being fought along ethnic lines, its springing from hatred and fear, its great cruelty, its targeting of civilians by their identity, its danger of genocide, and its deep and lasting wounds. It is among the bloodiest and most bitter of the conflicts of the modern world.

Question 3

Not all wars are alike: some are fought between nations, some within them, and some between the peoples who share a single land.

Distinguish between civil wars, ethnic wars and inter-state wars.

Model Answer

Wars may be of different kinds, chiefly the inter-state war fought between nations, the civil war fought within a nation, and the ethnic war fought between peoples. Though they often overlap, they differ in important ways. The differences between civil wars, ethnic wars and inter-state wars may be examined as follows.

Inter-state war is between countries. An inter-state war is fought between two or more separate countries, such as the two World Wars. It is a war of nation against nation across their borders. The enemy is a foreign state and its army. Being fought between countries marks out the inter-state war.

Civil war is within one country. A civil war, by contrast, is fought within a single country, between its own people or factions. The enemy is not foreign but domestic. The battlefield is the homeland itself. Being fought within one country marks the civil war apart from the inter-state war.

Ethnic war is between peoples. An ethnic war is fought between different ethnic or tribal groups, whether within one country or across borders. Its dividing line is blood and identity, not the flag. The enemy is another people. Being fought between peoples marks out the ethnic war.

They differ in the line of division. Inter-state wars divide along national borders, civil wars along political factions, and ethnic wars along ethnic identity. Each draws its enemy by a different line. The line of division sets them apart. This difference in the dividing line distinguishes the three kinds of war.

They differ in their causes. Inter-state wars spring from rivalry between nations, civil wars from the struggle for power within a state, and ethnic wars from hatred between peoples. Their deepest roots are different. Each has its own kind of cause. This difference in causes distinguishes them.

Civil and ethnic wars often overlap. Civil and ethnic wars often overlap, for many civil wars are fought along ethnic lines, as in Rwanda and Sudan. A single war may be both civil and ethnic at once. The two are closely bound together. This overlap must be remembered in distinguishing them.

They differ in their victims. Inter-state wars fall chiefly on soldiers and states, while civil and ethnic wars fall heavily on civilians, killed among their own homes. The innocent suffer most in a war within a land. This difference in victims sets them apart.

They differ in how they end. Inter-state wars end when one state defeats or makes peace with another, but civil and ethnic wars are far harder to end, for the enemies must go on sharing one land. Reconciliation is needed, not only victory. This difference in ending distinguishes them.

Civil wars, ethnic wars and inter-state wars therefore differ in that the inter-state war is fought between countries, the civil war within one country, and the ethnic war between peoples, differing further in their line of division, their causes, their victims and the way they end, though civil and ethnic wars often overlap. To understand a conflict, one must first see which kind of war it is.

Question 4

These are wars without front lines or uniforms, fought in the village and the street, where every neighbour may be an enemy.

Examine the nature and characteristics of civil and ethnic wars.

Model Answer

Civil and ethnic wars have a nature and character of their own, differing from the wars between states. Their features make them peculiarly cruel and hard to end. The nature and characteristics of civil and ethnic wars may be examined as follows.

They are fought within states. Civil and ethnic wars are fought within the borders of states, among their own peoples, rather than between nations. The homeland itself becomes the battlefield. The war is waged among the people themselves. Being fought within states is a chief characteristic of these wars.

They are fought by irregular forces. Such wars are often fought by irregular forces, militias and rebels, rather than by regular armies alone. Guerrilla tactics, ambush and terror are the common methods. There are seldom any clear front lines. Being fought by irregular forces is a characteristic of these wars.

They target civilians. Civil and ethnic wars fall heavily upon civilians, who are killed, driven out and abused in great numbers. The people, and not only the soldiers, are the true victims. Massacre and ethnic cleansing are common. The targeting of civilians is a chief characteristic of these wars.

They are marked by great cruelty. These wars are marked by terrible cruelty, including massacre, torture, rape and the use of child soldiers. The normal restraints of war are cast aside. Hatred drives men to great evil. Great cruelty is a characteristic of civil and ethnic wars.

They create refugees and displacement. Civil and ethnic wars drive great numbers of people from their homes, creating refugees and displaced persons. Whole populations flee the fighting in terror. The land is emptied of its people. The creating of refugees is a characteristic of these wars.

They destroy the economy and society. Such wars destroy the economy, the government and the very fabric of society. Farms, factories, schools and roads are ruined. Order collapses into chaos and want. The destroying of economy and society is a characteristic of these wars.

They are often long and recurring. Civil and ethnic wars are often long, and they tend to recur, breaking out afresh after an uneasy peace. Old hatreds are not easily healed. The fighting flares up again and again. Being long and recurring is a characteristic of these wars.

They draw in outside powers. Civil and ethnic wars often draw in neighbouring states and foreign powers, who back one side or another. What begins within a country may soon spread beyond it. Outsiders arm and fuel the fighting. The drawing in of outside powers is a characteristic of these wars.

The nature and characteristics of civil and ethnic wars are therefore that they are fought within states by irregular forces, that they target civilians and are marked by great cruelty, that they create refugees, destroy the economy and society, are often long and recurring, and draw in outside powers. These features make them peculiarly cruel, and among the hardest of all wars to bring to an end.

Question 5

There is a crime beyond even war, the deliberate attempt to wipe a whole people from the earth, and the twentieth century saw it more than once.

Examine genocide as the extreme form of ethnic conflict.

Model Answer

Genocide is the deliberate and systematic destruction of a whole people or group, and it is the most terrible extreme to which ethnic conflict can be carried. The modern world has witnessed it, above all in Rwanda in 1994. Genocide as the extreme form of ethnic conflict may be examined as follows.

The meaning of genocide. Genocide is the deliberate and systematic attempt to destroy a whole national, ethnic, racial or religious group. It seeks not merely to defeat a people but to wipe them wholly out. It is held to be the gravest of all crimes.

It is the extreme of ethnic hatred. Genocide is ethnic hatred carried to its furthest and most terrible extreme. Where ethnic war seeks to defeat or drive out, genocide seeks to exterminate a people. Hatred becomes a settled plan of extermination. Being the extreme of ethnic hatred marks out genocide.

It is planned and systematic. Genocide is not mere massacre but a planned and organised campaign, carried out by the state or by armed groups. Lists are drawn up and killers armed and directed. It is murder by cold design. Being planned and systematic is a chief feature of genocide.

The Rwandan genocide of 1994. The clearest recent case is Rwanda in 1994, where Hutu extremists killed some eight hundred thousand Tutsi and moderate Hutu in about a hundred days. Neighbours killed neighbours with machetes and clubs. The world stood by and did little. The Rwandan genocide was a terrible example of the crime.

It is often incited by propaganda. Genocide is often stirred up by propaganda that teaches hatred and calls for killing, as the radio station RTLM did in Rwanda. The victims are branded as enemies and as vermin. Words prepare the way for murder. Incitement by propaganda is a feature of genocide.

It causes vast loss of life. Genocide causes death on a vast scale, wiping out great numbers in a very short time. Whole communities are destroyed root and branch. The loss is beyond all counting or repair. Vast loss of life is the terrible effect of genocide.

It demands justice and prevention. Genocide is a crime against all mankind, and the world has vowed to punish and to prevent it, through courts and law. Yet the solemn vow of never again has too often been broken. Justice and prevention are the world's answer to genocide. The demand for them shows its gravity.

Genocide is therefore the deliberate and systematic destruction of a whole people, the most terrible extreme of ethnic hatred, planned and often incited by propaganda, as in the Rwandan genocide of 1994, and causing vast loss of life. It is the gravest of all crimes, and its prevention is among the deepest duties of mankind.

The causes of civil and ethnic wars

Question 6

Wars within nations do not spring from nowhere; they grow from the poisoned soil of hatred, injustice, poverty and the hunger for power.

Examine the causes of civil and ethnic wars.

Model Answer

Civil and ethnic wars have troubled many nations, above all in Africa, and they spring from many roots. Their causes lie in the divisions, injustices and rivalries of society. The causes of civil and ethnic wars may be examined as follows.

Ethnic and tribal hatred. Many such wars spring from the hatred and rivalry between ethnic or tribal groups, stirred by history and by leaders. Old grievances set one people against another. Hatred long nursed at last turns to violence. Ethnic and tribal hatred is a leading cause of civil and ethnic wars.

The legacy of colonialism. Colonialism left Africa with artificial borders that threw rival peoples together and split others apart. It set tribe against tribe by its rule of divide and rule. These divisions bred conflict long after independence. The legacy of colonialism is a deep cause of civil and ethnic wars.

Bad governance and dictatorship. Bad, corrupt and oppressive government drives people to revolt, and dictators cling to power by force. Where the state is unjust, the people take up arms against it. Misrule breeds rebellion and war. Bad governance and dictatorship are a chief cause of civil war.

The struggle for power. Civil wars often spring from the struggle for power among leaders and factions, each seeking to rule. The losers of politics turn from the ballot to the gun. Ambition arms the rivals against one another. The struggle for power is a leading cause of civil war.

Poverty and inequality. Poverty, want and the unfair sharing of wealth breed the anger and desperation from which war grows. The poor rise against the rich, and the neglected against the favoured. Injustice lights the fire of conflict. Poverty and inequality are a cause of civil and ethnic wars.

Competition for resources. Wars are often fought over land, water, minerals and other resources, as groups struggle for control of wealth. In the Congo, rich minerals have fed long and bloody war. Greed and need together drive the fighting. Competition for resources is a cause of civil and ethnic wars.

Religious differences. Differences of religion can also breed civil and ethnic war, as in Sudan and Nigeria. Faith becomes a badge of division and a cause of hatred. Belief itself is turned into a weapon. Religious difference is a cause of some civil and ethnic wars.

Weak states and the flood of arms. Weak states cannot keep order, and the flood of cheap arms puts a gun into every hand. Where the state is feeble and weapons plentiful, war easily breaks out. Weakness and arms together breed conflict. These are a cause of civil and ethnic wars.

Foreign interference. The meddling of foreign powers and neighbouring states, backing one side or another, fuels and prolongs civil and ethnic wars. Outsiders arm, fund and shelter the fighters. Their interference deepens and lengthens the conflict. Foreign interference is a cause of civil and ethnic wars.

The causes of civil and ethnic wars are therefore ethnic and tribal hatred, the legacy of colonialism, bad governance and dictatorship, the struggle for power, poverty and inequality, competition for resources, religious differences, weak states and the flood of arms, and foreign interference. These wars grow from the poisoned soil of hatred, injustice, poverty and the hunger for power, and only by tackling these roots can they be prevented.

Question 7

Long after the colonisers had departed, the borders they had drawn and the divisions they had sown went on setting the peoples of Africa at war.

Assess the role of colonialism in causing civil and ethnic wars in Africa.

Model Answer

Many of the civil and ethnic wars that have troubled Africa can be traced in part to the legacy of colonial rule. Though not the only cause, colonialism did much to sow the seeds of later conflict. The role of colonialism in causing civil and ethnic wars in Africa may be assessed as follows.

It drew artificial borders. Colonialism divided Africa by borders drawn for the convenience of Europe, without regard for its peoples. Rival groups were thrown together within one state, and single peoples were split apart between several. These arbitrary borders bred later conflict. The drawing of artificial borders was a chief way in which colonialism caused war.

It practised divide and rule. The colonial powers ruled by setting one group against another, favouring some and oppressing others. This bred division, jealousy and hatred among the peoples. Old rivalries were deepened and new ones created. The policy of divide and rule sowed the very seeds of ethnic war.

It favoured some groups over others. Colonial rule often raised up one ethnic group above the rest, giving it education, office and wealth. This bred deep resentment among those who were left out. The favoured and the neglected became enemies. The favouring of some groups over others was a cause of later conflict.

It created weak, artificial states. Colonialism created states that were artificial, joining peoples with no common bond or identity. These states were weak and hard to hold together after independence. They fell easily into division and war. The creating of weak, artificial states was a cause of civil war.

It bred uneven development. Colonial rule developed some regions and neglected others, creating deep inequalities within each colony. The poorer regions came to resent the richer and more favoured. This uneven development bred grievance and revolt. It was a real cause of later civil war.

It left no tradition of unity. Colonialism ruled by force and division, and left behind no tradition of national unity or shared citizenship. The new nations had little bond to hold their peoples together. Loyalty stayed with the tribe rather than the state. The lack of unity was a legacy that bred conflict.

It bred a struggle to inherit power. At independence, the different groups struggled to inherit the power the colonisers had held. Each feared to be ruled and oppressed by the others. This struggle often turned to violence and to war. The struggle to inherit colonial power was a cause of civil war.

Yet other causes also mattered. Colonialism was not the only cause, for bad government, poverty and the choices of African leaders also drove the wars. To blame colonialism alone is far too simple. Africans too bear a share of the blame. Other causes worked alongside the colonial legacy.

The role of colonialism in causing civil and ethnic wars in Africa was therefore great, for it drew artificial borders, practised divide and rule, favoured some groups over others, created weak and artificial states, bred uneven development, left no tradition of unity, and set off a struggle to inherit power, though bad government, poverty and the choices of African leaders also played their part. Long after the colonisers departed, the divisions they had sown went on setting the peoples of Africa at war.

Question 8

Where power is a prize to be seized and never shared, and where the ruler answers to no one, the gun soon takes the place of the ballot.

Examine the role of bad governance and the struggle for power in causing civil wars.

Model Answer

Many civil wars spring from bad governance and from the ruthless struggle for power among leaders and groups. Where government is unjust and power is not shared, war often follows. The role of bad governance and the struggle for power in causing civil wars may be examined as follows.

Dictatorship and oppression. Dictators who rule by force and deny the people their rights drive them at last to revolt. Oppression breeds resentment, and resentment breeds rebellion. The people take up arms against the tyrant who crushes them. Dictatorship and oppression are a chief cause of civil war.

The exclusion of groups from power. Where some groups are shut out of power and its benefits, they grow angry and may rebel. A government of one group over all the rest breeds ethnic war. The excluded feel they have no stake in the state. The exclusion of groups from power causes civil war.

Corruption and misrule. Corrupt and greedy government steals the wealth of the nation and misrules its people. The poor grow poorer while the rulers grow rich. Anger at this injustice slowly breeds revolt. Corruption and misrule are a cause of civil war.

Rigged and stolen elections. Where elections are rigged and stolen, the people are denied any peaceful way to change their rulers. Cheated of the ballot, they may turn instead to the gun. Fraud breeds violence and war. Rigged and stolen elections are a cause of civil war.

The winner-takes-all state. In many states the winner of power takes all, and the loser gets nothing but exclusion and fear. This makes every contest for power a matter of life and death. None dare to lose an election. The winner-takes-all state drives the struggle towards war.

The ambition of leaders. The naked ambition of leaders and would-be leaders, each grasping for power, drives many civil wars. Rival strongmen raise armies and plunge nations into war for their own ends. Ambition arms the rival factions. The ambition of leaders is a cause of civil war.

Military coups and counter-coups. The seizing of power by the army, and the coups and counter-coups that follow, breed instability and war. Government by the gun invites yet more of the same. Power changes hands by force rather than by vote. Military coups are a cause of civil conflict.

The failure to share power. Above all, the failure to share power fairly among the peoples and regions of a nation breeds civil war. Where power is hoarded by a few, the excluded rebel. Justice in the sharing of power is the price of peace. The failure to share power is a deep cause of civil war.

The role of bad governance and the struggle for power in causing civil wars is therefore seen in dictatorship and oppression, the exclusion of groups from power, corruption and misrule, rigged elections, the winner-takes-all state, the ambition of leaders, military coups, and above all the failure to share power fairly. Where power is a prize to be seized and never shared, and the ruler answers to no one, the gun soon takes the place of the ballot.

Question 9

It is easy to blame the tribe for Africa's wars, but beneath the hatred often lie deeper causes: poverty, injustice, and the greed for power and wealth.

"Ethnic hatred is the main cause of civil wars in Africa." How far do you agree with this statement?

Model Answer

The statement holds that the deepest cause of Africa's civil wars is the hatred between its tribes. There is truth in it, for many wars are fought along ethnic lines, yet other causes, such as bad government, poverty and the struggle for resources, are often deeper. How far ethnic hatred is the main cause of civil wars in Africa may be examined as follows.

Ethnic hatred has caused many wars. Many of Africa's worst wars, as in Rwanda and Burundi, have been fought along ethnic lines. Tribe has slaughtered tribe in the name of blood and belonging. Ethnic hatred has plainly caused great bloodshed. In this the claim holds much truth.

Tribal identity divides many nations. Many African nations are divided among many tribes with old rivalries and little sense of common bond. This tribalism makes ethnic conflict easy to stir up. Loyalty to the tribe often outweighs loyalty to the nation. Tribal division is a real cause of war.

Leaders use ethnic hatred to gain power. Leaders often stir up ethnic hatred to win support and to gain or hold power. They deliberately turn tribe against tribe for their own ends. Hatred becomes a ready tool in their hands. The use of ethnic hatred by leaders makes it a real cause of war.

Yet bad governance is often deeper. Beneath the ethnic hatred there often lies bad, unjust and exclusive government, which shuts whole groups out of power. The hatred is fed by the real grievances of misrule. Ethnicity is the form, but misrule the root. Bad governance is often the deeper cause.

Poverty and inequality drive the wars. Poverty, want and the unfair sharing of wealth breed the anger that fuels war. Where all are poor and some are favoured, conflict readily grows. The tribe becomes the banner, but poverty the cause. Poverty is often a deeper cause than hatred alone.

The struggle for resources fuels conflict. Many so-called ethnic wars are really struggles for land, minerals and wealth, as in the Congo. Greed for resources drives the fighting, and ethnicity merely masks it. Riches, not blood, are often the true prize. The struggle for resources is a deeper cause.

Ethnicity is often stirred, not natural. Ethnic hatred is often not natural but deliberately stirred up by leaders and by history, above all the divisions of colonialism. It is made, not born. To blame the tribe alone is to miss who lit the fire. Ethnicity is often the tool of deeper causes.

The weight of the argument. Ethnic hatred is a real and terrible cause of Africa's wars, yet it is often the surface beneath which lie bad governance, poverty and the greed for power and resources. These deeper causes give the hatred its force. Hatred is a leading cause, but seldom the only or the deepest one.

Ethnic hatred is therefore a real and important cause of civil wars in Africa, for it has driven terrible conflicts and is easily stirred by leaders, yet it is often the surface beneath which lie the deeper causes of bad governance, poverty, inequality and the struggle for resources. It is truest to say that ethnic hatred is a leading cause, but usually the banner rather than the root, and that to end Africa's wars one must tackle the deeper injustices that feed the hatred.

Question 10

No continent has been so torn by war within its own borders as Africa, and the reasons lie deep in its history and its condition.

Account for the frequency of civil and ethnic wars in Africa.

Model Answer

Since independence, Africa has suffered more civil and ethnic wars than any other continent, from Nigeria to Rwanda to the Congo. Several deep causes explain why such wars have been so frequent there. The reasons for the frequency of civil and ethnic wars in Africa may be accounted for as follows.

The artificial colonial borders. The borders drawn by the colonisers threw rival peoples together and split others apart, without regard for African realities. These artificial states were hard to hold together. Their built-in divisions bred endless conflict. The colonial borders are a chief reason for Africa's wars.

The many ethnic groups. Most African nations are made up of many ethnic groups, often with old rivalries and little sense of common nationhood. This deep diversity, left unhealed, breeds ethnic conflict. Loyalty to the tribe divides the nation. The many ethnic groups help to explain the frequency of war.

Weak states and institutions. The states of Africa are often weak, with feeble governments, armies and courts unable to keep order. Where the state is weak, war easily breaks out and is hard to stop. Weakness itself invites rebellion. Weak states are a reason for Africa's frequent wars.

Bad governance and dictatorship. Bad, corrupt and oppressive government has driven many African peoples to revolt. Dictators cling to power and exclude their rivals from it. Misrule breeds resentment and war. Bad governance is a leading reason for the frequency of conflict.

Poverty and the struggle for resources. Africa's poverty, and the struggle for its land, minerals and wealth, breed conflict across the continent. Rich resources have fed long wars, as in the Congo. Want and greed together drive the fighting. Poverty and the struggle for resources explain much of Africa's war.

The flood of arms. Africa has been flooded with cheap small arms, which put a gun into every hand and make war easy to wage. Armed rebels and militias spring up readily. The guns keep the many wars going. The flood of arms is a reason for the frequency of conflict.

The legacy of the Cold War. The Cold War armed and funded rival factions across Africa, leaving behind weapons, divisions and unfinished conflicts. The rivalry of the powers sowed war in the continent. Its bitter legacy outlived it. The Cold War legacy helps to explain Africa's wars.

Foreign interference. Neighbouring states and foreign powers have meddled in Africa's conflicts, backing one side or another for their own ends. Their interference fuels and prolongs the wars. Outsiders keep the fighting alive. Foreign interference is a reason for the frequency of war.

The failure to build nations. Since independence, many African states have failed to forge their many peoples into united nations. Without a shared identity, the tribe comes before the country. This failure leaves the nations prone to war. The failure to build nations is a deep reason for Africa's frequent conflicts.

Civil and ethnic wars have been so frequent in Africa therefore because of the artificial colonial borders, the many ethnic groups, the weakness of states, bad governance, poverty and the struggle for resources, the flood of arms, the legacy of the Cold War, foreign interference, and the failure to build united nations. No continent has been so torn by war within its own borders, and the reasons lie deep in its history and its condition.

Major civil and ethnic wars

Question 11

In a hundred days of 1994, a small African country became a slaughterhouse, as neighbours turned upon neighbours and killed some eight hundred thousand of their own people.

Examine the causes and effects of the Rwandan genocide of 1994.

Model Answer

The Rwandan genocide of 1994 was the deliberate mass killing of the Tutsi and moderate Hutu by Hutu extremists, one of the worst crimes of the twentieth century. It sprang from deep divisions and left terrible scars. The causes and effects of the Rwandan genocide may be examined as follows.

The old hatred of Hutu and Tutsi. The genocide sprang from the long hatred and rivalry between the Hutu majority and the Tutsi minority. This division, deepened by colonial rule, set the two peoples against each other. Old fear and resentment ran very deep. The Hutu and Tutsi hatred was the root of the genocide.

The legacy of colonial rule. Belgian colonial rule had favoured the Tutsi over the Hutu and hardened the division between them into a rigid one. It taught the two peoples to see each other as enemies. This colonial legacy sowed the seeds of the genocide. It was a deep cause of the killing.

The civil war and the RPF invasion. In 1990 the Tutsi-led Rwandan Patriotic Front invaded from Uganda, beginning a civil war. This frightened and angered the Hutu government and people. The war set the stage for the genocide. The civil war and the RPF invasion were a cause of the killing.

Hate propaganda. Hutu extremists spread hate propaganda, above all through the radio station RTLM, which called the Tutsi cockroaches and urged the people to kill them. This poisoned the minds of ordinary Hutu. Words prepared the way for murder. Hate propaganda was a cause of the genocide.

The trigger: the death of the president. On the sixth of April 1994 the aeroplane carrying the Hutu president Habyarimana was shot down, killing him. Hutu extremists blamed the Tutsi and used it as the signal to begin the killing. This was the immediate trigger. The death of the president set off the genocide.

The slaughter of the Tutsi. In about a hundred days, Hutu extremists and the Interahamwe militia killed some eight hundred thousand Tutsi and moderate Hutu. Neighbours killed neighbours with machetes and clubs. It was slaughter on a vast and terrible scale. The killing of the Tutsi was the dreadful effect of the genocide.

The flight of refugees. The genocide and the war that ended it drove some two million people, mainly Hutu, to flee into the neighbouring countries. Vast refugee camps sprang up in the Congo and in Tanzania. The whole region was flooded with the displaced. The flight of refugees was a grave effect of the genocide.

The victory of the RPF. The genocide was ended in July 1994 when the Rwandan Patriotic Front, led by Paul Kagame, defeated the Hutu government and took power. The killers fled or were driven out of the country. A Tutsi-led government took charge. The victory of the RPF brought the genocide to its end.

Lasting scars and the failure of the world. The genocide left Rwanda scarred by grief, guilt and the hard task of reconciliation. It also shamed the world, which had stood by and done nothing to stop it. The wounds ran very deep and long. Lasting scars and the failure of the world were effects of the genocide.

The Rwandan genocide of 1994 therefore sprang from the old hatred of Hutu and Tutsi, the legacy of colonial rule, the civil war and RPF invasion, hate propaganda, and the trigger of the president's death, and it brought the slaughter of some eight hundred thousand people, the flight of two million refugees, the victory of the RPF, and lasting scars upon Rwanda and shame upon the world. In a hundred days it turned a small country into a slaughterhouse, and stands as a terrible warning of where ethnic hatred can lead.

Question 12

In the heart of Africa, a nation rich beyond measure in minerals has been torn for decades by war, its wealth a curse that draws the greed of many.

Examine the causes and effects of the civil wars in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

Model Answer

The Democratic Republic of Congo has suffered some of the longest and deadliest civil wars in Africa, drawing in many nations in what has been called Africa's world war. The wars sprang from many causes and brought terrible destruction. The causes and effects of the civil wars in the Congo may be examined as follows.

The legacy of Mobutu's misrule. Decades of corrupt and ruinous rule under the dictator Mobutu left the Congo weak, poor and deeply divided. When his rule fell in 1997, the country collapsed into war. His long misrule sowed the seeds of the conflict. The legacy of Mobutu was a cause of the wars.

The spillover of the Rwandan genocide. The Rwandan genocide of 1994 spilled over into the Congo, as Hutu killers and refugees fled there and Rwanda pursued them across the border. This drew the Congo into war. The genocide lit the fuse of the conflict. The spillover of the Rwandan genocide was a cause of the Congo wars.

The struggle for rich minerals. The Congo is rich in minerals such as gold, diamonds and coltan, and the struggle to control this wealth has driven and funded the wars. Armed groups and foreign armies fought for the mines. Riches fed and prolonged the fighting. The struggle for minerals was a leading cause of the wars.

The involvement of many nations. The wars drew in many African nations, including Rwanda, Uganda, Angola and Zimbabwe, each backing a side or seeking gain. So many took part that it was called Africa's world war. The Congo became a battleground of the whole continent. The involvement of many nations deepened the wars.

Weak government and armed groups. The weakness of the Congolese state left much of the country in the hands of armed groups and militias. Where the government could not rule, the gun ruled instead. Rebellion and banditry flourished unchecked. Weak government and armed groups were a cause of the wars.

Vast loss of life. The Congo wars caused a vast loss of life, some millions dead from fighting, hunger and disease, the deadliest conflict since the Second World War. Whole regions were laid waste. The suffering was beyond measure. The vast loss of life was the terrible effect of the wars.

Displacement and suffering. The wars drove millions from their homes and brought famine, disease and terrible abuses, including mass rape. The people suffered beyond all telling. The land was filled with the displaced and the destitute. Displacement and suffering were grave effects of the wars.

Lasting instability. The wars left the Congo weak, divided and unstable, with armed groups still active in the east long afterwards. Peace has been very hard to build and to keep. The country remains troubled to this day. Lasting instability was an effect of the Congo wars.

The civil wars in the Democratic Republic of Congo therefore sprang from the legacy of Mobutu's misrule, the spillover of the Rwandan genocide, the struggle for rich minerals, the involvement of many nations, and the weakness of the state, and they brought a vast loss of life, mass displacement and suffering, and lasting instability. In the heart of Africa, a nation rich beyond measure has been torn for decades by war, its wealth a curse that draws the greed of many.

Question 13

Somalia is the very picture of the failed state, a land where the government fell and never rose again, and warlords and pirates filled the void.

Examine the civil war in Somalia and the collapse of the state.

Model Answer

The civil war in Somalia, which began in 1991, brought the total collapse of the state and left the country in the hands of warlords, clans and militias. It is the clearest case of a failed state in the modern world. The civil war in Somalia and the collapse of the state may be examined as follows.

The fall of Siad Barre in 1991. The war began with the overthrow of the dictator Siad Barre in 1991, whose harsh rule had bred revolt. His fall left a vacuum of power that no one could fill. The state collapsed at once into chaos. The fall of Siad Barre began the Somali civil war.

The rivalry of the clans. Somalia is divided among rival clans, and after Barre's fall these clans and their warlords fought one another for power. Clan loyalty divided the whole nation. The war became a struggle of clan against clan. The rivalry of the clans drove the civil war.

The collapse of central government. After 1991 Somalia had no effective central government for many years, a rare and total collapse of the state. No one ruled the whole country. Warlords held sway each in his own land. The collapse of central government marked the Somali war.

Warlords and militias. In the absence of government, warlords and their militias ruled by the gun, fighting and plundering at will. The country was carved up among armed factions. Might was the only law that remained. The rule of warlords and militias was a feature of the collapse.

Famine and suffering. The war and the collapse brought terrible famine and suffering, as fighting wrecked farming and blocked the flow of aid. Hundreds of thousands died of hunger. The people suffered grievously. Famine and suffering were dreadful effects of the war.

Foreign intervention and its failure. The United Nations and the United States intervened in the 1990s to bring aid and peace, but failed and withdrew after heavy losses. The outsiders could not master the chaos. Their intervention ended in failure. Foreign intervention and its failure marked the war.

The rise of Al-Shabaab. Out of the long chaos rose the terrorist group Al-Shabaab, which seized much of the south and waged war and terror. The failed state became a nest of terror. Somalia's collapse endangered the whole region. The rise of Al-Shabaab was an effect of the war.

Piracy and danger to the region. The lawlessness of Somalia bred piracy off its long coast and threatened the security of the whole region. The failed state became a danger to its neighbours and to the world. Its troubles spread far beyond its borders. Piracy and regional danger were effects of the collapse.

The civil war in Somalia therefore began with the fall of Siad Barre in 1991 and the rivalry of the clans, and it brought the total collapse of central government, the rule of warlords and militias, terrible famine, the failure of foreign intervention, the rise of Al-Shabaab, and the spread of piracy and danger to the region. Somalia became the very picture of the failed state, a land where the government fell and never truly rose again.

Question 14

For half a century the largest country in Africa was torn between its Arab north and its African south, until at last it broke in two.

Examine the causes and effects of the civil wars in Sudan and the secession of South Sudan.

Model Answer

Sudan suffered some of the longest civil wars in Africa, fought between the Arab, Muslim north and the African, largely Christian south, until the south broke away to form South Sudan in 2011. The wars sprang from deep divisions and brought terrible suffering. The causes and effects of the civil wars in Sudan may be examined as follows.

The division of north and south. Sudan was deeply divided between the Arab, Muslim north and the African, largely Christian and traditional south. This division of race, religion and culture set the two against each other. The country was really two nations in one. The division of north and south was the root of the wars.

The domination of the south by the north. The Arab north dominated the government and sought to impose its rule, religion and language upon the south. The southerners resented this domination and rose against it. Injustice bred rebellion. The domination of the south by the north was a cause of the wars.

Religious differences. The attempt to impose Islamic law upon the non-Muslim south deepened the conflict greatly. Religion became a badge of division and a cause of war. Faith set the two peoples against each other. Religious difference was a cause of the Sudanese civil wars.

The struggle for oil and resources. The finding of oil, much of it in the south, sharpened the struggle between north and south for its wealth. Resources fed and prolonged the war. Each side fought hard for the riches. The struggle for oil and resources was a cause of the wars.

The long civil wars. Sudan suffered two long civil wars, from 1955 to 1972 and from 1983 to 2005, between the north and the south. Millions died in the fighting and the famine it caused. The wars dragged on for decades. The long civil wars were the terrible course of the conflict.

Vast loss of life and suffering. The wars caused a vast loss of life, some two million dead, and drove millions more from their homes. Famine and disease followed close upon the fighting. The people suffered beyond measure. Vast loss of life and suffering were grave effects of the wars.

The secession of South Sudan in 2011. The second war ended in a peace that let the south vote to break away, and in 2011 South Sudan became an independent nation. Sudan was thus split in two. The long struggle ended in secession. The secession of South Sudan was a chief effect of the wars.

The conflict in Darfur and continued strife. Even as the north-south war ended, another conflict raged in Darfur in the west, where the government and its militias killed and drove out many. Sudan knew little lasting peace. Strife continued after the secession. The Darfur conflict and continued strife were effects of Sudan's divisions.

The civil wars in Sudan therefore sprang from the division of north and south, the domination of the south by the north, religious differences, and the struggle for oil, and they brought two long wars, a vast loss of life, the secession of South Sudan in 2011, and the further conflict in Darfur. For half a century the largest country in Africa was torn between its Arab north and its African south, until at last it broke in two.

Question 15

When the Igbo people tried to break away and form the nation of Biafra, Nigeria fought a bitter war to hold itself together, and a million died, most of them of hunger.

Examine the causes and effects of the Nigerian civil war of 1967 to 1970.

Model Answer

The Nigerian civil war of 1967 to 1970, also called the Biafran war, was fought when the eastern region tried to break away as the independent state of Biafra. It was one of the first great civil wars of independent Africa. The causes and effects of the Nigerian civil war may be examined as follows.

The ethnic divisions of Nigeria. Nigeria was deeply divided among its main peoples, the Hausa-Fulani of the north, the Yoruba of the west, and the Igbo of the east. These divisions bred rivalry and mistrust between the regions. The nation was uneasily held together. The ethnic divisions of Nigeria were the root of the war.

The legacy of colonial rule. British colonial rule had joined these different peoples into one state without ever uniting them. It left Nigeria divided and hard to govern as one. The artificial nation was prone to break apart. The legacy of colonial rule was a cause of the war.

The military coups of 1966. In 1966 two military coups, and the killing of leaders, deepened the ethnic mistrust, above all between the north and the Igbo east. Government fell into the hands of the army. Fear and hatred grew apace. The coups of 1966 were a cause of the war.

The massacre of the Igbo. After the coups, many thousands of Igbo living in the north were massacred, and the survivors fled home to the east in fear. This slaughter convinced the Igbo that they could not be safe within Nigeria. It drove them towards secession. The massacre of the Igbo was a cause of the war.

The secession of Biafra. In 1967 the eastern region, led by Ojukwu, declared itself the independent republic of Biafra. Nigeria refused to let it go and went to war to hold the nation together. The east had broken away. The secession of Biafra began the civil war.

The blockade and famine. Nigeria blockaded Biafra, and the resulting famine killed great numbers, above all children, who starved in their thousands. The images of the starving shocked the whole world. Hunger became a weapon of war. The blockade and famine were terrible effects of the war.

Vast loss of life. The war cost the lives of some one to three million people, most of them not from the fighting but from starvation and disease. Biafra was slowly crushed and starved. The loss of life was immense. Vast loss of life was the chief effect of the war.

The defeat of Biafra and reunion. In 1970 Biafra was at last defeated and the east rejoined Nigeria, which held together as one nation. The secession had failed. Nigeria survived, but deeply scarred. The defeat of Biafra and the reunion of Nigeria were the outcome of the war.

The Nigerian civil war of 1967 to 1970 therefore sprang from the ethnic divisions of Nigeria, the legacy of colonial rule, the military coups of 1966, and the massacre of the Igbo, and it ran through the secession of Biafra, the blockade and famine, to the defeat of Biafra and the reunion of Nigeria, at the cost of some one to three million lives. When the Igbo tried to form the nation of Biafra, Nigeria fought a bitter war to hold itself together, and most of the dead were the children who starved.

Question 16

In the diamond fields of West Africa, war was waged for the sake of gems, and children were armed to kill while men grew rich on blood diamonds.

Examine the causes and effects of the civil wars in Liberia and Sierra Leone.

Model Answer

Liberia and Sierra Leone, two neighbouring countries of West Africa, suffered terrible civil wars in the 1990s, marked by the use of child soldiers and the plunder of diamonds. Their wars are a byword for the horrors of civil conflict. The causes and effects of the civil wars in Liberia and Sierra Leone may be examined as follows.

Bad government and injustice. The wars sprang in part from bad, corrupt and unjust government, which bred anger and revolt. In Liberia the rule of a narrow elite bred deep resentment. Misrule at last lit the fire. Bad government and injustice were a cause of the wars.

The ambition of warlords. The wars were driven by the ambition of warlords such as Charles Taylor of Liberia, who seized power by force. These men raised armies for their own ends. Ambition plunged the region into war. The ambition of warlords was a cause of the conflict.

The struggle for diamonds. In Sierra Leone the rebels fought to control the diamond fields, funding their war by the sale of these blood diamonds. Riches drove and paid for the fighting. Greed prolonged the war for years. The struggle for diamonds was a cause of the Sierra Leone war.

The spread of war across borders. The war spread from Liberia into Sierra Leone, as Charles Taylor backed the rebels there. The conflicts of the two countries fed one another. War crossed the border freely. The spread of war across borders deepened the conflict.

The use of child soldiers. Both wars were marked by the terrible use of child soldiers, as boys and girls were seized, drugged and armed to kill. Childhood itself was destroyed by the war. This was among the cruellest features of the conflict. The use of child soldiers marked these wars.

Terrible atrocities. The wars were marked by terrible atrocities, including massacre, rape and the hacking off of limbs to spread terror. The cruelty appalled the whole world. The people suffered horribly. Terrible atrocities were a dreadful feature of the wars.

Vast destruction and suffering. The wars killed and maimed great numbers, drove many from their homes, and ruined the two countries. The people suffered grievously for years. The lands were laid waste. Vast destruction and suffering were effects of the wars.

Foreign intervention and peace. At last foreign intervention, by West African forces and the United Nations, helped to end the wars and bring peace by the early 2000s. Outside help restored a fragile order. Charles Taylor was later tried for his crimes. Foreign intervention and peace ended the conflicts.

The civil wars in Liberia and Sierra Leone therefore sprang from bad government, the ambition of warlords such as Charles Taylor, and the struggle for diamonds, and they were marked by the spread of war across borders, the use of child soldiers, terrible atrocities, and vast destruction, until foreign intervention brought peace. In the diamond fields of West Africa, war was waged for the sake of gems, and children were armed to kill while men grew rich on blood diamonds.

Question 17

When the state of Yugoslavia fell apart, its peoples turned upon one another in the worst bloodshed Europe had seen since the Second World War.

Examine the causes and effects of the ethnic conflict in the former Yugoslavia.

Model Answer

The ethnic conflict in the former Yugoslavia, in the 1990s, was fought among its rival peoples as the country broke apart. It brought ethnic cleansing and massacre back to Europe. The causes and effects of the ethnic conflict in the former Yugoslavia may be examined as follows.

The many peoples of Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia was made up of many peoples, Serbs, Croats, Bosnians and others, of different religions and histories. These peoples carried old rivalries and mistrust. The state had held them uneasily together. The many peoples of Yugoslavia were the root of the conflict.

The collapse of communism. The fall of communism at the end of the Cold War weakened the state that had held Yugoslavia together. Without it, the country began to break apart. The old bonds dissolved. The collapse of communism was a cause of the conflict.

The rise of nationalism. As the state weakened, leaders stirred up ethnic nationalism, each people seeking a state of its own. Nationalism set the peoples against one another. Leaders fanned the flames for their own power. The rise of nationalism was a cause of the conflict.

The break-up of the country. In the early 1990s the republics of Yugoslavia broke away one by one, and war followed as peoples fought over land and borders. The country dissolved into warring states. The break-up brought war in its train. The break-up of the country was a cause of the conflict.

Ethnic cleansing. The war was marked by ethnic cleansing, as each group sought to drive out or destroy the others to claim the land. Whole peoples were expelled by terror. It was the return of an old evil. Ethnic cleansing was a dreadful feature of the conflict.

The war in Bosnia and the Srebrenica massacre. The worst fighting was in Bosnia, where in 1995 some eight thousand Muslim men and boys were massacred at Srebrenica. It was the worst atrocity in Europe since the Second World War. The world was shamed anew. The Bosnian war and Srebrenica were terrible effects of the conflict.

Vast suffering and displacement. The wars killed some hundreds of thousands and drove millions from their homes across the region. The peoples suffered grievously. The land was torn apart. Vast suffering and displacement were effects of the conflict.

Foreign intervention and new states. At last foreign intervention, by NATO and the United Nations, helped to end the wars, and Yugoslavia broke up into several new states. Leaders were later tried for war crimes. Peace came at a heavy price. Foreign intervention and the birth of new states ended the conflict.

The ethnic conflict in the former Yugoslavia therefore sprang from its many rival peoples, the collapse of communism, the rise of nationalism, and the break-up of the country, and it brought ethnic cleansing, the war in Bosnia and the Srebrenica massacre, vast suffering, and at last foreign intervention and the birth of new states. When Yugoslavia fell apart, its peoples turned upon one another in the worst bloodshed Europe had seen since the Second World War.

The effects of civil and ethnic wars

Question 18

A civil war does not merely kill; it unmakes a nation, tearing down in a few years what generations had built.

Examine the effects of civil and ethnic wars on the countries affected.

Model Answer

Civil and ethnic wars have grave and lasting effects upon the countries they afflict, reaching into every part of national life. Their harm far outlasts the fighting itself. The effects of civil and ethnic wars on the countries affected may be examined as follows.

Great loss of life. Civil and ethnic wars kill great numbers, both soldiers and civilians, often more by hunger and disease than by battle. Whole generations are cut down before their time. The loss of life is terrible. Great loss of life is the first effect of these wars.

Destruction of the economy. These wars ruin the economy, wrecking farms, factories, roads and trade. The nation is made poor and its progress wholly undone. Wealth built up over years is destroyed. The destruction of the economy is a chief effect of civil war.

Displacement and refugees. Civil and ethnic wars drive great numbers from their homes, creating refugees and displaced persons within and beyond the country. Whole populations flee the fighting. The land is emptied of its people. Displacement and refugees are a grave effect of these wars.

The breakdown of government and order. Such wars break down the government and the rule of law, leaving chaos, lawlessness and the rule of the gun. The state may collapse altogether, as in Somalia. Order gives way to anarchy. The breakdown of government is an effect of civil war.

Famine and disease. War wrecks farming and blocks aid, bringing famine, and the ruin of order brings disease. Hunger and sickness kill even more than the fighting does. The people starve and fall ill. Famine and disease are effects of civil and ethnic wars.

Deep and lasting hatred. These wars leave behind deep hatred and mistrust among the peoples, who must still live together afterwards. Old wounds fester for generations. Reconciliation becomes very hard. Deep and lasting hatred is an effect of civil and ethnic wars.

The suffering of women and children. Women and children suffer terribly in these wars, through killing, rape, the loss of family, and the seizing of children as soldiers. The weakest bear the heaviest burden. Their suffering is immense. The suffering of women and children is an effect of civil war.

The undermining of development. By destroying so much, civil and ethnic wars set back the development of nations by years or even decades. Resources go to war rather than to progress. The future itself is stolen. The undermining of development is an effect of these wars.

The danger of renewed war. Civil and ethnic wars often leave behind the seeds of renewed conflict, for the old grievances and hatreds remain. Peace is fragile and easily broken again. War may flare up anew. The danger of renewed war is a lasting effect of these conflicts.

The effects of civil and ethnic wars on the countries affected are therefore great loss of life, the destruction of the economy, displacement and refugees, the breakdown of government and order, famine and disease, deep and lasting hatred, the suffering of women and children, the undermining of development, and the danger of renewed war. A civil war does not merely kill; it unmakes a nation, tearing down in a few years what generations had built.

Question 19

The true measure of these wars is not in the ground won or lost, but in the millions of the innocent who are killed, maimed, orphaned and driven from their homes.

Examine the humanitarian effects of civil and ethnic wars.

Model Answer

Civil and ethnic wars fall most heavily upon ordinary people, bringing a vast humanitarian catastrophe of death, hunger and displacement. Their human cost is terrible. The humanitarian effects of civil and ethnic wars may be examined as follows.

The killing of civilians. These wars kill great numbers of civilians, who are the chief victims of the fighting, the massacres and the reprisals. The innocent die in their homes and fields. War spares neither age nor sex. The killing of civilians is the first humanitarian effect.

Mass displacement and refugees. Civil and ethnic wars drive millions from their homes, into camps within their country and across the borders as refugees. Whole peoples become wanderers overnight. They lose home, land and livelihood. Mass displacement is a chief humanitarian effect of these wars.

Famine and starvation. By wrecking farming and blocking aid, these wars bring famine, and great numbers starve, as in Biafra and Somalia. Hunger becomes at once a weapon and a killer. The people slowly waste away. Famine and starvation are a grave humanitarian effect.

Disease and the lack of care. The ruin of order and of hospitals brings disease, which spreads through the camps and the ruined land. The sick can no longer be healed. Epidemics follow close upon the fighting. Disease and the lack of care are a humanitarian effect of these wars.

The suffering of women. Women suffer terribly, through killing, the loss of husbands and children, and above all through the mass rape used as a weapon of war. Their bodies become a battlefield. Their suffering is immense and lasting. The suffering of women is a humanitarian effect of these wars.

The plight of children. Children are orphaned, maimed, starved and seized as soldiers, their childhood destroyed by the war. They are the most helpless of all the victims. Their future is stolen from them. The plight of children is a grave humanitarian effect.

The use of child soldiers. Great numbers of children are seized and forced to fight, to kill and to suffer, robbed of their youth and their innocence. This is among the cruellest of the horrors. Children are made both victims and killers. The use of child soldiers is a humanitarian effect.

The burden on the world. The suffering of these wars burdens the whole world, which must feed, shelter and heal the millions of victims. The task is vast, costly and unending. The conscience of mankind is stirred. The burden on the world is a humanitarian effect of these wars.

The humanitarian effects of civil and ethnic wars are therefore the killing of civilians, mass displacement and refugees, famine and starvation, disease and the lack of care, the suffering of women, the plight of children, the use of child soldiers, and the burden upon the world. The true measure of these wars is not in the ground won or lost, but in the millions of the innocent who are killed, maimed, orphaned and driven from their homes.

Question 20

In the wars of our age, the gun has been placed in the hands of children, who are made to kill before they are old enough to understand what killing is.

Examine the use of child soldiers in civil and ethnic wars.

Model Answer

The use of child soldiers, the seizing of children to fight in war, has been among the cruellest features of the civil and ethnic wars of the modern world, above all in Africa. It destroys the young and shames mankind. The use of child soldiers in civil and ethnic wars may be examined as follows.

The meaning of the child soldier. A child soldier is a child, often below the age of fifteen, seized and forced to fight, to kill, or to serve an armed group. Children are made into weapons of war. Their youth gives them no protection. This is the meaning of the child soldier.

Why children are used. Children are used because they are many, cheap and easily controlled, and can be made to obey and to kill without question. They are seized where grown men grow scarce. They make fearfully obedient fighters. The reasons children are used explain the spread of the practice.

How they are seized and forced. Children are seized from their homes and schools, drugged, beaten and terrified into obedience. They are forced to kill, sometimes their own families, to bind them to the group. Fear and drugs make them fight. The way they are seized and forced is terrible.

Where it has happened. The use of child soldiers has been common in the wars of Africa, in Sierra Leone, Liberia, the Congo and Uganda, and elsewhere. Whole armies of children have been raised. The practice has spread widely and shamefully. Where it has happened shows the scale of the evil.

The harm to the children. Child soldiers are robbed of their childhood, their schooling and their innocence, and are left scarred in body and mind. Many are killed or maimed in the fighting. Those who survive are broken. The harm to the children is the cruellest effect of the practice.

The harm to society. The use of child soldiers harms society, filling it with damaged and violent young people who know only war. A whole generation is lost to hatred. The future is poisoned at its root. The harm to society is an effect of the practice.

Efforts to end it. The world has worked to end the use of child soldiers, through law, and to rescue and heal those who have been used. It is now a war crime to use them. Yet the practice is hard to stamp out. Efforts to end it show the world's abhorrence of the evil.

The use of child soldiers in civil and ethnic wars therefore means the seizing and forcing of children to fight and kill, done because they are many and easily controlled, seized by force, drugs and terror, above all in the wars of Africa, causing terrible harm to the children and to society, and now condemned and fought by the world. In the wars of our age, the gun has been placed in the hands of children, and this is among the deepest shames of mankind.

Question 21

While the nations of the world advanced, the peoples of Africa's war-torn lands stood still or slipped backward, their progress consumed by the flames of conflict.

Assess the impact of civil and ethnic wars on Africa's development.

Model Answer

The many civil and ethnic wars of Africa have gravely hindered the development of the continent, destroying what had been built and preventing what might have been. Their cost to Africa's progress has been immense. The impact of civil and ethnic wars on Africa's development may be assessed as follows.

They have destroyed infrastructure. The wars have destroyed roads, bridges, factories, schools and hospitals, the very foundations of development. What took years to build was wrecked in months. Nations were set back to the beginning. The destruction of infrastructure has hindered Africa's development.

They have ruined economies. Civil and ethnic wars have ruined the economies of many African nations, halting trade, farming and industry. Wealth was destroyed and poverty deepened. The nations were left impoverished. The ruining of economies has hindered Africa's development.

They have driven away investment. War and instability have driven away the investment that development needs, for none will invest where there is no peace. Capital fled the war-torn lands. Progress was starved of the funds it needed. The driving away of investment has hindered development.

They have wasted resources on arms. The wars have made nations spend their scarce wealth on arms and armies rather than on development. Money that might have built schools bought guns instead. Resources were consumed by war. The wasting of resources on arms has hindered development.

They have killed and scattered the people. By killing great numbers and driving millions into exile, the wars have robbed Africa of the very people who might have built it. Skilled and educated people fled or died. The workforce was destroyed. The loss of people has hindered development.

They have bred instability. The wars have left behind instability, mistrust and the danger of renewed conflict, which discourage all long-term effort. Where the future is uncertain, none will build. Instability paralyses development. The breeding of instability has hindered Africa's progress.

They have burdened nations with refugees. The wars have burdened many African nations with great numbers of refugees to feed and shelter. This has strained their already scarce resources, as in Tanzania. The burden fell heavily on the poor. The refugee burden has hindered development.

They have damaged Africa's image and unity. The wars have damaged the image of Africa in the world and weakened the unity of the continent. They have made Africa seem a place of endless conflict. This has harmed its standing and its cooperation. The damage to image and unity has hindered development.

The impact of civil and ethnic wars on Africa's development has therefore been deeply harmful, for they have destroyed infrastructure, ruined economies, driven away investment, wasted resources on arms, killed and scattered the people, bred instability, burdened nations with refugees, and damaged Africa's image and unity. While the nations of the world advanced, the peoples of Africa's war-torn lands stood still or slipped backward, their progress consumed by the flames of conflict.

Civil wars and the global military-industrial complex

Question 22

Behind the wars of the world stands a vast industry that grows rich on weapons, and has an interest not in peace but in the endless making and selling of arms.

Explain the concept of the military-industrial complex.

Model Answer

The military-industrial complex is the close alliance between the armed forces, the government and the industries that make weapons, which together have a powerful interest in war and arms. It has come to be seen as a force behind the conflicts of the world. The concept of the military-industrial complex may be explained as follows.

The meaning of the military-industrial complex. The military-industrial complex is the close and powerful alliance between a nation's armed forces, its government, and the industries that make and sell weapons. These three are bound together by a common interest. They profit and gain from arms and war.

The warning of Eisenhower. The term was made famous by the American president Eisenhower, who in 1961 warned his nation against the growing power of this complex. He feared it would come to drive policy for its own ends. His warning gave the idea its name. The warning of Eisenhower marks the concept.

The arms industry seeks profit. At the heart of the complex are the great arms industries, which grow rich by making and selling weapons. They have an interest in the buying of arms, and so in war itself. Peace threatens their profit. The profit-seeking of the arms industry drives the complex.

It binds industry, army and government. The complex binds together the arms makers, the military and the politicians, who serve one another's interests. The industry funds the politicians, who in turn buy its arms. They form a powerful web of interest. The binding of industry, army and government is the core of the complex.

It has an interest in war and arms. Because it profits from weapons, the military-industrial complex has an interest not in peace but in war, tension and the endless building of arms. It gains from every conflict. It is served by fear and rivalry. Its interest in war and arms is a chief feature of the complex.

It drives the arms trade. The complex drives the great trade in arms across the world, selling weapons to nations and even to warring factions. It arms the world for its own profit. Its weapons feed the wars. The driving of the arms trade is a feature of the complex.

It fuels conflict for gain. By making and selling arms, the military-industrial complex fuels and prolongs the conflicts of the world for its own gain. It profits from the very wars it helps to arm. Peace is against its interest. The fuelling of conflict for gain is the danger of the complex.

The military-industrial complex is therefore the close alliance of the armed forces, the government and the arms industry, named by Eisenhower in 1961, which is driven by the profit of the arms makers, binds industry, army and government together, has an interest in war and arms, drives the global arms trade, and fuels conflict for its own gain. Behind the wars of the world stands this vast interest, which profits not from peace but from the endless making and selling of arms.

Question 23

No war can be fought without weapons, and so those who make and sell the guns are, in truth, the silent partners of every conflict.

Examine how the arms trade and the military-industrial complex fuel civil and ethnic wars.

Model Answer

The global arms trade, driven by the military-industrial complex, plays a great part in fuelling and prolonging the civil and ethnic wars of the world, above all in Africa. By arming the fighters, it feeds the flames. How the arms trade and the military-industrial complex fuel civil and ethnic wars may be examined as follows.

It supplies the weapons of war. The arms trade supplies the weapons without which no war could be fought, from rifles to heavy arms. It puts guns into the hands of governments and rebels alike. Without arms there would be no war at all. The supplying of weapons is the first way the trade fuels conflict.

It floods the world with small arms. The trade floods the world, and above all Africa, with cheap small arms that are easy to buy and to use. These weapons arm rebels, militias and even children. They make war easy to wage and to sustain. The flooding of the world with small arms fuels civil and ethnic wars.

It arms both governments and rebels. The arms trade sells weapons to governments and to rebels alike, arming both sides of a single conflict. Profit knows no loyalty or scruple. Both sides are armed for gain. The arming of both governments and rebels prolongs the wars.

It profits from war. The military-industrial complex profits from the very wars it helps to arm, and so has an interest in their continuing. War is good for the arms trade. Peace threatens its gain. The profiting from war drives the complex to fuel conflict.

It prolongs conflicts. By ever supplying fresh weapons, the arms trade prolongs wars that might otherwise end for want of arms. The fighters can always buy more guns. Peace is pushed further away. The prolonging of conflicts is a way the arms trade fuels war.

It is often illegal and hidden. Much of the arms trade to war zones is illegal and hidden, smuggled past embargoes and law. The dealers and their weapons slip across borders in secret. The trade evades all control. Its illegal and hidden nature makes it hard to stop.

It exchanges arms for plundered resources. The arms are often paid for with the resources plundered in the war, such as diamonds and minerals, in a deadly exchange. Guns are traded for gems and gold. The trade feeds on the wealth of the war-torn lands. This exchange of arms for resources fuels the wars.

It serves the interests of the powerful. The great powers and their arms industries profit from the trade, and so are slow to stop it. Their interest lies in selling, not in peace. The powerful gain from the arming of the weak. The serving of the interests of the powerful sustains the trade.

The arms trade and the military-industrial complex therefore fuel civil and ethnic wars by supplying the weapons of war, flooding the world with small arms, arming both governments and rebels, profiting from war, prolonging conflicts, trading illegally and in secret, exchanging arms for plundered resources, and serving the interests of the powerful. No war can be fought without weapons, and so those who make and sell the guns are, in truth, the silent partners of every conflict.

Question 24

Few of the world's civil wars are truly civil, for behind the local fighters there stand, more often than not, the hidden hands of foreign powers.

Assess the role of foreign powers in civil and ethnic wars.

Model Answer

Foreign powers and neighbouring states have played a great part in the civil and ethnic wars of the world, backing one side or another for their own ends. Their intervention has often deepened and prolonged the conflicts. The role of foreign powers in civil and ethnic wars may be assessed as follows.

They arm and fund the fighters. Foreign powers arm, fund and supply the factions in civil wars, giving them the means to fight. Without this outside help, many wars would soon end for want of arms. The powers pay for the fighting. The arming and funding of the fighters is a chief role of foreign powers.

They back sides for their own interests. Foreign powers back one side or another to serve their own interests, whether for resources, influence or strategy. The local war becomes a tool of their aims. They fight for gain through others. The backing of sides for their own interests is a role of foreign powers.

They intervene with their own forces. Sometimes foreign powers and neighbours send their own forces to fight in a civil war, as many did in the Congo. The war then spreads far beyond the country. Outsiders join the fighting directly. Intervention with their own forces is a role of foreign powers.

They fight proxy wars. Foreign powers often fight proxy wars through the factions of a civil war, as the superpowers did in the Cold War. The local fighters serve as their proxies. The war is theirs at one remove. The fighting of proxy wars is a role of foreign powers.

They plunder resources. Foreign powers and companies often use civil wars to plunder the resources of the war-torn land, such as the minerals of the Congo. War becomes a cover for theft. They grow rich upon the chaos. The plundering of resources is a role of foreign powers.

They prolong the conflicts. By arming and backing the factions, foreign powers prolong civil wars that might otherwise end. The fighters keep fighting so long as they are supplied. Peace is delayed by the outside help. The prolonging of conflicts is an effect of foreign intervention.

They can also help to end wars. Yet foreign powers can also help to end civil wars, through mediation, peacekeeping and pressure, as they have done in many places. Not all intervention feeds the war. Some of it brings peace. The helping to end wars is another role of foreign powers.

They bear a share of the blame. By their meddling, foreign powers bear a share of the blame for the civil and ethnic wars they help to fuel. The conflicts are not wholly the fault of the local peoples. Outsiders too are guilty. The bearing of a share of the blame is the judgement on foreign powers.

The role of foreign powers in civil and ethnic wars is therefore great, for they arm and fund the fighters, back sides for their own interests, intervene with their own forces, fight proxy wars, plunder resources, and prolong the conflicts, though they can also help to end them, and they bear a share of the blame for the wars they fuel. Few of the world's civil wars are truly civil, for behind the local fighters there stand, more often than not, the hidden hands of foreign powers.

Question 25

In Africa, the richest lands have often bled the most, for diamonds, gold and oil have proved not a blessing but a curse that draws the sword.

Examine the role of natural resources in fuelling civil and ethnic wars.

Model Answer

Natural resources such as diamonds, oil and minerals have played a great part in fuelling and prolonging the civil and ethnic wars of the world, above all in Africa. What should have been a blessing has too often been a curse. The role of natural resources in fuelling civil and ethnic wars may be examined as follows.

Resources are a prize worth fighting for. Rich resources such as diamonds, gold, oil and minerals are a great prize, and groups fight to seize and control them. The wealth is worth a war to those who seek it. Greed draws the sword. Resources being a prize worth fighting for is a chief cause of resource wars.

Blood diamonds fund wars. In Sierra Leone and Angola, rebels seized the diamond fields and sold the gems, called blood diamonds, to fund their wars. The diamonds paid for the guns and the fighters. Wealth armed the rebels. Blood diamonds funded and prolonged these wars.

Minerals fuel the Congo wars. In the Democratic Republic of Congo, the struggle for gold, diamonds and coltan has driven and funded decades of war. Armed groups and foreign armies fought for control of the mines. The minerals fed the fighting. Minerals fuelled the long Congo wars.

Oil deepens conflicts. In Sudan and elsewhere, the finding of oil sharpened the struggle for its wealth and deepened the war. Each side fought hard to control the oil. Riches raised the stakes of the conflict. Oil has deepened and prolonged civil wars.

The resource curse. Rich resources have often proved a curse rather than a blessing, drawing greed, war and corruption instead of prosperity. The richest lands have bled the most. Wealth has brought war upon them. The resource curse is a bitter feature of resource wars.

Resources pay for arms. The resources plundered in war are used to buy the weapons that continue it, in a deadly exchange of gems for guns. The wealth of the land arms its own destroyers. War thus pays for itself. The paying for arms with resources fuels the conflicts.

Foreign powers and companies join the plunder. Foreign powers and companies join in the plunder of the resources, backing factions to gain access to the wealth. Outsiders profit from the chaos and the theft. Their greed deepens the war. The joining of the plunder by foreign powers fuels resource wars.

It prolongs the wars. Because the resources fund the fighting and are a prize worth holding, they prolong the wars, which do not end so long as there is wealth to seize. Peace is against the interest of the plunderers. Riches keep the war alive. The prolonging of wars is an effect of resource wealth.

The role of natural resources in fuelling civil and ethnic wars is therefore that resources are a prize worth fighting for, that blood diamonds funded the wars of Sierra Leone and Angola, that minerals fuelled the Congo wars and oil deepened Sudan's, that rich resources have proved a curse, that they pay for arms and draw the plunder of foreign powers, and that they prolong the wars. In Africa, the richest lands have often bled the most, for their wealth has proved not a blessing but a curse that draws the sword.

Peacebuilding and conflict resolution

Question 26

To end a war is not the same as to build a peace, for the guns may fall silent while the hatred still burns, ready to blaze again.

Explain the concept of peacebuilding.

Model Answer

Peacebuilding is the work of building a lasting peace in a country torn by war, by healing its wounds, resolving its conflicts and removing the causes of war. It is more than the mere ending of the fighting. The concept of peacebuilding may be explained as follows.

The meaning of peacebuilding. Peacebuilding is the long work of building a lasting and just peace in a land torn by war. It goes beyond the ending of the fighting to the healing of the causes and wounds of the conflict. It seeks a peace that will endure. This is the essential meaning of peacebuilding.

It is more than ending the fighting. Peacebuilding is more than the mere silencing of the guns, for a war may stop while its hatreds remain. It seeks to remove the very causes that would bring war again. Ending the fighting is only the beginning. Being more than ending the fighting marks out peacebuilding.

It heals the wounds of war. Peacebuilding works to heal the wounds of war, the grief, the hatred and the mistrust among the people. It seeks reconciliation between former enemies. It binds up the broken nation. The healing of wounds is a chief part of peacebuilding.

It rebuilds the state and economy. Peacebuilding rebuilds the government, the economy and the services of the war-torn land. It restores order, law and the means of life. It sets the ruined nation on its feet again. The rebuilding of state and economy is a part of peacebuilding.

It removes the causes of war. Peacebuilding seeks to remove the causes of the war, such as injustice, poverty and the exclusion of groups from power. By tackling the roots, it hopes to prevent the war's return. It builds a just and inclusive order. The removing of the causes of war is central to peacebuilding.

It reconciles the peoples. Peacebuilding works to reconcile the peoples who have fought, through justice, truth and forgiveness. The former enemies must learn to live together once more. Reconciliation is its deepest task. The reconciling of peoples is a part of peacebuilding.

It is long and difficult. Peacebuilding is a long, slow and difficult work, for the wounds of war are deep and peace is fragile. It may take a whole generation to achieve. It can easily fail and fall back into war. Being long and difficult is a feature of peacebuilding.

Peacebuilding is therefore the long work of building a lasting and just peace in a land torn by war, which is more than the mere ending of the fighting, and which heals the wounds of war, rebuilds the state and economy, removes the causes of conflict, and reconciles the peoples, though it is long and difficult. To end a war is not the same as to build a peace, for the guns may fall silent while the hatred still burns, and only peacebuilding can quench it.

Question 27

Since these wars cannot end in the total victory of one side, they must end, if they are to end at all, in agreement, sharing and the hard work of reconciliation.

Examine the methods of resolving civil and ethnic conflicts.

Model Answer

Civil and ethnic conflicts, being fought among peoples who must go on sharing one land, are resolved not by victory alone but by many methods of peacemaking. Several ways have been used to bring them to an end. The methods of resolving civil and ethnic conflicts may be examined as follows.

Negotiation and dialogue. The first method is negotiation and dialogue between the warring sides, to settle their quarrel by talk rather than by arms. The enemies are brought to the table. Talk comes to replace fighting. Negotiation and dialogue are a chief method of resolving conflict.

Mediation by a third party. A neutral third party, such as a respected leader or a body, may mediate between the sides to help them reach agreement, as Nyerere did in Burundi. The mediator bridges the gap between them. He brings the enemies together. Mediation by a third party is a method of resolving conflict.

Peace agreements and treaties. The warring sides may sign a peace agreement or treaty that ends the war and sets the terms of peace, as at Arusha. The agreement binds them to lay down their arms. It lays down the settlement. Peace agreements are a method of resolving conflict.

Power-sharing. Conflicts are often resolved by power-sharing, in which the rival groups share the government between them, so that none is wholly excluded. A share in power removes the grievance. All gain a stake in the peace. Power-sharing is a method of resolving conflict.

Peacekeeping forces. Peacekeeping forces, from the United Nations or the African Union, may be sent to keep the peace, separate the fighters and protect the people. They hold the two sides apart. They guard the fragile peace. Peacekeeping forces are a method of resolving conflict.

Disarmament of the fighters. The fighters must be disarmed, demobilised and returned to civilian life, so that the means of war are taken away. The guns are gathered up and destroyed. The soldiers go home at last. The disarmament of the fighters is a method of resolving conflict.

Reconciliation and justice. The peoples must be reconciled, through truth, justice and forgiveness, as in Rwanda and South Africa. The wrongs are faced and slowly healed. The enemies learn to live together. Reconciliation and justice are a method of resolving conflict.

Tackling the root causes. Above all, the root causes of the war, such as injustice, poverty and exclusion, must be tackled, or the war will return. A just order is built in place of the old. The grievances are removed. The tackling of the root causes is the surest method of resolving conflict.

The methods of resolving civil and ethnic conflicts are therefore negotiation and dialogue, mediation by a third party, peace agreements and treaties, power-sharing, peacekeeping forces, the disarmament of the fighters, reconciliation and justice, and above all the tackling of the root causes. Since these wars cannot end in the total victory of one side, they must end, if they are to end at all, in agreement, sharing and the hard work of reconciliation.

Question 28

When a nation tears itself apart, it is often to the United Nations that the world looks to keep the peace and to save the innocent.

Examine the role of the United Nations in resolving civil and ethnic wars.

Model Answer

The United Nations has played a great part in resolving the civil and ethnic wars of the world, through peacekeeping, mediation and aid. Though it has known both success and failure, it remains the chief keeper of world peace. The role of the United Nations in resolving civil and ethnic wars may be examined as follows.

It sends peacekeeping forces. The United Nations sends peacekeeping forces, the blue helmets, to war-torn lands to keep the peace, separate the fighters and protect the people. They stand between the enemies. They guard the fragile peace. The sending of peacekeeping forces is a chief role of the United Nations.

It mediates between the sides. The United Nations mediates between the warring sides, helping them to negotiate and to reach peace agreements. It brings the enemies to the table. It helps to bridge their bitter quarrels. The mediating between the sides is a role of the United Nations.

It gives humanitarian aid. The United Nations gives humanitarian aid, food, shelter and medicine, to the victims of civil and ethnic wars. It feeds the hungry and heals the sick. It cares for the refugees and the displaced. The giving of humanitarian aid is a role of the United Nations.

It imposes sanctions and embargoes. The United Nations imposes sanctions and arms embargoes to pressure the fighters and to cut off their weapons. It seeks to starve the war of arms and money. It brings the weight of the world to bear. The imposing of sanctions is a role of the United Nations.

It brings war criminals to justice. The United Nations has set up courts to try those guilty of genocide and war crimes, as for Rwanda and Yugoslavia. It seeks justice for the victims of the wars. It warns future tyrants. The bringing of war criminals to justice is a role of the United Nations.

It helps to rebuild after war. The United Nations helps to rebuild war-torn lands, restoring government, holding elections and repairing the economy. It aids the long work of peacebuilding. It sets ruined nations on their feet. The helping to rebuild after war is a role of the United Nations.

Its successes. The United Nations has helped to end many wars and to keep the peace in many lands, saving countless lives. Its peacekeepers have done much good in the world. It remains the chief peacemaker of mankind. Its successes are a mark of its worth.

Its failures and limits. Yet the United Nations has also failed, as in Rwanda and Somalia, where it could not stop the killing. It depends upon the will of its members and often lacks the means. Its power is limited. Its failures and limits temper its role.

The role of the United Nations in resolving civil and ethnic wars is therefore to send peacekeeping forces, to mediate between the sides, to give humanitarian aid, to impose sanctions, to bring war criminals to justice, and to help rebuild after war, with real successes though also failures and limits, as in Rwanda. When a nation tears itself apart, it is often to the United Nations that the world looks to keep the peace and to save the innocent.

Question 29

To the wars of Africa, Africa itself must be the first to answer, and its own bodies have taken up the task of making peace among its peoples.

Examine the role of the African Union and regional bodies in resolving civil and ethnic wars.

Model Answer

The African Union and the regional bodies of Africa have taken up the task of resolving the continent's many civil and ethnic wars, through mediation, peacekeeping and pressure. Under the banner of African solutions to African problems, they have laboured for peace. The role of the African Union and regional bodies in resolving civil and ethnic wars may be examined as follows.

The African Union leads the effort. The African Union, the body of all African states, leads the continent's effort to resolve its wars, through its Peace and Security Council. It seeks African solutions to African problems. It speaks and acts for the whole continent. The leadership of the African Union is central to the effort.

It sends peacekeeping missions. The African Union sends peacekeeping missions to war-torn lands, as in Somalia, Sudan and elsewhere. African soldiers keep the peace among African peoples. They stand between the fighters. The sending of peacekeeping missions is a chief role of the African Union.

It mediates between the sides. The African Union and its leaders mediate between the warring sides, helping them to negotiate peace. Respected African statesmen have brokered many agreements. They bring the enemies together. The mediating between the sides is a role of the African Union.

The regional bodies also act. Regional bodies such as ECOWAS in the west, IGAD in the east and SADC in the south work to resolve the wars of their regions. ECOWAS intervened in Liberia and Sierra Leone. Neighbours act together for peace. The regional bodies play a great part in the effort.

They intervene to stop the fighting. These bodies have sent forces to intervene and to stop the fighting, as ECOWAS did in West Africa. They separate the fighters and restore order. They act where the wider world is slow. The intervening to stop the fighting is a role of the regional bodies.

They press for peace and settlement. The African Union and the regional bodies press the warring sides towards peace and settlement, by diplomacy and pressure. They urge the fighters to lay down their arms. They lend their weight to peace. The pressing for peace is a role of these bodies.

Their achievements. These bodies have helped to end and to prevent many African wars, and to keep the peace in troubled lands. They have shown that Africa can master its own conflicts. They have saved many lives. Their achievements are a mark of their worth.

Their weaknesses. Yet these bodies are often weakened by poverty, division and the want of means, and cannot always act as they would. They depend upon the will and the wealth of their members. Their power is limited. Their weaknesses temper their role.

The role of the African Union and regional bodies in resolving civil and ethnic wars is therefore to lead the effort under the banner of African solutions, to send peacekeeping missions, to mediate between the sides, to intervene through regional bodies such as ECOWAS, IGAD and SADC, and to press for peace, with real achievements though weakened by poverty and division. To the wars of Africa, Africa itself must be the first to answer, and its own bodies have taken up the task of making peace among its peoples.

Question 30

After the killing has stopped, the hardest task remains: to make enemies into neighbours again, and to seek justice without seeking revenge.

Examine the role of reconciliation and justice in building peace after civil and ethnic wars.

Model Answer

After a civil or ethnic war, lasting peace can be built only through reconciliation and justice, by healing the hatreds and answering the wrongs of the conflict. Without them, the peace remains fragile. The role of reconciliation and justice in building peace after civil and ethnic wars may be examined as follows.

The need to heal hatred. After such wars, the peoples are left divided by deep hatred and mistrust, which must be healed if peace is to last. The former enemies must learn to live together again. The wounds must be bound up. The need to heal hatred makes reconciliation essential.

Truth and reconciliation commissions. Many nations have used truth and reconciliation commissions, as in South Africa, to bring the wrongs of the war into the light and to seek healing. The truth is told and faced by all. Forgiveness is sought. Truth and reconciliation commissions are a method of building peace.

Community justice, as in Rwanda. Rwanda used community courts, called gacaca, to try the great numbers guilty of the genocide and to reconcile the people. Justice was done in the villages themselves. The people faced their past together. Community justice helped to rebuild Rwanda.

Bringing the guilty to justice. The leaders and worst offenders must be brought to justice, in national or international courts, so that the crimes are answered. Impunity is denied to the guilty. The victims see justice done. The bringing of the guilty to justice is a part of building peace.

Balancing justice and forgiveness. Peace requires a balance between justice and forgiveness, punishing the worst crimes while forgiving enough to let the peoples live together. Too much revenge would renew the war. Mercy and justice must be joined. The balancing of justice and forgiveness is a delicate task.

Remembering the victims. The victims of the war must be remembered and honoured, so that the crimes are never forgotten or repeated. Memorials keep the memory alive. The lesson is taught to the young. The remembering of the victims is a part of reconciliation.

Building a shared future. Above all, reconciliation seeks to build a shared future, in which the former enemies live together as one people and one nation. A common life replaces the old division. The broken nation is made whole. The building of a shared future is the aim of reconciliation.

The role of reconciliation and justice in building peace after civil and ethnic wars is therefore to heal the hatred, to use truth and reconciliation commissions and community justice as in South Africa and Rwanda, to bring the guilty to justice, to balance justice with forgiveness, to remember the victims, and to build a shared future. After the killing has stopped, the hardest task remains: to make enemies into neighbours again, and to seek justice without seeking revenge.

Question 31

The peacemaker's task is harder than the warrior's, for it is easier to break a nation than to mend it, and the wounds of war are slow to heal.

Examine the challenges of peacebuilding in civil and ethnic war regions.

Model Answer

Peacebuilding in the regions torn by civil and ethnic war is a hard and uncertain work, beset by many challenges and obstacles. These difficulties often cause the peace to fail. The challenges of peacebuilding in civil and ethnic war regions may be examined as follows.

Deep hatred and mistrust. The deep hatred and mistrust left by the war make it very hard for the peoples to be reconciled. Old wounds fester and old fears remain alive. The enemies will not easily trust one another again. Deep hatred and mistrust are a chief challenge to peacebuilding.

The danger of renewed war. The peace is fragile, and the war may easily break out again, for the old grievances and the armed men remain. A single spark can relight the fire. Peace hangs by a slender thread. The danger of renewed war is a challenge to peacebuilding.

The presence of arms and armed groups. The land is often still full of weapons and of armed groups unwilling to disarm. So long as men keep their guns, the peace is uncertain. The means of war remain at hand. The presence of arms and armed groups is a challenge to peacebuilding.

The ruin of the economy and state. The economy and the government are often in ruins, so that the nation cannot provide for its people or keep order. Poverty breeds fresh discontent and unrest. The state is too weak to build the peace. The ruin of the economy and state is a challenge to peacebuilding.

The want of means. Peacebuilding needs money, skill and time, which the poor and war-torn nations often lack. The great task outruns their slender means. Aid from abroad is often too little. The want of means is a serious challenge to peacebuilding.

The problem of justice and revenge. It is hard to do justice for the crimes of the war without stirring up revenge and renewing the conflict. Too much punishment reopens the wounds, too little denies the victims. The balance is delicate and dangerous. The problem of justice and revenge is a challenge to peacebuilding.

The interference of outside powers. Outside powers and neighbours may continue to meddle, backing factions and undermining the peace for their own ends. Their interference keeps the conflict alive. Peace is undone from without. The interference of outside powers is a challenge to peacebuilding.

The healing of a broken society. The society itself is broken, its people traumatised, its children scarred, its trust destroyed. To heal such deep wounds takes a whole generation. The task is vast and slow. The healing of a broken society is the deepest challenge to peacebuilding.

The challenges of peacebuilding in civil and ethnic war regions are therefore the deep hatred and mistrust, the danger of renewed war, the presence of arms and armed groups, the ruin of the economy and state, the want of means, the problem of justice and revenge, the interference of outside powers, and the healing of a broken society. The peacemaker's task is harder than the warrior's, for it is easier to break a nation than to mend it, and the wounds of war are slow to heal.

Question 32

Better than to end a war is to prevent it, and the surest peace is that which removes the causes of war before the first shot is fired.

Examine the measures to prevent civil and ethnic wars.

Model Answer

Since civil and ethnic wars are so terrible and so hard to end, it is far better to prevent them before they begin, by removing their causes and building a just and united society. Several measures may prevent such wars. The measures to prevent civil and ethnic wars may be examined as follows.

Good and just governance. The surest prevention is good, just and honest government, which rules fairly and answers the needs of all. Where the state is just, the people have no cause to revolt. Justice itself keeps the peace. Good and just governance is a chief measure to prevent civil war.

The sharing of power. Power must be shared fairly among the peoples and regions of a nation, so that none is wholly excluded. A share in power removes the grievance that breeds war. All gain a stake in the state. The sharing of power is a measure to prevent civil war.

The building of national unity. Nations must build a shared identity and unity among their many peoples, so that loyalty to the nation outweighs loyalty to the tribe. A united people does not fall to civil war. Unity is a strong shield. The building of national unity is a measure of prevention.

The reduction of poverty and inequality. By reducing poverty and the unfair sharing of wealth, nations remove the anger and desperation from which war grows. Prosperity and fairness keep the peace. Development is a defence against war. The reduction of poverty and inequality is a measure of prevention.

Respect for rights and the rule of law. Where the rights of all are respected and the law rules fairly, grievances can be settled without violence. The people have peaceful ways to seek justice. The rule of law keeps the peace. Respect for rights and the rule of law is a measure of prevention.

Free and fair elections. Free and fair elections give the people a peaceful way to choose and to change their rulers, so that they need not turn to the gun. The ballot replaces the bullet. Democracy is a defence against war. Free and fair elections are a measure of prevention.

Control of arms. By controlling the flow of arms and disarming the people, nations take away the very means of war. Where guns are few, war is far harder to wage. Peace is easier to keep. The control of arms is a measure to prevent civil and ethnic wars.

Early warning and early action. By watching for the signs of coming conflict and acting early, through mediation and pressure, the world can prevent wars before they begin. A quarrel checked early does not become a war. Prevention is better than cure. Early warning and early action are a measure of prevention.

The measures to prevent civil and ethnic wars are therefore good and just governance, the sharing of power, the building of national unity, the reduction of poverty and inequality, respect for rights and the rule of law, free and fair elections, the control of arms, and early warning and early action. Better than to end a war is to prevent it, and the surest peace is that which removes the causes of war before the first shot is fired.

Tanzania and the significance of civil and ethnic wars

Question 33

From the city of Arusha, and through the labours of Mwalimu Nyerere, Tanzania has long been a maker of peace among the warring nations of Africa.

Examine the role of Tanzania in peacebuilding in Africa.

Model Answer

Tanzania has played a great and honoured part in peacebuilding in Africa, above all in the Great Lakes region, through mediation, the hosting of talks and refugees, and the leadership of Julius Nyerere. It has been a maker of peace among its neighbours. The role of Tanzania in peacebuilding in Africa may be examined as follows.

Nyerere's mediation in Burundi. Julius Nyerere, the former president of Tanzania, was the chief mediator of the Burundi peace process from 1996 until his death in 1999. He laboured to reconcile the warring parties of that troubled land. His prestige gave great weight to the effort. Nyerere's mediation in Burundi was a great work of peace.

The Arusha peace agreements. The city of Arusha in Tanzania hosted the peace talks and agreements for both Rwanda in 1993 and Burundi in 2000. Tanzania gave a home to the making of peace. Arusha became a byword for African peacemaking. The Arusha agreements were a mark of Tanzania's role.

The hosting of refugees. Tanzania has hosted great numbers of refugees fleeing the wars of Rwanda, Burundi and the Congo. It gave shelter to the victims of conflict for many years. It bore this heavy burden for the sake of its neighbours. The hosting of refugees was a part of Tanzania's role in peacebuilding.

Its principled foreign policy. Tanzania has long followed a foreign policy of peace, non-alignment and solidarity with Africa, which made it a trusted maker of peace. It sought no gain from its neighbours' wars. Its good name fitted it for mediation. Its principled foreign policy underpinned its role.

Its support for liberation and unity. Tanzania supported the liberation of Africa and the unity of the continent, and carried this spirit into its peacemaking. It worked for an Africa at peace with itself. It served the wider cause of the continent. Its support for liberation and unity shaped its role in peacebuilding.

Its work through the region and the African Union. Tanzania worked for peace through the regional bodies and the African Union, lending its weight to the common effort. It acted together with its neighbours for peace. It shared in the collective labour. Its work through the region and the African Union was a part of its role.

The moral leadership of Nyerere. Nyerere gave African peacemaking a moral leadership respected across the continent and the world. His wisdom and honesty were trusted by the warring parties. He spoke for the conscience of Africa. The moral leadership of Nyerere was a great gift to peacebuilding.

Its continuing role. Tanzania has continued to work for peace in the Great Lakes region, hosting talks and lending its good offices. It remains a maker of peace among its neighbours. Its labour for peace continues. Its continuing role shows the constancy of Tanzania in the cause of peace.

The role of Tanzania in peacebuilding in Africa has therefore been great, through Nyerere's mediation in Burundi, the Arusha peace agreements for Rwanda and Burundi, the hosting of refugees, its principled foreign policy, its support for liberation and unity, its work through the region and the African Union, and the moral leadership of Nyerere. From the city of Arusha, and through the labours of Mwalimu Nyerere, Tanzania has long been a maker of peace among the warring nations of Africa.

Question 34

In the heart of Africa, around its great lakes, the wars of one nation have spilled into another, until the whole region was bound together in a web of conflict.

Examine the effects of civil and ethnic wars on the Great Lakes region of Africa.

Model Answer

The Great Lakes region of Africa, which includes Rwanda, Burundi, the Congo, Uganda and Tanzania, has been deeply troubled by civil and ethnic wars, whose effects have spread across its borders. The wars of one nation became the burden of all. The effects of civil and ethnic wars on the Great Lakes region may be examined as follows.

The spread of war across borders. The wars of the region spread across its borders, as the Rwandan genocide spilled into the Congo and drew in many nations. Conflict flowed from one land into another. No nation was wholly safe from it. The spread of war across borders was a chief effect in the region.

The flood of refugees. The wars drove great floods of refugees across the borders, into Tanzania, the Congo and beyond. Millions fled from Rwanda, Burundi and the Congo. The whole region was filled with the displaced. The flood of refugees was a grave effect on the region.

The burden on neighbouring states. The refugees and the conflict burdened the neighbouring states, which had to shelter the displaced and guard their borders. Tanzania in particular bore a heavy burden. The wars of others became their trouble. The burden on neighbouring states was an effect of the wars.

The drawing in of many nations. The wars, above all in the Congo, drew in many nations of the region, each backing a side or seeking gain. The whole region was bound together in the conflict. It became Africa's world war. The drawing in of many nations was an effect of the wars.

Vast loss of life. The wars of the region cost a vast loss of life, some millions dead in the Congo alone, the deadliest conflict since the Second World War. The suffering was beyond measure. Whole peoples were laid low. The vast loss of life was a terrible effect on the region.

Instability and insecurity. The wars left the whole region unstable and insecure, with armed groups crossing borders and conflicts flaring anew. Peace was fragile everywhere. The region knew little rest for decades. Instability and insecurity were lasting effects of the wars.

The hindering of development. The wars hindered the development of the whole region, destroying wealth and driving away investment. The Great Lakes remained poor and troubled. Progress was consumed by the conflict. The hindering of development was an effect of the wars.

The effort at regional peacebuilding. In answer, the nations of the region, with Tanzania foremost, laboured for peace through mediation and cooperation. They sought to heal the region together. Arusha became a place of peacemaking. The effort at regional peacebuilding was a response to the wars.

The effects of civil and ethnic wars on the Great Lakes region of Africa were therefore the spread of war across borders, the flood of refugees, the burden on neighbouring states, the drawing in of many nations, a vast loss of life, instability and insecurity, and the hindering of development, which called forth in answer a great effort at regional peacebuilding led by Tanzania. In the heart of Africa, the wars of one nation spilled into another, until the whole region was bound together in a web of conflict.

Question 35

The wars within nations have taught the modern world a bitter lesson: that the deadliest enemy of a people is too often itself.

Assess the significance and lessons of civil and ethnic wars in the modern world.

Model Answer

The civil and ethnic wars of the modern world, from Rwanda to Yugoslavia to the Congo, have been among the gravest of its troubles, and they carry deep lessons for mankind. Their significance lies in what they reveal and what they teach. The significance and lessons of civil and ethnic wars may be assessed as follows.

They have become the commonest kind of war. In the modern world, civil and ethnic wars have become far commoner than wars between states. The great danger to peace now lies within nations rather than between them. War has turned inward upon peoples. Their being the commonest kind of war is their first significance.

They have caused terrible suffering. These wars have caused terrible suffering, killing many millions and driving many more from their homes. They have brought genocide, famine and ruin in their train. The human cost has been immense. The terrible suffering they cause is a chief part of their significance.

They have shown the danger of ethnic hatred. These wars have shown the world the deadly danger of ethnic and tribal hatred, which can lead even to genocide. Hatred left unchecked can destroy a whole nation. This is a grave warning to all. The danger of ethnic hatred is a lesson of these wars.

They have shown the harm of bad governance. These wars have shown that bad, unjust and exclusive government breeds conflict, and that good governance is the price of peace. Misrule leads in the end to war. This is a clear and costly lesson. The harm of bad governance is a lesson of these wars.

They have revealed the legacy of colonialism. The wars of Africa have revealed the bitter legacy of colonialism, its artificial borders and its divisions. The past still troubles the present. This legacy must be understood and overcome. The legacy of colonialism is a lesson of these wars.

They have shown the need for reconciliation. These wars have shown that peace requires not only the ending of the fighting but the reconciliation of the peoples, as in Rwanda and South Africa. Enemies must become neighbours once more. This is a deep lesson. The need for reconciliation is a lesson of these wars.

They have shown the importance of prevention. These wars have shown that it is far better and easier to prevent conflict than to end it, by removing its causes early. Prevention is better than any cure. This is a vital lesson for the world. The importance of prevention is a lesson of these wars.

They have called forth peacebuilding and cooperation. In answer to these wars, the world and Africa have developed the arts of peacebuilding and the habit of cooperation, through the United Nations and the African Union. Out of the wars came a search for peace. This is part of their significance.

They remain a threat to be overcome. Civil and ethnic wars remain a grave and present threat, above all in Africa, and the task of overcoming them is unfinished. The lesson must still be fully learned. The danger is by no means past. Their remaining a threat to be overcome is their lasting significance.

The significance and lessons of civil and ethnic wars in the modern world are therefore that they have become the commonest kind of war, caused terrible suffering, shown the danger of ethnic hatred and the harm of bad governance, revealed the legacy of colonialism, shown the need for reconciliation and prevention, called forth the arts of peacebuilding and cooperation, and remain a threat to be overcome. The wars within nations have taught the modern world a bitter lesson: that the deadliest enemy of a people is too often itself.

Chapter 6

DEVELOPMENT IN POST-COLONIAL AFRICA

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 background of development

Question 1

Development is more than the mere piling up of wealth; it is the lifting of a whole people into a fuller, freer and better life.

Explain the meaning of development and its main types.

Model Answer

Development is the process by which a society grows richer, healthier, better governed and more able to meet the needs of its people. It is more than mere economic growth, for it touches every side of human life. The meaning of development and its main types may be explained as follows.

The meaning of development. Development is the process by which a nation and its people advance from poverty and backwardness towards wealth, welfare and a fuller life. It is the improvement of the whole condition of a society, and not the mere enrichment of a favoured few. It touches the economy, the society and the government alike. It is a lasting and many-sided process rather than a sudden change.

Economic development. Economic development is the growth of a nation's wealth and productive power, through industry, agriculture, trade and infrastructure. It raises the income and the output of the whole nation. It gives the people the material means of a better life. It is seen in factories, farms, roads and rising incomes. Economic development is a chief type of development.

Social development. Social development is the improvement of the welfare of the people, through education, health, housing and clean water. It lifts the quality of human life beyond mere wealth. It is seen in schools, hospitals and longer, healthier lives. It measures development by the wellbeing of the people, not only their income. Social development is a chief type of development.

Political development. Political development is the building of good, stable and just government, able to keep order and to serve the people. It includes democracy, the rule of law and strong, honest institutions. It gives the nation the peace and good governance that progress needs. Without it, the other kinds of development cannot endure. Political development is a chief type of development.

Human development. Human development is the growth of the abilities, knowledge and freedom of the people themselves, so that they may live full lives. It puts people, and not things, at the very centre of development. It is measured by education, health and freedom of choice. It is the deepest aim of all true development. Human development is a chief type of development.

It is more than economic growth. Development is more than mere economic growth, for a nation may grow richer while its people remain poor. True development spreads its fruits to all and improves the whole of life. Growth is only its measure in wealth, and not the whole of it. Development must also bring welfare, justice and freedom. Being more than economic growth is central to the idea of development.

It is a many-sided and lasting process. Development is a many-sided process, joining the economic, social, political and human together into one, and it is lasting rather than sudden. It is the slow building of a better society over generations. It cannot simply be bought or borrowed but must be built from within. It reaches into every part of national life. Being many-sided and lasting is a feature of development.

Development is therefore the many-sided process by which a nation and its people advance towards wealth, welfare, good government and a fuller life, taking the forms of economic, social, political and human development, and being far more than mere economic growth. It is the lifting of a whole people into a fuller, freer and better life, and it has been the great task of the nations of Africa since their independence.

Question 2

A nation may grow richer year by year and yet remain undeveloped, if its new wealth flows to the few while the many stay in want.

Distinguish between economic growth and development.

Model Answer

Economic growth and development are often confused, yet they are not the same, for growth is the increase of wealth while development is the improvement of the whole of life. The two must be carefully distinguished. The differences between economic growth and development may be examined as follows.

Growth is the increase of wealth. Economic growth is simply the increase in the wealth and output of a nation, measured by the rise in its total production. It counts the money and the goods that a nation makes each year. It looks only at the size of the economy. It says nothing of how the wealth is shared among the people. Growth is the mere increase of wealth.

Development is the improvement of life. Development, by contrast, is the improvement of the whole condition and welfare of the people. It touches health, education, justice and freedom as well as wealth. It looks to the quality of life, and not only to its quantity. It asks whether the people live better, not only whether they earn more. Development is the improvement of life itself.

Growth may leave the people poor. A nation may enjoy economic growth while most of its people remain poor, if the new wealth flows only to a few. Growth without fair sharing is not development. The many may stay in want while the totals rise. Growth alone does not lift the people from poverty. That growth may leave the people poor distinguishes it from development.

Development spreads its fruits to all. Development, unlike mere growth, spreads its fruits among all the people, not merely a favoured few. It seeks to lift the whole nation, and above all the poor. It is measured by the welfare of the many, not the wealth of the few. It shares as well as produces. The spreading of its fruits to all marks true development.

Growth is measured in figures. Economic growth is measured in figures, such as the rise in national output and average income. It is a matter of statistics and of totals. It can be counted in money alone. It tells only a part of the story of a nation. Being measured in figures distinguishes growth from development.

Development is measured in welfare. Development is measured in the welfare of the people, such as their health, their education, and the length of their lives. It looks beyond money to the human condition. It counts schools, clinics and freedoms, and not only wealth. It measures the fuller life of the people. Being measured in welfare marks development.

Growth can occur without development. Growth can occur without development, as when a nation exports oil or minerals yet its people gain little from it. Riches may rise while ordinary life does not improve. The two do not always go together. Development needs growth, but growth alone is not development. That growth can occur without development is the key distinction between them.

Economic growth and development therefore differ in that growth is the mere increase of wealth, measured in figures, which may leave the people poor, while development is the improvement of the whole of life, measured in welfare, which spreads its fruits to all. Growth can occur without development, and so a nation may grow richer year by year and yet remain undeveloped, if its new wealth flows to the few while the many stay in want.

Question 3

The new nations of Africa were born free but not equal, inheriting from colonial rule economies made to serve Europe and little fitted to serve themselves.

Examine the state of Africa at independence.

Model Answer

When the African nations won their independence, they inherited from colonial rule economies, societies and states shaped to serve the colonisers rather than the African peoples. This colonial legacy weighed heavily on their development. The state of Africa at independence may be examined as follows.

Economies built to serve Europe. At independence, the African economies had been built to serve the needs of Europe, and not those of Africa. They produced raw materials for European industry and bought European goods in return. They were shaped for the profit of the coloniser. They were ill fitted to serve their own peoples. Economies built to serve Europe were a chief part of the colonial legacy.

Dependence on one or two products. Most African economies depended on one or two crops or minerals for their livelihood, such as cocoa, coffee, copper or cotton. This left them at the mercy of the swings of world prices. A fall in the price of the one product could ruin the nation. It was a narrow and fragile base for development. Dependence on one or two products was a heavy legacy.

Lack of industry. Colonial rule had left Africa with little industry, for the colonisers had wanted it to produce raw materials, not manufactures. Africa exported its wealth raw and bought back finished goods at a high price. It had few factories of its own. It could not make the things it needed. The lack of industry was a heavy legacy of colonialism.

Poor infrastructure. The roads, railways and ports of colonial Africa had been built to carry raw materials to the coast for export, and not to link the country together. Infrastructure served the coloniser's trade rather than the nation's growth. Much of the land had none of it at all. It was a poor foundation for development. Poor infrastructure was part of the colonial legacy.

Shortage of skilled manpower. Colonial rule had left Africa with few educated and skilled people, for it had provided little higher education. There were very few African doctors, engineers or managers at independence. The new nations lacked the trained hands they urgently needed. Skills had been kept from the African under colonial rule. The shortage of skilled manpower was a heavy legacy.

Weak and artificial states. The new states were weak and artificial, their borders drawn by the colonisers without regard for their peoples. They joined many tribes into uneasy and divided nations. They lacked unity and strong institutions of their own. They were hard both to govern and to hold together. Weak and artificial states were part of the colonial legacy.

Poverty and low development. At independence, most Africans were poor, and the continent was among the least developed in the whole world. There was much disease, hunger and illiteracy. The people lacked the means of a decent life. Development had scarcely begun in most of Africa. Poverty and low development were the condition of Africa at independence.

Continued economic dependence. The new nations remained economically dependent on their former colonial rulers, for trade, aid and investment. Their economies were still bound tightly to Europe. Political freedom had not brought economic freedom with it. This dependence would trouble them for many decades. Continued economic dependence was a heavy legacy of colonialism.

High hopes and great challenges. At independence the African peoples had high hopes of a better life, yet they faced great challenges in a continent left poor and unready by colonial rule. The gap between their hopes and their means was very wide. The task before them was immense. Much would depend on their leaders and their choices. High hopes and great challenges marked the dawn of independence.

At independence, therefore, the African nations inherited economies built to serve Europe, dependent on one or two products, lacking industry and infrastructure, short of skilled manpower, joined into weak and artificial states, sunk in poverty, and still economically dependent on their former rulers, even as their peoples hoped for a better life. The new nations were born free but not equal, and the colonial legacy weighed heavily on all their efforts to develop.

Question 4

To be free was only the beginning; the new nations of Africa awoke to a mountain of troubles, and the hardest work lay ahead.

Examine the challenges facing African states at independence.

Model Answer

When the African nations won their independence, they faced a host of great challenges, inherited from colonial rule and springing from their own condition. These challenges shaped their long struggle to develop. The challenges facing African states at independence may be examined as follows.

Widespread poverty. The new nations faced widespread poverty, for most of their people lived in want, with little income, food or comfort. Africa was among the very poorest of continents. To lift the people from this poverty was the first great challenge. It would take many years and much effort to overcome. Widespread poverty was a chief challenge at independence.

Shortage of skilled manpower. The new states had few educated and skilled people, for colonial rule had provided little higher education. There were far too few doctors, teachers, engineers and managers. The nations lacked the trained hands to run themselves well. Skills had to be built almost from nothing. The shortage of skilled manpower was a heavy challenge.

Weak and dependent economies. The economies were weak, narrow and dependent, built to export a few raw materials to Europe. They had little industry and were at the mercy of world prices. They served the coloniser's needs rather than the nation's. To remake them was a very great challenge. Weak and dependent economies were a chief challenge at independence.

National unity and tribalism. The new nations were divided among many tribes, with little sense of common nationhood, and tribalism threatened their unity. To weld the many peoples into one nation was a hard and slow task. Division could easily turn to open conflict. National unity had to be built from the start. The challenge of national unity and tribalism was great.

Building stable government. The new states had to build stable, honest and effective government where colonial rule had left only weak institutions. They lacked long experience of self-rule. Instability and military coups soon threatened many of them. Good government had to be created and then kept. The building of stable government was a challenge at independence.

Poverty of infrastructure. Africa lacked the roads, railways, power and services that development needs, for colonial infrastructure had served only export. Much of the land was without any of them. To build them would cost great sums of money and time. Development could not go far without them. The poverty of infrastructure was a challenge at independence.

Neo-colonial dependence. Though politically free, the new nations remained economically dependent on their former rulers, for trade, aid and investment. This neo-colonial dependence limited their real freedom of action. Political independence had not brought economic independence. To break free of it was a great challenge. Neo-colonial dependence was a challenge at independence.

The high expectations of the people. The people expected that independence would soon bring a better life, and their high hopes pressed hard upon their new leaders. To meet these expectations with such poor means was very hard. Disappointment could quickly breed unrest and anger. The gap between hope and means was wide. The high expectations of the people were a challenge at independence.

The challenges facing African states at independence were therefore widespread poverty, the shortage of skilled manpower, weak and dependent economies, the threat of tribalism to national unity, the building of stable government, the poverty of infrastructure, neo-colonial dependence, and the high expectations of the people. To be free was only the beginning, for the new nations awoke to a mountain of troubles, and the hardest work of development lay ahead.

Question 5

Underdevelopment is not merely the absence of wealth, but a condition of poverty, dependence and weakness in which much of Africa has long been held.

Explain the meaning of underdevelopment and its features in Africa.

Model Answer

Underdevelopment is the condition of poverty, backwardness and dependence in which the nations of Africa and much of the Third World have long lived. It is far more than the mere lack of wealth. The meaning of underdevelopment and its features in Africa may be explained as follows.

The meaning of underdevelopment. Underdevelopment is the condition of a nation that is poor, backward and dependent, and unable to meet the needs of its people. It is a state of arrested or hindered development. It is not natural but has its causes in history, above all in colonialism. It holds a whole people below the fullness of life. This is the meaning of underdevelopment.

Widespread poverty. A chief feature of underdevelopment is widespread poverty, in which most of the people lack the means of a decent life. Low incomes, hunger and want are common everywhere. The people cannot afford good food, health or education. Poverty is both the mark and the measure of underdevelopment. Widespread poverty is a feature of underdevelopment in Africa.

Dependence on primary products. Underdeveloped economies depend on the export of a few raw materials, such as coffee, cotton, copper or oil. They export their wealth raw and import finished goods in return. They are at the mercy of the swings of world prices. This narrow base keeps them poor and weak. Dependence on primary products is a feature of underdevelopment.

Lack of industry and technology. Underdeveloped nations have little industry and technology, and cannot make the goods they need. They depend on others for manufactures and machines. Their productive power is low and their tools are few. They remain hewers of wood and drawers of water. The lack of industry and technology is a feature of underdevelopment.

Economic dependence on the rich nations. Underdeveloped economies are dependent on the rich nations for trade, aid, investment and technology. They cannot stand on their own feet. Their fortunes are tied to those of the powerful. This dependence lies at the very heart of underdevelopment. Economic dependence on the rich nations is a feature of underdevelopment.

Poor social conditions. Underdevelopment shows in poor social conditions, such as much disease, hunger, illiteracy and short lives. The people lack good health, education and services. Their quality of life is low. These conditions both cause and reflect the underdevelopment. Poor social conditions are a feature of underdevelopment in Africa.

Weak states and institutions. Underdeveloped nations often have weak states and institutions, unable to govern well or to drive development forward. Government may be unstable, corrupt or ineffective. It cannot serve the people as it should. This weakness deepens the underdevelopment. Weak states and institutions are a feature of underdevelopment.

Underdevelopment is therefore the condition of poverty, backwardness and dependence in which much of Africa has long been held, marked by widespread poverty, dependence on primary products, the lack of industry and technology, economic dependence on the rich nations, poor social conditions, and weak states. It is not merely the absence of wealth but a whole condition, with deep roots in history, from which Africa has long struggled to escape.

Approaches to African development

Question 6

Some African nations chose to build their future on the free market and private enterprise, opening their doors to the capital and the ways of the West.

Examine the capitalist approach to development in Africa.

Model Answer

After independence, some African nations chose the capitalist approach to development, relying on the free market, private enterprise and foreign investment. Kenya and the Ivory Coast were among those that took this path. The capitalist approach to development in Africa may be examined as follows.

The meaning of the capitalist approach. The capitalist approach to development relies on the free market, private enterprise and private property to drive the growth of the economy. It leaves much to individuals and businesses rather than to the state. It trusts the market to create and to spread wealth. It follows in the main the model of the Western nations. This is the meaning of the capitalist approach.

Reliance on private enterprise. Under this approach, development is driven mainly by private businesses and individuals seeking profit, rather than by the state. The government leaves much of the economy in private hands. Private wealth is encouraged to grow freely. Enterprise is made the engine of development. Reliance on private enterprise is a chief feature of the approach.

Openness to foreign investment. The capitalist approach welcomes foreign capital and investment to help develop the economy. Foreign companies are invited to build, to mine and to trade. Their money and their skill are used to spur growth. The nation opens its doors to the outside world. Openness to foreign investment is a feature of the approach.

The examples of Kenya and the Ivory Coast. Kenya and the Ivory Coast were leading examples of the capitalist path in Africa, keeping their economies open to the market and to the West. They welcomed foreign investment and private enterprise. For a time they enjoyed real and rapid growth. They were held up as capitalist success stories. Their examples mark the capitalist approach.

Its successes. The capitalist approach brought real economic growth to some nations, above all in their early years. It raised production, built some industry and drew in investment. It created wealth and a measure of prosperity. It showed that the market could develop parts of Africa. Its successes were a real mark of the approach.

Its weakness of inequality. Yet the capitalist approach bred great inequality, as its wealth flowed to a few while many stayed poor. The gap between rich and poor widened sharply. Growth did not reach all the people alike. It served the fortunate far more than the many. The breeding of inequality was a weakness of the approach.

Its weakness of dependence. The capitalist approach also deepened dependence on the West and on foreign capital, which some called neo-colonialism. The nation's economy was tied closely to outside powers. Much of its wealth flowed abroad as profit. It was not truly independent. The deepening of dependence was a weakness of the approach.

A mixed record. The capitalist approach thus had a mixed record, bringing growth to some but inequality and dependence as well. It suited some nations and failed others. Its fruits were very unevenly shared among the people. It was neither a total success nor a total failure. A mixed record marks the capitalist approach in Africa.

The capitalist approach to development in Africa therefore relied on the free market, private enterprise and foreign investment, as in Kenya and the Ivory Coast, and it brought real economic growth to some nations, though at the cost of great inequality and a deepened dependence on the West. Some African nations chose to build their future on the free market, and their record was a mixed one, of growth for some and want for many.

Question 7

Other African nations, mistrusting the ways of the West, chose the path of socialism, seeking to build development on equality and the common good.

Examine the socialist approach to development in Africa.

Model Answer

After independence, many African nations chose the socialist approach to development, in which the state leads the economy and wealth is shared for the common good. Tanzania and Ghana were among those that took this path. The socialist approach to development in Africa may be examined as follows.

The meaning of the socialist approach. The socialist approach to development relies on the state, rather than the market, to lead and control the economy for the good of all. It seeks to build development on

equality, cooperation and the common good. It mistrusts private wealth and foreign capital. It follows an African form of socialism drawn from tradition. This is the meaning of the socialist approach.

The leading role of the state. Under this approach, the state takes the leading role, owning and controlling the main industries, banks and land. Development is planned and driven by the government rather than by private business. The state directs the whole economy for the nation. Public ownership replaces private ownership. The leading role of the state is a chief feature of the approach.

The aim of equality. The socialist approach aims above all at equality, so that the wealth of the nation is shared fairly among all the people. It seeks to prevent the rise of rich and poor classes. It puts the common good above private gain. Fairness among the people is its guiding aim. The aim of equality is a chief feature of the socialist approach.

The goal of self-reliance. Socialist African nations sought self-reliance, building development on their own efforts and resources rather than on foreign aid and capital. They wished to be masters of their own economies. They mistrusted dependence on the West and its money. They looked inward for their strength. Self-reliance was a feature of the socialist approach.

The examples of Tanzania and Ghana. Tanzania under Nyerere and Ghana under Nkrumah were the leading examples of African socialism. Tanzania followed its policy of Ujamaa, and Ghana built state industries and farms. Both sought equality and self-reliance. They led the socialist path in Africa. Their examples mark the socialist approach.

Its successes. The socialist approach brought real gains in some fields, above all in education, health and national unity. Tanzania spread schooling and healthcare widely and avoided the tribalism that troubled others. It served the welfare of the many. It built a united and peaceful nation. Its successes were a real mark of the approach.

Its economic weaknesses. Yet the socialist approach often brought economic weakness, as state control led to inefficiency, low production and shortages. The planned economies did not grow as had been hoped. Farming and industry both lagged behind. The nations grew poorer rather than richer. Economic weakness was a chief failing of the approach.

Its dependence on aid. Despite the aim of self-reliance, the socialist nations often fell into deep dependence on foreign aid to survive. Their weak economies could not stand alone. They borrowed heavily and leaned upon donors. Self-reliance was not in the end achieved. The fall into dependence on aid was a weakness of the approach.

The socialist approach to development in Africa therefore relied on the leading role of the state, the aim of equality, and the goal of self-reliance, as in Tanzania under Nyerere and Ghana under Nkrumah, and it brought real gains in education, health and national unity, though at the cost of economic weakness and a deep dependence on aid. Mistrusting the ways of the West, these nations sought to build development on equality and the common good, with mixed results.

Question 8

In 1967, at Arusha, Nyerere set Tanzania upon a path of its own, an African socialism built on the village, the hoe and the ideal of familyhood.

Examine the Arusha Declaration of 1967 and the policy of Ujamaa in Tanzania.

Model Answer

The Arusha Declaration of 1967 set out Tanzania's policy of socialism and self-reliance, known as Ujamaa, under the leadership of Julius Nyerere. It was the boldest experiment in African socialism. The Arusha Declaration and the policy of Ujamaa may be examined as follows.

The Arusha Declaration of 1967. The Arusha Declaration, made by Nyerere and the party TANU in February 1967, set out Tanzania's policy of socialism and self-reliance. It was the very foundation of Ujamaa. It laid down the principles by which Tanzania would develop. It marked a bold new path for the nation. The Arusha Declaration was the charter of Tanzanian socialism.

The meaning of Ujamaa. Ujamaa, a Swahili word meaning familyhood, was Nyerere's idea of an African socialism built on the values of the traditional African family. It taught that people should live and work together as one family, sharing their wealth and their labour. It rooted socialism in African tradition rather than foreign theory. It was a socialism of cooperation. Ujamaa was the heart of Tanzania's policy.

Socialism and self-reliance. The Declaration proclaimed socialism and self-reliance as the twin foundations of development. Tanzania would share its wealth fairly and build development by its own efforts. It would not depend on foreign aid or capital. It would rely on its own land and people. Socialism and self-reliance were the two pillars of Ujamaa.

The nationalisation of the economy. After the Declaration, the state took over the main banks, industries and businesses of the country. The economy was brought under public control for the good of all. Private wealth was limited and directed by the state. The government became the leading economic force. The nationalisation of the economy was a chief step of Ujamaa.

The Ujamaa villages. Nyerere sought to gather the scattered rural people into cooperative villages, called Ujamaa villages, where they would live and farm together. There they could be given schools, clinics and clean water more easily. Cooperation would replace the lonely toil of the peasant. The village was made the centre of Ujamaa. The Ujamaa villages were a key part of the policy.

The leadership code. The Declaration laid down a leadership code, forbidding the leaders of the party and state from growing rich or exploiting others. Leaders were to be servants of the people, not a wealthy class apart. It sought to keep the rulers honest and equal with the people. It guarded against the rise of a new elite. The leadership code was a feature of Ujamaa.

Education for self-reliance. Nyerere reshaped education to serve self-reliance, teaching the young to work with their hands and to serve their communities. Schooling was tied to the land and the village. It was to make useful citizens, not a privileged few. It served the true needs of the nation. Education for self-reliance was a part of Ujamaa.

The aim of equality and unity. Ujamaa aimed at equality among the people and unity among the tribes, so that Tanzania might avoid the divisions of others. It built one nation from many peoples. It shared the nation's modest wealth among all. It put the common good first. The aim of equality and unity was central to Ujamaa.

Its bold and original character. Ujamaa was a bold and original experiment, an African socialism drawn from African values rather than borrowed from abroad. It sought a development path of Tanzania's very own. It won the admiration of many across the world. It was watched everywhere as a great experiment. Its bold and original character marked the policy.

The Arusha Declaration of 1967 and the policy of Ujamaa therefore set out Tanzania's socialism and self-reliance, built on the African idea of familyhood, and brought the nationalisation of the economy, the Ujamaa villages, the leadership code, education for self-reliance, and the aims of equality and unity. At Arusha, Nyerere set Tanzania upon a bold path of its own, an African socialism built on the village, the hoe and the ideal of familyhood.

Question 9

Ujamaa built a nation united and educated, yet left it poor and hungry, so that its balance is one of noble aims and disappointing fruits.

Assess the successes and failures of Ujamaa in Tanzania.

Model Answer

The policy of Ujamaa, Tanzania's experiment in African socialism, had both real successes and serious failures, and its balance is much debated. It achieved much in some fields while falling short in others. The successes and failures of Ujamaa may be assessed as follows.

It built national unity. Ujamaa built a strong national unity, welding Tanzania's many tribes into one people with little tribalism. Where others were torn by ethnic conflict, Tanzania stayed united and at peace. The nation was firmly held together. This unity was among the greatest successes of Ujamaa.

It spread education. Ujamaa spread education widely, and Tanzania made great gains in literacy, which rose to be among the highest in Africa. Schools were built across the whole land. The people were taught to read and to write. This spreading of education was a real success of the policy.

It spread health and welfare. Ujamaa spread health services, clean water and welfare to the villages, improving the lives of the ordinary people. Clinics and dispensaries were built widely across the country. The common people gained services they had never had. This spreading of welfare was a success of Ujamaa.

It kept the nation peaceful and equal. Ujamaa kept Tanzania peaceful, stable and relatively equal, without the great gulf of rich and poor seen elsewhere. It avoided the coups and conflicts that troubled its neighbours. It shared its modest wealth fairly among the people. This peace and equality were a success of the policy.

Yet the economy declined. Despite its aims, the economy of Tanzania declined under Ujamaa, with low production and slow growth. The state industries were inefficient and made heavy losses. The nation grew poorer rather than richer over time. This economic decline was a chief failure of Ujamaa.

Food production fell. Farming suffered under Ujamaa, and food production fell, so that Tanzania, once able to feed itself, had to import food. The villagisation disrupted the farming of the peasants. Harvests declined year by year. This fall in food production was a serious failure.

The forced villagisation. The gathering of the people into Ujamaa villages was often forced, and the peasants were moved against their will, which bred resentment and disrupted their lives. Coercion replaced the persuasion Nyerere had wished. The policy lost the goodwill of many. The forced villagisation was a failure of Ujamaa.

It deepened dependence on aid. Despite the aim of self-reliance, Tanzania fell into deep dependence on foreign aid to survive its economic troubles. It borrowed heavily and leaned upon donors. Self-reliance was not in the end achieved. This deepening of dependence was a failure of the policy.

The overall balance. The balance of Ujamaa was thus mixed, of noble aims and real gains in welfare and unity, but of serious failure in the economy. It succeeded as a social and political policy but failed as an economic one. Its fruits fell short of its high hopes. The overall balance was one of partial success and partial failure.

The successes of Ujamaa were therefore the building of national unity, the spreading of education, health and welfare, and the keeping of peace and equality, while its failures were the decline of the economy, the fall of food production, the forced villagisation, and the deepening of dependence on aid. Ujamaa built a nation united and educated, yet left it poor and hungry, so that its balance is one of noble aims and disappointing fruits.

Question 10

Weary of depending on the goodwill and the gold of others, some African nations resolved to build their development by their own hands and their own means.

Examine the policy of self-reliance as an approach to development.

Model Answer

Self-reliance is the policy by which a nation seeks to develop mainly by its own efforts and resources, rather than by depending on foreign aid and capital. It was a leading idea of African socialism, above all in Tanzania. The policy of self-reliance as an approach to development may be examined as follows.

The meaning of self-reliance. Self-reliance is the policy of building development by a nation's own efforts, resources and people, rather than by depending upon others. It means standing on one's own feet. It looks

inward for strength rather than outward for aid. It was central to the policy of Ujamaa. This is the meaning of self-reliance.

It relies on local resources. Self-reliance relies on the land, the labour and the resources of the nation itself to drive development. It makes the most of what the country already has. It builds with local hands and local materials. It does not wait upon foreign wealth. Reliance on local resources is a chief feature of self-reliance.

It reduces dependence on foreign aid. Self-reliance seeks to reduce dependence on foreign aid, loans and investment, which it holds to breed weakness and control by others. It mistrusts the gifts of the powerful. It fears the strings that come attached to aid. It values true independence above easy help. The reducing of dependence on foreign aid is a feature of self-reliance.

It stresses agriculture and the rural people. Self-reliance, above all in Tanzania, stressed the development of agriculture and the rural people, the true base of the economy. It looked to the peasant and the village for progress. It built development from the land upward. It valued the many, not the few. The stress on agriculture was a feature of self-reliance.

It stresses hard work and effort. Self-reliance taught that development must be earned by hard work, for a nation cannot be developed by others but only by itself. It called the people to labour for their own future. It rejected the hope of an easy road to wealth. It valued effort above gifts. The stress on hard work was a feature of self-reliance.

Its strengths. Self-reliance had real strengths, for it fostered pride, independence and the fuller use of a nation's own resources. It freed the nation from the control of others. It taught the people to help themselves rather than to beg. It was a worthy and dignified aim. Its strengths were a real mark of the policy.

Its weaknesses. Yet self-reliance had serious weaknesses, for a poor nation often lacks the capital, skills and technology to develop alone. It could not wholly do without some foreign help. Its aims outran its slender means. Tanzania itself fell back into dependence. Its weaknesses limited the policy in practice.

Its lasting appeal. Despite its failures, self-reliance kept a lasting appeal, for it spoke to the African wish to be truly free and master of its own fate. It remained a noble and honoured ideal. It shaped African thinking on development for years. Its spirit outlived its practical failures. The lasting appeal of self-reliance is a part of its story.

The policy of self-reliance as an approach to development therefore meant building development by a nation's own efforts and resources, relying on local resources, reducing dependence on foreign aid, and stressing agriculture, the rural people and hard work, as in Tanzania. Though it had real strengths of pride and independence, it was weakened by the want of capital and skill, yet its noble ideal of standing on one's own feet kept a lasting appeal for Africa.

Question 11

At independence Africa stood at a crossroads, and its nations went two ways, some following the market of the West, and some the socialism of equality.

Compare the capitalist and socialist approaches to development in Africa.

Model Answer

After independence, the African nations divided between two great approaches to development, the capitalist and the socialist, each with its own principles, methods and results. To weigh them, one must set them side by side. The capitalist and socialist approaches to development in Africa may be compared as follows.

Market against state. The capitalist approach relied on the free market and private enterprise, while the socialist approach relied on the state to lead the economy. The one trusted private business to create wealth, the other public ownership. This was the deepest difference between them. Market against state divided the two approaches.

Private against public ownership. Under capitalism, the main industries and land were held privately, while under socialism they were owned by the state. The one kept private property, the other took it into public hands. Ownership of the economy set them apart. Private against public ownership marked the two approaches.

Growth against equality. The capitalist approach aimed above all at economic growth, while the socialist approach aimed above all at equality. The one sought to enlarge the wealth, the other to share it fairly among all. Their chief aims plainly differed. Growth against equality distinguished the two approaches.

Openness against self-reliance. The capitalist approach welcomed foreign capital and trade, while the socialist approach sought self-reliance and mistrusted dependence on the West. The one opened its doors wide, the other looked inward. Their stance towards the world differed. Openness against self-reliance marked the two approaches.

Their differing examples. Kenya and the Ivory Coast were the leading capitalist nations, while Tanzania and Ghana were the leading socialist ones. The two groups followed opposite paths from the same starting point. Their differing choices divided them. Their examples show the two approaches in practice.

Their differing strengths. The capitalist approach brought faster economic growth, while the socialist approach brought greater equality and welfare, above all in education and health. Each was strong where the other was weak. Their strengths lay in different fields. Their differing strengths distinguish the two approaches.

Their common failures. Both approaches, however, largely failed to develop Africa as had been hoped, for the capitalist nations bred inequality and dependence, and the socialist nations bred economic weakness. Neither escaped poverty and dependence. Both fell short of their promise. Their common failures link the two approaches.

Their common dependence. In the end, both the capitalist and the socialist nations remained dependent on the outside world, whether on foreign capital or on foreign aid. Neither achieved true economic independence. The chains of dependence held them both fast. Their common dependence is a key point of comparison.

The capitalist and socialist approaches to development in Africa therefore differed in relying on the market against the state, private against public ownership, growth against equality, and openness against self-reliance, as seen in Kenya and the Ivory Coast against Tanzania and Ghana, each with its own strengths, yet both largely failed to develop Africa and both remained dependent on the outside world. At independence Africa stood at a crossroads and went two ways, but neither road led it out of poverty and dependence.

Development strategies and regional patterns

Question 12

The new nations tried many roads to development, from building factories to gathering peasants, yet found that no single strategy could lift them swiftly from poverty.

Examine the development strategies adopted by African states after independence.

Model Answer

After independence, the African states adopted many strategies to develop their economies and to lift their peoples from poverty. These strategies met with mixed success. The development strategies adopted by African states may be examined as follows.

Import-substitution industrialisation. Many states tried to build industries to make at home the goods they had imported, a strategy called import substitution. They hoped to save money and to build a modern economy. New factories were set up behind protective tariff walls. It was a leading strategy of the early years. Import-substitution industrialisation was a chief development strategy.

State-led planning. Many African states, above all the socialist ones, adopted state-led planning, in which the government planned and drove the economy. Development plans were drawn up and the state directed the investment. The market was distrusted and closely controlled. Planning was to guide the nation's progress. State-led planning was a common development strategy.

The nationalisation of industries. Some states nationalised the main industries, banks and businesses, taking them into public ownership. They sought to control the commanding heights of the economy. The state became the chief owner and employer. Wealth was to serve the whole nation. Nationalisation was a development strategy of the socialist states.

The stress on agriculture. Some states, such as Tanzania, stressed the development of agriculture and the rural people as the base of the economy. They looked to the peasant and the village for growth. They sought to raise both food and cash crops. They built development from the land. The stress on agriculture was a development strategy.

Reliance on cash-crop and mineral exports. Many states relied on the export of cash crops and minerals to earn the money for development. They sold coffee, cotton, cocoa, copper and oil abroad. Their development was funded by these exports. It tied them closely to world prices. Reliance on export earnings was a common strategy.

Foreign aid and loans. Many states relied on foreign aid and loans to fund their development plans. They borrowed to build roads, dams and factories. Aid filled the gap between their needs and their means. It also bred growing debt and dependence. Reliance on foreign aid and loans was a development strategy.

Regional cooperation. Some states sought development through regional cooperation, joining together to trade and to build larger markets. They formed bodies such as the East African Community. Together they hoped to grow stronger than apart. Cooperation was seen as a road to development. Regional cooperation was a development strategy.

Their mixed results. These strategies met with mixed and often disappointing results, for many industries failed, plans went awry, and debt grew heavy. Development came more slowly than had been hoped. The strategies did not swiftly lift Africa from poverty. Their mixed results marked the whole era. The disappointing outcome of the strategies is an important judgement.

The development strategies adopted by African states after independence therefore included import-substitution industrialisation, state-led planning, the nationalisation of industries, the stress on agriculture, reliance on cash-crop and mineral exports, foreign aid and loans, and regional cooperation. The new nations tried many roads to development, from building factories to gathering peasants, yet found that no single strategy could lift them swiftly from poverty, and their results were mixed and often disappointing.

Question 13

Since the lowering of the colonial flags, Africa has known both progress and setback, building schools and states even as poverty and conflict have held it back.

Examine the social, political and economic development of Africa since independence.

Model Answer

Since independence, Africa has seen both progress and disappointment in its social, political and economic development. Its record is a mixed one of real gains and grave shortcomings. The social, political and economic development of Africa since independence may be examined as follows.

The winning of independence. The first and greatest achievement was the winning of political independence itself, as the African nations threw off colonial rule. They became free at last to govern themselves. They took their place among the nations of the world. This was the very foundation of all later development. The winning of independence was a great political gain.

The spread of education. Since independence, Africa has greatly spread education, building schools and universities and teaching millions to read. Literacy has risen across the whole continent. The young have

gained the learning their parents lacked. This was a real and lasting social gain. The spread of education is a chief achievement since independence.

The spread of health services. Africa has spread health services since independence, building hospitals and clinics and fighting disease. Life expectancy has risen and some diseases have been checked. The people have gained care they never had before. This was a real social gain. The spread of health services is an achievement since independence.

Some economic growth and industry. Africa has seen some economic growth and built some industry since independence, in mining, manufacturing and farming. Roads, dams and factories have been built across the land. Parts of the economy have grown steadily. This was a real if uneven gain. Some economic growth and industry is an achievement since independence.

The building of nations and institutions. Africa has built new nations and institutions since independence, forging states and governments from the colonial inheritance. Some have grown stable and united over time. National identities have taken root where none existed. This was a real political gain. The building of nations and institutions is an achievement since independence.

Yet widespread poverty remains. Despite these gains, widespread poverty remains, and much of Africa is still among the poorest of the world. Many people still lack the means of a decent life. Development has not reached all its peoples. Poverty remains a grave shortfall. The persistence of poverty is a failure of development since independence.

Political instability and conflict. Africa has suffered much political instability, coups, dictatorship and civil war since independence. Good and stable government has often failed to take root. Conflict has destroyed much of what was built. This was a grave political shortfall. Political instability and conflict have hindered development since independence.

Continued economic dependence. Africa remains economically dependent on the outside world, for trade, aid and investment, and is burdened by heavy debt. It still exports raw materials and imports manufactures. True economic independence has not yet come. This dependence is a grave shortfall. Continued economic dependence has limited development since independence.

A mixed and uneven record. The development of Africa since independence has thus been mixed and uneven, of real gains in education, health and nationhood, but of grave failures in wealth, stability and independence. Some nations have fared far better than others. Progress and setback have gone hand in hand. A mixed and uneven record marks Africa since independence.

The social, political and economic development of Africa since independence has therefore brought real gains, in the winning of independence, the spread of education and health, some economic growth, and the building of nations, yet also grave shortfalls, in widespread poverty, political instability and conflict, and continued economic dependence. Since the lowering of the colonial flags, Africa has known both progress and setback, and its record is a mixed and uneven one.

Question 14

Amid all the tales of Africa's troubles, it is easily forgotten how much the new nations have built from so little in so short a time.

Examine the achievements of African states since independence.

Model Answer

Though Africa's development since independence is often judged a disappointment, the new nations have in truth achieved much from a poor and difficult beginning. Their achievements deserve to be remembered. The achievements of African states since independence may be examined as follows.

The winning and keeping of independence. The African states won their political independence from colonial rule and have kept it, governing themselves for over half a century. They took their place among the free nations of the world. They ended foreign rule over their lands. This was their first and greatest achievement. The winning and keeping of independence is a chief achievement.

The building of nations. The African states have built nations from the artificial inheritance of colonial borders, forging scattered peoples into countries. Some have grown united and stable against great odds. National identities have taken root where none had existed. This was a real achievement. The building of nations is an achievement since independence.

The spread of education. Africa has greatly spread education, raising literacy and building schools and universities across the continent. Millions who would have stayed unlettered can now read and write. The young are far better taught than their parents were. This was a great achievement. The spread of education is an achievement since independence.

The spread of health and longer life. Africa has spread health services and lengthened the lives of its people since independence. Hospitals and clinics have been built and diseases fought. More children survive and people live longer than before. This was a real achievement. The spread of health and longer life is an achievement since independence.

The growth of towns and industry. Africa has seen the growth of towns and some industry since independence, as economies have grown and modernised in part. New cities, factories and roads have risen across the land. The continent is more developed than at independence. This was a real if uneven achievement. The growth of towns and industry is an achievement.

The rise of an African voice in the world. Africa has won a voice in the affairs of the world, through the United Nations, the African Union and the Non-Aligned Movement. It is no longer ruled and ignored but heard. It speaks now for itself among the nations. This was a real achievement. The rise of an African voice is an achievement since independence.

The freeing of the whole continent. Africa has completed the freeing of the whole continent, ending colonial rule and, at last, the apartheid of South Africa. The last of foreign and racist rule was overthrown. Africa became wholly free at last. This was a great achievement. The freeing of the whole continent is an achievement since independence.

The growth of cooperation. Africa has built habits and bodies of cooperation, through the African Union and the regional communities. The nations have learned to act together for common ends. Unity has grown, if slowly and unevenly. This was a real achievement. The growth of cooperation is an achievement since independence.

The achievements of African states since independence therefore include the winning and keeping of independence, the building of nations, the spread of education and health, the growth of towns and industry, the rise of an African voice in the world, the freeing of the whole continent, and the growth of cooperation. Amid all the tales of Africa's troubles, it is easily forgotten how much the new nations have built from so little in so short a time.

Question 15

Africa is not one but many, and its regions have fared very differently, some racing ahead while others have lagged or been torn by war.

Examine the differences in development among the regions of Africa.

Model Answer

Africa is a vast and varied continent, and its regions have developed very differently since independence, some faring far better than others. These differences spring from many causes. The differences in development among the regions of Africa may be examined as follows.

Africa is not one but many. Africa is not a single land but many regions and nations, differing in resources, history and fortune. Development has been very uneven among them. What is true of one region is often false of another. This great variety must first be understood. That Africa is not one but many is the first point.

North Africa. North Africa, with its oil, its old cities and its nearness to Europe, has often developed further than the rest. Nations such as Egypt and the oil states have grown comparatively rich. Yet they too

have known instability and want. Their record is not without its troubles. North Africa has fared comparatively well.

West Africa. West Africa, rich in resources such as oil, cocoa and gold, has seen both growth and grave conflict. Nigeria grew wealthy on oil, yet the region was torn by wars in Liberia and Sierra Leone. Its record has been very mixed indeed. Wealth and war have gone together. West Africa shows the unevenness of development.

East Africa. East Africa, with its farming and its growing economies, has developed steadily but remains poor. Kenya and Tanzania have grown, though from a very low base. The region has known relative peace but continued want. Its progress has been slow but real. East Africa has developed slowly and unevenly.

Central Africa. Central Africa, above all the Congo, is rich in minerals yet has been among the least developed, torn by war and misrule. Its great wealth has proved a curse rather than a blessing. Conflict has wrecked its development for decades. Its potential remains unrealised. Central Africa has fared among the worst.

Southern Africa. Southern Africa, with the strong economy of South Africa, is among the more developed regions, though marked by great inequality. South Africa is the continent's largest economy by far. Yet apartheid left deep wounds and division behind it. Wealth and inequality lie side by side. Southern Africa is developed but unequal.

The causes of the differences. The differences among the regions spring from their resources, their peace or conflict, their leadership, and their history. Where there was peace and good rule, development advanced. Where there was war and misrule, it failed and fell back. These causes explain the uneven record. The causes of the differences must be understood.

The general unevenness. In general, the development of Africa has been very uneven, both among its regions and within them, so that great wealth and deep poverty lie side by side. No single tale fits the whole continent. Progress and failure are mingled across it. The picture is a patchwork, not a single colour. The general unevenness marks the development of Africa.

The differences in development among the regions of Africa are therefore great, for North Africa and Southern Africa have often fared better, West and East Africa have known mixed fortunes, and Central Africa has fared among the worst, according to their resources, their peace or conflict, their leadership and their history. Africa is not one but many, and its regions have fared very differently, some racing ahead while others have lagged or been torn by war.

Factors hindering African development

Question 16

Half a century after independence, Africa remains poor, and the reasons are many: the wounds of the past, the failures of the present, and the unfairness of the world.

Examine the factors hindering the development of Africa since the 1960s.

Model Answer

Since the 1960s, despite great efforts, Africa has developed slowly and remains among the poorest of continents. Many factors have hindered its development. The factors hindering the development of Africa since the 1960s may be examined as follows.

The colonial legacy. Africa began its independent life with economies, states and infrastructure shaped by colonialism to serve Europe, and not itself. This poor inheritance held back its development from the very start. It began the race far behind the rest. The wounds of the past were slow to heal. The colonial legacy is a chief factor hindering African development.

Neo-colonialism and dependence. Though free, Africa remained economically dependent on the West, for trade, aid and investment, in what is called neo-colonialism. Its wealth flowed abroad and its economy

served others. It could not truly control its own fate. This dependence hindered its development. Neo-colonialism is a chief factor hindering development.

Poor leadership and corruption. Africa has suffered much poor, corrupt and selfish leadership, as rulers stole the wealth of their nations and misruled their peoples. Corruption drained away the resources needed for development. Bad leaders squandered the future of their nations. This was a grave hindrance. Poor leadership and corruption are a factor hindering development.

Political instability and civil war. Africa has been troubled by coups, dictatorship and civil war, which have destroyed what development had built. Conflict wrecked economies and drove away investment. Instability made steady progress impossible. This was a grave and recurring hindrance. Political instability and civil war are a factor hindering development.

The debt burden. Africa has been crushed by a heavy burden of foreign debt, so that its wealth goes to pay interest rather than to develop. Debt has drained the continent for decades. It has bound Africa tightly to its creditors. This was a heavy hindrance. The debt burden is a factor hindering development.

Unfair international trade. Africa suffers from unfair terms of trade, selling cheap raw materials and buying dear manufactures. Its exports fetch too little and its imports cost too much. The world economy is tilted against it. This has hindered its development. Unfair international trade is a factor hindering development.

Poverty, disease and population growth. Africa is held back by poverty, disease such as HIV and AIDS, and rapid population growth that outpaces its economy. Sickness weakens the people, and rising numbers strain the land. Development cannot keep up with the need. These were heavy hindrances. Poverty, disease and population growth are a factor hindering development.

The lack of capital, skills and technology. Africa lacks the capital, the skilled people and the technology that development needs. It cannot fund or build what it requires by itself. It depends on others for machines and money. This held back its progress. The lack of capital, skills and technology is a factor hindering development.

Over-dependence on primary products. Africa still depends on the export of a few raw materials, whose prices rise and fall beyond its control. A fall in the price of coffee or copper can ruin a nation. This narrow base keeps the economies weak. This hindered development. Over-dependence on primary products is a factor hindering development.

The factors hindering the development of Africa since the 1960s are therefore the colonial legacy, neo-colonialism and dependence, poor leadership and corruption, political instability and civil war, the debt burden, unfair international trade, poverty, disease and population growth, the lack of capital, skills and technology, and over-dependence on primary products. Half a century after independence, Africa remains poor, for the reasons are many: the wounds of the past, the failures of the present, and the unfairness of the world.

Question 17

The chains of empire were struck off, but its shadow remained, in economies, borders and habits shaped to serve the coloniser rather than the African.

Assess the role of the colonial legacy in hindering African development.

Model Answer

Much of Africa's difficulty in developing can be traced to the legacy of colonial rule, which left the continent poor, dependent and divided. Though not the only cause, this legacy weighed heavily on African development. The role of the colonial legacy in hindering African development may be assessed as follows.

It left economies shaped for Europe. Colonialism left Africa with economies built to serve Europe, producing raw materials for its industry. These economies were ill fitted to serve Africa itself. They had to be remade at great cost and effort. This was a heavy handicap at the start. The leaving of economies shaped for Europe hindered development.

It left dependence on primary products. Colonial rule left Africa dependent on the export of one or two crops or minerals. This narrow base was fragile and at the mercy of world prices. It was a poor foundation for development. It kept Africa weak and exposed. The dependence on primary products was a hindering legacy.

It left little industry. Colonialism left Africa with little industry, for it had wanted raw materials, not manufactures. Africa could not make what it needed and had to import it dearly. Industrialisation had to begin almost from nothing. This held back development. The lack of industry was a hindering legacy.

It left poor infrastructure. The roads and railways of colonial Africa were built to carry exports to the coast, and not to develop the country. Much of the land had no infrastructure at all. This poor base hindered all development. It had to be built anew at great cost. Poor infrastructure was a hindering legacy.

It left few skilled people. Colonial rule provided little higher education, leaving Africa short of doctors, engineers and managers at independence. The new nations lacked the skilled hands to develop. Education had to be built up from a very low base. This slowed development for years. The shortage of skilled people was a hindering legacy.

It left artificial and divided states. Colonialism drew artificial borders that joined rival peoples and split others, leaving weak and divided states. These states were hard to govern and prone to conflict. Division hindered their development. Instability followed the arbitrary borders. The artificial and divided states were a hindering legacy.

It left economic dependence. Colonial rule left Africa economically tied to Europe, for trade, aid and investment, so that political freedom did not bring economic freedom. This dependence limited Africa's development. It bound the continent to its former rulers. Economic dependence was a hindering legacy.

Yet Africa's own failures also mattered. The colonial legacy was not the only cause, for the poor leadership, corruption and misrule of Africans themselves also hindered development. To blame colonialism alone is far too simple. Africa bears a real share of the blame. Yet Africa's own failures worked alongside the colonial legacy.

The role of the colonial legacy in hindering African development was therefore great, for it left economies shaped for Europe, dependent on primary products, lacking industry and infrastructure, short of skilled people, divided into artificial states, and tied to Europe by economic dependence, though the failures of Africans themselves also played their part. The chains of empire were struck off, but its shadow remained, and it weighed heavily on all Africa's efforts to develop.

Question 18

Africa's tragedy has too often worn a human face, that of the leader who plundered his nation and betrayed the hopes his people placed in him.

Examine the role of poor leadership, corruption and bad governance in hindering African development.

Model Answer

Much of Africa's failure to develop can be traced to poor leadership, corruption and bad governance, which have squandered its wealth and betrayed its peoples. These are among the gravest and most self-inflicted of Africa's wounds. The role of poor leadership, corruption and bad governance may be examined as follows.

Corrupt and greedy leaders. Africa has suffered many corrupt and greedy leaders, who stole the wealth of their nations for themselves. Vast sums were plundered and hidden away abroad. The money needed for development was carried off. This was a grave hindrance to progress. Corrupt and greedy leaders have hindered African development.

Dictatorship and misrule. Africa has been troubled by dictators who ruled by force, crushed their peoples and misgoverned their nations. They put their own power above the good of the people. Misrule wrecked

the economy and the state alike. This hindered development. Dictatorship and misrule have hindered African development.

The squandering of resources. Poor leaders have squandered the resources of their nations on vanity, waste and war, rather than on development. Wealth that might have built schools was thrown away. The nation's future was wasted for the present. This was a grave hindrance. The squandering of resources has hindered development.

Tribalism and favouritism. Many leaders have ruled by tribalism and favouritism, sharing power and wealth among their own people and excluding the rest. This bred division, resentment and conflict. It set the nation against itself. This hindered development. Tribalism and favouritism have hindered African development.

The lack of good institutions. Bad governance has left Africa with weak institutions, unable to keep order, deliver justice or drive development. Where the state is weak and corrupt, little works well. Development has no firm foundation to stand on. This hindered progress. The lack of good institutions has hindered development.

The waste of aid and loans. Poor and corrupt leaders have wasted or stolen the aid and loans given for development, leaving debt but no progress. The money vanished into private pockets. The nation gained the debt but not the development. This was a grave hindrance. The waste of aid and loans has hindered development.

The driving away of talent and investment. Bad governance has driven away skilled people and investors, who flee misrule and instability. The nation loses both its best minds and its capital. Development is starved of both together. This hindered progress. The driving away of talent and investment has hindered development.

The betrayal of the people's hopes. Above all, poor leadership has betrayed the high hopes the people placed in independence, leaving them poor and disappointed. The promise of a better life was broken. Trust in government was lost. This was a deep and lasting hindrance. The betrayal of the people's hopes has hindered African development.

The role of poor leadership, corruption and bad governance in hindering African development has therefore been great, through corrupt and greedy leaders, dictatorship and misrule, the squandering of resources, tribalism and favouritism, the lack of good institutions, the waste of aid and loans, the driving away of talent and investment, and the betrayal of the people's hopes. Africa's tragedy has too often worn a human face, that of the leader who plundered his nation and betrayed the hopes his people placed in him.

Question 19

No nation can build in the midst of the storm, and Africa's frequent coups, wars and upheavals have again and again torn down what its peoples had painfully built.

Examine the effect of political instability, coups and civil wars on African development.

Model Answer

Political instability, coups and civil wars have been among the gravest hindrances to African development, destroying wealth, order and hope. Where there is no peace, there can be no development. The effect of political instability, coups and civil wars on African development may be examined as follows.

They destroy what has been built. Coups and civil wars destroy the roads, factories, schools and farms that development had built. What took years to raise is wrecked in a few months of fighting. The nation is thrown back to the beginning. This destruction gravely hinders development. The destroying of what has been built is a chief effect.

They drive away investment. Instability and war frighten away the investors and capital that development needs, for none will invest where there is no peace. Money flees to safer and calmer lands. Development is starved of the funds it needs. This hinders progress. The driving away of investment is an effect of instability.

They waste resources on war and arms. Coups and wars make nations spend their scarce wealth on soldiers and weapons rather than on development. Money that might have built is spent instead to destroy. Resources are consumed by the conflict. This hinders development. The wasting of resources on war is an effect of instability.

They kill and scatter the people. Civil wars kill great numbers and drive millions from their homes, robbing the nation of its people. Skilled and able people die or flee abroad. The workforce of development is lost. This hinders progress. The killing and scattering of the people is an effect of instability.

They break down government and order. Coups and wars break down the government and the rule of law, leaving chaos in which nothing can be built. Where there is no order, there is no development. The state itself may collapse altogether. This hinders progress. The breakdown of government and order is an effect of instability.

They breed further instability. Coups and wars breed yet more of the same, as violence becomes the way of changing power. One coup invites another in its turn. The nation cannot find stable and lasting rule. This endless instability hinders development. The breeding of further instability is an effect.

They discourage long-term effort. Where the future is uncertain and war may come at any time, none will plan or build for the long term. Development needs peace and confidence, which instability destroys. Effort and enterprise are discouraged. This hinders progress. The discouraging of long-term effort is an effect of instability.

They deepen poverty and dependence. By destroying so much, instability and war deepen the poverty of nations and their dependence on foreign aid. The war-torn nation cannot feed or fund itself. It falls ever further behind. This hinders development. The deepening of poverty and dependence is an effect of instability.

The effect of political instability, coups and civil wars on African development has therefore been to destroy what has been built, drive away investment, waste resources on war, kill and scatter the people, break down government and order, breed further instability, discourage long-term effort, and deepen poverty and dependence. No nation can build in the midst of the storm, and Africa's frequent upheavals have again and again torn down what its peoples had painfully built.

Question 20

Africa borrowed to develop, and found itself instead in chains of debt, its wealth flowing outward to its creditors while its people went without.

Examine the burden of foreign debt and the structural adjustment programmes on African development.

Model Answer

The heavy burden of foreign debt, and the structural adjustment programmes imposed to deal with it, have gravely hindered African development since the 1980s. They drained the continent and dictated its policies. The burden of foreign debt and the structural adjustment programmes may be examined as follows.

Africa borrowed heavily to develop. After independence, African nations borrowed heavily from foreign lenders to fund their development plans. They built roads, dams and industries on borrowed money. The debts grew larger year by year. This heavy borrowing was the root of the burden. The borrowing to develop began the debt problem.

The debt grew crushing. In time the debts grew crushing, swollen by interest and by falling export earnings. Many nations owed far more than they could ever repay. The debt hung like a millstone about their necks. This crushed their development. The growth of a crushing debt was a chief part of the burden.

Wealth flowed out to pay debt. Under the burden of debt, the wealth of Africa flowed outward to pay interest to foreign creditors, rather than serving development at home. The poor continent paid the rich. Its scarce resources were drained away. This hindered development. The outflow of wealth to pay debt was a grave effect.

The structural adjustment programmes. To deal with the debt, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund imposed structural adjustment programmes, which forced nations to cut spending and open their economies. These were made the price of further loans. They dictated African policy from outside. The structural adjustment programmes were imposed upon the debtor nations.

Cuts in spending on the people. The programmes forced governments to cut their spending on health, education and welfare, so that the poor suffered most. Schools and clinics were starved of funds. The people paid the price of the debt. This hindered social development. The cuts in spending on the people were a harsh effect of the programmes.

The forced opening of economies. The programmes forced nations to open their economies to foreign trade and to sell off state industries. Local industries, unprotected, often collapsed before foreign competition. The state's control of the economy was lost. This harmed development. The forced opening of economies was an effect of the programmes.

Their harm to the poor. The structural adjustment programmes brought hardship to the poor, as prices rose, jobs were lost and services were cut. The burden fell heaviest on the weakest. Poverty deepened rather than lifted. This was a grave effect. The harm to the poor was a chief failing of the programmes.

Their disputed results. The results of the programmes were bitterly disputed, for they brought much hardship yet little lasting development. Many held that they did more harm than good. Africa remained poor and deep in debt. Their record was, at best, a mixed one. The disputed results of the programmes are an important judgement.

The burden of foreign debt and the structural adjustment programmes therefore hindered African development, as nations borrowed heavily, the debt grew crushing, and wealth flowed out to pay it, while the programmes of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund forced cuts in spending, the opening of economies, and hardship for the poor, with bitterly disputed results. Africa borrowed to develop, and found itself instead in chains of debt, its wealth flowing outward while its people went without.

Question 21

In the markets of the world, Africa sells cheap and buys dear, so that the very trade that should enrich it leaves it poorer year by year.

Examine the effect of unfair international trade and dependency on African development.

Model Answer

Unfair international trade and the dependence of Africa on the world economy have gravely hindered its development. The terms of trade are tilted against the poor continent, keeping it weak. The effect of unfair international trade and dependency on African development may be examined as follows.

Africa sells cheap raw materials. Africa sells chiefly cheap raw materials, such as coffee, cotton, copper and oil, whose prices are low and unstable. It earns too little from what it sells. Its wealth leaves it raw and cheap. This keeps it poor. The selling of cheap raw materials is a chief part of unfair trade.

Africa buys dear manufactures. Africa buys back dear manufactured goods, made from its own raw materials, at high prices. It pays much for what it must import. The difference steadily drains its wealth. This unfair exchange keeps it poor. The buying of dear manufactures is a part of unfair trade.

The unfair terms of trade. The terms of trade are tilted against Africa, for the prices of its exports fall while the prices of its imports rise. It must sell ever more merely to buy the same. The gap widens against it year by year. This hinders development. The unfair terms of trade are a chief effect.

The instability of commodity prices. The prices of Africa's raw materials rise and fall sharply on the world market, beyond its control. A fall in the price of its one export can ruin a whole nation. It cannot plan or depend upon its earnings. This hinders development. The instability of prices is an effect of dependency.

Dependence on the world economy. Africa's economies are dependent on the world economy, which is ruled by the rich nations for their own benefit. Africa is a weak player in a game made by others. Its fortunes

are not truly its own. This dependence hinders development. Dependence on the world economy is a chief effect.

The power of foreign companies. Foreign companies and multinationals control much of Africa's trade, mines and industry, taking their profits abroad. The wealth of Africa enriches others. Africa gains little from its own resources. This hinders development. The power of foreign companies is an effect of dependency.

It hinders industrialisation. Unfair trade hinders Africa's industrialisation, for it is kept a seller of raw materials and a buyer of manufactures. It cannot easily build industries against foreign competition. It stays undeveloped and dependent. This is a grave effect. The hindering of industrialisation is an effect of unfair trade.

The call for a fairer order. The unfairness of world trade has led Africa and the Third World to call for a new and fairer international economic order. They seek better prices and fairer terms of trade. This call shows the depth of the grievance. It has met with little success. The call for a fairer order is a response to unfair trade.

The effect of unfair international trade and dependency on African development has therefore been that Africa sells cheap raw materials and buys dear manufactures, on unfair and unstable terms, dependent on a world economy ruled by others and on foreign companies that take their profits abroad, so that its industrialisation is hindered and it has called in vain for a fairer order. In the markets of the world, Africa sells cheap and buys dear, so that the very trade that should enrich it leaves it poorer year by year.

Question 22

A people sick, hungry and multiplying faster than its means can grow will struggle to develop, however hard it labours.

Examine the effect of disease, poverty and rapid population growth on African development.

Model Answer

Disease, poverty and rapid population growth have been among the heaviest hindrances to African development, weakening the people and straining the economy. They form a vicious circle from which it is hard to escape. The effect of disease, poverty and rapid population growth may be examined as follows.

Disease weakens the people. Disease, such as malaria, HIV and AIDS, and many others, weakens and kills great numbers of Africans, robbing the nation of its workers. The sick cannot work or learn. The people are drained of their strength. This gravely hinders development. The weakening of the people by disease is a chief effect.

HIV and AIDS strikes the young and able. The scourge of HIV and AIDS has struck hardest at the young and able, the very people on whom development depends. It has killed millions in the prime of their lives. It has left orphans and grief behind it. This gravely hindered development. The heavy toll of HIV and AIDS is a grave effect.

Disease drains the nation's resources. The fight against disease drains the scarce resources of poor nations, which must spend on medicine what they might have spent on growth. Health swallows much of the budget. Less is left over for development. This hinders progress. The draining of resources by disease is an effect.

Poverty breeds poverty. Poverty breeds further poverty, for the poor cannot save, invest or educate their children, and so remain poor. The nation lacks the wealth to develop itself. It is caught in a trap of want. This hinders development. The vicious circle of poverty is a chief effect.

Rapid population growth. Africa's population grows rapidly, often faster than its economy, so that the gains of development are swallowed by the rising numbers. More mouths must be fed from the same land. Growth cannot keep pace with the numbers. This hinders development. Rapid population growth is a chief hindrance.

It strains land and resources. The growing population strains the land, the food, the water and the resources of the nation. There is less for each as the numbers rise. Resources are stretched ever thinner. This hinders development. The straining of land and resources is an effect of population growth.

It strains services. Rapid population growth strains schools, hospitals and jobs, which cannot be built fast enough for the rising numbers. Each gain is outrun by the growing need. Services fall behind the demand. This hinders development. The straining of services is an effect of population growth.

They form a vicious circle. Disease, poverty and population growth form a vicious circle, each feeding the others and holding the nation down. The poor are sick, the sick stay poor, and the numbers rise. It is very hard to break the circle. This deeply hinders development. The vicious circle is the gravest effect of the three together.

The effect of disease, poverty and rapid population growth on African development has therefore been that disease, above all HIV and AIDS, weakens the people and drains resources, that poverty breeds poverty, and that rapid population growth strains the land, resources and services, all forming a vicious circle that holds the nation down. A people sick, hungry and multiplying faster than its means can grow will struggle to develop, however hard it labours.

Question 23

Development needs money, machines and skilled hands, and Africa, at its independence and long after, has been short of all three.

Examine the effect of the lack of capital, technology and skilled manpower on African development.

Model Answer

The lack of capital, technology and skilled manpower has been a heavy hindrance to African development, for a nation cannot develop without the means to do so. These shortages sprang largely from the colonial legacy. The effect of the lack of capital, technology and skilled manpower may be examined as follows.

The lack of capital. Africa lacks the capital, the money and savings, that development needs to build industries, roads and services. Its people are too poor to save and invest much. It cannot fund its own development from within. This hinders progress. The lack of capital is a chief hindrance to development.

Dependence on foreign capital. Lacking capital of its own, Africa depends on foreign investment and loans, which bring debt and dependence. It must borrow from abroad to build. Its development is therefore not its own. This deepens its weakness. The dependence on foreign capital is an effect of the lack of it.

The lack of technology. Africa lacks modern technology and the ability to make it, and so depends on others for machines and knowledge. It cannot produce what it needs for itself. It stays behind in productive power. This hinders development. The lack of technology is a chief hindrance.

Dependence on foreign technology. Lacking technology of its own, Africa must import machines and skills from abroad, at high cost and on others' terms. It cannot easily adapt or renew them. It stays dependent on the makers. This hinders development. The dependence on foreign technology is an effect of the lack of it.

The shortage of skilled manpower. Africa is short of skilled and educated people, such as doctors, engineers, scientists and managers, for colonial rule provided little higher education. It lacks the trained hands to develop. Skills of every kind are scarce. This hinders progress. The shortage of skilled manpower is a chief hindrance.

The brain drain. Many of Africa's few skilled people leave for better pay and life in the rich nations, in what is called the brain drain. The continent thus loses its best minds. It trains people for others to use. This deepens the shortage. The brain drain is a grave effect of the lack of skills.

It hinders industrialisation. The lack of capital, technology and skill together hinders Africa's industrialisation, for industry needs all three at once. Africa cannot build the factories it requires. It stays a mere producer of raw materials. This hinders development. The hindering of industrialisation is an effect of these shortages.

It deepens dependence. The lack of the means of development deepens Africa's dependence on the outside world for money, machines and skills. It cannot stand upon its own feet. It leans on others for all that it lacks. This hinders true development. The deepening of dependence is an effect of these shortages.

The effect of the lack of capital, technology and skilled manpower on African development has therefore been that Africa lacks the money, machines and trained hands that development needs, so that it depends on foreign capital and technology, suffers a brain drain of its best minds, cannot easily industrialise, and is deepened in its dependence on the outside world. Development needs money, machines and skilled hands, and Africa has long been short of all three.

Neo-colonialism and dependency

Question 24

The flag of empire was lowered, but a subtler rule remained, for the former masters kept by wealth what they had lost by arms.

Explain the concept of neo-colonialism.

Model Answer

Neo-colonialism is the continued control of the former colonies by the rich nations, through economic rather than political means, after formal independence. It is a new form of an old domination. The concept of neo-colonialism may be explained as follows.

The meaning of neo-colonialism. Neo-colonialism is the continued domination of the former colonies by the rich and powerful nations, through economic, financial and other means, after they have won political independence. It is colonialism in a new and hidden form. The master rules by wealth rather than by the flag. This is the essential meaning of neo-colonialism.

It is control without formal rule. Neo-colonialism controls the former colonies without ruling them openly, so that they are free in name but not in fact. The old master keeps his power by other and quieter means. Independence becomes more form than substance. This hidden control is the essence of neo-colonialism.

It works through economic dependence. Neo-colonialism works through the economic dependence of the poor nations on the rich, for trade, aid, investment and technology. Their economies are bound tightly to the powerful. They cannot stand on their own. This dependence is the chief tool of neo-colonialism.

It works through trade and companies. Neo-colonialism works through unfair trade and the great foreign companies that control the mines, plantations and industries of the poor nations. Their wealth flows abroad as profit. The former master takes the riches still. Trade and companies are tools of neo-colonialism.

It works through aid and debt. Neo-colonialism works through aid and loans, which come with conditions and breed debt and dependence. The giver gains power over the receiver. The poor nation is bound fast by its debts. Aid and debt are tools of neo-colonialism.

Nkrumah named and warned of it. Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana named and warned of neo-colonialism, calling it the last stage of imperialism. He saw that political freedom without economic freedom was hollow. He urged Africa to beware of it. Nkrumah gave the idea its clearest and most famous voice.

It keeps Africa poor and dependent. Neo-colonialism keeps Africa poor and dependent, drawing off its wealth and denying it true independence. The former colonies gain the form of freedom but not its substance. They remain in chains of a new and subtler kind. This is the effect of neo-colonialism. Its keeping of Africa dependent is the heart of the matter.

Neo-colonialism is therefore the continued domination of the former colonies by the rich nations through economic means, control without formal rule, working through economic dependence, unfair trade and foreign companies, and aid and debt, as Nkrumah named and warned, and keeping Africa poor and dependent. The flag of empire was lowered, but a subtler rule remained, for the former masters kept by wealth what they had lost by arms.

Question 25

Neo-colonialism is the chain that binds while seeming to free, drawing off Africa's wealth and denying it the power to shape its own future.

Examine how neo-colonialism hinders African development.

Model Answer

Neo-colonialism, the continued economic domination of Africa by the rich nations, has been a chief hindrance to African development. It drains the continent's wealth and denies it true independence. How neo-colonialism hinders African development may be examined as follows.

It drains Africa's wealth. Neo-colonialism drains the wealth of Africa, as profits, interest and unfair trade carry its riches abroad to the rich nations. The continent's wealth enriches others rather than itself. Little is left to develop Africa. This hinders development. The draining of Africa's wealth is a chief way neo-colonialism hinders it.

It keeps Africa dependent. Neo-colonialism keeps Africa dependent on the rich nations for trade, aid, capital and technology, so that it cannot stand alone. Its economy is bound tightly to the powerful. It is not the master of its own fate. This hinders development. The keeping of Africa dependent is a chief effect.

It ties Africa to raw materials. Neo-colonialism keeps Africa a producer of cheap raw materials for the industries of the rich, hindering its own industrialisation. It sells raw and buys finished goods. It stays undeveloped and poor. This hinders progress. The tying of Africa to raw materials is a way neo-colonialism hinders it.

It controls Africa through companies. The great foreign companies control much of Africa's mines, plantations and industries, taking their profits abroad. Africa gains little from its own resources. Its wealth serves distant shareholders. This hinders development. The control through foreign companies is a way neo-colonialism hinders it.

It uses aid to gain power. Neo-colonialism uses aid and loans, with their conditions, to gain power over African policy and to bind the continent in debt. The giver comes to dictate to the receiver. Africa loses its freedom of action. This hinders development. The use of aid to gain power is a way neo-colonialism hinders it.

It supports friendly rulers. Neo-colonialism supports rulers who serve the interests of the rich nations, even against their own peoples. It keeps in power those who protect foreign wealth. It works against true reform and change. This hinders development. The supporting of friendly rulers is a way neo-colonialism hinders it.

It hinders true independence. Neo-colonialism hinders the true independence of Africa, so that political freedom does not bring the power to shape its own future. Africa is free in name but bound in fact. It cannot fully control its own development. This hinders progress. The hindering of true independence is a chief effect.

It keeps Africa poor. By all these means, neo-colonialism keeps Africa poor and underdeveloped, drawing off its wealth and denying it the power to develop. The continent stays sunk in want. Its riches flow always to others. This is the sum of the harm. The keeping of Africa poor is the deepest effect of neo-colonialism.

Neo-colonialism therefore hinders African development by draining its wealth, keeping it dependent, tying it to raw materials, controlling it through foreign companies, using aid to gain power, supporting friendly rulers, and hindering its true independence, so that it keeps Africa poor and underdeveloped. Neo-colonialism is the chain that binds while seeming to free, drawing off Africa's wealth and denying it the power to shape its own future.

Question 26

To one school of thought, Africa is poor not in spite of the rich world but because of it, its underdevelopment the very price of the West's development.

Explain the dependency theory and its view of African underdevelopment.

Model Answer

The dependency theory holds that the underdevelopment of Africa and the Third World is caused by their dependence on the rich nations, which developed by exploiting them. It is a powerful explanation of African poverty. The dependency theory and its view of African underdevelopment may be explained as follows.

The meaning of the dependency theory. The dependency theory holds that the poverty of Africa and the Third World is not natural or their own fault, but is caused by their dependence on the rich nations. The poor are poor because the rich are rich. Their fates are bound tightly together. This is the core of the dependency theory.

The world is divided into centre and periphery. The theory divides the world into a rich centre, the developed nations, and a poor periphery, the underdeveloped ones. The centre grows rich by drawing wealth from the periphery. The two are locked in an unequal bond. This division is central to the theory.

The rich developed by exploiting the poor. The theory holds that the rich nations developed by exploiting the poor, taking their resources, labour and wealth through slavery, colonialism and trade. The West grew rich upon Africa's back. Its development caused Africa's underdevelopment. This is a key claim of the theory.

Walter Rodney and the underdevelopment of Africa. The historian Walter Rodney gave the theory its famous African voice in his book on how Europe underdeveloped Africa. He argued that Europe grew rich by robbing and exploiting Africa over centuries. Rodney's work spread the idea widely. His name is bound to the dependency theory.

Underdevelopment is actively created. The theory holds that underdevelopment is not a mere lack of development but is actively created by the exploitation of the poor by the rich. Africa was made poor, not merely left poor. Its poverty was, in a sense, manufactured. This active creation of underdevelopment is a key idea of the theory.

Dependence continues after independence. The theory holds that dependence continued after independence, through neo-colonialism, unfair trade and foreign control. Political freedom did not end the old exploitation. The bond of dependence remained unbroken. The continuing of dependence is central to the theory.

Its remedy: to break the dependence. The theory holds that Africa can develop only by breaking its dependence on the rich nations, through self-reliance and a fairer world order. It must escape the unequal bond that holds it. Only then can it truly develop. The call to break dependence is the remedy of the theory.

The dependency theory therefore holds that the underdevelopment of Africa is caused by its dependence on the rich nations, who developed by exploiting the poor, dividing the world into a rich centre and a poor periphery, as Walter Rodney argued of Africa, so that underdevelopment was actively created and continued after independence, and can be ended only by breaking the dependence. To this school of thought, Africa is poor not in spite of the rich world but because of it.

Efforts and measures for development

Question 27

Faced with poverty and dependence, Africa has not stood idle, but has tried by many means to lift itself towards the development it seeks.

Examine the measures taken to promote development in Africa.

Model Answer

Since independence, the nations of Africa have taken many measures, at home and together, to promote their development and to overcome the many hindrances they face. These measures have met with mixed success. The measures taken to promote development in Africa may be examined as follows.

Building industry and infrastructure. African nations have sought to build industries, roads, dams and power to modernise their economies. They have tried to make at home what they once had to import. Infrastructure has been laid across much of the land. This was a chief measure. The building of industry and infrastructure is a measure to promote development.

Developing agriculture. African nations have worked to develop their agriculture, to feed their peoples and to earn from cash crops. They have improved farming and brought in new methods. The land is the true base of the economy. This was a chief measure. The developing of agriculture is a measure to promote development.

Spreading education and skills. African nations have spread education and trained skilled people, to overcome the shortage left by colonial rule. Schools and universities have been built widely. The people have been taught new and needed skills. This was a vital measure. The spreading of education and skills is a measure to promote development.

Regional cooperation and integration. African nations have joined together in regional bodies, such as the East African Community and ECOWAS, to trade and to build larger markets. Together they are stronger than apart. Cooperation aids their development. This was a chief measure. Regional cooperation is a measure to promote development.

Seeking self-reliance. Some African nations, above all Tanzania, sought self-reliance, building development by their own efforts and resources. They wished to escape their dependence on others. They looked to their own strength. This was a bold measure. The seeking of self-reliance is a measure to promote development.

Attracting aid and investment. African nations have sought foreign aid and investment to fund the development they could not fund themselves. They have borrowed and invited capital to build. Aid filled the gap in their slender means. This was a common measure. The attracting of aid and investment is a measure to promote development.

Pan-Africanism and the African Union. African nations have worked for unity and cooperation through Pan-Africanism and the African Union, to strengthen the continent as a whole. Together they press for a fairer world and common development. Unity is strength. This was a chief measure. Pan-Africanism and the African Union are a measure to promote development.

NEPAD and new partnerships. African nations have adopted new plans such as NEPAD, the New Partnership for Africa's Development, to guide and to fund their development. These seek investment, good governance and cooperation together. They mark a new and hopeful effort. This was a modern measure. NEPAD and new partnerships are a measure to promote development.

Their mixed success. These measures have met with mixed success, for some have borne fruit while many have fallen short of their aims. Africa has developed, but slowly and unevenly. Much still remains to be done. Their record is a mixed one. The mixed success of the measures is an important judgement.

The measures taken to promote development in Africa have therefore included building industry and infrastructure, developing agriculture, spreading education and skills, regional cooperation, the seeking of self-reliance, attracting aid and investment, Pan-Africanism and the African Union, and new plans such as NEPAD, though with mixed success. Faced with poverty and dependence, Africa has not stood idle, but has tried by many means to lift itself towards the development it seeks.

Question 28

Divided into many small and weak nations, Africa has sought strength in union, joining its markets and its efforts for the sake of development.

Examine the role of regional cooperation and integration in African development.

Model Answer

Regional cooperation and integration, the joining together of African nations for common ends, has been an important means of promoting African development. By uniting, small and weak nations hope to grow

stronger. The role of regional cooperation and integration in African development may be examined as follows.

It joins small markets into larger ones. Regional cooperation joins the small national markets of Africa into larger regional ones, big enough to support industry and trade. A larger market draws investment and allows growth. Together the nations are stronger buyers and sellers. This aids development. The joining of markets is a chief benefit of cooperation.

It promotes trade among African nations. Regional bodies promote trade among their members, by lowering the barriers between them. African nations come to trade more with one another. Wealth is kept and shared within the region. This aids development. The promoting of trade is a role of regional cooperation.

The regional communities. Africa has formed many regional communities, such as the East African Community, ECOWAS in the west and SADC in the south. These bind the nations of each region together for common ends. They are the vehicles of cooperation. The regional communities are the chief means of integration.

It allows common projects. Regional cooperation allows nations to build together what none could build alone, such as roads, railways, power and dams. Shared projects serve the whole region at once. The costs and the benefits are shared. This aids development. The building of common projects is a role of cooperation.

It strengthens Africa's voice. By acting together, the nations of a region speak with a stronger voice in the world, in trade and in politics. United, they are much harder to ignore. They can press their common case far better. This aids development. The strengthening of Africa's voice is a role of cooperation.

It fosters peace and stability. Regional cooperation fosters peace and stability among neighbours, who come to depend on one another and to settle disputes together. Peace is the very ground of development. Neighbours grow friendlier through trade. This aids development. The fostering of peace and stability is a role of cooperation.

Its difficulties. Regional cooperation has met many difficulties, for the nations are poor, rival and jealous of their sovereignty. Some bodies, such as the first East African Community, broke apart in 1977. Union is hard to build and to keep. These difficulties limit cooperation. The difficulties are an important part of the story.

Its promise for the future. Despite its difficulties, regional cooperation holds great promise for Africa's future, for only by uniting can its small nations grow strong. The African Union works towards ever closer union. The hope of it endures. This promise is real and living. The promise for the future is the enduring value of cooperation.

The role of regional cooperation and integration in African development has therefore been to join small markets into larger ones, to promote trade among African nations, through communities such as the East African Community, ECOWAS and SADC, to allow common projects, to strengthen Africa's voice, and to foster peace, though it has met many difficulties. Divided into many small and weak nations, Africa has sought strength in union, and cooperation holds great promise for its future development.

Question 29

To lift a whole continent, Africa has built continental bodies of its own, seeking through unity and new partnerships the development that has so long eluded it.

Examine the role of the African Union and NEPAD in African development.

Model Answer

The African Union and its development plan, NEPAD, have taken up the task of promoting the development of the whole continent, through unity, good governance and new partnerships. They are Africa's chief continental efforts for development. The role of the African Union and NEPAD in African development may be examined as follows.

The African Union leads the continent. The African Union, the body of all African states, leads the continent's efforts for development, peace and unity. It succeeded the Organisation of African Unity in 2002. It speaks and acts for Africa as one. This leadership aids development. The leadership of the African Union is central to the effort.

It promotes unity and cooperation. The African Union promotes the unity and cooperation of African nations, that they may be stronger together than apart. It works towards ever closer union among them. Unity is a source of real strength. This aids development. The promoting of unity and cooperation is a role of the African Union.

It works for peace and stability. The African Union works for peace and stability, without which development cannot go on. It mediates and keeps the peace in troubled lands. Peace is the very ground of progress. This aids development. The working for peace and stability is a role of the African Union.

NEPAD, the plan for development. NEPAD, the New Partnership for Africa's Development, adopted in 2001, is Africa's plan to promote its own development. It sets out goals for growth, investment and good governance. It is a new and hopeful effort. This aids development. NEPAD is the development plan of the African Union.

It seeks investment and partnership. NEPAD seeks foreign investment and partnership with the rich nations, offering good governance in return for aid and capital. It looks for a fairer deal with the world. It ties development to real reform. This aids development. The seeking of investment and partnership is a role of NEPAD.

It stresses good governance. NEPAD stresses good governance, democracy and the rule of law as the foundations of development. It holds that Africa must reform itself in order to develop. It links progress to good government. This aids development. The stressing of good governance is a role of NEPAD.

It promotes African ownership. NEPAD stresses that Africa must own and lead its own development, rather than have it dictated from outside. It seeks African solutions to African problems. It puts Africa itself in charge. This aids development. The promoting of African ownership is a role of NEPAD.

Their achievements and limits. The African Union and NEPAD have done real good, in peace, unity and planning, yet Africa remains poor and their power is limited. They depend on the will and the wealth of their members. Much still remains undone. Their record is a mixed one. The achievements and limits temper their role.

The role of the African Union and NEPAD in African development has therefore been to lead the continent, to promote unity and cooperation, to work for peace, and, through NEPAD, to plan development, seek investment and partnership, stress good governance, and promote African ownership, though with real limits. To lift a whole continent, Africa has built continental bodies of its own, seeking through unity and new partnerships the development that has so long eluded it.

Question 30

From its birth, the dream of Pan-Africanism has held that a divided Africa is a weak Africa, and that only in unity can the continent find strength and development.

Examine the role of Pan-Africanism and African unity in development.

Model Answer

Pan-Africanism, the movement for the unity and solidarity of all Africans, has long been linked to the cause of African development. Its champions held that only a united Africa could be strong and prosperous. The role of Pan-Africanism and African unity in development may be examined as follows.

The meaning of Pan-Africanism. Pan-Africanism is the movement and idea that all Africans should unite in solidarity and cooperation for their common good. It holds that Africa is one and should act as one. It seeks the unity of the whole continent. This idea underlies the drive for African unity. This is the meaning of Pan-Africanism.

Unity as strength. Pan-Africanism holds that a united Africa would be strong, while a divided one is weak. Many small nations are easily dominated, but a united Africa could stand tall among the powers. Union is strength. This belief drives the whole cause. Unity as strength is a central idea of Pan-Africanism.

The vision of leaders such as Nkrumah. Leaders such as Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana championed Pan-Africanism, dreaming even of a united states of Africa. They held that only unity could bring true development and freedom. Their vision inspired the whole movement. The vision of such leaders shaped Pan-Africanism.

The founding of the Organisation of African Unity. Pan-Africanism led to the founding of the Organisation of African Unity in 1963, to unite the continent and to complete its liberation. It bound the African states together for the first time. It was a great step towards unity. The founding of the Organisation of African Unity was a fruit of Pan-Africanism.

It promotes cooperation for development. Pan-Africanism promotes the cooperation of African nations for their common development, in trade, projects and planning. Together they can do what none can do alone. Cooperation aids their development. This promoting of cooperation is a role of Pan-Africanism.

It strengthens Africa's voice. Pan-Africanism strengthens the voice of Africa in the world, so that the continent, speaking as one, can press for a fairer deal. United, Africa is far harder to ignore. Its voice carries much further. This aids development. The strengthening of Africa's voice is a role of Pan-Africanism.

It fosters African pride and identity. Pan-Africanism fosters pride in Africa and a common identity, which inspire the peoples to build their continent. It teaches Africans to value themselves and their own. Pride spurs effort and confidence. This aids development. The fostering of African pride and identity is a role of Pan-Africanism.

Its unfulfilled promise. Yet the promise of Pan-Africanism remains largely unfulfilled, for Africa is still divided and its unity is more of hope than of fact. The dream of true union has not yet come. Rivalry and sovereignty still divide the nations. This limits its role. The unfulfilled promise is part of the story of Pan-Africanism.

The role of Pan-Africanism and African unity in development has therefore been to hold up unity as strength, as leaders such as Nkrumah dreamed, to found the Organisation of African Unity, to promote cooperation for development, to strengthen Africa's voice, and to foster African pride and identity, though its promise of true union remains largely unfulfilled. From its birth, Pan-Africanism has held that a divided Africa is a weak Africa, and that only in unity can the continent find strength and development.

Question 31

A nation's greatest wealth is its people, and only by educating and skilling them can Africa build the development it seeks.

Examine the role of education and human resource development in African development.

Model Answer

Education and the development of human resources have been recognised as vital to African development, for a nation's people are its greatest asset. Africa began with few skilled people and has laboured to build them. The role of education and human resource development may be examined as follows.

People are the true wealth of a nation. The people themselves are the true wealth of a nation, for it is they who build, farm, teach and govern. Without skilled and educated people, no development is possible at all. Human resources are the foundation of all else. This truth underlies the stress on education. That people are the true wealth is the first point.

Africa began short of skills. Africa began its independent life short of skilled and educated people, for colonial rule had provided little higher education. There were far too few doctors, engineers and teachers. The nations lacked the trained hands they urgently needed. This shortage had to be overcome. Africa's beginning short of skills made education vital.

Education spreads knowledge and skills. Education spreads the knowledge and skills that development needs, training the doctors, engineers, teachers and workers of the future. It equips the people to build their own nations. It turns raw hands into skilled ones. This aids development. The spreading of knowledge and skills is a chief role of education.

It raises productivity. Educated and skilled people work better and produce more, raising the productivity of the whole economy. A trained worker is worth many untrained ones. Skill multiplies the fruits of labour. This aids development. The raising of productivity is a role of education.

It fosters good citizens and leaders. Education fosters good citizens and able leaders, who can build and govern their nations well. It teaches the values and the knowledge that nationhood needs. It shapes the very people who shape the nation. This aids development. The fostering of good citizens and leaders is a role of education.

It reduces dependence on foreign skills. By training its own skilled people, Africa reduces its dependence on foreign experts and knowledge. It can run and build its own economy. It comes to rely less on others. This aids development. The reducing of dependence on foreign skills is a role of education.

The problem of the brain drain. Yet Africa loses many of its educated people to the rich nations, in the brain drain, so that it trains skills for others to use. Its investment in education flows abroad. This weakens the gain of education. The brain drain is a serious problem for human resource development.

Its lasting importance. Education remains of lasting importance to African development, for only a skilled and educated people can build a developed nation. It is a slow but sure investment in the future. Its fruits ripen over generations. This makes it vital. The lasting importance of education is the heart of the matter.

The role of education and human resource development in African development has therefore been vital, for people are the true wealth of a nation, and education spreads knowledge and skills, raises productivity, fosters good citizens and leaders, and reduces dependence on foreign skills, though Africa loses much through the brain drain. A nation's greatest wealth is its people, and only by educating and skilling them can Africa build the development it seeks.

Question 32

Foreign aid and investment have been for Africa both a helping hand and a snare, giving with one hand what they sometimes take back with the other.

Examine the role of foreign aid and investment in African development.

Model Answer

Foreign aid and investment have played a great and much-debated part in African development, bringing both benefits and dangers. Africa has needed them yet feared the dependence they breed. The role of foreign aid and investment in African development may be examined as follows.

They provide needed capital. Foreign aid and investment provide the capital that Africa lacks, funding the roads, dams, industries and services it cannot fund itself. They fill the gap between Africa's needs and its slender means. They make possible what could not otherwise be built. This aids development. The providing of needed capital is a chief benefit.

They bring skills and technology. Foreign investment brings skills, technology and knowledge that Africa lacks, along with the money. It teaches new methods and builds new industries. It fills the shortage of expertise. This aids development. The bringing of skills and technology is a benefit of foreign aid and investment.

They fund development projects. Aid funds development projects, such as schools, hospitals, roads and dams, that improve the lives of the people. It builds what the poor nation could not build alone. It brings visible and lasting progress. This aids development. The funding of development projects is a benefit of foreign aid.

They can relieve poverty and disaster. Aid can relieve poverty, hunger and the effects of disaster, feeding the hungry and helping in famine and flood. It saves many lives in times of need. It cushions the poor against calamity. This is a real benefit. The relieving of poverty and disaster is a role of foreign aid.

Yet they breed dependence. Yet foreign aid and investment breed dependence, so that Africa comes to rely on them and cannot stand alone. The habit of aid weakens self-reliance. Dependence steadily deepens. This is a real danger. The breeding of dependence is a chief danger of foreign aid.

They bring debt. Loans, though often called aid, must be repaid with interest, and so bring the burden of debt that has crushed Africa. Borrowing to develop breeds heavy debt. The debt outlasts the benefit. This is a danger. The bringing of debt is a danger of foreign aid.

They come with conditions. Foreign aid often comes with conditions that serve the giver and limit the freedom of the receiver, as in the structural adjustment programmes. The giver dictates to the receiver. Africa loses control of its own policy. This is a danger. The conditions attached to aid are a danger.

They can serve neo-colonialism. Foreign aid and investment can serve neo-colonialism, binding Africa to the rich nations and drawing off its wealth. The helping hand may also be a chain. Aid can deepen dependence rather than end it. This is a danger. The serving of neo-colonialism is a danger of foreign aid and investment.

The role of foreign aid and investment in African development has therefore been double-edged, for they provide needed capital, skills and technology, fund development projects, and relieve poverty, yet they also breed dependence, bring debt, come with conditions, and can serve neo-colonialism. Foreign aid and investment have been for Africa both a helping hand and a snare, giving with one hand what they sometimes take back with the other.

Tanzania and the prospects for African development

Question 33

Tanzania's road from independence has run through the bold experiment of Ujamaa to the open market, a journey that mirrors the wider story of Africa's search for development.

Examine the development experience of Tanzania since independence.

Model Answer

Tanzania's development experience since independence in 1961 has passed through the bold socialism of Ujamaa to the later opening of the economy, and it holds many lessons for Africa. Its story is one of noble aims, real gains and hard lessons. The development experience of Tanzania since independence may be examined as follows.

The poor beginning at independence. Tanzania won independence in 1961 as one of the poorest nations in the world, with little industry, few skilled people and a weak economy. Its people were poor and largely unlettered. It began the race far behind the rest. This poor beginning shaped its whole experience. The poor beginning at independence is the first point.

The choice of socialism and Ujamaa. Tanzania chose the path of socialism and self-reliance, set out in the Arusha Declaration of 1967 and the policy of Ujamaa. It sought to develop by equality, cooperation and its own efforts. It took a bold and original road of its own. This choice defined its experience. The choice of socialism and Ujamaa was a chief part of it.

Gains in unity, education and health. Under Ujamaa, Tanzania made great gains in national unity, education and health, avoiding the tribalism and conflict of others. Literacy rose high and services spread to the villages. The people gained much in welfare. These were real successes. The gains in unity, education and health were a chief part of the experience.

The failure of the economy. Yet the economy of Tanzania declined under Ujamaa, with low production, food shortages and growing debt. The state industries proved inefficient and made losses. The nation grew

poorer rather than richer. This was a grave failure. The failure of the economy was a chief part of the experience.

The forced villagisation. The gathering of the people into Ujamaa villages was often forced, and disrupted farming and bred resentment. The peasants were moved against their will. Food production fell as a result. This was a costly error. The forced villagisation was a hard lesson of the experience.

The fall into dependence on aid. Despite the aim of self-reliance, Tanzania fell into deep dependence on foreign aid to survive its economic troubles. Self-reliance was not achieved in practice. It leaned heavily upon donors. This was a keen disappointment. The fall into dependence on aid was part of the experience.

The turn to the market. From the 1980s, Tanzania turned away from Ujamaa towards the open market, liberalising its economy under the pressure of its troubles and its creditors. It sold state industries and welcomed private enterprise. The great experiment was set aside. The turn to the market was a chief change in the experience.

Later growth and continued poverty. After the turn to the market, Tanzania saw renewed economic growth, though poverty remained widespread. The economy revived in part and in places. Yet many people stayed poor. The gains were real but incomplete. Later growth and continued poverty mark the recent experience.

Its lessons for Africa. Tanzania's experience holds lessons for Africa, that noble aims are not enough without a sound economy, and that unity and welfare may be won even where wealth is not. Its story both warns and instructs. It mirrors Africa's wider search. Its lessons for Africa are a chief value of the experience.

The development experience of Tanzania since independence has therefore run from a poor beginning through the bold socialism of Ujamaa, with its real gains in unity, education and health but its grave failure in the economy, the forced villagisation and the fall into dependence, to the later turn to the market and renewed but incomplete growth, holding many lessons for Africa. Tanzania's road has run from Ujamaa to the open market, a journey that mirrors the wider story of Africa's search for development.

Question 34

Half a century on, the balance of Africa's development is neither triumph nor disaster, but a mingling of real gains with stubborn troubles yet unconquered.

Assess the achievements and challenges of development in post-colonial Africa.

Model Answer

The development of post-colonial Africa has brought both real achievements and enduring challenges, so that its record must be weighed on both sides. It is a story neither of pure success nor of pure failure. The achievements and challenges of development in post-colonial Africa may be assessed as follows.

The winning of independence and nationhood. Africa won and kept its independence and built nations from the colonial inheritance. It governs itself and has taken its place among the nations of the world. This was the very foundation of all else. It was a great achievement. The winning of independence and nationhood is a chief achievement.

The spread of education and health. Africa greatly spread education and health, raising literacy, building schools and hospitals, and lengthening lives. The people are far better taught and cared for than at independence. These were real and lasting gains. The spread of education and health is a chief achievement.

Some economic growth and modernisation. Africa achieved some economic growth and modernisation, building industry, towns and infrastructure. The continent is more developed than it was at independence. Parts of it have genuinely prospered. This was a real gain. Some economic growth and modernisation is an achievement.

A voice and unity in the world. Africa won a voice in world affairs and built bodies of unity such as the African Union. It now speaks for itself and acts together. It is no longer ruled and ignored by others. This was a real achievement. A voice and unity in the world is an achievement of post-colonial Africa.

Yet widespread poverty remains. Despite these gains, widespread poverty remains, and Africa is still among the poorest of continents. Many people still lack the means of a decent life. Development has not yet reached all. This is a grave challenge. The persistence of widespread poverty is a chief challenge.

Political instability and conflict. Africa has suffered much instability, dictatorship, corruption and civil war, which have wrecked development. Good governance has often failed to take root. Conflict has destroyed much of what was built. This is a grave challenge. Political instability and conflict remain a chief challenge.

Continued dependence and debt. Africa remains economically dependent on the outside world and burdened by debt. It still exports raw materials and imports manufactures. True economic independence has not yet come. This is a grave challenge. Continued dependence and debt are a chief challenge.

Disease, population and new threats. Africa faces disease such as HIV and AIDS, rapid population growth, and new threats such as terrorism and climate change. These strain its development anew. Old troubles are joined by new ones. This is a real challenge. Disease, population growth and new threats are a challenge.

The mixed and unfinished balance. The balance of Africa's development is therefore mixed and unfinished, of real gains in freedom, welfare and unity, but of stubborn challenges in poverty, stability and dependence. Much has been achieved, yet much remains to do. The task is far from complete. The mixed and unfinished balance is the true judgement.

The development of post-colonial Africa has therefore achieved much, in the winning of independence and nationhood, the spread of education and health, some economic growth, and a voice and unity in the world, yet it faces enduring challenges, in widespread poverty, political instability and conflict, continued dependence and debt, and disease, population growth and new threats. Half a century on, the balance is neither triumph nor disaster, but a mingling of real gains with stubborn troubles yet unconquered.

Question 35

The story of Africa's development is not yet written to its end, and the continent, for all its troubles, holds within it the means of a brighter future.

Assess the prospects for the development of Africa.

Model Answer

Though Africa has struggled to develop, its prospects for the future are not without hope, for it holds great resources and has learned hard lessons. Its future will depend on the choices it makes. The prospects for the development of Africa may be assessed as follows.

Its great natural resources. Africa holds vast natural resources, in minerals, oil, land and water, which could be the foundation of great development. Its wealth is enormous if it is well used. These resources are a firm ground for hope. This is a reason for optimism. Its great natural resources are a bright prospect for development.

Its youthful and growing population. Africa has a young and growing population, which, if educated and employed, could drive its development forward. Its people are its greatest resource of all. A skilled youth could build the continent. This is a reason for hope. Its youthful population is a prospect for development, if well used.

The lessons learned. Africa has learned hard lessons from its failures, of the need for good governance, peace and sound economics. It knows now what does not work. This hard-won knowledge can guide it better. This is a reason for hope. The lessons learned are a prospect for better development.

The spread of better governance. In some parts of Africa, better governance, democracy and the rule of law have spread, which are the foundations of development. Where they take root, progress tends to follow. This is a hopeful sign for the future. This is a reason for optimism. The spread of better governance is a prospect for development.

Growing unity and cooperation. Africa's unity and cooperation are growing, through the African Union and the regional communities. Together the nations can be stronger and press for a fairer world. Unity greatly aids development. This is a reason for hope. Growing unity and cooperation are a prospect for development.

Yet the old challenges remain. Yet the old challenges remain, of poverty, dependence, conflict and disease, which must still be overcome. The obstacles are great and stubborn. Hope must be tempered with realism. This qualifies the prospects. That the old challenges remain is a caution for the future.

The need for good leadership. Above all, Africa's future depends on good, honest and able leadership, which alone can make the most of its resources and its chances. Bad leaders can waste the brightest prospects. Everything turns upon this one thing. This is the key. The need for good leadership is central to Africa's prospects.

The need for self-reliance and fair trade. Africa's development will need both greater self-reliance and a fairer place in the world economy. It must build by its own efforts and yet win fairer terms of trade. Both are needed together. This shapes the prospects. The need for self-reliance and fair trade is central to Africa's future.

A future in Africa's own hands. In the end, the future of Africa's development lies chiefly in Africa's own hands, in the choices of its peoples and leaders. It is neither doomed nor assured, but open. Much will depend on what Africa itself does. This is the deepest truth. That the future lies in Africa's own hands is the heart of its prospects.

The prospects for the development of Africa are therefore mixed but not without hope, for the continent holds great natural resources, a youthful population, hard lessons learned, some spread of better governance, and growing unity, though the old challenges of poverty, dependence, conflict and disease remain, and all depends on good leadership, self-reliance and fair trade. The story of Africa's development is not yet written to its end, and the continent, for all its troubles, holds within it the means of a brighter future, if it will grasp them.

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

"The peace of the world between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries was broken less by accident than by design." Assess the validity of this statement.

Question 2

"It was the merchant, and not the soldier, who built the capitalism of the modern age." Discuss.

Question 3

"Capitalism was the child of the Commercial Revolution." How far do you agree?

Question 4

"It was commerce, even more than conquest, that first set the powers of Europe at one another's throats." How far do you agree, with reference to the period before 1800?

Question 5

"Africa was enslaved less by the sword than by the ledger of the New World planter." Comment on this statement.

Question 6

"The Atlantic slave trade was a war waged upon Africa." To what extent is this true?

Question 7

"What began as a quarrel over heaven ended as a struggle for the mastery of Europe." How far is this true of the Thirty Years' War of 1618 to 1648?

Question 8

"The lasting importance of the Thirty Years' War lay in the settlement that closed it, not in the ruin it wrought." How far do you agree?

Question 9

"The French Revolution was long in the making and sudden only in the striking." How far do you agree?

Question 10

"The Revolution of 1789 gave Europe both her liberties and her wars." How valid is this statement?

Question 11

"Napoleon was at once the heir of the Revolution and the scourge of Europe." Discuss.

Question 12

"The settlement of 1815 restored the old order in form but destroyed it in substance." How far do you agree?

Question 13

"The Congress of Vienna gave Europe peace by denying her liberty." How far do you agree?

Question 14

"The year 1848 was the springtime of the peoples and the winter of the kings." How far is this a fair verdict on the revolutions of 1830 and 1848?

Question 15

"The new nations of Europe were forged not by speeches and majorities but by blood and iron." How far is this true of the unification of Germany and Italy?

Question 16

"The Franco-Prussian War completed one nation and embittered a whole age." Comment on this statement.

Question 17

"Imperialism carried the quarrels of Europe to the ends of the earth." To what extent is this true?

Question 18

"The slow death of the Ottoman Empire troubled Europe more than its life had ever done." How valid is this statement?

Question 19

"The balance of power preserved the peace of Europe only by keeping her always on the edge of war." Discuss.

Question 20

"The seeds of twentieth-century conflict were sown in the rivalries of the nineteenth." How far do you agree?

Question 21

"The scramble for Africa was the work of the counting-house as much as of the chancellery." How far do you agree?

Question 22

"The partition drew lines across Africa that still bleed today." Comment on this statement.

Question 23

"The alliances that were meant to keep the peace of Europe became the machinery of its destruction." To what extent is this true?

Question 24

"The First World War was an accident that the great powers had spent a generation preparing." How far do you agree?

Question 25

"The men of 1914 marched out to a short and glorious war and found a long and terrible one." How valid is this statement?

Question 26

"The First World War settled nothing and unsettled everything." Discuss.

Question 27

"The alliance system was the main cause of the First World War." How valid is this claim?

Question 28

"The peace of Versailles was a diktat dressed as a settlement." Comment on this statement.

Question 29

"The Treaty of Versailles carried within it the seeds of another war." To what extent is this true?

Question 30

"The League of Nations was a noble house built without foundations." How valid is this statement?

Question 31

"The League of Nations failed because the great powers would not stand behind it." How far do you agree?

Question 32

"Where democracy faltered, the strong man promised bread and order." How far does this explain the rise of dictatorship between the two World Wars?

Question 33

"The dictators tore up the peace treaty by treaty while the world looked on." Discuss.

Question 34

"The Second World War was made in Versailles." How far do you agree?

Question 35

"Appeasement fed the crocodile in the hope of being eaten last." How far does this account for the coming of the Second World War?

Question 36

"The Second World War ended one age and began another." Comment on this statement.

Question 37

"The United Nations was built upon the grave of the League it hoped to surpass." To what extent is this true?

Question 38

"The United Nations was the League of Nations that had learned from its own death." How far do you agree?

Question 39

"The African who fought for freedom abroad returned to demand it at home." How far does this explain the growth of nationalism in Africa after the World Wars?

Question 40

"The two World Wars ended Europe's mastery of the world." How valid is this statement?

Question 41

"The Cold War was a war fought by every means but the open clash of arms." Discuss.

Question 42

"The war that ruined Europe made giants of America and Russia." Comment on this statement.

Question 43

"The wartime alliance died with the enemy that had held it together." How far does this explain the origins of the Cold War?

Question 44

"The Cold War was caused above all by ideological differences." How far do you agree?

Question 45

"The Cold War revealed itself in doctrines and airlifts, in missiles and moon-shots." To what extent is this true?

Question 46

"America set out to build a wall of dollars and alliances around the communist world." How valid is this statement?

Question 47

"Two armed camps faced each other across a divided Europe for a generation." Discuss.

Question 48

"Berlin was the wound in the side of the Cold War that would not heal." Comment on this statement.

Question 49

"The peace of the age rested upon the certainty of mutual destruction." To what extent is this true?

Question 50

"The rivalry of the superpowers reached at last beyond the earth itself." How valid is this statement?

Question 51

"The Cold War stayed cold in Europe only because it burned so hot in the Third World." How far do you agree?

Question 52

"Korea was the war that carried the Cold War from Europe into Asia." Discuss.

Question 53

"For thirteen days in 1962 the world stood upon the edge of the abyss." Comment on this statement.

Question 54

"The greatest power on earth was worn down by a small and stubborn nation." How far is this a fair verdict on the Vietnam War?

Question 55

"The Cold War brought Africa little but weapons and war." How far do you agree?

Question 56

"The new nations wished to serve neither Washington nor Moscow." To what extent is this true?

Question 57

"The Non-Aligned Movement gave the weak a voice but not a sword." How far do you agree?

Question 58

"The terror of Cuba taught the powers the wisdom of restraint." How valid is this statement?

Question 59

"The Cold War was lost by the Soviet Union rather than won by the West." How far do you agree?

Question 60

"The Cold War was won by no one and paid for by everyone." Discuss.

Question 61

"The new threats to peace wear no uniform and respect no border." Comment on this statement.

Question 62

"The wars of states have given way to the threats of shadows." To what extent is this true?

Question 63

"The new threats to world peace are the dark side of globalisation." How far do you agree?

Question 64

"The new threats to world peace are more dangerous than the traditional ones." How far do you agree?

Question 65

"Terrorism is the theatre of fear, played for an audience of millions." How valid is this statement?

Question 66

"The terrorist is made, not born." How far do you agree?

Question 67

"The bomb in the market place strikes not only the dead but the living who fear to follow." Discuss.

Question 68

"Terrorism can be contained but not defeated." How far do you agree?

Question 69

"Organised crime is a dark business that keeps no borders and pays no taxes." Comment on this statement.

Question 70

"The drug trade turns the misery of the poor into the wealth of the wicked." To what extent is this true?

Question 71

"Human trafficking is the slavery that the modern world pretends to have abolished." How valid is this statement?

Question 72

"The cheap gun in many hands has done more killing than the great bomb in few." Discuss.

Question 73

"An ancient crime has returned to trouble the sea lanes of the modern world." Comment on this statement.

Question 74

"The thief now steals without breaking a lock, from the other side of the world." To what extent is this true?

Question 75

"The dread of the age is the ultimate weapon in the hands of those who cannot be deterred." How valid is this statement?

Question 76

"A changing climate is the quiet multiplier of every other danger." Discuss.

Question 77

"A disease born in one land may in days trouble the whole earth." Comment on this statement.

Question 78

"The quiet threats of want and flight underlie the louder ones of war and terror." To what extent is this true?

Question 79

"The weakness of Africa has made it the softest target of the new threats." How far do you agree?

Question 80

"The new threats have taught the world that no nation is safe alone." How far do you agree?

Question 81

"A civil war is a nation that has turned its weapons upon itself." How valid is this statement?

Question 82

"Where men fight as peoples rather than as parties, the war is hardest to end." Discuss.

Question 83

"Genocide is the point at which ethnic hatred ceases to seek victory and seeks only extermination." Comment on this statement.

Question 84

"Africa's wars spring from a meeting of old grievance and present greed." How far do you agree?

Question 85

"Africa's wars were drawn on the maps of the colonisers." How far do you agree?

Question 86

"Where the ballot is denied, the bullet is taken up." To what extent is this true?

Question 87

"Ethnic hatred is the main cause of civil wars in Africa." How far do you agree?

Question 88

"No continent has been so troubled by war within its own borders as Africa." How valid is this statement?

Question 89

"The Rwandan genocide was the harvest of hatreds that others had sown and armed." How far do you agree?

Question 90

"The tragedy of the Congo was that its great wealth became its curse." Discuss.

Question 91

"Somalia showed the world what it means for a state wholly to cease to be." Comment on this statement.

Question 92

"Sudan's long war ended not in peace but in the parting of its peoples." To what extent is this true?

Question 93

"Biafra was starved into a unity it had sought to leave." How valid is this statement?

Question 94

"Ethnic cleansing returned to Europe within living memory of the last time." Discuss.

Question 95

"In civil war it is the child, the woman and the villager who pay the heaviest price." Comment on this statement.

Question 96

"Behind every long war stands someone who profits from its continuance." To what extent is this true?

Question 97

"In Africa's wars the foreigner has more often fanned the flames than quenched them." How far do you agree?

Question 98

"It is easier to end a war than to build the peace that must follow." How valid is this statement?

Question 99

"Tanzania has been a patient friend to a troubled continent." Discuss.

Question 100

"The lesson of Africa's wars is that difference need not mean division." How far do you agree?

Question 101

"A nation may grow richer while its people remain poor." Comment on this statement.

Question 102

"The new states inherited the flag of freedom and the chains of a colonial economy." To what extent is this true?

Question 103

"Underdevelopment is not the absence of progress but the presence of exploitation." How valid is this statement?

Question 104

"The capitalist road brought Africa growth, and bound it the tighter to the West." Discuss.

Question 105

"The socialist road sought justice and self-reliance, and found decline." Comment on this statement.

Question 106

"Arusha proclaimed that a nation could not be built upon the wealth of others." To what extent is this true?

Question 107

"Ujamaa was a triumph of the heart and a failure of the head." How far do you agree?

Question 108

"In Africa, capitalism brought growth without justice, and socialism justice without growth." How far do you agree?

Question 109

"Africa has been judged too often by its failures and too seldom by its achievements." How valid is this statement?

Question 110

"Africa's underdevelopment was made abroad but perfected at home." How far do you agree?

Question 111

"Africa's poverty is the legacy of its colonial past." How far do you agree?

Question 112

"The peoples hoped for freedom, and too often found their own rulers as harsh as the colonisers." Discuss.

Question 113

"Where there is no peace, there can be no development." Comment on this statement.

Question 114

"Africa borrowed to develop and was crushed by the debt it could not repay." To what extent is this true?

Question 115

"The flag came down, but the grip of the former ruler remained." How valid is this statement?

Question 116

"The wealth of the West and the poverty of the rest are two sides of one coin." Discuss.

Question 117

"In unity the states of Africa sought the strength that single nations lacked." Comment on this statement.

Question 118

"Education builds the people, and foreign capital may build or bind them." To what extent is this true?

Question 119

"Tanzania tried both the socialist road and the market, and learned hard lessons from each." How valid is this statement?

Question 120

"The future of Africa lies in its own hands." How far do you agree?

PART THREE

MODEL SOLUTIONS TO THE EXAMINATIONS

Question 1

A threat to world peace is any event, action or condition that endangers the security of nations and drives them towards war. The statement holds that the great disturbances of these three centuries flowed from deliberate ambition rather than from chance, and the weight of the evidence supports it. The threats of the age sprang above all from the calculated pursuit of trade, empire, dynastic power and national glory by rulers and merchants who chose profit and dominion over concord. Yet design worked upon deeper structural conditions, and a few crises owed something to miscalculation. The claim is therefore largely valid, with an important qualification.

The threats of the age were rooted in deliberate ambition rather than in accident. War in this period was seldom stumbled into; it was willed by men who reckoned that they had more to gain by fighting than by keeping the peace. Kings sought territory, merchants sought monopoly and nations sought glory, each pursuing a settled interest. The disturbance of the peace was the predictable fruit of these designs. Ambition, not misfortune, was the mainspring of conflict.

Commercial ambition set the powers deliberately against one another. Under the doctrine of mercantilism trade was treated as a fixed quantity in which one nation's gain was another's loss, so that merchants pressed their governments to fight for markets and monopolies. The Anglo-Dutch wars of the seventeenth century were fought coldly for shipping and commerce. Such wars were policy, not accident. The counting-house calculated the road to war.

Dynastic and religious ambition drove the great wars of state. The Thirty Years' War arose from the Habsburg design to restore Catholic imperial authority and from the resolve of princes to defend their power. Rulers spent the lives of their subjects to enlarge their dynasties and their faiths. These were wars of purpose pursued with open eyes. The crown and the altar willed the conflicts of the age.

The pursuit of empire was a conscious policy of the powers. The scramble for colonies in the nineteenth century was no accident but a deliberate race for markets, raw materials and prestige, formalised at the Berlin Conference of 1884 to 1885. Statesmen planned the partition of whole continents. Empire was designed in the chancelleries of Europe. The map of the world was carved by intention.

Napoleon's bid for the mastery of Europe was the supreme example of design. The wars that bear his name flowed from one man's calculated ambition to dominate the continent, an ambition that forced coalition after coalition against him. He chose war as the instrument of his greatness. No accident explains twelve years of continental conflict. Here design was written plain.

Nationalism was harnessed to policy by calculating statesmen. Bismarck did not wait upon events but engineered the wars that made Germany, declaring that the great questions would be settled by blood and iron. Cavour likewise manoeuvred Piedmont into war to build Italy. The unifications were achieved by deliberate provocation. Statecraft, not chance, forged the new nations.

The cold partition of weaker states revealed calculated ambition. The powers coldly agreed to carve up their weaker neighbours, as in the successive partitions of Poland that erased a whole kingdom from the map. Such acts were the fruit of deliberate design, not of accident. Territory was seized by arrangement. Ambition planned the very destruction of states.

Yet structural forces and miscalculation also broke the peace. The balance of power, the slow decline of the Ottoman Empire and the arms race created dangers that no single ruler wholly designed, and crises such as the Crimean War owed much to drift and misjudgement. The system itself, not merely men's intentions, bred conflict. Design worked within conditions it did not fully control. This qualifies, without overturning, the statement.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The great threats to world peace in these centuries were, in the main, the deliberate work of rulers, merchants and nations pursuing wealth, empire and glory, from the trade wars of the seventeenth century to the engineered unifications of the nineteenth. Chance and structural

pressure played their part, but they were the setting rather than the cause. The peace of the world was broken above all because powerful men chose ambition over concord.

Examiner's Note

"Assess the validity" requires the claim tested on both sides: deliberate design against accident and structure.

The trap is to narrate a series of wars without ever addressing the question of intention.

The top band commits to design as the primary force while conceding the role of structural pressures.

Question 2

Merchant capitalism was the system in which wealthy traders accumulated capital through commerce, and it rose in Europe from the sixteenth century. The statement gives the credit for it to the merchant rather than the soldier, to commerce rather than conquest, and there is much truth in the claim. For it was above all the growth of trade that raised the merchant to power and laid the foundations of the capitalist age, though the plunder of conquest lent its aid. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The Commercial Revolution provided the seedbed. From the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries European trade expanded enormously in volume, range and profit, an expansion known as the Commercial Revolution. Commerce became the surest road to great wealth, and those who commanded it grew rich and powerful. This surge of trade was the soil in which capitalism took root. Without it the merchant could not have risen.

The voyages of discovery opened the trade of the world. The voyages of Columbus in 1492 and Vasco da Gama in 1498 unlocked new sea routes to the Americas and the East. Through them the trade of whole continents was drawn into European hands. New lands meant new markets and new wealth. Discovery widened the very world in which the merchant worked.

The plunder of the New World swelled European capital. The conquest of the Americas poured a flood of gold and silver into Europe, above all from the mines of Mexico and Peru into Spain. This bullion enlarged the capital available to the merchant class and quickened trade across the continent. Plundered treasure financed further commerce. The riches of the New World fed the rising capitalism.

The profits of the slave trade enriched the merchants. The trans-Atlantic slave trade brought enormous gains through the sale of captives and the produce of the plantations. This wealth was ploughed back into commerce and, in time, into industry. Human misery was turned into merchant capital. The traffic in slaves helped to build the fortunes of the capitalist class.

The growth of towns and markets gave the merchant a base. Trading centres, fairs and ports multiplied across Europe, and great commercial cities such as Amsterdam and London flourished on trade. The town became the home and stronghold of the merchant class. Urban commerce nourished the new system. From the city the capitalist extended his reach.

Mercantilist states protected and promoted their traders. The rising nation-states advanced commerce through the policy of mercantilism, granting charters and monopolies and founding great joint-stock companies such as the English East India Company of 1600 and the Dutch of 1602. State and merchant worked hand in hand for wealth. Royal power stood behind commercial gain. Mercantilism was the nursery of capitalism.

The price revolution swelled the profits of commerce. The flood of American silver set off a long rise in prices across Europe that favoured merchants and enterprising producers while it impoverished those who lived on fixed rents. Rising prices fattened commercial profit. The inflation shifted wealth toward capital. The price revolution itself fed the merchant's rise.

Banking, credit and the decline of feudalism completed the change. The growth of banking and credit supplied the money and organisation that large-scale trade required, while the slow decay of feudalism freed land and labour for commerce and wage-work. Serfs became free workers and lords gave way to men of trade. The old order yielded to the new. These changes cleared the last obstacles to the merchant's rise.

The statement is therefore largely valid. It was indeed the merchant, and not the soldier, who chiefly built the capitalism of the modern age, for the Commercial Revolution, the voyages of discovery, the growth of towns and the support of mercantilist states raised commerce and the merchant to power. Yet the soldier played his part, for the plunder of the conquered New World and the profits of the slave trade supplied much of the capital. Commerce was the true maker of capitalism, though conquest lent it the sinews.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that commerce, not conquest, built capitalism, not merely to describe trade.

The trap is to describe how trade was carried on without explaining what caused capitalism to rise.

Strong answers stress the partnership of merchant and state and the feeding-in of colonial plunder.

Question 3

The Commercial Revolution was the great expansion of European trade that followed the voyages of discovery from the late fifteenth century. The statement makes it the very parent of capitalism, and there is much truth in the claim, for the Revolution accumulated the capital, widened the markets and transformed the commerce upon which the new system rose. Yet capitalism in its full, industrial form came later, so that the Revolution was the parent of its infancy rather than of its maturity. The claim may therefore be weighed as follows.

It accumulated the capital that capitalism required. The vast profits of the expanded trade gathered into the hands of the merchant class as capital that could be invested in further commerce and, in time, in industry. Wealth was piled up on a new scale. Capital was the lifeblood of the coming system. The Commercial Revolution built up the store on which capitalism would draw.

It widened markets across the whole world. Trade was no longer local but reached into the Americas, Africa and Asia, opening markets for European goods across the globe. Wide markets invited production on a large scale. The world became the market of the European merchant. This global reach was essential to the growth of capitalism.

It stimulated banking and finance. The growth of trade called forth new instruments of banking, credit and insurance, and great banking houses and money markets arose to serve the merchants. Finance grew alongside commerce. The machinery of modern money was born. Capitalism gained the financial sinews it needed.

It gave rise to new forms of business. The scale of the new trade produced the joint-stock company, such as the English East India Company of 1600, in which merchants pooled their capital and shared their risks. New forms of enterprise were created. Commerce gave birth to the modern company. The organisation of capitalism took shape.

It shifted wealth and power to the merchant class. The Commercial Revolution enriched the merchants and traders, the rising bourgeoisie, at the expense of the old landed nobility. Wealth and influence began to pass to the men of commerce. A new class rose towards mastery of society. The social basis of capitalism was laid.

It fostered the spirit of enterprise and profit. The pursuit of gain through trade bred habits of calculation, investment and risk that are the very temper of capitalism. Profit became the measure and the motive of activity. A new economic spirit spread through Europe. The mind of capitalism was formed in the counting-house.

Yet it was a beginning rather than the whole. The Commercial Revolution created merchant capitalism, but the full capitalist order awaited the Industrial Revolution that came later. It prepared the ground without completing the work. Commercial capital was not yet industrial capital. This qualifies its significance without diminishing it.

The statement may therefore be largely accepted. The Commercial Revolution was indeed the parent of capitalism, for it accumulated the capital, widened the markets, created the banking and the business forms,

and raised the class and the spirit on which the new system depended. Yet the full, industrial capitalism came only later, so that the Revolution gave capitalism its birth rather than its maturity. Capitalism was the child of the Commercial Revolution, though it grew to its full stature only in the age of industry.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the claim weighed, not merely a list of the Revolution's effects.

The trap is to describe the Commercial Revolution without testing whether it truly fathered capitalism.

The top band affirms the Revolution as the parent of capitalism while noting that industrial capitalism came later.

Question 4

Commercial rivalry was the competition of the European powers for trade, markets and monopolies, and in the mercantile age it was among the deepest sources of conflict between them. The statement claims that trade, rather than territorial conquest, was the prime early cause of great-power war, and for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries this is largely true. Under mercantilism the pursuit of wealth was itself a cause of war, and the great struggles of the age were fought as much for commerce as for land. Yet conquest and commerce were so entwined that neither can be wholly separated from the other. The claim is therefore valid in the main, with qualification.

Mercantilism made trade a cause of war. The doctrine held that the wealth of the world was fixed, so that one nation could grow rich only at another's expense. This turned commerce into a zero-sum struggle in which trade rivalry led directly to armed rivalry. Nations fought to engross the trade their neighbours coveted. Commerce itself became a battlefield.

The Anglo-Dutch Wars were fought for trade and shipping. The wars between England and the Dutch Republic in the mid-seventeenth century arose from rivalry over commerce, carrying-trade and the Navigation Acts. They were quarrels of merchants pursued by fleets. Little territory was at stake; the prize was trade. Here commerce plainly set the powers at war.

Colonial trade was a constant source of conflict. The powers competed fiercely for the trade of the East and West Indies, the Spice Islands and the Atlantic. Control of these lucrative routes and markets bred rivalry and war among them. The wealth of distant commerce provoked conflict at home. Trade abroad meant war in Europe.

The slave trade itself was fought over. So valuable was the traffic in slaves that nations warred for the right to supply the plantations, a right embodied in the Asiento wrung from Spain. Commercial companies clashed along the African coast for the trade in captives. Even this cruel commerce was a cause of war. Profit in slaves was defended by force.

Chartered companies became instruments of armed rivalry. The great trading companies, the English and Dutch East India Companies and their French rival, maintained fleets and forts and fought one another across the oceans. Commerce and warfare were united in a single enterprise. The merchant company was also a military power. Trade was pursued with cannon.

The Anglo-French duel fused commerce with empire. The long rivalry of Britain and France, culminating in the Seven Years' War of 1756 to 1763, was fought for trade and colonies together in India and North America. Commercial supremacy and imperial dominion were the same prize. Here the two motives were inseparable. Trade and empire drove one struggle.

The hunger for bullion sharpened commercial rivalry. Because mercantilist doctrine prized gold and silver as the very measure of national wealth, the powers competed to engross the world's supply of bullion. The chase for treasure set them at odds. Precious metal was counted as power. The scramble for bullion embittered their trade rivalry.

Yet conquest and dynastic ambition persisted alongside commerce. The wars of Louis XIV were fought for territory, glory and dynasty as much as for trade, and dynastic quarrels continued to trouble Europe.

Commerce was not the sole cause of conflict. Conquest kept its old place among the causes of war. This qualifies the statement without overturning it.

The statement may therefore be accepted in large measure. In the mercantile age wealth was the great prize and trade the great provocation, and the characteristic wars of the period, from the Anglo-Dutch conflicts to the Anglo-French duel, were fought for commerce as much as for land. But commerce and conquest were twin faces of a single ambition, and the pursuit of trade led naturally to the pursuit of empire. Trade set the powers at one another's throats precisely because it was inseparable from dominion.

Examiner's Note

"How far" demands a measured verdict, not wholesale agreement or rejection.

The trap is to ignore the persistence of dynastic and territorial wars such as those of Louis XIV.

The top band shows commerce and conquest fused, above all in the Anglo-French struggle for India and America.

Question 5

The trans-Atlantic slave trade carried millions of Africans in bondage to the plantations of the Americas from the sixteenth century. The statement holds that this enslavement was driven less by force than by the economic demand of the New World planter, and there is much truth in it. It was the hunger of the plantation for labour, more than any love of conquest, that fastened slavery upon Africa. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The plantation economy demanded vast supplies of cheap labour. The sugar, tobacco and cotton estates of the Americas were worked on a great scale and could be made to pay only with abundant and cheap labour. This hunger for hands was insatiable and continuous. The plantation system therefore drove the search for a servile workforce. Its demand was the root condition of the trade.

The decimation of the American Indians created a labour vacuum. Conquest, forced labour and above all Old World diseases destroyed much of the native population of the Americas. The Europeans thus found themselves masters of vast lands but without the labour to work them. This vacuum had to be filled from outside. The loss of Indian labour opened the way to African.

European labour proved insufficient and costly. The supply of indentured servants from Europe was too small, too expensive and too temporary to meet the plantations' needs, and such servants served only for a term. They could not satisfy a permanent and growing demand. The planters looked elsewhere for a cheaper and more lasting labour force. European hands would not suffice.

Africans were valued as suited to plantation labour. African peoples were skilled cultivators accustomed to agricultural work, and many possessed some resistance to the diseases of the tropics. To the planters they seemed better fitted to the labour than either European or Indian. This supposed suitability recommended them to the trade. Prejudice and calculation combined to fix upon African labour.

Enslaved Africans were far from home and hard to escape. Carried across an ocean to a strange land, the African captive could not easily flee or return, unlike a native labourer on his own soil. This made the African, in the planter's cold reckoning, a more secure possession. Distance itself was a chain. The ocean bound the slave to the estate.

The nearness of West Africa and the triangular trade made supply easy. West Africa lay conveniently upon the Atlantic routes, and the triangular trade linked Europe, Africa and the Americas in a single profitable circuit. Ships carried goods to Africa, slaves to the Americas and produce back to Europe. This geography made the traffic efficient. Convenience of route sustained the trade.

The sanction of law and custom silenced scruple. Slavery was accepted in the law of the age and too often blessed by religious authority, so that few Europeans questioned the enslavement of Africans. Custom and doctrine gave the traffic its licence. Conscience was stilled by convention. The age raised no barrier to the trade.

African fragmentation and the guns-for-slaves exchange enabled supply. Political division in Africa and existing systems of servitude allowed European merchants to obtain captives through African middlemen, who exchanged them for firearms and goods. The trade in guns for slaves gave the traffic its terrible momentum. African rulers were drawn into supplying it. The merchant's profit was served by African hands.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Africa was indeed enslaved less by the sword than by the ledger of the planter, for it was the boundless labour demand of the plantations, meeting the collapse of the American Indian population, that drove the merchants to seek African hands. The sword had its part, in the raiding and the guns-for-slaves trade, but the deeper cause was the cold calculation of profit. It was the planter's ledger, more than the soldier's sword, that doomed millions to bondage.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that economic demand, not force, drove the enslavement of Africans.

The trap is to narrate the suffering of the enslaved instead of explaining why Africans were chosen.

The top band ranks plantation demand and the collapse of the Indian population as the prime conditions.

Question 6

For more than three centuries the trans-Atlantic slave trade drew millions of captives from Africa to the Americas. The statement likens that traffic to a war upon the continent, and as a judgement upon its effects on African peace and security the metaphor is largely apt. The trade bred raiding and insecurity, drained population, corrupted politics and retarded development across wide regions. Its impact, however, was uneven, and it was waged with African as well as European hands. The claim may therefore be discussed and, in the main, upheld.

It bred wars of capture and raiding. The demand for captives turned neighbour against neighbour, as states and bands raided one another to seize men, women and children for sale. Warfare became a means of supplying the trade. Whole districts lived in fear of the slave-raider. In this sense the trade was indeed a kind of continual war.

The guns-for-slaves cycle militarised society. European firearms were exchanged for captives, so that the states which slaved most successfully armed themselves most heavily and preyed the more upon their neighbours. War became profitable and self-sustaining. The musket and the manacle went together. The trade thus fed upon and multiplied violence.

Depopulation drained the continent of its strength. The trade carried off millions in the most productive years of life, robbing African societies of their labour and their future. Villages were emptied and fields left untilled. The loss of people weakened whole regions. A continent was bled of its human strength.

Insecurity disrupted production and settlement. The constant danger of capture unsettled agriculture, trade and the ordinary life of communities. People dared not cultivate distant fields or travel freely to market. Fear paralysed the economic life of whole regions for generations. Villages were abandoned and lands left untilled. The peace on which all prosperity depends was destroyed by the trade.

It corrupted African politics and society. The profits of slaving raised up predatory states such as Dahomey, Oyo and Ashanti, while others were broken and dispersed. Rulers came to depend upon the trade for arms and wealth. Politics was bent towards raiding and selling. The trade poisoned the government of African peoples.

It retarded the development of the continent. By diverting energy from production to predation and by draining labour, the trade held back Africa's economic growth, as the underdevelopment thesis of Walter Rodney contends. The continent gave up its people and received guns and trinkets in return. Development was sacrificed to the traffic. Africa was left the poorer for centuries.

Yet its impact was uneven and complicit. Some coastal states grew rich and powerful on slaving, and the trade was carried on with the active participation of African rulers and middlemen. Not every region

suffered alike, and Africans shared in the guilt and the profit. The war, if such it was, was in part a civil one. This qualifies, without overturning, the verdict.

The metaphor of a war upon Africa is therefore largely just. For three centuries the slave trade spread raiding, insecurity, depopulation and political corruption across wide regions, retarding the continent's development and destroying the peace on which its prosperity depended. Its effects were uneven, and it was waged with African complicity as well as European greed. But taken as a whole the traffic turned Africa against itself and left it wounded, and the language of war fairly captures the scale of the harm.

Examiner's Note

"To what extent" invites a balanced verdict that tests the metaphor of a war upon Africa rather than merely illustrating it.

The trap is a one-sided narration of suffering that ignores African participation and regional variation.

The top band concedes African complicity yet still affirms the devastation of African peace and security.

Question 7

The Thirty Years' War, which began in Bohemia in 1618 and engulfed Europe until 1648, was the last great war of religion and the first of the modern wars of state. The statement holds that it began as a religious quarrel but ended as a struggle for the mastery of Europe, and this is largely just. What opened as a war of Catholic against Protestant closed as a contest of Bourbon against Habsburg for the domination of the continent. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Religious division since the Reformation prepared the ground. The Reformation had split the Empire between Catholic and Protestant, and the Peace of Augsburg of 1555 had settled the quarrel only imperfectly, leaving out the Calvinists altogether. Religious hatred simmered for two generations. The confessional divide was a standing invitation to war. The Reformation's unfinished quarrel awaited its renewal.

The weakness of the Holy Roman Empire invited conflict. The Empire was not a state but a loose patchwork of hundreds of principalities, and the authority of the Emperor over its princes was weak and contested. This fragmentation made ordered settlement impossible. The Empire could neither reform itself nor keep its peace. Its very structure bred conflict.

Habsburg ambition sought to restore Catholic imperial power. The Emperor Ferdinand II was resolved to roll back Protestantism and to strengthen Habsburg authority over the princes. This design alarmed the Protestant states and the princes jealous of their liberties. Habsburg ambition was the driving force of the crisis. It turned religious tension into political war.

The Bohemian revolt provided the spark. In 1618 the Protestant nobles of Bohemia, fearing for their faith and their rights, threw the imperial officials from a window of the castle of Prague, the famous Defenestration, and rose in revolt. This act of defiance opened the war. A local rising became a general conflagration. Bohemia lit the fire that consumed Europe.

Constitutional fears drove the princes to arms. The German princes, Protestant and Catholic alike, feared that a victorious Emperor would destroy their cherished liberties and reduce them to subjects. To defend their independence they took up arms against the imperial design. The quarrel was thus as much constitutional as religious. The princes fought for their power as well as their faith.

Foreign intervention widened the war. Denmark and then Sweden, under the warrior-king Gustavus Adolphus, entered the war to defend the Protestant cause and their own interests in the Baltic. Their armies turned a German war into a European one. Outside powers seized the chance to press their designs. Intervention spread the conflict far beyond its origin.

The mercenary armies made the war feed upon itself. The great hired hosts of commanders such as Wallenstein lived off the lands they ravaged and had every interest in prolonging the fighting. Armies that

fed on plunder were slow to disband. War sustained itself by pillage. The soldiery became a cause of its own continuance.

Bourbon–Habsburg rivalry turned religion into power-politics. France, though Catholic, entered the war against the Catholic Habsburgs, for Cardinal Richelieu feared Habsburg encirclement more than he loved his faith. Reason of state now openly overrode religion. The war became a struggle for the mastery of Europe. Dynastic rivalry gave it its final and largest shape.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The Thirty Years' War did begin as a quarrel over heaven, kindled by the religious hatreds of the Reformation and the Habsburg design to restore the Catholic faith. But it ended as a struggle for the earth, for the entry of Catholic France against the Catholic Habsburgs showed that reason of state had eclipsed religion, and the war became a contest for the mastery of Europe. It began in the name of God and ended in the name of power.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the war shifted from a religious quarrel to a struggle for power.

The trap is to treat the war as purely religious and miss the constitutional and dynastic causes.

The top band explains the paradox of Catholic France fighting the Habsburgs through reason of state.

Question 8

The Thirty Years' War ended in 1648 with the Peace of Westphalia, a settlement so far-reaching that it is often taken to mark the birth of the modern state system. The statement holds that the war's true importance lay less in its immense destruction than in the order that the peace established, and this judgement is largely sound. The direct effects of the war were terrible but local and, in time, repaired; the settlement founded a European order that endured for centuries. The effects and the peace may be examined together as follows.

The war devastated Germany. The fighting, famine and disease of thirty years destroyed the population and wealth of the German lands, with some regions losing perhaps a third of their people. Towns and fields lay ruined. This was the war's most terrible and immediate effect. Yet, grievous as it was, the devastation was in time repaired.

It broke the power of the Holy Roman Empire. The Empire emerged from the war a shadow, its central authority destroyed and its princes made masters in their own lands. The dream of a united Catholic Empire was finished. Germany would remain divided for two centuries. This political effect long outlasted the ruin of the war.

Westphalia established the sovereignty of states. The settlement recognised the full sovereignty of the German princes and of states generally, together with the principle that rulers should not interfere in one another's domains. This was the foundation of the modern international order. The sovereign state became the unit of European politics. Here lay the peace's deepest significance.

It settled the religious question of Europe. Westphalia extended toleration to Calvinists and confirmed the right of rulers to determine the religion of their lands, and thereafter religion ceased to be the great cause of European war. The confessional struggle of a century was closed. Faith gave way to reason of state as the mainspring of policy. The wars of religion were ended.

It shifted the balance of power in Europe. The war and its settlement raised France to the leadership of the continent and confirmed the decline of Spain and the Habsburgs. A new order of powers emerged. The balance of Europe was recast. This redistribution of power shaped the age that followed.

It recognised new independent states. The peace acknowledged the formal independence of the Dutch Republic and the Swiss Confederation and redrew the frontiers of the Empire. New states took their place among the powers. The map of Europe was altered. The settlement gave legal form to changes long in the making.

It gave the German princes the right of independent alliance. Westphalia allowed the princes to conduct their own diplomacy and to make alliances, so long as these were not directed against the Emperor, and so confirmed their near-sovereignty. The Empire became a shell over independent states. Princely power was secured in law. German division was written into the settlement.

It left Germany the battlefield of foreign powers. The weakness confirmed at Westphalia meant that the divided German lands remained for two centuries the arena in which France, Sweden and others pursued their quarrels. Germany could not defend itself. Its weakness tempted its neighbours. Division invited foreign interference.

It set the pattern of settlement by congress. Westphalia was reached through a great international congress, and it established the method of composing Europe's quarrels by collective negotiation and balance. This diplomatic model was followed at Vienna and beyond. The peace bequeathed a lasting way of making peace. Its example endured in European diplomacy.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The war's destruction was immense, but it fell chiefly upon Germany and was in time repaired, whereas the Peace of Westphalia founded an order that lasted for centuries. By establishing the sovereignty of states, closing the wars of religion, recasting the balance of power and setting the method of settlement by congress, the peace shaped modern Europe far more than the fighting did. Its importance lay, as the statement claims, in the settlement rather than in the slaughter.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the war's effects against the significance of the settlement, not to list one or the other.

The trap is to dwell on the devastation and neglect the constitutional legacy of sovereignty.

The top band argues that Westphalia's birth of the sovereign-state system is the war's enduring importance.

Question 9

The French Revolution of 1789 overturned the monarchy and the whole social order of France. The statement holds that its causes were deep and long in the making, and that only its outbreak was sudden, and this is largely just. Beneath the sudden events of 1789 lay an unjust society, a bankrupt state and the long criticism of the Enlightenment, needing only an occasion to bring them to a head. The claim may therefore be weighed as follows.

The unjust society of the three estates bred resentment. French society was divided into privileged First and Second Estates, the clergy and nobility, and a Third Estate of commoners who bore the burdens and enjoyed none of the privileges. The prosperous and educated bourgeoisie especially resented their exclusion from power. This inequality was the deepest grievance of the age. A society so ordered invited revolt.

The financial crisis brought the state to bankruptcy. Years of costly wars, including intervention in the American War of Independence, and an extravagant court had ruined the royal finances. By 1789 the state faced bankruptcy and could not meet its debts. The crown was forced to seek new taxes and so to summon its critics. Financial ruin opened the door to revolution.

The burden of taxation fell upon those least able to bear it. The privileged orders were largely exempt from taxation, so that its weight fell upon the peasantry and the commoners. This injustice was felt as intolerable. The tax system embodied the inequality of the whole order. Resentment of it fed the coming revolt.

Enlightenment ideas undermined the old order. The writings of Rousseau, Voltaire and Montesquieu attacked absolutism, privilege and the authority of the Church, and spread ideas of liberty, equality and popular sovereignty. Educated France came to question the legitimacy of the whole system. The Enlightenment supplied the language of revolution. Ideas prepared the way for action.

The weakness of Louis XVI deprived France of leadership. The king was well-meaning but irresolute, unable to master the crisis or to carry through reform against the resistance of the privileged. His indecision

squandered every chance of orderly change. A stronger hand might have saved the monarchy. Royal weakness let the crisis run to revolution.

Economic distress drove the people to desperation. The bad harvest of 1788 sent bread prices soaring, and hunger stalked the towns and countryside on the eve of the Revolution. The common people, pressed by want, were ready to rise. Economic misery gave the Revolution its popular force. Hunger turned grievance into action.

The ambition of the rising bourgeoisie sought an outlet. The wealthy and educated middle class had outgrown a society of orders that shut them from office and honour, and they demanded a place to match their wealth. Their frustrated ambition made them the natural leaders of revolt. A confident class sought power. The bourgeoisie became the engine of revolution.

The example of England and America fired the reformers. The constitutional monarchy of England and the successful revolution of the American colonies showed Frenchmen that absolutism was neither natural nor eternal. Foreign models kindled the hopes of reformers. Liberty seemed within reach. The wider world taught France to expect change.

The calling of the Estates-General provided the occasion. Driven by bankruptcy, the king summoned the Estates-General in 1789 for the first time in a century and three-quarters, and the assembly at once became the arena of revolution. The Third Estate claimed to speak for the nation and defied the crown. The occasion long sought had come. The meeting of the estates lit the fuse.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The causes of the French Revolution were indeed long in the making, for the unjust society of estates, the bankrupt monarchy, the criticism of the Enlightenment and the ambition of the bourgeoisie had been gathering for generations. It was sudden only in the striking, when the calling of the Estates-General and the distress of 1788 brought the old order down at last. The Revolution was the long-prepared harvest of deep causes, reaped in a single season.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the deep causes weighed against the suddenness of the outbreak.

The trap is to narrate the events of 1789 rather than testing the claim about long and short causes.

The top band shows the long-term causes as decisive and the meeting of the Estates-General as merely the occasion.

Question 10

The French Revolution was felt far beyond France, for its ideas and its armies alike swept across the continent. The statement captures its double character: the same upheaval that spread the ideals of liberty and nationhood also plunged Europe into a generation of war and summoned a conservative reaction against it. To assess its impact is to weigh these opposite consequences, which flowed from a single source. The judgement of the statement is, on the evidence, well founded. Its impact may be assessed as follows.

It spread the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity. The Revolution proclaimed the rights of man and the sovereignty of the people, and these principles echoed across Europe. They inspired reformers and frightened kings. The old assumptions of privilege and absolutism were thrown into question. A new political creed was loosed upon the continent.

It gave rise to modern liberalism. From the Revolution flowed the demand for constitutions, representative government and the rule of law. Liberals throughout Europe took up its principles against absolute monarchy. The movement for constitutional government drew its strength from 1789. Liberty found a lasting cause.

It kindled the force of nationalism. The Revolution taught that sovereignty belonged to the nation and summoned the citizen to arms in its defence, and this idea of the nation spread wherever French influence reached. Peoples began to think of themselves as nations with a right to self-rule. Nationalism became a force that would remake the map. The nation was born as a political principle.

It abolished feudalism where its influence reached. In France and in the lands the French armies entered, feudal privileges and burdens were swept away and the reformed law of the Code Napoléon was introduced. The old order was dismantled over much of Europe. These reforms outlived the wars that carried them. The Revolution's institutions took root abroad.

Yet it provoked a generation of war. The Revolution's challenge to the old order and its own expansive energy led to the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, two decades of conflict that engulfed the continent. Liberty was carried on the point of the bayonet. The same movement that freed also fought. War was the Revolution's constant companion.

It summoned a conservative reaction. Alarmed by revolution and war, the powers combined to restore the old order at the Congress of Vienna and to suppress liberal and national movements under Metternich's system. The Revolution thus called forth its own opposite. Reaction was the answer to revolution. The struggle between the two would define the age.

It challenged the Church and secularised the state. The Revolution attacked the wealth and power of the Church and proclaimed the authority of the secular nation, a challenge felt throughout Catholic Europe. Politics was loosed from religion. The old alliance of throne and altar was shaken. A secular idea of the state was spread abroad.

It gave modern politics its language and its symbols. From the Revolution came the vocabulary of left and right, of citizen and nation, together with the tricolour and the anthem of a new age. It furnished the very terms of modern political life. Its symbols outlived its armies. Europe learned to speak in the Revolution's language.

Its ideals reawakened in the revolutions that followed. The principles of 1789 did not die but revived in the risings of 1830 and 1848 and in the movements for national unity. The Revolution cast a long shadow over the century. Its ideas outlived their suppression. What Vienna buried, later generations exhumed.

The statement is therefore just. The French Revolution was the fountainhead of modern liberty, liberalism and nationalism, and it reshaped the political imagination of Europe. Yet the same energy plunged the continent into war for a generation and provoked a conservative reaction that sought to undo its work. Its legacy was double and inseparable, giving Europe at once her liberties and her wars, and the struggle between the two would run through the whole of the nineteenth century.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh liberties and wars together, not to treat only the ideals or only the conflicts.

The trap is to narrate the course of the Revolution instead of assessing its impact upon Europe.

The top band shows that liberty and war were inseparable consequences of a single upheaval.

Question 11

The Napoleonic Wars, waged from 1803 to 1815, carried the conflict born of the Revolution to every corner of Europe. The statement casts Napoleon as both the inheritor of the Revolution's energy and reforms and the tormentor of the continent through endless war, and this paradox illuminates both the causes and the character of the wars. They arose from the Revolution's momentum and Napoleon's ambition, and they were fought on a new, national scale that spread the Revolution even as it ravaged Europe. Their causes and character may be examined as follows.

They grew from the momentum of the Revolutionary Wars. Europe's monarchies had been at war with revolutionary France since 1792, and Napoleon inherited a conflict already in being. The wars of his name continued a struggle he did not begin. The Revolution had already set France against the old order. He took up a war already raging.

Napoleon's boundless ambition drove them on. His hunger for personal glory and for the mastery of Europe turned defence into conquest and made peace impossible while he lived and ruled. His ambition

was the engine of continual war. He could not rest content within France's borders. One man's design kept the continent in arms.

British commercial and naval rivalry made the struggle irreconcilable. Britain, secure behind her fleet and jealous of her trade, would not accept French domination of the continent, and the two powers fought a duel that neither could quickly win. This Anglo-French rivalry lay at the heart of the wars. Sea-power faced land-power in a long deadlock. Their enmity sustained the conflict.

The hostility of the old order forced coalition upon coalition. The monarchies of Europe, fearing revolutionary France and Napoleon's ambition, combined again and again to bring him down. Each defeat of a coalition was followed by the forming of another. The powers would not accept his mastery. Their resistance prolonged the wars to the end.

In character they were wars of unprecedented scale. The Revolution's levée en masse had created the nation-in-arms, and Napoleon commanded citizen armies of a size Europe had never seen. War became a contest of whole peoples, not of small professional forces. The scale of the fighting was new. These were the first modern mass wars.

They were continental and ideological in their reach. Through the Continental System Napoleon sought to close Europe to British trade, and his conquests carried the reforms and institutions of the Revolution across the continent. The wars were fought for an order as well as for territory. They spread a new model of state. Their aims were ideological as well as military.

They were prolonged by the genius and reforms of Napoleon himself. Napoleon's military genius and the reformed institutions of the French state gave his armies a reach and an endurance that extended the wars year upon year. His talents made the conflict the more formidable and the harder to end. The wars bore the stamp of one commander. His very ability lengthened their course.

They spread the nationalism that finally destroyed him. The French conquests awakened national feeling among the peoples they subdued, in Spain, in Germany and in Russia, and this nationalism turned against Napoleon himself. The Spanish rising and the disastrous Russian campaign of 1812 broke his power. He sowed the nationalism that reaped his fall. The scourge was undone by the forces he released.

The Napoleonic Wars therefore arose from the momentum of the Revolutionary Wars, Napoleon's ambition and the irreconcilable hostility of Britain and the old order, and they were fought on a new, national and ideological scale. Napoleon was indeed the heir of the Revolution, carrying its reforms and its citizen armies across Europe, and its scourge, drenching the continent in war for twelve years. The paradox of the statement captures the essence of wars that both spread and ravaged, and that were destroyed at last by the national forces they had roused.

Examiner's Note

The demand is for both causes and character; answers that give only one leave the question half-addressed.

The trap is a campaign-by-campaign narrative from Austerlitz to Waterloo.

The top band ties the “heir and scourge” paradox to the wars' revolutionary and national character.

Question 12

The defeat of Napoleon in 1815 closed a generation of war and led to the restoration of the old order at the Congress of Vienna. The statement holds that this restoration was one of form only, and that the wars had in substance destroyed the old Europe, and there is much truth in it. For the wars, even as they restored monarchy, released the nationalism and liberalism that would in time overthrow it. The claim may be assessed as follows.

They led to the Congress of Vienna and the restoration of the old order. The victorious powers met at Vienna in 1814 and 1815 to restore the legitimate monarchies and to rebuild the balance of power. The map of Europe was redrawn to contain France and to reward the victors. The old order returned in triumph. Restoration was the wars' most immediate effect.

They gave rise to the Concert of Europe. To preserve the settlement the powers established a system of consultation and cooperation, the Concert of Europe, meeting in congress to manage the continent's affairs. This new machinery helped to keep the general peace for decades. A method of collective management was born. The wars taught the powers to concert their policy.

They spread nationalism across the continent and beyond. The experience of French conquest and resistance had awakened national feeling in Germany, Italy, Poland and elsewhere, and the collapse of Spanish power opened the way to independence in Latin America. Nationalism became a force that would remake the map. The wars scattered its seeds widely. A new principle of politics was loosed.

They carried the reforms of the Revolution into European life. The Code Napoléon and the administrative and legal reforms of the Revolutionary era survived the fall of Napoleon in much of Europe. The old feudal order could not everywhere be restored. Modern institutions had taken root. The wars left a lasting reforming legacy.

They redrew the map of Europe. The settlement created the German Confederation, enlarged Prussia and gave it lands on the Rhine, and united the Netherlands, among many other changes. The territorial order of the continent was remade. These arrangements shaped the politics of the century. The map itself bore the mark of the wars.

They provoked a conservative reaction. Frightened by revolution and war, Metternich and the powers set themselves to suppress liberal and national movements wherever they arose. Reaction became the policy of the restored order. The wars called forth their own opposite. Repression sought to hold back the forces they had released.

They opened the way to the independence of Latin America. By toppling the Spanish monarchy and severing the colonies from Madrid, the wars gave the peoples of Spanish America their chance, seized by leaders such as Bolívar and San Martín. A whole hemisphere was set loose. The wars' effects crossed the Atlantic. Empire in the New World was shaken by war in the Old.

Their released forces fed the revolutions and unifications to come. The nationalism and liberalism awakened by the wars could not be permanently contained and broke out in the revolutions of 1830 and 1848 and in the unification of Germany and Italy. The Vienna order held only for a generation. The wars' deepest effects unfolded across the century. What was restored in 1815 was overthrown by degrees.

The statement may therefore be largely accepted. In form the Napoleonic Wars restored the old order, for the Congress of Vienna brought back the legitimate monarchies and the Concert of Europe kept the general peace for a generation. But in substance they had destroyed it, for they spread the nationalism and liberalism, and carried the reforms of the Revolution, that would in time overthrow the restored order. The wars restored the old Europe in name while dooming it in fact.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the restoration weighed against the forces the wars had released.

The trap is to list effects without judging whether the restoration was real or only formal.

The top band shows the wars restoring the old order in form while destroying it in substance.

Question 13

After the fall of Napoleon the powers gathered at Vienna in 1814 and 1815 to reconstruct the continent. The statement holds that the peace they gave rested upon the denial of liberty and nationhood, and this is largely just. The settlement secured a long peace by suppressing the very forces of nationalism and liberalism that the age demanded. The claim may therefore be weighed as follows.

It restored legitimate dynasties. Guided by the principle of legitimacy, the Congress restored the rightful monarchs whom the Revolution and Napoleon had displaced, above all the Bourbons in France. The old ruling houses returned to their thrones. Order was to rest upon lawful authority. Legitimacy was the settlement's guiding maxim.

It re-established the balance of power. The powers were determined that no single state should again dominate Europe as France had done, and they arranged the settlement so that the great powers should check one another. A rough equilibrium was restored. The balance was the settlement's central aim. Peace was to rest upon equipoise.

It contained France within strong frontiers. To guard against a renewal of French ambition the Congress strengthened the states around France, uniting the Netherlands and giving Prussia lands on the Rhine as a barrier. France was ringed with buffers. Aggression was to be hemmed in. Containment secured the settlement against its chief danger.

It rewarded the victors by compensation. The powers that had defeated Napoleon were compensated with territory, so that Prussia, Austria, Russia and Britain all made gains. The spoils were shared to satisfy the victors. Interests were balanced by exchange. Compensation held the alliance together.

It redrew the map and created the German Confederation. The Congress reorganised the German lands into a Confederation of thirty-nine states under Austrian presidency and redrew frontiers across the continent. A new territorial order was established. The settlement reshaped the map of Europe. Its arrangements framed the politics of the age.

It founded the Concert of Europe to preserve the peace. The powers agreed to meet in congress to manage the continent's affairs and bound themselves in the Quadruple and Holy Alliances to uphold the settlement. This machinery of cooperation was the Congress's most original creation. Collective management was to keep the peace. The Concert gave the settlement its guardian.

It condemned the slave trade in principle. At Vienna the powers issued a declaration against the trade in slaves, the first great international condemnation of the traffic, even if its enforcement long lagged behind the words. A moral principle was proclaimed among nations. The Congress spoke for humanity as well as for order. It set a precedent for international reform.

Its contribution to peace was real but limited. The settlement gave Europe a century without a general war and a generation of stability, a solid achievement. But by ignoring the aspirations of nationalism and liberalism it denied the deepest forces of the age and so prepared the revolutions to come. It secured peace at the price of suppression. Its success carried within it the seeds of future conflict.

The statement may therefore be largely accepted. The Congress of Vienna did give Europe a real peace, sparing her a general war for a century through the balance of power and the Concert of Europe. But it bought that peace by denying liberty, for it restored the old dynasties and set its face against the nationalism and liberalism of the age, so storing up the revolutions of 1830 and 1848. Vienna gave Europe order at the price of freedom.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the peace weighed against the liberty that was denied.

The trap is to describe the settlement without judging the price at which its peace was bought.

The top band affirms the long peace while showing it rested on the suppression of nationalism and liberalism.

Question 14

The order established at Vienna was twice shaken by waves of revolution, in 1830 and more violently in 1848. The statement calls 1848 the springtime of the peoples and the winter of the kings, and as a verdict on these risings it is largely just. For the revolutions were the rising of the peoples, in the name of liberty and nationhood, against the restored monarchies of the old order. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The revolution of 1830 in France overthrew a restored king. In July 1830 the people of Paris rose against Charles X, whose reactionary rule had defied the liberal spirit of the age, and replaced him with the more liberal Louis Philippe. The Bourbon restoration was undone in France. The revolution showed the fragility of the settled order. It reopened the age of revolution.

The rising of 1830 spread beyond France. The example of Paris kindled revolt across Europe: Belgium won its independence from the Netherlands, and risings broke out in Poland and in the Italian states. The disturbance threatened the frontiers drawn at Vienna. Revolution proved contagious. The settlement was breached in several places at once.

These risings sprang from the clash of Vienna's order with new forces. The conservative settlement had denied the demands of liberals for constitutions and of nations for self-rule, and this denial bred revolt. The suppressed forces of the age would not be still. The revolutions were the answer to reaction. Their cause lay in the settlement itself.

The revolutions of 1848 convulsed the whole continent. In 1848 a far greater wave, the Springtime of Nations, swept across France, the German and Italian states, the Austrian Empire and Hungary almost at once. Thrones tottered from Paris to Vienna. The order of Europe seemed on the point of collapse. This was the gravest threat the settlement ever faced.

In France 1848 destroyed the July Monarchy. The Parisian revolution of February 1848 swept away the throne of Louis Philippe. In its place the revolutionaries proclaimed the Second Republic. Once more, as in 1830, France had led the way into revolution. The example of Paris spread swiftly across the continent. The heart of Europe was again in open upheaval.

1848 shook the multinational empires. The revolutions convulsed the Habsburg lands, drove the aged Metternich himself from power and set the peoples of the empire in motion, while nationalism stirred in Germany and Italy. The very architects of reaction were overthrown. The suppressed nations rose together. The empires trembled to their foundations.

The revolutions of 1848 failed for want of unity. The revolutionaries were divided between moderate liberals and radicals, and between rival nationalities, so that the old order recovered its nerve and crushed them one by one. Disunity was the ruin of the risings. They fell apart from within. Their very breadth proved their weakness.

Their suppression did not undo their effect. Though the risings of 1848 were in the end crushed and the old order in large part restored, they had discredited the Vienna system beyond recovery and shown that nationalism and liberalism could not be permanently held down. The forces they released lived on. The settlement was mortally weakened. The revolutions failed yet triumphed.

The statement is therefore a largely fair verdict. The revolutions of 1830 and, above all, 1848 were indeed the springtime of the peoples, for liberals and nationalists rose across the continent against the settled order, and for a moment the thrones of Europe tottered, even driving Metternich from power. Yet the winter of the kings proved brief, for the old order recovered its nerve and crushed the risings, so that the spring did not last. The peoples had risen, but the kings, for a time, still reigned.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that 1848 was a rising of the peoples against the kings.

The trap is to describe 1830 and 1848 country by country without linking them to the stability of Europe.

The top band presents 1848 as the hinge on which the Vienna settlement finally broke.

Question 15

In the middle decades of the nineteenth century two new great states, Italy and Germany, were forged out of divided lands. The statement holds that they were made not by speeches and majorities but by blood and iron, echoing Bismarck's own words, and this is largely true. For it was war and calculated diplomacy, rather than popular assemblies, that built the new nations. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Nationalism supplied the driving force. The Revolution and the experience of the Napoleonic Wars had awakened among Germans and Italians the desire for national unity, a desire sharpened by the risings of 1848. This national feeling was the deepest cause of unification. The peoples longed to be gathered into single states. Nationalism was the engine of the age.

Piedmont and Prussia provided the leadership. Unification was led not by popular movements alone but by two ambitious states, the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia in Italy and the Kingdom of Prussia in Germany. Each became the nucleus around which its nation was gathered. Strong states supplied the direction that sentiment lacked. Leadership turned longing into achievement.

Italy was united by Cavour's diplomacy and Garibaldi's arms. Cavour manoeuvred Piedmont into a war with Austria in 1859 with French help, while Garibaldi and his Thousand won the south, so that the Kingdom of Italy was proclaimed in 1861 and completed by the taking of Rome in 1870. Craft and daring together made Italy. Diplomacy and popular action combined. A divided peninsula became a nation.

Germany was united by Bismarck's policy of blood and iron. Bismarck declared that the great questions of the age would be settled not by speeches but by blood and iron, and he made good the boast through three wars, against Denmark in 1864, Austria in 1866 and France in 1870 to 1871. The German Empire was proclaimed at Versailles in 1871. War was the instrument of unity. Prussia forged Germany on the battlefield.

Unification was achieved by war and calculated diplomacy. In both cases the new states were made not chiefly by popular revolution but by the deliberate use of war and alliance by their leaders. Cavour and Bismarck engineered the conflicts that served their ends. Statecraft, not sentiment alone, built the nations. The unifications were works of policy.

Favourable diplomacy isolated their victims. Both Cavour and Bismarck secured the favour or the neutrality of other powers before they struck, from Napoleon III's help against Austria to Russia's benevolence toward Prussia. Their enemies were left without allies. The unifiers chose their moment with care. Diplomacy prepared the way for war.

The wars of unification were brief and decisive. Bismarck's campaigns in particular were swift and sharp, overthrowing Denmark, Austria and France each before the other powers could intervene. Speed was the secret of his success. The victories were quick and final. War was wielded as a precise instrument of policy.

The exclusion of Austria remade Central Europe. The Austro-Prussian War of 1866 drove Austria out of Germany and hastened her exclusion from Italy, ending a primacy she had held for centuries. A great power was thrust aside. The old order of Central Europe was overturned. Austria's decline was the price of the new nations.

A powerful new Germany overturned the balance of power. The German Empire of 1871 was the strongest military and industrial state on the continent, and its rise destroyed the equilibrium arranged at Vienna. The centre of European power shifted decisively. A giant now stood in the heart of Europe. The old balance was gone.

France was weakened and embittered, and a new alliance system followed. The defeat of France and the loss of Alsace-Lorraine in 1871 left her humiliated and thirsting for revenge, while a wary Europe divided into armed alliances to manage the new German power. Franco-German enmity became the fixed point of continental politics. The road toward 1914 was opened. The unifications reshaped the whole system of European relations.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The new nations of Europe were indeed forged by blood and iron, for it was the wars of Cavour and Bismarck, and their cold diplomacy, that made Italy and Germany, while the liberal assemblies of 1848 had failed. Popular nationalism supplied the desire for unity, but it was war that achieved it, from Solferino to Sedan. Blood and iron, not speeches and majorities, made the new nations, and in the making overturned the balance of Europe.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the new nations were made by war rather than by popular assembly.

The trap is a narrative of campaigns from Solferino to Sedan without analysis of causes or consequences.

The top band ties the birth of a strong Germany to the collapse of the Vienna balance and the road to 1914.

Question 16

The Franco-Prussian War, fought in 1870 and 1871, was the last of Bismarck's wars of unification. The statement holds that it both completed the making of Germany and left a bitterness that poisoned the age that followed, and both halves are just. Its victory crowned German unity, while its terms bred a Franco-German enmity that pointed toward a greater war. The claim may be discussed as follows.

Prussia sought a war to complete German unification. Bismarck judged that only a patriotic war against a foreign enemy would draw the southern German states into union with the north. He therefore desired a conflict with France. Unity was to be forged in war. The completion of Germany required a common enemy.

France feared and resented the rise of Prussia. After the Prussian victory over Austria in 1866, Napoleon III saw with alarm the growth of a great power on his frontier and sought to check it. French pride would not accept a Prussian-led Germany. Rivalry hardened into hostility. France was ready to be provoked.

The dispute over the Spanish succession provided the occasion. The candidacy of a prince of the Prussian house for the vacant throne of Spain alarmed France, which feared encirclement by Hohenzollern power. The affair brought the two nations to the point of quarrel. A dynastic question became a national crisis. The occasion for war had come.

The Ems telegram inflamed both nations. Bismarck edited the dispatch reporting the King of Prussia's meeting with the French ambassador so as to wound French pride and stiffen German feeling. The doctored telegram enraged opinion in both countries. France was goaded into declaring war. Bismarck had his conflict.

The war destroyed the Second Empire of France. The French armies were overwhelmed, and at Sedan in 1870 Napoleon III himself was captured, whereupon the Second Empire collapsed and Paris was besieged. France was humbled and thrown into revolution. The imperial regime fell in ruin. The defeat was total.

It completed the unification of Germany. In the flush of victory over France the southern German states joined the north. The German Empire was proclaimed in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles in January 1871. A new and powerful nation had been born in the heart of Europe. Bismarck's long design was at last accomplished. Germany was made whole upon the battlefield.

It bred a lasting Franco-German enmity. The victorious Germans annexed Alsace and Lorraine, a loss that France never forgave and always sought to reverse. Revanchism became the fixed point of French policy. The two nations faced each other as settled enemies. The quarrel of 1871 pointed toward the war of 1914.

The statement is therefore just. The Franco-Prussian War completed one nation, for its victory drew the southern states into the German Empire proclaimed at Versailles in 1871. But it embittered a whole age, for the fall of the Second Empire and the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine left France humiliated and vengeful, fixing a Franco-German enmity that would run on toward the Great War. The war that made Germany also poisoned the peace of Europe.

Examiner's Note

"Comment" requires both halves of the claim weighed: the nation completed and the age embittered.

The trap is to narrate the campaign of Sedan instead of testing the claim.

The top band links the completion of German unity to the Franco-German enmity behind 1914.

Question 17

In the last decades of the nineteenth century the European powers competed fiercely for colonies across Africa and Asia, in the movement known as the new imperialism. The statement holds that this scramble spread the rivalries of Europe across the globe and so endangered world peace, and the evidence bears it

out. Driven by the needs of a maturing capitalism and by national prestige, the powers were repeatedly brought to the brink of war by their colonial quarrels, and the hostilities they bred fed directly into the crisis of 1914. The ways in which the scramble threatened peace may be examined as follows.

The turn to monopoly capitalism drove the search for colonies. As competitive capitalism gave way to monopoly and finance capitalism, the industrial powers sought colonies for markets, raw materials and the profitable investment of surplus capital, a process analysed by Lenin as the highest stage of capitalism. Economic pressure impelled expansion. The needs of capital reached across the world. Imperialism was rooted in the economy of the age.

National prestige turned colonies into a matter of honour. Colonies came to be seen as the measure of a great power's standing, so that no nation could allow itself to be outstripped in the race. Prestige as much as profit drove the scramble. To fall behind was to be humbled. Honour made the rivalry the more dangerous.

The scramble for Africa intensified great-power rivalry. The powers partitioned almost the whole of Africa within a generation, and the Berlin Conference of 1884 to 1885, though it laid down rules for the scramble, only quickened the competition. Rivalry was regulated but not calmed. The race for African territory set the powers against one another. A continent was carved amid mutual suspicion.

Colonial clashes brought the powers to the brink of war. Rival ambitions collided in distant places, as at Fashoda in 1898, where Britain and France came close to war over the upper Nile. Such confrontations showed how colonial quarrels could ignite a European conflict. The periphery threatened the peace of the centre. War was more than once narrowly avoided.

The Moroccan crises nearly caused a European war. Germany's challenges to French ambitions in Morocco in 1905 and again in 1911 provoked dangerous confrontations among the powers. Twice Europe stood close to war over a colonial question. The crises hardened the hostility between the alliance blocs. Morocco was a rehearsal for the greater conflict.

Imperial rivalry fed the alliance system and the arms race. The competition for empire sharpened the division of Europe into armed camps and spurred the naval race between Britain and Germany. Colonial suspicion deepened continental enmity. The scramble armed the powers against one another. Rivalry abroad hardened alliances at home.

New technology made the conquest of empires possible. The steamship and the telegraph, quinine against malaria and the repeating rifle gave Europe the means to penetrate and hold vast territories once beyond her reach. Technology turned ambition into conquest. The tools of empire multiplied its grasp. Invention itself served the scramble.

A jingoistic press inflamed the passion for empire. Popular newspapers and an imperial-minded public opinion pressed governments toward expansion and stiffened them in every colonial crisis. The masses were caught up in the fever of empire. Popular passion made retreat difficult. Opinion at home hardened the rivalry abroad.

It globalised European rivalry. Because the powers now confronted one another in Africa and Asia as well as in Europe, their quarrels became worldwide, and a dispute in any quarter could set the whole system trembling. The rivalries of Europe were spread to the ends of the earth. Local disputes acquired global weight. The world became the arena of European conflict.

The statement is therefore well founded. The scramble for colonies, driven by the needs of monopoly capitalism and by national prestige and armed by new technology, carried the rivalries of Europe across Africa and Asia and repeatedly brought the powers to the edge of war, from Fashoda to the Moroccan crises. In feeding the alliance system and the arms race and in globalising European enmity, imperialism was among the deepest threats to world peace in the age, and the hostilities it bred passed directly into the origins of the First World War.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to explain how the scramble endangered peace, not merely to describe the partition of Africa.

The trap is a descriptive account of colonies acquired, with no link to great-power conflict.

The top band traces the colonial crises to the alliance system, the arms race and the road to 1914.

Question 18

The Eastern Question was the problem posed to Europe by the slow decline of the Ottoman Empire and the rivalry of the powers over its lands. The statement holds that the empire's decline troubled Europe more than its power had ever done, and there is much truth in it. For as the Ottoman strength ebbed, the scramble of the powers over its dying body brought crisis after crisis. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The decline of the Ottoman Empire created a dangerous vacuum. The empire once called the terror of Europe had become the sick man of the continent, its authority crumbling and its lands inviting partition. Its weakness tempted the powers to intervene. A great vacuum opened in the south-east of Europe. Decay itself was a source of danger.

Russian ambition sought to expand southward. Russia coveted Constantinople and the Straits and posed as the protector of the Balkan Slavs and of Orthodox Christianity. Her drive toward the Mediterranean alarmed the other powers. Russian expansion was the sharpest edge of the Question. The Tsar's ambition threatened the balance.

Britain and France resolved to check Russia. Fearing that Russian expansion would threaten their interests and the routes to the East, Britain and France set themselves to prop up the Ottoman Empire against her. The Question thus became a great-power rivalry. The powers took opposing sides. Their contest endangered the peace.

The Crimean War sprang from the Question. The rivalry over the Ottoman lands erupted into the Crimean War of 1853 to 1856, in which Britain and France fought Russia. A general European war grew directly from the Eastern Question. The danger became reality. The Question had shown its power to bring on war.

Balkan nationalism destabilised the region. The subject peoples of the empire, Greeks, Serbs and Bulgarians, rose in turn for their independence, and their struggles drew in the interested powers. Nationalism inflamed the Question. The Balkans seethed with revolt. Every rising threatened a wider war.

Crisis followed crisis without lasting settlement. The powers managed the Question at gatherings such as the Congress of Berlin of 1878, but they never resolved it, and each settlement gave way to a new crisis. The danger was contained but not removed. The Question festered on. Peace in the region was always provisional.

Austria and Russia collided over the Balkan lands. As Ottoman power receded, both Austria-Hungary and Russia sought to fill the vacuum in the Balkans, and their rivalry there grew ever more dangerous. Two great powers pressed upon the same region. Their ambitions could not be reconciled. The Balkans became the meeting-place of their quarrel.

It made the Balkans the powder keg of Europe. Unresolved through the century, the Eastern Question left south-eastern Europe a tangle of rival ambitions and nationalisms where the great powers dangerously met. It became the likeliest spark for a general war. In 1914 that spark was struck. The Question passed its peril to the new century.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The slow death of the Ottoman Empire did indeed trouble Europe more than its life had done, for while its power had once merely threatened the frontiers of Christendom, its decline drew the great powers into a dangerous scramble for its lands. The ambition of Russia, the resistance of Britain and France, and the rise of Balkan nationalism made the dying empire a standing danger, from the Crimean War to the powder keg of 1914. The sick man troubled Europe more in his dying than ever in his strength.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that Ottoman decline was a graver threat to peace than Ottoman power.
The trap is to describe the decline of the empire without linking it to great-power rivalry and war.
The top band traces the Question from the Crimean War to the Balkan powder keg of 1914.

Question 19

The balance of power was the principle that no single state should be allowed to dominate Europe, and after 1815 it became the guiding rule of the continent's diplomacy. The statement holds that this balance kept the peace only through a constant readiness for war, and there is much truth in the paradox. The methods by which the balance was maintained, shifting alliances, congresses and armaments, preserved a general peace, but they did so through perpetual tension and recurring crisis. The claim may be discussed as follows.

The balance was designed to prevent domination. After the overthrow of Napoleon the powers resolved that no state should again be allowed to master the continent. The balance was the safeguard of their independence. Its whole purpose was to check the over-mighty. It rested upon mutual jealousy.

It was maintained by shifting alliances. The powers combined and recombined to oppose whichever state grew too strong, so that alliances were made and unmade as the balance required. Diplomacy was a constant manoeuvre. Friendships were matters of convenience. The balance lived by perpetual readjustment.

It was upheld by the Concert of Europe and its congresses. The great powers met in congress to manage disputes and preserve the settlement of Vienna, acting together to contain threats to the order. This machinery of cooperation helped to keep the peace. The Concert was the guardian of the balance. Consultation replaced, for a time, the resort to arms.

It rested increasingly upon armaments. To hold the balance the powers maintained great armies and, in time, competing fleets. Force stood always ready behind the manoeuvres of diplomacy. Peace was guarded by the ever-present threat of war. The nations remained armed to the teeth against one another. The balance of power was, in the end, a balance of weapons.

It preserved Europe from a general war for a century. Between 1815 and 1914 no war engulfed all the powers at once, a remarkable achievement of the balancing system. The general peace of the continent was, on the whole, maintained. This was the balance's solid success. For a hundred years catastrophe was averted.

Yet it worked through constant crisis and limited war. The peace it gave was punctuated by the Crimean War, the wars of unification and the colonial crises, so that Europe was repeatedly brought to the edge of conflict. Stability was purchased at the price of perpetual tension. The balance kept peace by threatening war. Its calm was never secure.

In the end the same system produced catastrophe. The alliances and armaments that had balanced the powers turned a Balkan crisis into a world war in 1914, when the machinery of the balance dragged all the powers into conflict. The system that had preserved the peace at last destroyed it. The edge of war became the abyss. The paradox was resolved in disaster.

The statement may therefore be largely accepted. The balance of power did preserve Europe from a general war for a century, a real achievement of nineteenth-century diplomacy through alliance, congress and Concert. But it did so through shifting combinations and mounting armaments that kept the continent in perpetual tension and repeatedly on the brink of war. The peace it gave was genuine but precarious, and the very methods that maintained it produced at last the catastrophe of 1914.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" invites the claim tested on both sides: the peace achieved and the danger sustained.
The trap is to describe the balance of power without judging whether its peace rested on readiness for war.
The top band shows the same system that kept the peace for a century producing the war of 1914.

Question 20

The wars, rivalries and ambitions of the nineteenth century did not end with it but passed their legacy to the century that followed. The statement claims that the great conflicts of the twentieth century, above all the First World War, had their roots in the rivalries of the nineteenth, and a survey of those rivalries strongly supports the claim. The structures that produced 1914, a powerful Germany, a divided Europe, imperial rivalry and militarism, were all laid down before 1900. Yet seeds are not harvests, and the final catastrophe still required the choices of a later generation. The claim may be assessed as follows.

The rise of a united Germany overturned the old balance. The creation of a powerful German Empire in 1871 destroyed the equilibrium of Vienna and alarmed Germany's neighbours, who feared her strength. This new colossus at the centre of Europe was the deepest source of instability. The balance that had kept the peace was gone. Here lay the first seed of future war.

Franco-German enmity became a fixed and dangerous rivalry. The defeat of France and the loss of Alsace-Lorraine in 1871 left her thirsting for revenge, and this abiding hostility poisoned European politics for a generation. France and Germany faced one another as settled enemies. Revanchism drove the search for allies. The quarrel of 1871 pointed toward 1914.

The alliance system divided Europe into armed camps. Out of these rivalries grew the opposing alliances, the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente, which split the continent into two hostile blocs. A local quarrel could now draw in all the powers. The alliances turned rivalry into a system. Europe was armed and divided against itself.

Imperial rivalry sharpened the hostility of the powers. The scramble for colonies and the crises it bred, at Fashoda and in Morocco, deepened the enmity among the powers and hardened the alliance blocs. Rivalry abroad fed hostility at home. The empires collided across the world. Imperialism embittered the relations of Europe.

Militarism and the arms race made war ever more likely. The powers built great conscript armies and competed in armaments, and Britain and Germany raced to build fleets, so that the machinery of war was ready and its use came to seem inevitable. Militarism prepared both the means and the mood for conflict. The nations stood armed to the teeth. War was made probable and terrible.

Nationalism and the Eastern Question destabilised the Balkans. The decline of the Ottoman Empire and the rise of Balkan nationalism turned south-eastern Europe into a powder keg where the interests of the great powers dangerously met. The Eastern Question, unresolved through the century, festered on. The Balkans became the likeliest spark. Here the nineteenth century's quarrels awaited their explosion.

Economic rivalry sharpened the antagonism of the powers. The industrial and commercial competition of Britain and a surging Germany added a bitter economic edge to their political rivalry. Prosperity itself became a field of conflict. Economic strength was reckoned as power. Rivalry in the market deepened the enmity of the nations.

Rigid war plans made a crisis harder to halt. The general staffs drew up inflexible schemes of mobilisation, such as the German Schlieffen Plan, that turned any serious crisis into a race to strike first. Strategy itself pressed toward war. The timetables of mobilisation left little room for pause. The plans of the soldiers narrowed the choices of the statesmen.

A generation had learned to see war as glorious. Long peace and nationalist teaching had bred a dangerous readiness to welcome war as a test of national greatness, and few foresaw the horror that awaited. War was expected almost with eagerness. The mood of the age made catastrophe the easier. Europe went armed and willing toward the abyss.

Yet contingency and the choices of 1914 still mattered. The seeds sown in the nineteenth century did not have to bear their bitter fruit, for the outbreak of war in 1914 depended also upon particular decisions and miscalculations in the July crisis. Structure made war possible; human choice made it actual. The harvest required the sower's hand. This qualifies, without overturning, the statement.

The statement may therefore be accepted in large measure. The forces that produced the catastrophe of 1914, the rise of Germany, Franco-German enmity, the alliance system, imperial rivalry, militarism, economic competition and Balkan nationalism, were all rooted in the rivalries of the nineteenth century, whose threats to peace ran on into the twentieth. Yet the seeds needed the spark, and the final decision for war belonged to the men of 1914. The nineteenth century prepared the conflict; it did not, of itself, compel it.

Examiner's Note

"How far" demands a judged synthesis of the chapter, not a wholesale account of the causes of the First World War.

The trap is to list the causes of 1914 without drawing each back to a nineteenth-century root.

The top band connects every twentieth-century danger to its nineteenth-century origin while conceding the role of contingency.

Question 21

The scramble for Africa was the sudden seizure of almost the whole continent by the European powers between about 1880 and 1900. The statement holds that it was as much the work of the counting-house, of economic interest, as of the chancellery, of political calculation, and there is much truth in it. For economic hunger and political rivalry drove the partition together, each spurring the other. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The Industrial Revolution demanded markets and raw materials. The industrial nations of Europe needed secure sources of raw materials such as rubber, palm oil, cotton and minerals, and markets in which to sell their manufactures. Africa promised both in abundance. Economic need drove the powers outward. Industry reached across the seas for what it required.

The search for fields of investment impelled expansion. As competitive capitalism matured into monopoly and finance capitalism, surplus capital sought profitable outlets abroad, a process later analysed by Lenin. Colonies offered fresh ground for investment. The pressure of accumulated capital pushed Europe into Africa. Finance as well as trade demanded empire.

National prestige turned colonies into a point of honour. In an age of intense rivalry, colonies came to be seen as the measure of a great power's standing, so that no nation dared be left behind. France sought to recover the prestige lost in 1871, and the new Germany and Italy demanded their share. Pride drove the powers into the race. To hold aloof was to be counted weak.

Strategic considerations shaped the scramble. The powers seized territory to guard vital routes and to deny them to rivals, above all after the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 made Egypt and the Nile of the first importance. Britain took Egypt in 1882 to secure the road to India. Strategy hastened the partition. Territory was taken to protect other territory.

Explorers opened the interior to European ambition. The journeys of men such as Livingstone and Stanley mapped the great rivers and lakes and revealed the wealth of the interior. Their discoveries fired the imagination and the greed of Europe. The unknown continent was made known and so made vulnerable. Exploration was the herald of conquest.

Missionaries and the anti-slavery cause prepared the ground. Christian missionaries sought converts and the suppression of the slave trade, and often called upon their governments for protection. Their presence gave a moral colouring to expansion and drew the flag after the cross. Humanitarian motives were entangled with imperial ones. The mission station was often the forerunner of the colony.

King Leopold and the Congo touched off the race. The ambition of King Leopold II of Belgium to carve out a personal empire in the Congo basin alarmed the other powers and set off a general scramble to stake claims before rivals could. His activity forced the pace. One man's greed quickened the whole partition. The Congo lit the fuse.

The Berlin Conference gave the scramble its rules. Convened by Bismarck in 1884 and 1885, the Conference laid down that a power must effectively occupy territory to claim it, and it opened the Congo and Niger to free trade. It did not divide Africa but set the terms of the race. Its rules turned a scramble into an orderly partition. The powers agreed how they should quarrel.

New technology made conquest possible. The steamship, the railway and the telegraph, quinine against malaria and the Maxim gun against resistance gave Europe the means to penetrate and hold the interior. What ambition desired, technology now allowed. The tools of the age turned the wish for empire into its reality. Africa lay open at last to the conqueror.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The scramble for Africa was indeed the work of the counting-house as much as of the chancellery, for the industrial hunger for markets, raw materials and fields of investment drove the powers outward quite as powerfully as their strategic and prestige rivalries. Economic motive supplied the deepest cause, while great-power rivalry supplied the spur, and new technology the means. Trade and empire were the twin engines of the partition, and neither can be set above the other.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that economic motives drove the scramble as much as political ones.

The trap is to describe the partition country by country instead of explaining why it happened.

The top band ranks the economic drive and great-power rivalry first, with technology as the enabling means.

Question 22

The partition of Africa placed almost the entire continent under European rule within a single generation. The statement holds that the borders it drew have left a lasting legacy of conflict, that they bleed still, and there is much truth in it. For the arbitrary frontiers of the colonisers sowed divisions that outlived colonial rule itself. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It destroyed the sovereignty and independence of African states. The kingdoms and societies of Africa lost their power to govern themselves and passed under the rule of foreign masters. Old states were dismembered and their rulers reduced to agents or exiles. A continent of independent peoples became a patchwork of colonies. The loss of freedom was the deepest wound of the partition.

It imposed artificial and arbitrary boundaries. The powers drew frontiers to suit their own convenience, splitting single peoples between colonies and forcing hostile groups together within them. These borders paid no heed to African realities. They sowed the seeds of division and conflict that outlived colonial rule. The map of Africa was drawn in the chancelleries of Europe.

It bound Africa to a colonial economy serving Europe. The colonies were made to produce cash crops and minerals for the industries of the metropole and to buy its manufactures in return. African economies were reshaped to serve foreign needs, not their own. The continent was locked into a subordinate place in the world market. Its wealth flowed outward.

It brought forced labour, taxation and exploitation. To make the colonies pay, the rulers imposed taxes, seized land and compelled Africans to labour on plantations, mines and public works. The burden fell heavily upon the ordinary people. Coercion underlay the colonial economy. Exploitation was the daily experience of colonial rule.

It provoked violent resistance and its suppression. Africans rose again and again against the invader, in risings such as the Maji Maji war and the Herero revolt, and these were crushed with great bloodshed. The conquest was completed by force and held by force. Resistance was met with massacre. The partition was written in African blood.

It introduced new administrations, religions and education. Colonial rule brought European systems of government, the Christian religion, the languages of the rulers and a western education for a small elite. These transformed African society and created a new class of the educated. Their long-term effects were profound and double-edged. New institutions took root in African soil.

It drew Africa into the world capitalist system. Through roads, railways and ports built to carry its produce, Africa was linked to the global economy as a supplier of raw materials. This integration was on unequal terms that favoured Europe. The continent was developed for extraction, not for itself. Its economy was made an appendage of the metropole.

It laid the foundations of later underdevelopment and of nationalism alike. By draining African wealth and distorting African economies, the partition entrenched a poverty that outlasted colonial rule, yet by creating an educated class and a shared experience of oppression it also bred the nationalism that would end that rule. The colony contained the seeds of its own overthrow. What Europe imposed, Africa would in time reject.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The partition did indeed draw lines across Africa that still bleed today, for the arbitrary borders split single peoples and forced hostile groups together, breeding the ethnic conflicts and civil wars of the independent age. Yet the harm went beyond its borders, for the partition also destroyed African sovereignty and bound the continent to an exploitative colonial economy. The lines drawn in the chancelleries of Europe remain among the deepest wounds of modern Africa.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the partition's arbitrary borders left a lasting legacy of conflict.

The trap is to treat the effects as wholly negative and miss the unintended rise of an educated nationalist class.

The top band links arbitrary borders and colonial economy to the lasting problems of independent Africa.

Question 23

In the decades before 1914 the great powers of Europe bound themselves into two rival systems of alliance. The statement holds that these alliances, meant to preserve the peace, became instead the machinery of its destruction, and this is largely just. For the very system devised to deter war served in the end to spread it across the continent. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Bismarck built his system to isolate France. After 1871 Bismarck sought to keep France friendless and so unable to seek revenge, binding the powers to Germany instead. The Dual Alliance with Austria-Hungary in 1879 was the foundation of his design. His diplomacy aimed at security through combination. The alliance system was born of German policy.

The Triple Alliance bound Germany, Austria and Italy. In 1882 Italy joined Germany and Austria-Hungary in the Triple Alliance, a defensive league of the central powers. It gave Germany allies on either flank and confirmed the division of Europe. This bloc became one pole of the coming confrontation. Three powers were now pledged together.

The fall of Bismarck loosed the forces he had contained. When Germany let the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia lapse in 1890, it drove Russia toward France. The careful balance Bismarck had maintained was upset by his successors. Germany's clumsiness created the very combination he had feared. The system began to work against its makers.

The Franco-Russian Alliance ended France's isolation. In 1894 France and Russia, drawn together by common fear of Germany, formed an alliance that placed the central powers between two possible fronts. France was isolated no longer. A second bloc took shape against the first. Europe was dividing into two.

Britain abandoned isolation for the Ententes. Alarmed by the growth of German power and the naval race, Britain settled her colonial quarrels with France in the Entente Cordiale of 1904 and with Russia in 1907. Though not binding alliances, these understandings drew Britain toward the Franco-Russian camp. The Triple Entente was complete. The two blocs now faced each other.

The alliances divided Europe into two armed camps. By 1907 the powers were ranged in two hostile groups, each arming against the other and each bound to support its partners. Flexibility of diplomacy was lost. Europe was frozen into confrontation. The continent had taken sides in advance.

They turned local disputes into general dangers. Because each power was pledged to its allies, a quarrel between any two threatened to draw in all, so that a Balkan crisis could set the whole continent at war. The alliances acted as a mechanism for spreading conflict. A spark anywhere endangered the peace everywhere. The system multiplied the consequences of any dispute.

They bred suspicion and a sense of encirclement. Germany felt hemmed in by the Entente and grew the more aggressive, while the Entente powers feared German ambition. Each bloc read the other's moves as threats. Mutual suspicion hardened into hostility. The alliances poisoned the atmosphere of Europe.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The alliances meant to keep the peace did indeed become the machinery of its destruction, for by binding each power to its partners they turned the quarrel of Austria and Serbia into a war of all the powers. Meant to deter aggression by combination, they instead divided Europe into armed camps, bred suspicion and encirclement, and ensured that a Balkan crisis became a world war. The instrument of peace became the engine of catastrophe.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the alliances turned from keeping the peace to spreading war.

The trap is to narrate each treaty without explaining the mechanism by which the system spread war.

The top band shows how the alliances converted a local Balkan dispute into a general European conflict.

Question 24

The First World War broke out in 1914 after an assassination at Sarajevo, yet its roots ran back over a generation. The statement holds that the war was in one sense an accident, sprung from a chance murder, and in another the fruit of long preparation, and both halves are just. The deep rivalries of the powers had made Europe ready for war, so that a single spark could set it ablaze. The claim may therefore be weighed as follows.

Militarism and the arms race prepared the means and the mood for war. The powers built great conscript armies and competed in armaments, and Britain and Germany raced to build dreadnought battleships. This militarism made war seem both possible and even desirable to some. The machinery of destruction stood ready. An armed Europe was a Europe prepared to fight.

The alliance system divided Europe into hostile camps. The Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente ranged the powers in two blocs, each bound to support its partners. A quarrel between any two now threatened to involve them all. The alliances turned a local dispute into a general danger. Europe had taken sides before the war began.

Imperial rivalry sharpened the antagonism of the powers. The competition for colonies and the crises it bred deepened the enmity among the powers, above all between Germany and the Entente. Rivalry abroad hardened hostility at home. Empire embittered the relations of Europe. The scramble left a legacy of suspicion.

Germany's bid for world power alarmed the other powers. Germany's pursuit of a “place in the sun,” her naval building and her assertive world policy alarmed Britain and deepened her own sense of encirclement. This ambition unsettled the balance and sharpened the rivalry. A restless and rising Germany frightened her neighbours. Weltpolitik was a standing provocation.

Nationalism inflamed the peoples and the states. Aggressive national feeling glorified war and stiffened every quarrel, while the nationalism of the subject peoples of Austria-Hungary threatened to tear that empire apart. France nursed the dream of recovering Alsace-Lorraine. Nationalism made compromise difficult and conflict likely. It was a fever in the blood of Europe.

The Balkans became the powder keg of Europe. The decline of the Ottoman Empire and the ambitions of the Balkan states and of Austria and Russia made south-eastern Europe a region of chronic crisis, as the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913 had shown. Here the great powers' interests dangerously met. The Balkans were the likeliest place for the spark. The powder keg awaited a match.

A succession of pre-war crises had rehearsed the conflict. The Moroccan crises of 1905 and 1911 and the Bosnian crisis of 1908 had repeatedly brought the powers to the brink and hardened their hostility. Each confrontation left the atmosphere more poisoned than before. Europe had rehearsed its war many times. The crises were the tremors before the earthquake.

The assassination at Sarajevo provided the spark. On the 28th of June 1914 the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir to the Austrian throne, was murdered at Sarajevo by a Bosnian Serb nationalist. Austria seized the occasion to crush Serbia. The murder set the crisis in motion. A single act of violence lit the train of powder.

Austria's ultimatum and the July crisis widened the quarrel. Backed by Germany's promise of support, Austria sent Serbia an ultimatum designed to be rejected and then declared war. Diplomacy failed to contain the crisis. Step by step the powers were drawn in. The quarrel of two states became the war of many.

The rigid war plans made mobilisation into war. The general staffs had drawn up inflexible plans, above all the German Schlieffen Plan, that turned mobilisation into an unstoppable march to attack. Once the armies moved, there was no halting them. Strategy overrode statesmanship. The timetables of the soldiers made war inevitable.

The statement may therefore be largely accepted. The occasion of the war was in a sense an accident, for it sprang from the chance assassination at Sarajevo and the miscalculations of the July crisis. But the war itself was no accident, for the militarism, the alliances, the imperial rivalry and the Balkan tensions of a generation had prepared the ground and armed the powers. The spark was accidental; the powder had been laid with care. Europe had made itself ready for the war that a chance murder began.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the accident of the spark weighed against the long preparation of the causes.

The trap is to give only the assassination, or only the deep causes, and neglect the other.

The top band shows the spark as accidental and the war itself as the fruit of a generation's rivalry.

Question 25

The First World War, fought from 1914 to 1918, was a struggle of a scale the world had never seen. The statement holds that the men of 1914 expected a short and glorious war but found a long and terrible one, and this is largely just. For the hopes of a swift victory gave way to years of trench deadlock and attrition. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It opened with the failure of the German war plan. Germany's Schlieffen Plan sought a swift victory over France before turning east, but the German advance was halted at the Battle of the Marne in 1914. The hope of a short war was dashed. The armies dug in where they stood. The war settled into deadlock.

The Western Front became a war of trenches and stalemate. From the Channel to Switzerland the armies faced each other across lines of trenches, and vast battles such as Verdun and the Somme in 1916 gained little ground at enormous cost. The front scarcely moved for years. Deadlock defined the western war. Attrition wore down a generation.

New and terrible weapons transformed warfare. The machine gun, poison gas, the tank, the aeroplane and the submarine gave the war a mechanised and deadly character. These weapons multiplied the slaughter. War became an industrial process. The battlefield was remade by the machine.

It was a total war that mobilised whole societies. Governments harnessed their entire economies and populations to the war, directing industry, rationing food and enlisting the labour of women. The distinction between soldier and civilian blurred. Whole nations, not just armies, were at war. The home front became a field of battle.

It was a global and imperial conflict. The war was fought not only in Europe but in Africa, the Middle East and at sea, and the colonial empires supplied troops and labour to their masters. Campaigns such as

Gallipoli carried the war far afield. It was a world war in fact as well as name. The whole globe was drawn in.

The entry of the United States turned the balance. In 1917 the United States entered the war on the Allied side, its fresh men and vast resources tipping the scale against the exhausted central powers. American strength revived the Allied cause. The New World came to redress the balance of the Old. The war's outcome was decided.

The collapse of Russia and the central powers ended the war. Revolution took Russia out of the war in 1917, but the German offensives of 1918 failed, and as her allies collapsed and her people starved, Germany sought an armistice. The fighting ceased on the 11th of November 1918. The central powers were beaten. The long ordeal was over.

The statement is therefore a largely fair verdict. The men of 1914 did indeed march out to what they thought would be a short and glorious war, and found instead a long and terrible one, for the failure of the German plan at the Marne turned the conflict into years of trench stalemate and attrition. New and terrible weapons, total mobilisation and a global reach made the war a horror without precedent. The bright hopes of 1914 perished in the mud of the Western Front.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim by contrasting the expectation of a short war with the reality of a long one.

The trap is a bare chronicle of battles with no attention to what made the war new.

The top band highlights trench stalemate, total war and the mechanisation of slaughter as the defining features.

Question 26

The First World War ended in 1918 having killed millions and shaken the world to its foundations. The statement holds that it settled none of the quarrels that caused it while overturning the whole order of Europe, and there is much truth in it. The war destroyed empires and redrew the map, yet its very settlement sowed the seeds of a second and greater war. The claim may be examined as follows.

It caused death and destruction on an unprecedented scale. Some ten million soldiers perished and many more were maimed, while famine and disease followed the fighting. A generation was cut down in its youth. The material and human loss was staggering. The war left Europe grieving and diminished.

It destroyed four great empires. The German, Austro-Hungarian, Russian and Ottoman empires all collapsed under the strain of the war. Ancient dynasties fell and their dominions broke apart. The political map of Europe and the Near East was transformed. The old order of empires was swept away.

It redrew the map of Europe and the Middle East. From the ruins of the fallen empires arose new states such as Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, while the Arab lands passed under mandates. Frontiers were drawn afresh across the continent. A new Europe of nation-states emerged. The war remade the world's boundaries.

It produced the peace settlement and the League of Nations. The victors imposed the Treaty of Versailles and its companion treaties and founded the League of Nations to keep the peace. The settlement sought to order the post-war world. Yet its harshness sowed future grievance. The peace was itself a source of conflict.

It ruined the economies of Europe. The war left the powers burdened with debt, their industry disrupted and their trade dislocated, and it bred the inflation and instability of the post-war years. Europe emerged impoverished. The economic wounds ran deep. Recovery would be slow and troubled.

It raised the United States and Japan to greater power. While Europe exhausted itself, the United States rose to be the world's leading creditor and Japan extended her power in the Pacific and East Asia. The centre of world power began to shift away from Europe. New powers stood ready to inherit. Europe's supremacy was shaken.

It gave rise to the Russian Revolution and communism. The strain of the war brought down the Tsar and carried the Bolsheviks to power in 1917, founding the first communist state. A new ideology now challenged the capitalist world. The war had loosed a revolutionary force. Its shadow would lie across the century.

It bred disillusionment and prepared a second war. The horror of the war and the resentments left by the peace bred bitterness, extremism and a longing for revenge, above all in Germany. The settlement satisfied few and angered many. Within twenty years the world was at war again. The Great War proved the prelude to a greater one.

The statement is therefore largely just. The First World War unsettled everything, for it destroyed four empires, redrew the map of Europe and the Middle East, ruined its economies and raised new powers, while loosing revolution and disillusion upon the world. Yet it settled nothing, for the peace it produced satisfied none and bred the grievances that led within twenty years to a second and greater war. The war overturned the old order without building a lasting new one.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires the effects weighed, testing whether the war settled its quarrels or merely unsettled the world.

The trap is to list effects without weighing the claim that nothing was truly settled.

The top band links the overturning of the old order to the failure to build a lasting peace.

Question 27

The alliance system that divided Europe into the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente is often blamed for the outbreak of the First World War. The claim holds that these rival blocs, more than any other factor, turned the crisis of 1914 into a general war. There is real force in the argument, for the alliances did convert a local quarrel into a continental conflict, yet they were themselves the product of deeper rivalries and worked alongside other powerful causes. The claim is therefore partly valid, and may be tested as follows.

The alliances turned a local quarrel into a general war. Because each power was pledged to support its partners, the dispute between Austria and Serbia drew in Germany, Russia, France and Britain in turn. The alliances acted as the mechanism that spread the conflict. Here their responsibility is plain. They made a Balkan crisis into a world war.

They divided Europe into hostile and rigid camps. By ranging the powers in two opposed blocs, the alliances destroyed the flexibility of diplomacy and froze Europe into confrontation. Compromise became harder and suspicion deeper. The blocs faced each other braced for war. This division was a genuine cause of the catastrophe.

They bred the encirclement that made Germany aggressive. Germany felt hemmed in by the Entente and grew reckless in her efforts to break the ring, offering Austria the blank cheque in 1914. The alliance system fed her fear and her belligerence. It sharpened the very rivalry it was meant to balance. In this it contributed directly to war.

Yet the alliances were the symptom of deeper rivalries. The blocs did not create the antagonisms of Europe but expressed them, for they arose from the enmity of France and Germany and the fears of the powers. To blame the alliances is to mistake the effect for the cause. Beneath them lay older quarrels. They were a channel, not a source.

Militarism and the war plans bore a heavy share of blame. The arms race and the rigid mobilisation plans, above all the Schlieffen Plan, turned the crisis into an unstoppable march to war. These military pressures were causes in their own right. The soldiers' timetables did much to make war inevitable. Militarism stands beside the alliances in guilt.

Nationalism and the Balkan question supplied the tinder. The nationalism of the Balkan peoples and the rivalry of Austria and Russia in the region created the crisis that the alliances then spread. Without the

Balkan powder keg there would have been no spark. Nationalism lit the fire the alliances fanned. This cause was independent of the blocs.

Imperial and economic rivalry deepened the hostility. The competition for colonies and markets had long embittered relations among the powers, especially between Britain and Germany. This rivalry underlay the whole confrontation. It was a cause the alliances did not create. Empire helped to bring the powers to the brink.

The decisions of July 1914 were needed to bring on war. The alliances did not compel war, for statesmen still chose whether to honour them, and it was the particular decisions of 1914, Austria's ultimatum, Germany's support and the failure of diplomacy, that turned crisis into conflict. Human choice completed the work. The system offered the means, but men made the war.

The claim is therefore partly valid. The alliance system was indeed a principal cause, for it was the mechanism that turned the quarrel of Austria and Serbia into a war of all the powers, and it bred the rigidity and encirclement that made war likely. But it was itself the product of deeper rivalries and worked alongside militarism, nationalism, imperialism and the Balkan question, and it needed the fatal choices of July 1914 to take effect. The alliances were the great multiplier of the conflict rather than its single origin.

Examiner's Note

"How valid" demands the claim tested, with weight given both to the alliances and to the other causes.

The trap is to accept or reject the claim wholesale rather than weighing it.

The top band concedes the alliances as the mechanism of escalation while ranking them among, not above, the deeper causes.

Question 28

The Treaty of Versailles, signed in 1919, was the settlement imposed by the victorious Allies upon a defeated Germany. The statement holds that it was a diktat dressed as a settlement, a peace dictated rather than negotiated, and there is much truth in it. For Germany was compelled to accept its terms without a voice in their making. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Germany was made to accept the guilt for the war. By the notorious War Guilt Clause, Article 231, Germany was forced to accept sole responsibility for causing the war. This clause was the moral foundation of the whole treaty and the justification for reparations. Germans felt it a bitter and unjust humiliation. The guilt clause wounded national pride.

Germany was burdened with heavy reparations. Germany was required to pay vast sums in compensation for the damage of the war, later fixed at some thirty-three billion dollars. This burden crippled her economy and bred deep resentment. The reparations were felt as a punishment beyond her power to bear. They poisoned the post-war years.

Germany lost territory in Europe. Alsace-Lorraine was returned to France, the Saar placed under League control, and the Polish Corridor and Danzig taken to give Poland access to the sea. Germany was diminished on every frontier. Millions of Germans passed under foreign rule. The losses were felt as a dismemberment.

Germany was stripped of her colonies. Her overseas possessions were taken from her and distributed among the victors as mandates of the League of Nations. Germany ceased to be a colonial power. Her place among the imperial nations was ended. The empire she had lately built was lost.

Germany's armed forces were drastically reduced. Her army was limited to a hundred thousand men, conscription was forbidden, and she was denied tanks, submarines, an air force and a fleet of battleships. Germany was rendered militarily weak. Her power to make war was, it was hoped, destroyed. The disarmament was felt as a further humiliation.

The Rhineland was demilitarised and occupied. German territory west of the Rhine, and a strip to the east, was to be free of German troops and occupied by the Allies for a term of years. This created a buffer

to protect France. Germany's own frontier was placed beyond her control. Her sovereignty was curtailed in her own land.

Union with Austria was forbidden. Germany was prohibited from uniting with German-speaking Austria, so that the two should not combine their strength. The principle of national self-determination was thus denied to the Germans. This prohibition rankled as a double standard. Nationhood was allowed to others but refused to them.

The treaty established the League of Nations. The Covenant of the League of Nations formed part of the treaty, creating an international body to keep the peace. Germany, however, was at first excluded from membership. The instrument of the new order was bound up with the settlement she resented. Peace and punishment were joined in one document.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The peace of Versailles was indeed a diktat dressed as a settlement, for its terms, the war guilt, the reparations, the loss of territory and the disarmament, were imposed upon Germany without negotiation and accepted only under threat. Designed to punish and to restrain rather than to reconcile, it left Germany humiliated and resentful. A peace dictated to the vanquished, it satisfied none and prepared the way for a second war.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that Versailles was an imposed diktat rather than a negotiated peace.

The trap is to list terms mechanically without noting their purpose and the resentment they caused.

The top band organises the terms into guilt, reparations, territory, military and the League, and hints at their consequences.

Question 29

The Treaty of Versailles was meant to secure a lasting peace, yet within twenty years Europe was at war again. The statement holds that the settlement itself, by its harshness and its flaws, prepared the ground for the Second World War, and there is much truth in the claim. The treaty's effects upon Germany, upon the new Europe and upon the fragile international order all worked toward renewed conflict, though other forces shared in the result. Its effects may be examined as follows.

It left Germany humiliated and resentful. The war guilt clause, the loss of territory and the disarmament wounded German pride and bred a burning desire to overturn the settlement. The treaty was hated across the political spectrum. This resentment became a powerful force in German politics. It was the soil in which extremism grew.

It burdened Germany with a crippling economic load. The reparations strained the German economy and contributed to the ruinous inflation of 1923 and to later instability. Economic hardship bred anger and despair. The treaty was blamed for every misfortune. Its financial terms fed political extremism.

It weakened and discredited the Weimar Republic. The democratic government that signed the treaty was branded by its enemies as the traitor that had accepted the diktat. The Republic bore the odium of Versailles. Its authority was undermined from birth. The treaty poisoned German democracy.

It gave the demagogues their cause. Hitler and the Nazis made the overthrow of Versailles the very centre of their appeal. They promised to tear up the hated treaty and to restore German greatness. The settlement thus handed them a ready and powerful grievance. It supplied the fuel on which their movement fed and rose. The treaty armed its own bitterest enemies.

It created unstable successor states. The new states carved from the fallen empires contained discontented minorities, including many Germans, whose grievances Hitler would later exploit. The map drawn at Versailles was fragile. It offered pretexts for future aggression. The settlement built weakness into the new Europe.

It was fatally weakened by the absence of the United States. The American Senate refused to ratify the treaty, so that the United States neither joined the League nor guaranteed the settlement. The order created

at Versailles lacked its strongest possible support. The peace was left to powers too weak or too divided to uphold it. Its foundation was incomplete.

It satisfied neither the vanquished nor fully the victors. Germany found the treaty too harsh, while France thought it too lenient to give lasting security, so that it pleased no one and commanded no loyalty. A settlement that satisfies none is hard to defend. Its very compromises were its weakness. It carried the seeds of its own undoing.

Yet the treaty alone did not make the second war. The Great Depression, the failures of the League, the policy of appeasement and the ambitions of Hitler were also needed to bring on the war. Versailles created grievance, but grievance had to be exploited. The treaty was a cause, not the sole cause. This qualifies, without overturning, the statement.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The Treaty of Versailles left Germany humiliated, impoverished and resentful, discredited the Weimar Republic, gave the Nazis their cause, and built weakness into the new Europe, while the absence of the United States left the whole settlement without a firm guarantor. In these ways it did indeed carry the seeds of another war. Yet those seeds needed the Depression, the failure of the League and the ambition of Hitler to bring them to their bitter harvest.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the effects of the settlement against the claim that it caused the next war.

The trap is to blame Versailles alone and neglect the Depression, appeasement and Hitler's ambition.

The top band accepts the treaty as a major cause while placing it among the other causes of the Second World War.

Question 30

The League of Nations was founded in 1920 as the first great attempt to build a permanent organisation for peace. The statement calls it a noble house built without foundations, and there is much truth in the image. For its aims and its structure were lofty, but the strength to uphold them was wanting. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Its chief aim was to preserve peace through collective security. The League sought to prevent war by binding its members to act together against any aggressor, so that the many should restrain the one. Peace was to rest upon collective action rather than rival alliances. This was the heart of the whole design. Security was to be shared.

It aimed to settle disputes by arbitration. Members undertook to submit their quarrels to the League rather than resort to war. Reason, law and negotiation were to take the place of force. The League offered machinery for the just and peaceful resolution of disputes. Conflict was to be judged and settled, not fought out. Arbitration was to replace the arbitrament of arms.

It aimed to promote disarmament. The League sought a general reduction of the armaments of the nations. The ruinous arms race that had preceded 1914 was to be undone. Disarmament was held to be central to the hope of a lasting peace. Fewer weapons, it was believed, would mean fewer wars. A disarmed world would be a safer world for all.

It aimed to foster international cooperation. Beyond keeping the peace, the League worked to improve health, labour and welfare and to combat such evils as slavery and disease. It sought to bind the nations in common effort. Cooperation was to build the habits of peace. The League looked to the good of humanity as well as its security.

The Assembly represented all the members. In the Assembly every member state, great or small, had a voice and a vote. There the general questions of the world were openly debated. It was the parliament of the League and of the nations. All met upon a footing of formal equality. The Assembly gave the League its broad and representative character.

The Council was the executive of the powers. The Council, containing permanent seats for the great powers and rotating seats for others, met more often and dealt with urgent questions of peace and security. It was the League's directing body. Upon it the burden of action chiefly fell. The Council was meant to be the League's strong arm.

The Secretariat and the Court served the League's work. A permanent Secretariat carried on the administrative work, while the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague judged legal disputes between states. These gave the League continuity and a means of doing justice. They were the machinery of its daily operation. The League was equipped to function as a standing body.

Specialised agencies pursued its wider aims. Bodies such as the International Labour Organisation and various commissions worked for social and economic betterment and administered the mandated territories. Through these the League reached into many fields of human welfare. Its work went far beyond diplomacy. The agencies were among its most enduring creations.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The League of Nations was indeed a noble house built without foundations, for its aims of collective security, arbitration and disarmament, and its structure of Assembly, Council and agencies, were noble in conception. But the foundations were wanting, for it lacked the great powers, above all the United States, and had no army to enforce its will. Grand in design but weak in substance, the noble house could not stand against the storms to come.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the League's noble aims and structure rested on weak foundations.

The trap is to drift into the League's failures instead of examining its purposes and organisation.

The top band presents collective security as the central aim and links the organs to the functions they served.

Question 31

The League of Nations, founded in 1920 to keep the peace of the world, enjoyed a mixed and finally a tragic history. The statement traces its failure to the absence of the great powers from behind it, and this is largely just. For its real successes in lesser matters could not make up for its impotence when the great powers defied or deserted it. The claim may be assessed as follows.

It settled a number of minor disputes. In its early years the League peacefully resolved quarrels between smaller states, such as the dispute over the Aaland Islands and the clash between Greece and Bulgaria in 1925. Where the great powers were not engaged, it could keep the peace. These were genuine if modest successes. The machinery of arbitration worked among the weak.

It did valuable humanitarian and social work. Through its agencies the League cared for refugees and prisoners of war, fought disease and the traffic in slaves and drugs, and improved conditions of labour. This work relieved much suffering and won wide respect. It was among the League's most enduring achievements. Here it served humanity well.

It administered the mandated territories. The League oversaw the government of the former German and Ottoman territories held as mandates, providing a measure of international supervision. This introduced the principle of accountability for colonial rule. It was a modest advance in the ordering of the world. The mandate system was a lasting legacy.

It pioneered the idea of collective security. For the first time the nations had built a permanent body to keep the peace by common action, and the very existence of the League was an advance upon the old anarchy of alliances. It set a precedent that would be taken up again. In principle it pointed the way forward. Its idea outlived its failure.

Yet it failed to halt aggression in Manchuria. When Japan seized Manchuria in 1931, the League condemned the act through the Lytton Report but could do nothing to reverse it, and Japan simply left the League. Its impotence was exposed to the world. The first great test was failed. Aggression had gone unpunished.

It failed still more grievously over Abyssinia. When Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935, the League imposed only feeble sanctions and its leading members schemed to appease Mussolini. Abyssinia was conquered and Italy left the League. This failure destroyed the League's credit. Collective security was shown to be hollow.

Its efforts at disarmament collapsed. The great Disarmament Conference of the early 1930s ended in failure as the powers rearmed and Germany walked out. The hope of a disarmed world was dashed. The arms race resumed unchecked. The League could not master the ambitions of the powers.

It was fatally weakened by the absence of the great powers. The United States never joined, the Soviet Union entered only late, and the aggressor states withdrew when condemned, so that the League seldom commanded the strength of all the great powers at once. It was a body of the willing, not of all. This crippled its authority. It could not enforce a peace the strong would not keep.

It lacked the means to enforce its will. The League had no army of its own, and its rule of unanimity and its reliance on voluntary sanctions left it unable to compel an unwilling great power. When words failed, it had no force to fall back upon. This weakness was the root of its failures. An unarmed guardian could not keep the peace.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The League achieved real successes in settling minor disputes and in its humanitarian work, and it pioneered the idea of collective security. But it failed in its supreme task because the great powers would not stand behind it: the United States never joined, the aggressors withdrew when condemned, and none would enforce its will by arms. Its failure over Manchuria and Abyssinia flowed from this want of great-power support. The League fell because it was never truly backed by the powers that mattered.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires successes and failures weighed, and the claim about great-power support tested.

The trap is to list Manchuria and Abyssinia without rooting the failure in the absence of the great powers.

The top band ties the League's impotence to the desertion of the great powers.

Question 32

In the years between the wars democracy gave way to dictatorship over much of Europe. The statement holds that the strong man rose where democracy faltered, by promising bread and order, and this is largely just. For it was the failure of the new democracies, amid economic ruin, that opened the way to the dictators. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The discontents of the First World War and the peace prepared the ground. Italy felt cheated of her rewards in a "mutilated victory," while Germany burned under the humiliation of Versailles. This resentment bred a longing for a leader who would restore national pride. Grievance was the seedbed of dictatorship. The peace had sown the anger the dictators would reap.

The Great Depression brought economic ruin and despair. The collapse that began in 1929 threw millions out of work and ruined the middle classes, above all in Germany. In their desperation people turned from failed democratic governments to those who promised bread and order. Economic misery drove the masses toward extremism. The slump was the making of the dictators.

The new democracies were weak and discredited. The liberal state of Italy and the Weimar Republic of Germany were unstable, divided and unable to master their problems. Their weakness made them contemptible in the eyes of many. People lost faith in parliaments and sought a firmer hand. Feeble democracy invited the strong man.

The fear of communism drove the propertied classes to the right. Frightened by the example of the Russian Revolution and by the strength of the socialist and communist parties, the industrialists, landowners and middle classes looked to the dictators to protect them. They financed and tolerated the

fascists as a bulwark against revolution. Fear of the left raised up the right. Anti-communism was a ladder to power.

Aggressive nationalism promised the restoration of greatness. The dictators appealed to wounded national pride, promising to overturn the settlement, to expand, and to make their nations great and feared again. This nationalism stirred the masses and united them behind the leader. It gave dictatorship its emotional force. Pride was harnessed to power.

Charismatic leaders and propaganda won the masses. Mussolini and Hitler were gifted demagogues who used oratory, spectacle and the new means of propaganda to build a mass following. They offered themselves as saviours in a time of chaos. Their personal magnetism was itself a cause of their rise. The leader became the movement.

Private armies and violence intimidated opponents. The Blackshirts and the Brownshirts terrorised their rivals and created an atmosphere of crisis that the dictators then promised to end. Violence cleared their path to power and cowed resistance. Force and fear were instruments of their rise. They made disorder and offered themselves as its cure.

The dictators exploited the machinery of the state to seize total power. Once admitted to office, Mussolini and Hitler used their positions to destroy their rivals, suppress opposition and make themselves masters of the state, as Hitler did through the Enabling Act of 1933. Legality was the road to tyranny. They entered by the door and then bolted it. Power once gained was made absolute.

Yet dictatorship was not inevitable, but made by choice and circumstance. The conditions were grave, but it was the ambition of particular men and the failures of their opponents that turned crisis into dictatorship, for other nations weathered the storm without succumbing. Human choice completed the work of circumstance. The dictators were made, not merely born of their times. This qualifies the account without overturning it.

The statement therefore explains much of the rise of dictatorship. Where democracy faltered, the strong man did indeed promise bread and order, for the weakness of the Weimar Republic and the liberal Italian state, amid the ruin of the Great Depression, drove the masses toward those who promised work and firm government. Yet grievance, the fear of communism, aggressive nationalism and the demagoguery of the leaders were also needed. The failure of democracy opened the door, and the strong man, promising bread and order, walked through it.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that dictatorship rose from the failure of democracy and the promise of order.

The trap is to narrate the careers of the dictators rather than to explain the conditions of their rise.

The top band ranks the Depression and post-war grievance first, with leadership and fear of communism as accelerators.

Question 33

Between the wars the dictatorships of Italy, Germany and Japan pursued policies of aggression that overturned the peace settlement. The statement holds that they tore up the peace treaty by treaty while the world looked on, and this is largely just. For each act of aggression went unpunished, and each emboldened the next. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The dictators were determined to overturn the post-war order. Germany sought to tear up the Treaty of Versailles, Italy to build a new Roman empire, and Japan to dominate East Asia. Each rejected the settlement of 1919 and the limits it imposed. Their common aim was expansion by force. The peace was their enemy.

Japan opened the era of aggression in Manchuria. In 1931 Japan seized the Chinese province of Manchuria and set up the puppet state of Manchukuo, defying the League and leaving it when condemned.

This was the first great act of unpunished aggression. It showed the powers unwilling to act. Japan led the way that others followed.

Italy conquered Abyssinia. In 1935 Mussolini invaded Abyssinia to avenge an old defeat and to build his empire, and the feeble response of the League allowed him to succeed. Abyssinia was overrun and annexed. The League was humiliated a second time. Italy had shown that aggression paid.

Germany rearmed in defiance of Versailles. From 1935 Hitler openly rebuilt Germany's armed forces, reintroducing conscription and building an air force in breach of the treaty. Germany's strength grew rapidly. The military limits of Versailles were cast aside. Rearmament was the foundation of German aggression.

Germany remilitarised the Rhineland. In 1936 Hitler marched his troops into the demilitarised Rhineland, a grave breach of the treaty that the Western powers let pass unopposed. The gamble succeeded and emboldened him. A key safeguard of French security was gone. Hitler had tested the powers and found them weak.

The aggressors drew together in the Axis. Germany and Italy formed the Rome-Berlin Axis in 1936, and with Japan they joined in the Anti-Comintern Pact, while they intervened together in the Spanish Civil War. The aggressors made common cause. Their combination magnified the danger. A hostile bloc now faced the democracies.

Germany absorbed Austria and threatened Czechoslovakia. In 1938 Hitler achieved the Anschluss with Austria and then, at Munich, wrung the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia through the appeasement of Britain and France. His empire grew without a shot. Each success whetted his appetite. Aggression was rewarded with concession.

The seizure of Czechoslovakia and the attack on Poland brought war. In 1939 Hitler broke his word and occupied the rest of Czechoslovakia, then invaded Poland, at last provoking Britain and France to war. The policy of aggression had reached its term. The dictators had gambled once too often. Their expansion ended in world war.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The dictators did indeed tear up the peace treaty by treaty while the world looked on, from Manchuria and Abyssinia to the Rhineland, Austria and Czechoslovakia, each aggression meeting no effective resistance. The feeble League and the policy of appeasement allowed the settlement of 1919 to be dismantled piece by piece. Unopposed, the dictators pulled down the peace until it collapsed at last into the Second World War.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the dictators dismantled the settlement while the world stood by.

The trap is to treat one power alone, or to list events without showing how they destroyed collective security.

The top band traces the rising line of aggression from Manchuria to Poland and links it to the coming of war.

Question 34

The Second World War broke out in 1939, only twenty years after the first. The statement traces its origin to the Treaty of Versailles that closed the earlier war, and there is real force in the claim, for the grievances of that settlement did much to bring on the new conflict. Yet Versailles alone did not make the war, for the Depression, the failure of the League, appeasement and the ambition of Hitler were also needed. The claim may therefore be weighed as follows.

The Treaty of Versailles bred lasting grievance. The harshness of the settlement of 1919 left Germany humiliated and resentful and gave the demagogues their cause. The desire to overturn Versailles was at the root of German aggression. The peace had sown the seeds of war. Grievance was the foundation of the conflict.

The rise of aggressive dictatorships threatened the peace. The dictatorships of Germany, Italy and Japan were committed to expansion and to the overthrow of the existing order. Their very nature made them a danger to peace. Aggression was their creed. The world was menaced by states that lived for conquest.

Hitler's ambition drove Europe toward war. Hitler sought to overturn Versailles, to unite all Germans, and to win living space, or Lebensraum, in the east, aims that could be achieved only by war. His ambition was the mainspring of the crisis. He willed the conflict that others sought to avoid. His designs made war all but certain.

The Great Depression fostered extremism and division. The economic collapse of the 1930s brought the dictators to power or strengthened them and set the nations against one another in a scramble for self-sufficiency. Hard times bred aggression and weakened cooperation. The slump was a cause of the coming war. Economic ruin fed political extremism.

The League of Nations failed to keep the peace. The League proved unable to halt the aggressions of Japan, Italy and Germany, and its impotence over Manchuria and Abyssinia destroyed collective security. The one body meant to prevent war had failed. Aggression went unpunished. The guardian of peace was shown to be powerless.

The policy of appeasement emboldened the aggressors. By conceding to Hitler at every turn, above all at Munich in 1938, Britain and France encouraged him to believe that they would never fight. Appeasement fed his appetite and gave him time to grow strong. Concession was mistaken for weakness. The democracies taught the dictator to be bold.

The aggressions of the 1930s went unchecked. From Manchuria and Abyssinia to the Rhineland, Austria and Czechoslovakia, each act of aggression succeeded and prepared the next. The failure to resist in time allowed the danger to grow. Small surrenders led to great ones. The road to war was paved with concessions.

The Nazi-Soviet Pact opened the way to war. In August 1939 Hitler secured his eastern flank by a sudden pact with Stalin. The two dictators secretly agreed to divide Poland between them. Freed from the fear of a war on two fronts, Hitler could now strike. The pact removed the last obstacle to his aggression. It was the immediate prelude to the attack on Poland.

The invasion of Poland was the immediate cause. On the 1st of September 1939 Germany invaded Poland, and Britain and France, having guaranteed her, at last declared war. The long series of aggressions had reached the point of no return. Poland was the spark that lit the war. Appeasement was over and the fighting began.

The failure of the powers to unite doomed the peace. Divided by suspicion, weakened by the Depression and paralysed by the fear of war, the powers that might have restrained the dictators failed to combine in time. Their disunity was itself a cause of the war. Had they stood firm together, aggression might have been checked. The peace fell for want of defenders.

The statement is therefore only partly valid. The Treaty of Versailles did much to make the Second World War, for its harshness left Germany resentful and gave the Nazis their cause. Yet the war was not made in Versailles alone, for the Great Depression, the failure of the League, the policy of appeasement and above all the ambition of Hitler were needed to bring it on. Versailles laid the grievance, but many hands built the war upon it. The treaty was a chief cause, and not the sole one.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires Versailles weighed against the other causes of the war.

The trap is to blame Versailles wholesale and neglect the Depression, appeasement and Hitler.

The top band accepts Versailles as a major cause while ranking it among the others.

Question 35

Appeasement was the policy of making concessions to the dictators in the hope of avoiding war. The statement likens it to feeding the crocodile in the hope of being eaten last, and as an account of its part in the coming of the Second World War this is largely just. For each concession fed Hitler's appetite rather than satisfying it. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It sprang from the horror of another war. The memory of the slaughter of the First World War made the peoples and governments of Britain and France desperate to avoid a second. This dread of war disposed them to concession. Peace was to be bought at almost any price. The horror of the past shaped the policy of the present.

It rested upon military and economic weakness. Britain and France were unprepared for war and burdened by the Depression, and they needed time to rearm. Appeasement bought that time, or seemed to. Weakness counselled caution. The democracies dared not risk a war they were unready to fight.

It was fed by a sense that Versailles had been unjust. Many in Britain came to feel that the Treaty of Versailles had treated Germany too harshly, so that Hitler's early demands seemed only the righting of wrongs. This guilt weakened the will to resist. Germany's grievances were thought to be reasonable. Sympathy blunted the response to aggression.

It was strengthened by the fear of communism. Some looked upon a strong Germany as a bulwark against the spread of Soviet communism and were therefore reluctant to weaken her. Fear of the east made them tender toward the aggressor in the centre. Anti-communism served appeasement. The dictator was tolerated as a shield.

It allowed Hitler a succession of bloodless victories. Through appeasement Hitler remilitarised the Rhineland, annexed Austria and, at Munich, gained the Sudetenland, each time without war. Concession followed concession. His power grew at every step. Appeasement handed him his early triumphs.

Munich was the high point of the policy. At Munich in 1938 Britain and France compelled Czechoslovakia to yield the Sudetenland to Hitler, and Chamberlain returned proclaiming “peace for our time.” It was hailed as the salvation of peace. In truth it was a surrender. Munich became the byword for appeasement.

It emboldened Hitler and fed his ambition. Each concession persuaded Hitler that the democracies would never fight, so that he grew bolder and more contemptuous of them. Appeasement taught him to expect surrender. It whetted rather than satisfied his appetite. The policy encouraged the very aggression it sought to avoid.

Its failure left war the only recourse. When Hitler seized the rest of Czechoslovakia in 1939 and then attacked Poland, appeasement stood exposed as a failure, and Britain and France had at last to fight. The policy had bought time but not peace. It had strengthened the enemy it meant to appease. War came, but on worse terms.

The statement therefore accounts well for the coming of the war. Appeasement did indeed feed the crocodile in the hope of being eaten last, for by conceding to Hitler at every turn, above all at Munich, Britain and France emboldened him and fed his ambition. Sprung from the horror of war and from weakness, the policy taught Hitler that the democracies would not fight, until his attack on Poland left them no choice. Meant to avoid war, appeasement helped to bring it on.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that appeasement, by feeding Hitler, helped to cause the war.

The trap is to condemn appeasement without explaining the reasons that made it seem wise at the time.

The top band explains the motives fairly yet shows how the policy emboldened Hitler and hastened the war.

Question 36

The Second World War ended in 1945 as the most destructive conflict in history. The statement holds that it closed one age and opened another, and this is largely just. For it ended the long age of European mastery and opened the age of the superpowers, the Cold War and the end of empire. The claim may be assessed as follows.

It caused death and destruction beyond all precedent. Some fifty million people and more perished in the Second World War. Among them were the millions murdered in the horror of the Holocaust. Whole cities across Europe and Asia were laid in ruins. The scale of the killing was without parallel in history. The war left the world in mourning and in ashes.

It devastated and impoverished Europe. The war shattered the economies, cities and industries of Europe. The continent emerged exhausted, ruined and dependent upon others for its recovery. Its old wealth and its old power alike were spent. Millions were left homeless and hungry amid the rubble. The old heart of the world lay broken and impoverished.

It raised the United States and the Soviet Union to superpower status. The two powers emerged from the war immeasurably stronger than the rest, dominating world affairs as no states had done before. Power passed from Europe to Washington and Moscow. A new order of giants had arisen. The world was theirs to shape.

It divided the world and began the Cold War. The victors soon fell out, and Europe and the world were divided between the communist east and the capitalist west, separated by an Iron Curtain. A long rivalry of the superpowers began. Germany itself was split in two. The hot war gave way to a cold one.

It led to the founding of the United Nations. Resolved to prevent a third world war, the nations founded the United Nations in 1945, a stronger successor to the failed League. A new attempt at collective security was made. The hope of world order survived the war. From the ruin came a new institution of peace.

It opened the atomic age. The war ended with the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, ushering in an age of nuclear weapons and nuclear fear. Warfare had acquired the power to destroy the world. A terrible new force was loosed. The shadow of the bomb fell across the peace.

It hastened the end of the European empires. The war weakened the colonial powers and stirred the subject peoples to demand their freedom. Within two decades most of Asia and Africa had won their independence. The long age of European empire was drawing to its close. The war had shaken the foundations of colonial rule. Decolonisation swept the world in its aftermath.

It transformed the international economy and society. The war brought reconstruction and new economic institutions, the reshaping of societies and the founding of the state of Israel, and it advanced the cause of human rights in reaction to its atrocities. The world was remade in many ways. Its effects reached into every field. A new age had begun.

The statement may therefore be largely accepted. The Second World War ended one age, for it destroyed the old Europe and closed the long era of its mastery over the world. And it began another, for it raised the United States and the Soviet Union to superpower status, opened the Cold War and the atomic age, founded the United Nations and hastened the end of the European empires. Out of the greatest of wars came a wholly new world order.

Examiner's Note

"Comment" requires the effects weighed as the ending of one age and the beginning of another.

The trap is to list effects without the framing of an age ended and an age begun.

The top band links the ruin of Europe to the rise of the superpowers and the new world order.

Question 37

The United Nations was founded in 1945, at the close of the Second World War, as a stronger successor to the failed League of Nations. The statement holds that it was built upon the grave of the League it hoped to surpass, and this is largely just. For it was framed in the very knowledge of the League's failure, and designed to avoid it. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It grew out of the wartime planning of the Allies. The idea took shape in the Atlantic Charter of 1941 and in the conferences of the war years, and it was given form at San Francisco in 1945, where the Charter was signed. The United Nations was thus the fruit of the war against the Axis. It was built while the fighting still raged. Its founders were determined not to repeat the failure of the League.

Its supreme aim was to maintain international peace and security. The United Nations was founded above all to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, by preventing aggression and settling disputes peacefully. Peace was its first purpose. Collective security was renewed on a firmer basis. The keeping of peace was its reason for being.

It aimed to promote cooperation and human rights. Beyond keeping the peace, the United Nations sought to foster friendly relations among nations, to advance economic and social welfare, and to promote respect for human rights and the self-determination of peoples. Its purposes were broad and humane. It looked to the betterment of mankind. Cooperation was to underpin peace.

The General Assembly is the parliament of the nations. In the General Assembly every member state has a seat and a vote, and here the questions of the world are debated. It is the most representative organ of the United Nations. All nations meet there as equals. The Assembly is the voice of the whole membership.

The Security Council bears the chief responsibility for peace. The Security Council, with five permanent members holding the power of veto and a number of elected members, has the primary duty of maintaining peace and may authorise action against aggressors. It is the most powerful organ of the United Nations. Upon it the burden of security chiefly rests. The great powers here hold a special place.

The Secretariat and the Secretary-General administer the organisation. The Secretariat, headed by the Secretary-General, carries on the daily work of the United Nations and may bring threats to peace before the Council. It gives the body continuity and a public voice. The Secretary-General is its chief servant and spokesman. The Secretariat is the engine of its work.

The Court, the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council complete the structure. The International Court of Justice judges disputes between states, the Economic and Social Council directs cooperation in welfare, and the Trusteeship Council oversaw the path of dependent territories to self-rule. Together these organs served the wider purposes of the United Nations. They gave effect to its many aims. The structure was designed for peace and progress alike.

Specialised agencies carry its work across the world. Bodies such as the World Health Organisation, UNESCO and UNICEF pursue the United Nations' aims in health, education and welfare across the globe. Through them it touches the lives of millions. Its work reaches far beyond diplomacy. The agencies are among its most valued creations.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The United Nations was indeed built upon the grave of the League, for it took up the same purpose of keeping the peace but sought to surpass its predecessor by remedying its weaknesses. It embraced the great powers the League had lacked, armed its Security Council with the veto and with force, and widened its aims to embrace cooperation and human rights. Learning from the death of the League, it was built to be the stronger guardian of the peace.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the United Nations was built on, and to surpass, the failed League.

The trap is to list the organs mechanically without the aims they serve or the circumstances of foundation.

The top band shows the Security Council and its veto as the heart of the design, learned from the League's weakness.

Question 38

The League of Nations and the United Nations were the two great attempts of the twentieth century to build a world organisation for peace. The statement calls the United Nations the League that had learned from its own death, and there is much truth in it. For the younger body was modelled upon the elder, but strengthened where the elder had failed. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Both were founded to preserve world peace. Each arose from a world war determined to prevent another, and each made the maintenance of peace its supreme aim. In purpose they were one. Both embodied the hope of collective security. The United Nations took up the task the League had failed to complete.

Both rested upon collective security and the peaceful settlement of disputes. Each bound its members to settle their quarrels peacefully and to act together against aggression. The principle was the same in both. Each offered machinery for arbitration and common action. The idea of the League lived on in the United Nations.

Both shared a similar structure of assembly, council and secretariat. Each had a general assembly of all members, a council charged with security, a secretariat to administer, and a court to judge disputes. The framework was much alike. The United Nations built upon the model of the League. The forms were inherited.

Both undertook wide humanitarian and social work. Each worked through specialised agencies for health, labour and welfare, and the United Nations' bodies continued and enlarged the work the League had begun. In this field there was clear continuity. The good work of the one passed to the other. Cooperation for welfare was common to both.

Yet the United Nations embraced the great powers the League had lacked. The United States, which never joined the League, was a founder of the United Nations, and the great powers were all included. This gave the United Nations a strength the League never had. Its authority rested on the powers that mattered. Here lay a decisive difference.

The United Nations armed its Council with the veto and with force. The five permanent members of the Security Council hold the power of veto, and the United Nations may raise forces for peacekeeping, whereas the League had no army and required unanimity. The United Nations could act where the League could only speak. Its Council had teeth. This was a deliberate remedy for the League's impotence.

The United Nations proved wider in membership and in purpose, and more enduring. Nearly universal in membership, the United Nations has taken on the causes of development, human rights and decolonisation and has outlasted the century, whereas the League collapsed within twenty years. It has proved the stronger and more lasting body. Learning from the League's failure, it succeeded where the League fell. Its endurance is the measure of the difference.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The United Nations was indeed the League of Nations that had learned from its own death, for it shared the same purpose, the same reliance on collective security, and much the same structure, yet it corrected the fatal weaknesses of the League. It embraced the great powers, armed its Council with the veto and with force, and took on a wider role, and so it endured where the League had collapsed. It was the League reborn and made strong by the lessons of failure.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the United Nations was an improved League that learned from its failures.

The trap is to describe the two organisations separately without drawing the comparison.

The top band shows the United Nations as a deliberate correction of the League's fatal weaknesses.

Question 39

The two World Wars, though fought chiefly for Europe, did much to quicken the nationalism that would end colonial rule in Africa. The statement holds that the African who fought for freedom abroad returned to demand it at home, and this is largely just. For the ex-serviceman, his eyes opened by the war, became a leader of the coming struggle. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Africans served in the wars and saw the wider world. Great numbers of Africans fought as soldiers or laboured as carriers in both wars, in Africa and beyond, and the experience broadened their horizons. They saw distant lands and met other peoples. The world grew larger in their eyes. Service abroad awakened new expectations.

They saw that their colonial masters were neither invincible nor united. On the battlefield Africans saw white men fight, suffer and die, and saw the imperial powers turn upon one another, while in the Second World War the fall of European colonies to Japan shattered the myth of white supremacy. The master was shown to be mortal. The aura of invincibility was broken. Respect for the ruler was undermined.

Ex-servicemen returned with new ideas and grievances. Those who had served came home with wider experience, with skills of organisation, and often with bitterness at the poor reward for their sacrifice. They became leaders and recruits for the nationalist cause. Their discontent was a powerful force. The returning soldier carried the seeds of revolt.

Wartime propaganda of freedom contradicted colonial rule. The Allies proclaimed that they fought for freedom, democracy and self-determination, above all in the Atlantic Charter of 1941, and Africans asked why these should not apply to them. The rulers were caught in their own words. The rhetoric of the war exposed the injustice of empire. Freedom promised abroad was demanded at home.

The wars imposed economic hardship that bred discontent. To feed the war effort the colonial powers forced up production, raised taxes and requisitioned goods, bringing hardship and inflation to the African peoples. Economic grievance sharpened political discontent. The burdens of the war fell upon the ruled. Suffering fed the desire for change.

The wars weakened the colonial powers. Exhausted and impoverished by the wars, the European powers were less able to hold their empires by force and less willing to bear their cost. The grip of the metropole was loosened. Weakness at the centre gave opportunity at the edge. The empires were ripe for challenge.

The wars spread ideas of democracy, equality and anti-imperialism. The struggle against fascism was fought in the name of liberty and the rights of nations, and these ideas, together with the growing influence of socialism, inspired African nationalists. The intellectual climate turned against empire. New principles armed the nationalist cause. Ideas crossed the seas to Africa.

International pressure and Pan-Africanism grew after the wars. The Pan-African Congress at Manchester in 1945 demanded independence, and the new United Nations, with its charter of self-determination, gave the nationalists a wider stage. The cause of African freedom was now heard in the world. External support strengthened the movement. The tide of world opinion began to turn.

An educated elite and mass grievances combined into organised movements. The wars brought together the educated leaders and the discontented masses into political parties and movements that pressed for self-rule after 1945. Leadership met popular grievance. Nationalism became an organised force. The scattered discontents were gathered into a movement.

The statement therefore explains much of the growth of African nationalism. The African who fought for freedom abroad did indeed return to demand it at home, for the ex-servicemen came back with new ideas, new grievances and the skills of organisation, and asked why the freedom they had fought for should be denied them. Yet the wars stirred nationalism in other ways too, weakening the colonial powers, spreading ideas of self-determination and rousing international support. The returning soldier was a powerful spur, but one among several, to the nationalism the wars awoke.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the returning ex-servicemen drove the growth of African nationalism.

The trap is to describe African participation without linking it to the growth of political nationalism.

The top band connects the ex-servicemen, the Atlantic Charter and the weakening of the powers to organised post-war nationalism.

Question 40

For four centuries Europe had extended its power over the globe until, by 1914, it dominated the world through its empires, its wealth and its prestige. The statement holds that the two World Wars destroyed this mastery, and the claim is largely just, for the wars ruined Europe, raised new powers above it and swept away its empires. Yet Europe's decline had older roots and its influence did not wholly vanish. The claim may be discussed as follows.

The wars ruined and exhausted Europe. Two great wars within a generation drained the wealth, manpower and confidence of the European powers and left the continent in ruins. Europe emerged impoverished and dependent. Its strength was spent. The seat of world power was gravely weakened.

They raised the United States to world leadership. While Europe destroyed itself, the United States grew to be the world's greatest economic and military power and the leader of the western world. Power crossed the Atlantic. America inherited much of Europe's place. The New World had eclipsed the Old.

They raised the Soviet Union as a rival superpower. The Soviet Union emerged from the war a great military power dominating eastern Europe. Its armies stood victorious across half the continent. A second giant now overshadowed the ruined states of Europe. The world had become bipolar, divided between two superpowers. Europe was caught between the might of America and of Russia.

They fatally weakened the colonial empires. The wars sapped the strength and will of the imperial powers and roused their subject peoples, so that within two decades the great empires dissolved. The age of European empire was ended. Decolonisation swept Asia and Africa. Europe's dominion overseas was lost.

They destroyed the prestige of European civilisation. The spectacle of Europe tearing itself apart, and the barbarities of the Second World War, shattered the belief in European superiority that had underpinned its rule. The moral authority of the west was broken. Its claim to lead by right was gone. Prestige, once lost, could not be regained.

They shifted the centres of world power away from Europe. After 1945 the great decisions of the world were taken in Washington and Moscow rather than in London, Paris or Berlin. Europe became an object of others' policy. The initiative had passed from it. The old powers were now the lesser powers.

The new world order reflected the new powers, not European primacy. The United Nations and the Cold War alike were shaped by the superpowers, and Europe's divisions were now managed from outside. The framework of the post-war world was not European. Europe sat within an order it no longer ruled. Its supremacy was a thing of the past.

Yet Europe's decline had begun before the wars. The rise of the United States, Japan and other powers, and the strains within the empires, were already visible before 1914, so that the wars accelerated a decline that was already under way. The wars hastened rather than began the process. Europe's supremacy was ebbing before it fell. This qualifies the statement.

And European influence did not wholly disappear. Through economic ties, culture, language and the lingering bonds of neo-colonialism, the former powers kept much influence over their old possessions. Europe was diminished but not erased. Its mark remained upon the world. Mastery was lost, but presence endured.

Nor was European power revived in a new form negligible. In time the nations of Europe drew together and, through their union, recovered a measure of collective weight in the world. Europe fell as master but

rose again as a partner. Its story did not end in 1945. The decline of the old mastery was not the end of European influence.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The two World Wars did end Europe's mastery of the world, for they ruined the continent, raised the United States and the Soviet Union above it, destroyed its empires and its prestige, and shifted the centres of power to Washington and Moscow. Yet Europe's decline had begun before 1914 and the wars hastened rather than created it, and European influence survived through culture, economics and, in time, a new unity. The wars did not merely diminish Europe; they dethroned it from the mastery of the world it had so long enjoyed.

Examiner's Note

"How valid" requires the claim weighed on both sides, with a clear final judgement.

The trap is to assert the end of European power without noting its older decline and its surviving influence.

The top band affirms the loss of mastery while conceding the pre-war roots of decline and the persistence of influence.

Question 41

The Cold War was the long rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union that lasted from 1945 to 1991. The statement holds that it was a war fought by every means but the open clash of arms, and this is largely just, for the two never met in direct battle yet fought by all other means. It was war in everything but the meeting of armies. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It was a state of hostility without direct war. The Cold War was a bitter and prolonged conflict in which the two superpowers never met in open battle. They stopped short of direct war for fear that it would end in their mutual destruction. Instead they fought by threat, pressure, subversion and every indirect means. Each treated the other as an enemy while avoiding the open clash of arms. This peculiar restraint gave the whole struggle its distinctive character and its name.

It was a clash of two opposed ideologies. The struggle set the capitalism and democracy of the West against the communism of the Soviet East. Each side believed that its own system was destined to triumph over the other. This ideological division ran through the whole conflict and coloured every dispute. It made genuine compromise difficult and the hostility deep and lasting. Beliefs, not merely interests, divided the two blocs.

It divided the world into two hostile blocs. The powers gathered their allies into rival camps, the West around the United States and the East around the Soviet Union. Each bloc was bound together by its own alliance, ideology and economic system. The nations of the world were pressed to take sides in the quarrel. Even the newly independent states were courted by both camps. The globe was split into two armed and watchful camps.

It was waged by every means short of open war. The superpowers fought through propaganda, espionage, subversion and economic pressure. Each sought to weaken, isolate and outdo the other at every possible turn. Trade, aid, spies and broadcasts all became weapons of the rivalry. Every field of human activity was drawn into the contest. War was pursued by all means but the open clash of armies.

It was marked by a costly and dangerous arms race. The two powers competed endlessly to build ever greater stocks of nuclear and conventional weapons. This race consumed vast wealth and bred a constant fear of sudden attack. It held over the world the threat of a war that could destroy it. Each advance by one side was swiftly matched by the other. The arms race was among the war's most defining and perilous features.

It was fought through proxy wars in the Third World. Unable to fight each other directly, the superpowers backed opposing sides in local conflicts. Wars in Korea, Vietnam and elsewhere became battlegrounds of their wider rivalry. The poorer nations of the world bore the heavy cost of this struggle.

Their lands were ravaged for a quarrel that was not their own. Proxy war was the Cold War's characteristic form of combat.

It was expressed through rival alliances and spheres of influence. The powers built great military blocs such as NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Each claimed and guarded its own sphere of influence across the world. Every power pressed against the other's sphere while defending its own. These alliances hardened and made visible the division of the world. Rival blocs were a permanent feature of the whole age.

It lasted from 1945 to 1991 and shaped the whole world. The Cold War endured for more than four decades after the Second World War. It touched almost every country and dominated the whole of world politics. It ended only with the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. From Berlin to the Congo, its rivalries reached into every continent. Its long shadow lay across the second half of the twentieth century.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The Cold War was indeed a war fought by every means but the open clash of arms, for the superpowers, forbidden by the bomb from meeting directly, fought through propaganda and espionage, through the arms and space races, through rival alliances and through the proxy wars of the Third World. Hostility, rivalry and the readiness for war were all present; only the direct battle of their armies was absent. It was, in truth, a war in all but name.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim by defining the Cold War and showing it was waged by every means short of direct war.

The trap is to narrate the history of the Cold War instead of defining it and listing its features.

The top band explains why the war was “cold” and links each feature to that central character.

Question 42

After the Second World War the United States and the Soviet Union rose above all other states to become the two superpowers. The statement holds that the war which ruined Europe made giants of America and Russia, and this is largely just. For the same conflict that exhausted the old powers raised these two to unrivalled strength. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The Second World War destroyed the old European powers. The war shattered the economies and armies of Britain, France and Germany and left much of Europe in ruins. The states that had long ruled the world were now exhausted, indebted and impoverished. A great vacuum of power opened at the very centre of world affairs. None of the old powers had the strength to fill it alone. Into that vacuum the two new giants stepped.

The United States emerged with overwhelming economic strength. The war had enriched rather than ruined the American economy, which by 1945 produced a huge share of the world's goods. The United States ended the war as the world's leading creditor and industrial power. Its factories, farms and finance gave it unmatched influence everywhere. It alone could lend and give on a scale that shaped whole continents. Economic might was the foundation of American power.

The United States held a monopoly of the atomic bomb. At the war's end the United States alone possessed the terrible new weapon it had used against Japan. This gave it a military advantage over every other state on earth. The bomb made America, for a time, the strongest power the world had known. No rival could yet answer this fearful weapon. Its atomic monopoly confirmed its rise to superpower rank.

The United States led the western world. America emerged as the guardian and paymaster of the capitalist and democratic states of the West. It built alliances and poured out aid to bind these nations to itself. The countries of western Europe looked to it for protection and recovery. Through NATO and the Marshall Plan it made itself the leader of a bloc. Leadership of the West greatly enlarged American power.

The Soviet Union emerged with the largest army in the world. The Red Army had borne the main burden of defeating Germany and stood victorious across eastern Europe. Its vast forces made the Soviet Union a military power of the very first rank. This great army was the solid basis of Soviet strength. It gave

Moscow the means to hold its conquests and overawe its neighbours. Military might raised the Soviet Union to superpower status.

The Soviet Union dominated eastern Europe. As its armies advanced westward, the Soviet Union installed friendly communist governments across eastern Europe. It gathered these states into a bloc firmly under its own control. This empire of satellites extended Soviet power deep into the continent. It gave the USSR a broad sphere and a shield against the West. Domination of eastern Europe confirmed it as a superpower.

Communism gave the Soviet Union a worldwide appeal. The Soviet Union stood as the champion of communism and of struggles against capitalism and empire. Its ideology won it followers, parties and sympathy far beyond its own borders. This appeal extended its influence into every continent. To the poor and the colonised it offered a rival model to the West. Ideology was thus a real source of Soviet power.

Both powers filled the vacuum left by the old order. With the old European powers fallen, only the United States and the Soviet Union had the strength to lead. Each stepped forward to shape the post-war world in its own image. Between them they divided the leadership of mankind into two camps. No third power could rival either in strength or reach. The two rose together to fill the empty seat of world power.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The war that ruined Europe did indeed make giants of America and Russia, for it shattered the old European powers while leaving the United States supreme in wealth and the atomic bomb, and the Soviet Union supreme in armies and in the domination of eastern Europe. Into the vacuum left by the fall of the old order the two new giants stepped. Europe's ruin was the making of the superpowers.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the war ruined Europe and raised the United States and the Soviet Union.

The trap is to treat only one power and neglect the other, or to omit the fall of the old powers.

The top band contrasts the economic basis of American power with the military basis of Soviet power.

Question 43

The Cold War arose in the years after 1945 from the breakdown of the wartime alliance between the United States and the Soviet Union. The statement holds that this alliance died with the enemy that had held it together, and there is much truth in it, though it is not the whole. For the common war against Hitler had masked deep divisions that surfaced once he was defeated. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The clash of two opposed ideologies divided the powers. The capitalism and democracy of the United States stood against the communism of the Soviet Union. Each side regarded the other's system as a mortal threat to its own way of life. This deep ideological gulf underlay the whole of the conflict. It shaped how each read the intentions of the other. It made lasting friendship between them all but impossible.

Mutual suspicion had built up during the war. Even as wartime allies, the two powers had distrusted each other's aims and ambitions. The West remembered the earlier Nazi-Soviet Pact, and the Soviets resented the long delay in opening a second front. This suspicion, bred in the war, outlived the common enemy. Neither power fully believed the other's assurances. It poisoned relations once the fighting was over.

The powers disagreed over the future of Germany. The victors could not agree whether to keep Germany weak or to rebuild it. The West sought to revive the German economy as a barrier against communism, while the Soviets sought reparations and lasting security. This quarrel over Germany became a central cause of the division. It set the powers against one another in the very heart of Europe. Germany became the sharpest of their disputes.

The powers disagreed over Poland and eastern Europe. The West wished for free and democratic governments in the liberated states of eastern Europe. The Soviet Union insisted on friendly communist

regimes as a shield against future invasion. This clash over eastern Europe broke the accord reached during the war. Each accused the other of breaking its wartime promises. It became the first great grievance of the Cold War.

Soviet expansion alarmed the West. The Soviet Union installed communist governments across the states its armies had liberated. To the West this looked like a deliberate drive to spread communism over the world. Churchill warned that an "iron curtain" had descended across Europe. The advance of Soviet power seemed to threaten the whole continent. This expansion convinced the West that the USSR must be firmly resisted.

The American atomic bomb alarmed the Soviet Union. The United States alone possessed the atomic bomb and had shown its willingness to use it. The Soviet Union feared this fearful new weapon and hastened to build one of its own. The bomb deepened the mistrust between the two powers. Each now measured the other's strength in terms of this weapon. It made the rivalry more dangerous and more suspicious.

The Truman Doctrine committed America to containment. In 1947 President Truman pledged to support free peoples resisting communism, beginning with Greece and Turkey. This doctrine of containment set America squarely against the further spread of Soviet power. It marked an open and lasting commitment to the struggle. It turned a mood of suspicion into a settled policy. The Doctrine hardened the division of the world.

The Marshall Plan divided Europe economically. The United States offered vast aid to rebuild Europe and to bind it firmly to the West. The Soviet Union forbade its satellites to accept and replied with arrangements of its own. Europe was thus split into two rival economic camps. Aid became a weapon in the contest of the blocs. The Plan deepened the division of the continent.

The breakdown of the Grand Alliance completed the rupture. With the common enemy defeated, the alliance of necessity swiftly fell apart. The clash of personalities between Stalin and the western leaders sharpened every quarrel. Old distrust, once held in check, now had free rein. There was no longer a shared purpose to bind the powers. The wartime partnership gave way to open rivalry.

The ambition of the superpowers filled the vacuum. With the old powers fallen, each superpower sought to shape the post-war world in its own image. Their rival ambitions met and clashed across the whole globe. The empty seat of world power drew them into fierce competition. Each feared that any gain by the other was a loss to itself. This rivalry for mastery underlay the whole Cold War.

The statement therefore explains much of the origins of the Cold War. The wartime alliance did indeed die with the enemy that had held it together, for once Hitler was defeated the old distrust between capitalism and communism had free rein. Yet the alliance did not die of that alone, for the quarrels over Germany and Poland, the fear roused by the bomb and by Soviet expansion, and the ambition of two rival powers all drove it to its end. The common enemy had bound the allies; his fall set them free to quarrel.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the Cold War sprang from the death of the wartime alliance.

The trap is to give only ideology and neglect the concrete disputes over Germany and eastern Europe.

The top band balances ideology, security and the specific quarrels that hardened suspicion into rivalry.

Question 44

The Cold War is often blamed above all upon the clash of the capitalist and communist ideologies of the two superpowers. The statement holds that this ideological gulf, more than any other factor, brought on the conflict. There is real truth in this, for ideology divided the powers deeply and shaped the whole of their rivalry. Yet security, power and particular quarrels were also plainly at work in the struggle. The claim is therefore partly valid, and may be weighed as follows.

Ideology divided the two powers to their roots. The United States stood for capitalism and democracy, the Soviet Union for communism and the one-party state. These systems were founded upon opposite principles and could not easily coexist. The gulf between them was fundamental and admitted of no easy compromise. Each was, by its very nature, the negation of the other. Ideology set the powers apart from the very beginning.

Each side saw the other's creed as a mortal threat. The West feared that communism aimed to conquer the whole world, while the Soviets feared that capitalism sought to destroy them. Each read the other's every move through this lens of ideological fear. This bred a deep and lasting mistrust between them. Even defensive acts were taken as proof of hostile intent. Ideology thus made the two powers into natural enemies.

Ideology shaped their aims and their propaganda. Each power sought to spread its own system and to check the advance of the other's. Their propaganda proclaimed the righteousness of their cause and the evil of their rival. The whole struggle was cast as a great contest of beliefs. Schools, films and broadcasts all preached the ideological quarrel. Ideology gave the Cold War its very language and purpose.

Ideology drove containment and the sovietisation of eastern Europe. The Soviet Union imposed communism upon the states it controlled, and the United States committed itself to containing that spread. The great policies of both powers flowed directly from their creeds. Ideology thus translated at once into concrete action. The Truman Doctrine and the Iron Curtain alike had ideological roots. It lay behind the decisive steps of the conflict.

Yet the search for security also drove the powers. The Soviet Union, twice invaded from the west, sought a belt of friendly states for its own defence. This was a concern of security at least as much as of ideology. Each power acted to guard itself against the danger of attack. A great power without communism might have sought the same buffer. Fear, not only belief, drove their conduct.

Power politics and the vacuum of 1945 played their part. With the old powers fallen, the two giants competed to fill the empty seat of world leadership. Their rivalry for power would have existed whatever their ideologies had been. Great powers had clashed over spheres of influence long before communism arose. The struggle had the shape of an old contest for dominance. Ambition as well as ideology was plainly at work.

Concrete quarrels had a logic of their own. The disputes over Germany, Poland and reparations arose from real and practical interests. These quarrels sharpened the conflict far beyond what ideology alone required. They gave the rivalry its particular flashpoints and crises. Even allies of the same creed might have quarrelled over such prizes. Interest, not creed alone, divided the powers.

Personalities and misperception deepened the divide. The suspicion of Stalin and the firmness of Truman hardened the quarrel between the powers. Each side often misread the other's defensive moves as acts of aggression. Such human factors worsened an already bitter hostility. A different set of leaders might have managed the tension better. This shows that ideology was not the sole cause.

The statement is therefore partly valid. Ideology was indeed central to the Cold War, for the clash of capitalism and communism divided the powers to their roots, shaped their aims and drove their great policies. Yet the search for security, the rivalry for power in a world vacuum, the concrete quarrels over Germany and eastern Europe, and the fears and misperceptions of leaders were also powerful causes. Ideology was the deepest source of the conflict, but it worked together with power and security to bring on the Cold War.

Examiner's Note

"How far" demands a weighed verdict, giving ideology its weight yet testing it against other causes.

The trap is to accept the claim wholesale and ignore security and power politics.

The top band ranks ideology first while showing how security and concrete quarrels reinforced it.

Question 45

The Cold War, though it never became a direct war, showed itself in many forms across the world. The statement holds that it revealed itself in doctrines and airlifts, in missiles and moon-shots, and this is largely just, for these were among its many and varied manifestations. It appeared in every field, from diplomacy to the heavens. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The Truman Doctrine proclaimed the policy of containment. In 1947 the United States pledged to help free peoples resist communism, beginning in Greece and Turkey. This doctrine committed America openly and firmly to the struggle. It set the guiding tone for all western policy that followed. It announced to the world that the USSR would be resisted. Containment became the settled purpose of the West.

The Marshall Plan bound western Europe to the West. The United States poured vast aid into Europe to rebuild its shattered economies and to check communism. The plan tied the western states firmly to America by gratitude and interest. It was a powerful weapon in the contest of the blocs. Prosperity was to be a barrier against Soviet influence. Economic aid thus became an instrument of the Cold War.

The Soviet Union replied with Cominform and Comecon. To bind its own bloc, the Soviet Union created bodies to coordinate the communist parties and economies. These answered the western programmes with organisations of the East. They welded the satellite states firmly to Moscow. They gave the eastern bloc its own economic and political framework. The Soviet reply matched the moves of the West.

Rival military alliances were formed. The West created NATO in 1949 and the East the Warsaw Pact in 1955. Each bound its members to common defence against the rival bloc. The two alliances now faced each other in arms across Europe. Every member was pledged to the quarrel of its leader. These alliances were among the clearest signs of the division.

Germany and Berlin were divided and disputed. Germany was split into two states and Berlin into two halves. The city became the scene of blockade, airlift and, in time, a dividing wall. It was the sharpest and most dangerous flashpoint of the rivalry. What happened there was watched by the whole world. Divided Germany embodied the divided world itself.

The arms race threatened the world with destruction. The powers competed to build ever greater stocks of nuclear weapons. This race consumed vast wealth and bred a constant, gnawing fear. It held over mankind the threat of universal ruin. Each new weapon by one side spurred the other to match it. The arms race was a central manifestation of the Cold War.

The space race carried the rivalry beyond the earth. The powers competed to lead in the conquest of space, from Sputnik to the moon. Success in space brought prestige and hinted at military advantage. The contest of the blocs reached even to the heavens. Each triumph was proclaimed as proof of a system's worth. The space race was a striking form of the rivalry.

Propaganda, espionage and subversion were everywhere. Each side used spies, broadcasts and secret agents to weaken and discredit the other. The war was fought in the shadows as well as in the open. Every means of undermining the enemy was freely employed. Truth itself became a casualty of the contest. Subversion was a constant feature of the whole struggle.

Proxy wars were fought across the Third World. The superpowers backed opposing sides in conflicts in Korea, Vietnam and elsewhere. These wars let them fight one another without meeting directly. The Third World thus became the battleground of their rivalry. Its peoples paid in blood for the quarrel of the great powers. Proxy war was the Cold War's bloodiest manifestation.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The Cold War did indeed reveal itself in doctrines and airlifts, in missiles and moon-shots, for it appeared in the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, in the blockade and airlift of Berlin, in the nuclear arms race and the race to the moon, as well as in rival alliances and the proxy wars of the Third World. Each of these was a face of the one great rivalry. Through all of them the depth of the struggle was made plain.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim by showing the many forms in which the Cold War revealed itself.

The trap is to describe one manifestation at length and neglect the range of the others.

The top band shows the manifestations as matched moves and counter-moves between the two blocs.

Question 46

Containment was the policy by which the United States sought to halt the spread of communism. The statement holds that America set out to build a wall of dollars and alliances around the communist world, and this is largely just, for containment was pursued by economic aid and military alliance alike. It sought to ring in the Soviet Union on every side. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Its aim was to halt the spread of communism. Containment sought not to destroy communism where it already existed but to prevent its further advance. The United States would resist every attempt to extend Soviet power. The line already reached in 1945 was to be firmly held. It was a policy of limitation rather than of rollback. This was the guiding purpose of American policy.

It grew from an analysis of Soviet conduct. The diplomat George Kennan argued that Soviet expansion could be checked by firm and patient resistance. His analysis gave containment its intellectual foundation and its confidence. It persuaded American leaders that the USSR could be held in check over time. It suggested that patience would outlast Soviet pressure. Kennan's thinking shaped the whole of the policy.

The Truman Doctrine gave it its first expression. In 1947 President Truman pledged aid to Greece and Turkey against the threat of communism. This was the first clear application of containment in action. It committed America to support free peoples wherever they were threatened. It marked a decisive break with earlier isolation. The Doctrine launched the policy upon the world.

The Marshall Plan was its economic arm. By rebuilding the shattered economies of Europe, the United States sought to remove the misery on which communism fed. Prosperity was to serve as a barrier against Soviet influence. The Plan bound the western nations firmly to America. It showed that containment could be pursued by aid as well as arms. It was containment carried on by generosity.

NATO gave it a military form. The North Atlantic alliance of 1949 bound America and western Europe to common defence. It placed American power directly in the path of Soviet expansion in Europe. Armed force now stood behind the policy of containment. Any advance would meet a united and prepared resistance. NATO was the military shield of the whole policy.

It was applied across the whole world. Containment was carried beyond Europe into Asia and elsewhere, above all in Korea and Vietnam. Wherever communism seemed to advance, America sought to resist it. The policy thus became global in its reach and its burdens. It drew the United States into distant and costly conflicts. Containment turned America into a worldwide power.

It relied on alliances and bases around the Soviet Union. The United States built a ring of alliances and military bases encircling the communist world. These allowed it to meet any advance at many different points. The USSR was to be hemmed in on every side. From Europe to Asia the ring was drawn tight. Encirclement was a key method of containment.

It had both successes and heavy costs. Containment held western Europe and much of Asia against communism, a real and lasting success. Yet it also drew America into ruinous wars such as that in Vietnam. The policy brought both security and heavy burdens in its train. Its gains and its costs were alike very great. Its long record was therefore a mixed one.

The statement is therefore largely valid. America did indeed set out to build a wall of dollars and alliances around the communist world, for containment was pursued through the Marshall Plan's aid, through NATO and a ring of alliances and bases, and through the Truman Doctrine's pledge to resist communism everywhere. Dollars and alliances were the very bricks of the wall. From Europe to Asia, America sought to hem in the Soviet Union and to hold the line against the spread of communism.

Examiner's Note
The demand is to weigh the claim that containment ringed the communist world with economic and military power.
The trap is to describe the Truman Doctrine alone and omit the economic and military arms of the policy.
The top band links containment's aim to its several instruments and weighs its successes against its costs.

Question 47

NATO and the Warsaw Pact were the two great military alliances of the Cold War. The statement holds that two armed camps faced each other across a divided Europe for a generation, and this is largely just, for the alliances embodied the division of the continent into two hostile blocs. Each stood opposed to the other in arms. The claim may be weighed as follows.

NATO was formed in 1949 as a western alliance. The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation united the United States, Canada and the states of western Europe. It was created to defend the West against the growing fear of Soviet attack. It bound America firmly to the defence of the European continent. Its birth followed hard upon the Berlin crisis. NATO became the shield of the whole western bloc.

NATO bound its members to collective defence. Under its treaty an attack upon one member was to be treated as an attack upon all. This solemn pledge of mutual defence was the very heart of the alliance. It deterred aggression by the certainty of a common response. No aggressor could strike one without facing them all. Collective security was NATO's guiding principle.

NATO answered the fear of Soviet expansion. The alliance grew from the western alarm at Soviet power in Europe, sharpened by the Berlin blockade. It was meant to hold the line against any further communist advance. It gave the policy of containment its firm military form. It reassured the small nations of the West. NATO was the West's collective reply to the Soviet threat.

The Warsaw Pact was formed in 1955 in reply. The Soviet Union and its satellites created the Pact as their own military alliance. It answered the western bloc with an organised bloc of the East. It bound the communist states together under one command. It gave the eastern camp a matching military structure. The Pact was the eastern counterpart to NATO.

The Warsaw Pact bound the communist states under Soviet command. The alliance placed the armies of eastern Europe under Soviet leadership and control. It tied the satellite states firmly to the will of Moscow. It served to hold the bloc together quite as much as to face the West. Its forces could be used to crush revolt within the bloc. Soviet command was the true reality behind the Pact.

It was prompted by West German rearmament and NATO. The admission of a rearmed West Germany into NATO deeply alarmed the Soviet Union. The Pact was created directly in response to this dangerous step. It was meant to balance the newly strengthened western bloc. The memory of German invasion made the alarm acute. West German rearmament was its immediate cause.

Together they hardened the division of Europe. The two alliances faced each other across a divided continent for four decades. They froze Europe into two armed and watchful camps. Their rivalry made the division of the world permanent and visible. Every crisis was measured as a test between them. Together they embodied the confrontation of the Cold War.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Two armed camps did indeed face each other across a divided Europe for a generation, for NATO, formed in 1949 to defend the West, and the Warsaw Pact, formed in 1955 in reply, bound their members to common defence and stood opposed across the continent. Each was pledged to the quarrel of its leader, and each armed against the other. The two alliances gave the division of Europe its firmest and most lasting military shape.

Examiner's Note
The demand is to weigh the claim that NATO and the Warsaw Pact were two armed camps dividing Europe.
The trap is to describe NATO fully and treat the Warsaw Pact as an afterthought.
The top band shows the Pact as a direct response to NATO and West German rearmament.

Question 48

Germany and its former capital Berlin lay at the very heart of the Cold War in Europe. The statement calls Berlin the wound in the side of the Cold War that would not heal, and there is much truth in it, for the divided city was the scene of its most dangerous and enduring crises. It troubled the peace again and again. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Germany was divided into four occupation zones. At the war's end Germany was divided among the United States, Britain, France and the Soviet Union. The three western zones and the Soviet zone soon drifted apart in policy and spirit. Germany thus became the meeting-point of the two blocs. The line between the zones became a line between two worlds. Its division mirrored the division of Europe itself.

Berlin lay deep within the Soviet zone, itself divided. Though it stood well inside the Soviet zone, Berlin too was split among the four powers. West Berlin was thus an island of the West within the communist East. This exposed and awkward position made it dangerously vulnerable. It could be cut off from the West with ease. Berlin's peculiar situation made it a natural flashpoint.

Disagreement over Germany's future divided the Allies. The West wished to rebuild Germany as a barrier against communism, while the Soviets feared a revived and hostile neighbour. The powers could not agree on how the country should be governed. This quarrel over Germany became central to the whole Cold War. Each step by one side alarmed the other. It set the blocs against one another in the heart of Europe.

The Berlin Blockade of 1948 was the first great crisis. Alarmed by western plans to unite and revive their zones, Stalin cut off the land routes to West Berlin. He hoped to force the western powers to abandon the city. The blockade brought the powers to the very edge of war. It was a bold attempt to drive the West out of Berlin. It was the first open trial of strength of the Cold War.

The Berlin Airlift defeated the blockade. The West supplied the city entirely by air for almost a year until Stalin at last gave way. The airlift saved West Berlin without a single shot being fired. It was a striking victory for the resolve of the western powers. It showed that the West would not be forced out. The blockade ended in clear Soviet failure.

Germany was split into two states in 1949. The western zones became the Federal Republic and the Soviet zone the German Democratic Republic. Germany was now formally divided into two hostile states. Each belonged firmly to a rival bloc and system. The division of the country was made complete and lasting. Two Germanys now faced each other across the Cold War.

Berlin remained a flashpoint and an escape route. Through still-open Berlin many East Germans fled to the freedom and prosperity of the West. This steady flight embarrassed and weakened the communist state. Berlin thus became a wound in the very side of the East. The loss of skilled people alarmed its rulers. The city remained a constant source of crisis.

The Berlin Wall was built in 1961. To stop the flight of its people, the East sealed off West Berlin with a guarded wall. The Wall swiftly became the very symbol of the divided world. It stood as a grim monument to the Cold War in stone and wire. Families and a city were split in two. Its building marked a hardening of the whole division.

Berlin came to symbolise the divided world. The fate of the city stood for the confrontation of the two great blocs. Its crises drew the anxious eyes of the whole world. What happened in Berlin was watched and weighed everywhere. Leaders staked their prestige upon its defence. The city became the very emblem of the Cold War in Europe.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Berlin was indeed the wound in the side of the Cold War that would not heal, for the divided city, an island of the West within the communist East, was the scene of blockade, airlift and, at last, a dividing wall. From 1948 to 1961 it drew the powers to the brink again and again, and the flight of refugees through it embarrassed the East until the Wall was built. Berlin remained a running sore, the sharpest and most lasting flashpoint of the Cold War in Europe.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that Berlin was the persistent flashpoint of the Cold War.

The trap is to describe the blockade alone and omit the deeper reasons for Germany's centrality.

The top band links Berlin's exposed position to its role as the sharpest flashpoint of the Cold War.

Question 49

The nuclear arms race was the competition between the superpowers to build ever greater stocks of atomic weapons. The statement holds that the peace of the age rested upon the certainty of mutual destruction, and this is largely just, for it was the terror of the bomb that held the powers from war. Fear, not trust, kept the peace. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The American atomic monopoly began the race in 1945. The United States alone possessed the atomic bomb and had used it against Japan. This gave America a fearful and unmatched advantage over every rival. The Soviet Union was determined not to remain defenceless before it. The very existence of the weapon compelled a response. The bomb thus set the whole race in motion.

Soviet fear drove the quest to break the monopoly. The Soviet Union feared that America might one day use its advantage against it. It therefore raced with all its resources to build a bomb of its own. Each power armed itself because it feared the other's strength. Neither could trust the other to hold back. Mutual fear was the true engine of the race.

The Soviet Union broke the monopoly in 1949. Within a few years the Soviet Union tested its own atomic bomb. The American monopoly was ended and the race was now joined in earnest. Both powers possessed the terrible weapon and could threaten each other. The balance of the world was transformed at a stroke. The age of two-sided nuclear terror had begun.

Both powers developed the far deadlier hydrogen bomb. In the early 1950s each side built the hydrogen bomb, many times more powerful than the first weapons. The destructive power of their arsenals grew beyond all former measure. The stakes of the race rose ever higher and more frightening. Each new leap was swiftly matched by the rival. The competition drove the weapons to ever greater force.

They built vast arsenals and delivery systems. The powers amassed thousands of warheads and the missiles, bombers and submarines to deliver them. Each strove to match and then to surpass the other's stockpile. The arsenals grew far beyond any conceivable need. The intercontinental missile made every city a target. The race seemed to have no natural limit.

The doctrine of deterrence governed the race. Each power sought enough weapons to deter the other from ever attacking. Safety was thought to lie in the certainty of a crushing retaliation. The threat of destruction was meant to keep the peace. Weakness, not strength, was held to invite attack. Deterrence became the very logic of the arms race.

The balance of terror rested on mutual assured destruction. Since each side could annihilate the other even after being struck first, neither dared to strike at all. This grim and stable equilibrium was the balance of terror. The peace of the world rested upon the fear of universal ruin. Survival depended on the certainty of shared destruction. Terror, not trust, kept the powers from war.

The race was ruinously expensive and perilous. The building of these vast arsenals consumed wealth that might have served far better ends. It held over mankind the constant danger that a war might destroy the world. The cost and the peril were alike enormous and unceasing. A single miscalculation might have proved fatal to all. The arms race was a burden and a threat to the whole of mankind.

Yet the balance of terror may have prevented war. Because a direct war would have meant mutual destruction, the powers drew back from the brink. The very terror of the weapons made their use seem unthinkable. Some argue that this fear kept the peace between the superpowers. No such long peace had followed earlier arms races. The balance of terror was perhaps its own strange restraint.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The peace of the age did indeed rest upon the certainty of mutual destruction, for as each side came to possess the power to annihilate the other even after being struck, neither dared to strike at all. This balance of terror, grim and stable, held the superpowers from a direct war throughout the Cold War. The peace was real but precarious, resting not upon goodwill but upon the shared fear of universal ruin.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the balance of terror, not trust, preserved the peace.

The trap is to list weapons without explaining the fear that drove the race or the logic of deterrence.

The top band explains how mutual assured destruction turned terror into a restraint upon war.

Question 50

The space race was the competition between the United States and the Soviet Union to lead in the exploration of space. The statement holds that the rivalry of the superpowers reached at last beyond the earth itself, and this is largely just, for the two carried their contest into the heavens. Space became another arena of the Cold War. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It was an extension of the superpower rivalry. The contest in space grew directly from the wider competition of the two blocs. Each sought to outdo the other in this dramatic new field. Space thus became yet another arena of the Cold War. Victory there was proclaimed as a victory for a way of life. The rivalry of the powers reached beyond the earth itself.

The Soviet Union led at first with Sputnik in 1957. The Soviet Union launched the first artificial satellite, Sputnik, into orbit. This unexpected triumph astonished and alarmed the watching world. It seemed to prove the strength of Soviet science and industry. It shook the western belief in its own superiority. The Soviet Union had struck the first blow in space.

It scored further firsts with the first man in space. In 1961 the Soviet Union sent Yuri Gagarin as the first man to orbit the earth. This was another great victory for Soviet prestige and confidence. It deepened western alarm at the run of Soviet successes. The lead in space seemed firmly to lie with the East. The Soviet triumphs pressed hard upon the pride of the West.

Soviet successes alarmed and spurred the United States. America feared that it had fallen behind its rival in science and in arms. The shock of Sputnik spurred it to vast new efforts and spending in space. It poured resources into catching and then passing the Soviets. National pride and security alike demanded a response. The challenge roused the United States to great action.

The United States answered with the moon landing of 1969. America set itself the goal of landing men on the moon and achieved it in 1969. This was the crowning triumph of the whole space race. It restored American prestige and seemed to prove western superiority. It answered Sputnik and Gagarin with a feat still greater. The moon landing was America's decisive reply.

The race was driven by prestige and military advantage. Success in space brought great honour to the victor and shamed the loser. The same rockets that launched satellites could also carry warheads. The contest was thus about power quite as much as glory. Each launch was watched for its meaning in the arms race. Prestige and arms alike were at stake in space.

It brought great scientific and technological gains. The race drove swift advances in rockets, computers and communications. Much of modern technology sprang from its restless efforts. The rivalry, for all its cost, greatly enriched human knowledge. Satellites came to serve weather, television and navigation. Science was among the true gainers from the contest.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The rivalry of the superpowers did indeed reach at last beyond the earth itself, for the Soviet Union led with Sputnik and the first man in space, and the United States answered with the moon landing of 1969. Driven by the desire for prestige and by the shadow of the arms race, the

two powers strove to prove the superiority of their systems even in the heavens. In space as on earth, the Cold War was fought out between them.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the superpower rivalry extended into space.

The trap is to narrate the missions without linking them to prestige, arms and superpower rivalry.

The top band connects each space triumph to the contest of prestige and the shadow of the arms race.

Question 51

Throughout the Cold War the United States and the Soviet Union never met in open battle, yet their rivalry was fought out in many wars across the world. The statement holds that the peace of Europe was bought by the fires of the Third World, and there is much truth in it. Unable to fight each other directly for fear of the bomb, the superpowers fought instead through others, and the poorer nations bore the cost. The claim may therefore be weighed as follows.

The superpowers dared not fight each other directly. A direct war between the two giants would have been of terrible cost and unimaginable danger. Each therefore drew back from any open conflict with the other. They sought instead to compete without ever meeting in battle. The risk of such a war was one neither would take. Direct war was a gamble too fearful to contemplate.

Nuclear weapons made a direct war suicidal. Both powers possessed arsenals able to destroy each other utterly and swiftly. A war between them might well have ended in their mutual annihilation. The certain fear of this outcome held the two powers apart. Victory would have been indistinguishable from ruin. The bomb thus made direct conflict quite unthinkable.

They fought instead through client states and movements. Each power supported the governments and rebel groups friendly to its cause. These local forces did the actual fighting in the superpowers' stead. The great struggle was thus waged by others on their behalf. The powers supplied the means while others supplied the blood. Proxies became the true soldiers of the Cold War.

They armed and financed rival sides in local conflicts. The superpowers poured weapons, money and advisers into the wars of the Third World. Each backed whichever side best served its own interests. Their support turned mere local quarrels into Cold War battles. A regional dispute could thus swell into a great conflict. Aid and arms were their chief weapons in these wars.

They sought to win allies and deny them to the enemy. Each power strove to draw new states into its own camp and orbit. To gain an ally anywhere was to weaken the rival everywhere. Every corner of the world became a prize to be contested. No region was thought too distant to matter. The struggle for allies drew them into far-off conflicts.

The Third World became the arena of their rivalry. The newly independent and often unstable states offered many openings for interference. Here the superpowers could compete at far less risk to themselves. The poorer nations thus became the battleground of the rich. Their weakness invited the meddling of the great powers. The Third World bore the brunt of the whole rivalry.

Proxy wars let them compete without mutual destruction. By fighting through others, the powers pursued their contest while avoiding open war. They could test each other's strength and resolve at a safe remove. Proxy war was thus the answer to the danger of the bomb. It gave an outlet to a rivalry that could not be fought head-on. It allowed competition without the risk of ruin.

These wars brought great suffering to the Third World. The peoples in whose lands the proxy wars were fought paid a heavy price. Their countries were ravaged for a quarrel that was not their own. Millions suffered and died in these long and cruel conflicts. Development was wrecked and old wounds deepened. The Third World endured the cost of the superpowers' caution.

The statement may therefore be largely accepted. The Cold War stayed cold between the superpowers because the nuclear bomb made a direct war unthinkable, so that they drew back from open conflict in Europe. But it burned hot in the Third World, where they fought their rivalry through client states and movements in Korea, Vietnam and beyond. The peace of the centre was in a sense bought by the wars of the periphery, and the poorer nations paid the price of the superpowers' caution.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the cold peace of Europe weighed against the hot wars of the Third World.

The trap is to narrate a proxy war instead of testing the claim about where the Cold War burned.

The top band links nuclear deterrence in Europe to the fighting of proxy wars in the Third World.

Question 52

The Korean War was one of the first and bloodiest of the proxy wars of the Cold War. The statement holds that it was the war that carried the Cold War from Europe into Asia, and this is largely just, for it turned the rivalry of the blocs into open fighting in the East. The struggle had become global. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Korea was divided at the 38th parallel after 1945. At the end of the war Korea was split between a Soviet zone and an American zone. A communist state arose in the north and a capitalist one in the south. The division left two hostile regimes facing each other across a line. Neither accepted the border as a lasting settlement. This split was the deep root of the conflict.

Two hostile regimes claimed the whole country. Each Korean government wished to unite the country under its own rule. The border thus became a line of constant tension and provocation. Both regarded the other as a usurper to be overthrown. Small clashes flared along the frontier. Their rivalry made a wider war very likely.

The North invaded the South in 1950. The communist North, backed by the Soviet Union, attacked the South to unite Korea by force. Its armies swept swiftly far to the south. This sudden invasion opened the war in earnest. It seemed a direct challenge to the whole western position. It turned a divided country into a battlefield.

The United States and the United Nations intervened. To contain the spread of communism, America led a United Nations force to defend the South. Its troops drove the invaders back and then pushed into the North. Containment was thus put into action in Asia. The intervention gave the war its Cold War character. A local quarrel became a struggle of the blocs.

China entered the war on the North's side. As the United Nations forces neared its border, China sent great armies to aid the North. The Chinese drove the western forces back toward the south again. The war now involved a third great power directly. It became a wider and far bloodier conflict. China's entry both widened and prolonged the war.

The war ended in stalemate and armistice in 1953. After three years of bitter and costly fighting neither side could win. An armistice fixed the border near where it had first begun, at the 38th parallel. The war thus ended almost where it had started. Much blood had been shed for very little change. The armistice froze rather than settled the quarrel.

Korea remained divided and devastated. The country was left split into two hostile states, as it had been before the war. Its land and people had suffered terribly in the long fighting. Millions had died and its cities lay in ruins. The two Koreas remained enemies across the line. The war hardened the division of the country.

The war spread and hardened the Cold War. The conflict carried the Cold War firmly into Asia and deepened the hostility of the blocs. It confirmed the western policy of containment and spurred a great rearmament. The rivalry of the superpowers grew sharper and more global. It showed that the Cold War could turn hot at the edges. Korea made the Cold War a truly worldwide struggle.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Korea was indeed the war that carried the Cold War from Europe into Asia, for the invasion of the South drew in the United States and the United Nations, and then China, turning a divided land into a battlefield of the blocs. It confirmed the policy of containment, spurred a great rearmament, and showed that the Cold War could turn hot at its edges. From Korea onward the rivalry of the superpowers was a truly worldwide struggle.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that Korea carried the Cold War from Europe into Asia.

The trap is to describe the fighting in detail and neglect the wider effects on the Cold War.

The top band shows Korea as the war that carried containment and the Cold War into Asia.

Question 53

The Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 was the moment at which the Cold War came closest to a direct nuclear war. The statement holds that for thirteen days the world stood upon the edge of the abyss, and this is largely just, for never before or since did the powers come so near to catastrophe. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Cuba had turned communist under Castro. A revolution had brought a communist government to power in Cuba under Fidel Castro. The island lay only a short distance from the shores of the United States. Its communism alarmed the Americans and drew it toward the Soviet Union. A failed American-backed invasion had pushed it further east. Cuba became a Soviet foothold in America's own hemisphere.

The Soviet Union placed nuclear missiles on the island. Moscow secretly sent to Cuba missiles able to strike much of the United States. It sought both to defend Cuba and to match the American missiles near its own borders. The move greatly strengthened the Soviet strategic position. It was carried out in secret to present the world with a fact. It was a bold and exceedingly dangerous gamble.

The missiles threatened the United States directly. From Cuba the missiles could reach American cities within a few minutes. This brought the nuclear threat directly to America's own doorstep. The United States could not accept so grave and near a danger. To ignore it would have been to invite worse. The missiles made a crisis quite unavoidable.

Kennedy imposed a naval blockade of Cuba. President Kennedy ringed the island with warships to stop any further missiles arriving. He publicly demanded that the Soviets remove those already in place. The blockade was a firm but carefully measured response. It avoided an outright attack while showing resolve. It brought the two powers to a direct trial of will.

The world stood on the brink of nuclear war. For several tense days the powers faced each other with their weapons ready. A single misstep or accident might have brought catastrophe upon all. The whole world watched and waited in real fear. Leaders weighed the fate of millions in their hands. Humanity stood closer to nuclear war than ever before or since.

Khrushchev agreed to withdraw the missiles. Rather than risk a war, the Soviet leader agreed to remove the missiles from Cuba. In return the United States pledged publicly not to invade the island. The Soviets thus drew back from the very brink. Both leaders chose retreat over ruin. The crisis was resolved by a tense compromise.

The United States made secret concessions. In a private understanding, America agreed to remove its own missiles from Turkey. This helped Khrushchev to retreat without open and total humiliation. The settlement thus gave something to each side. It allowed both to claim that they had not simply surrendered. Compromise, not victory, brought the crisis to its end.

The crisis was the closest the Cold War came to war. Never again did the superpowers come so near to a direct conflict. The terror of those thirteen days deeply shook both leaders. It taught them the peril of pushing their rivalry too far. The memory of it steadied them in later crises. The crisis was the great turning-point of the Cold War.

It led toward measures to reduce tension. Sobered by the danger, the powers set up a hotline and agreed to limit nuclear testing. The crisis thus opened the way toward the policy of détente. Fear itself became the spur to greater caution. Both sides drew back from the recklessness of before. Out of the danger came the first steps toward relaxation.

The statement is therefore largely valid. For thirteen days in 1962 the world did indeed stand upon the edge of the abyss, for the placing of Soviet missiles on Cuba and the American blockade brought the superpowers face to face with the certainty of mutual destruction. Only Khrushchev's withdrawal of the missiles, in return for American pledges, drew the world back from the brink. It was the closest the Cold War came to nuclear war, and its terror sobered both powers and opened the way toward détente.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the crisis brought the world closest to nuclear war.

The trap is to dwell on the drama of the thirteen days and neglect causes and results.

The top band shows the crisis as the turning-point that led toward the hotline and détente.

Question 54

The Vietnam War was the longest and most damaging of the proxy wars of the Cold War. The statement holds that the greatest power on earth was worn down by a small and stubborn nation, and as a verdict on the war this is largely just. For the mighty United States was in the end defeated by the communist North. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Vietnam was divided at the 17th parallel in 1954. After the French were driven out, Vietnam was split between a communist north and a non-communist south. The division was meant to be temporary but soon hardened into a fixed border. Two hostile states now faced each other across the line. Promised elections to unite the country were never held. This split was the deep root of the war.

The communist North sought to unite the country. The North, led by Ho Chi Minh, was determined to bring the whole country under communist rule. It supported and supplied a growing rebellion in the South. The drive for unity thus fuelled the conflict. It saw the war as one of national liberation. Vietnam became a battleground of rival ideologies.

The United States backed the South to contain communism. Fearing that the fall of Vietnam would spread communism across Asia, America supported the southern government. It gave money, arms and advisers, and at length its own troops. This “domino” fear drew America ever deeper into the war. Containment had reached South-East Asia. The Cold War now raged in the jungles of Vietnam.

The United States escalated its involvement from 1965. America sent great armies to Vietnam and bombed the North on a vast scale. Its forces were drawn ever more deeply into the conflict. The war grew into a major and costly American commitment. Half a million troops were at length engaged. Escalation turned a distant struggle into a great war.

The war was a brutal guerrilla struggle. The communist fighters used ambush, tunnels and concealment against the powerful American forces. The Americans could not readily defeat an enemy they could not find. The fighting was cruel, confused and destructive. Firepower alone could not win such a war. Guerrilla tactics frustrated the whole of American strength.

The Tet Offensive of 1968 shook American resolve. A great communist assault across the South showed that the enemy was far from beaten. It shocked American opinion and cast grave doubt upon the war. Confidence in an early victory was shattered at a stroke. The gap between official hopes and reality was exposed. Tet was the turning-point of the whole conflict.

Opposition to the war grew at home and abroad. The mounting cost and cruelty of the war bred protest across America and the world. Public opinion turned steadily against the fighting. The government came under heavy pressure to withdraw. Young people especially rose against the draft and the war. This opposition sapped the will to continue.

The United States withdrew and the North won in 1975. America at length pulled out its forces, and the South soon fell to the North. Vietnam was united under communist rule. The war thus ended in clear American defeat. The greatest power on earth had been driven back by a small nation. It was a humbling of American arms and pride.

The war was costly and a defeat for the United States. It cost countless lives and vast wealth and left deep and lasting scars. It shook American confidence, prestige and unity at home. It showed plainly the limits of even superpower strength. It made America wary of foreign wars for years. Vietnam was a grievous blow to the United States.

The statement is therefore a largely fair verdict. The greatest power on earth was indeed worn down by a small and stubborn nation, for the United States, for all its wealth and firepower, could not defeat the communist guerrillas of Vietnam. The brutal guerrilla war, the shock of the Tet Offensive and the rise of opposition at home broke its will to fight, and it withdrew, leaving the North to unite the country in 1975. The defeat was a humbling of American power and a lesson in the limits of even superpower strength.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that a small nation wore down the greatest power on earth.

The trap is a battle narrative that omits the war's effects on America and the Cold War.

The top band links containment to America's entry and the defeat to the limits of superpower power.

Question 55

Africa, newly emerging from colonial rule, could not escape the rivalry of the superpowers. The statement holds that the Cold War brought the continent little good and much harm, and there is much truth in it. The rivalry made Africa an arena of interference, conflict and the flooding of arms, though a few states won aid by playing the powers against each other. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Africa became an arena of superpower rivalry. The two powers competed keenly for influence among the new African states. Each sought to draw them into its own camp and system. The continent thus became a field of the wider Cold War contest. Its rivers, mines and ports were all counted as prizes. Africa's affairs were shaped by a quarrel not its own.

The superpowers backed rival regimes and movements. Each power supported the governments and rebels friendly to its own cause. Their backing turned African disputes into Cold War struggles. Local rivals thus became clients of the great powers. Aid and arms flowed to whichever side served the giver. This interference deepened and prolonged Africa's divisions.

The Congo Crisis was worsened by their interference. In the newly independent Congo the superpowers took opposing sides. Their rivalry deepened the chaos and helped to cost the country its first leaders. The Congo became an early battleground of the Cold War in Africa. Foreign meddling turned a crisis into a tragedy. Interference brought the young nation grief and division.

Angola was torn by a Cold War proxy war. In Angola the superpowers and their allies backed rival movements in a long civil war. Soviet and Cuban forces supported one side, the West and South Africa the other. The country was ravaged by a war fed and armed from outside. Its independence brought not peace but proxy conflict. Angola suffered grievously for the rivalry of others.

The rivalry fuelled coups, wars and instability. Superpower support propped up dictators and stirred up rebellions across the continent. It made African politics more violent and far less stable. Regimes rose and fell with the backing of foreign powers. Ambition at home was armed from abroad. The Cold War bred disorder throughout much of Africa.

It flooded the continent with weapons. The powers poured modern arms into Africa to equip their chosen allies. These weapons fed its wars and made them far more deadly. The continent was left awash with the tools of war. Guns outlasted the quarrels that had brought them. The arms of the Cold War left a long and bitter curse.

Some African states played the powers off for aid. A few leaders won money and arms by courting both sides in turn. They used the rivalry cleverly to their own advantage. But such gains were often bought at a heavy price. Dependence on foreign patrons could sap true independence. The game of playing off the powers was a dangerous one.

The rivalry hindered genuine development and unity. Cold War quarrels diverted Africa from its true tasks of development and unity. Resources went to arms and factions rather than to real progress. The continent's energies were wasted in the struggles of others. Its efforts at unity were cut across by the blocs. The Cold War held back the advance of Africa.

The statement may therefore be largely accepted. The Cold War brought Africa much harm, for it made the continent an arena of superpower rivalry, deepened crises such as those in the Congo and Angola, fuelled coups and wars, and flooded the land with weapons. A few states won aid by playing the powers off against each other, so that the rivalry was not wholly without gain. But on the whole it brought Africa little but weapons and war, and diverted the continent from the true tasks of development and unity.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the harm of the Cold War in Africa weighed against any gains.

The trap is to describe the Congo or Angola without testing the claim about weapons and war.

The top band concedes the aid some states won while judging the net effect harmful.

Question 56

The Non-Aligned Movement was the association of states that refused to join either camp in the Cold War. The statement holds that the new nations wished to serve neither Washington nor Moscow, and this is largely just, for the desire to avoid both blocs was the very root of the movement. They sought to keep their freedom between the two. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It arose from the desire to avoid the two blocs. The new states wished neither to serve Washington nor to serve Moscow. They sought to keep their hard-won freedom in a sharply divided world. Non-alignment offered them a path between the rival camps. They feared that alignment would cost them their independence. This desire for freedom gave the movement its birth.

Its roots lay in the Bandung Conference of 1955. At Bandung the nations of Africa and Asia met to affirm their solidarity. They condemned colonialism and proclaimed their common wish for peace. The spirit of Bandung prepared the way for non-alignment. It brought the leaders of the new world together for the first time. There the movement's guiding principles were first declared.

It was founded at Belgrade in 1961. The first full conference of non-aligned states met at Belgrade. There the movement took its formal shape and name. Its members pledged to stand apart from the Cold War blocs. They agreed to judge each question upon its own merits. Belgrade marked the true beginning of the movement.

Great leaders of the Third World founded it. Tito of Yugoslavia, Nehru of India, Nasser of Egypt and Nkrumah of Ghana were among its founders. Their prestige gave the movement weight and a powerful voice. They spoke for the hopes of the newly freed nations. Their standing drew others to the cause. Their leadership launched the movement upon the world.

Its chief aim was to keep clear of both camps. The movement sought above all to avoid entanglement in the superpower rivalry. Its members would join neither of the two military blocs. They wished to preserve their freedom of judgement and action. They would not be tied to the quarrels of the great powers. Non-alignment was the movement's guiding purpose.

It stood for anti-colonialism and self-determination. The movement firmly supported the struggle of peoples still under colonial rule. It upheld the right of every nation to govern itself. Freedom from foreign domination was among its highest aims. It gave moral support to liberation movements everywhere. It was a champion of the whole colonised world.

It sought world peace and disarmament. The movement worked to ease the dangerous tensions of the Cold War. It called for peace and for the reduction of armaments. It hoped to spare the world the horror of a nuclear war. It urged the great powers toward restraint. Peace was thus central to its whole purpose.

It worked for the economic development of its members. The movement sought a fairer deal for the poorer nations in the world economy. It pressed for aid, for better trade and for development. It spoke for the shared interests of the Third World. It called for a new and more just economic order. Economic progress was among its chief goals.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The new nations did indeed wish to serve neither Washington nor Moscow, for the desire to keep clear of the superpower rivalry, born of the spirit of Bandung and founded at Belgrade in 1961, was the guiding purpose of the Non-Aligned Movement. Under leaders such as Nehru, Nasser and Nkrumah it stood for non-alignment, for anti-colonialism, for peace and for development. Its aim was to preserve the freedom of the new nations in a world divided between two camps.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the wish to avoid both blocs founded the Non-Aligned Movement.

The trap is to list the founders without explaining why the movement was needed or what it sought.

The top band links the movement to the wish of new states to keep their freedom between the blocs.

Question 57

The Non-Aligned Movement set out to give the Third World a voice and to keep it clear of the Cold War blocs. The statement holds that it gave the weak a voice but not a sword, and this is largely just, for it won a hearing in the world but lacked the power to enforce its will. Its strength was moral rather than material. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It gave the Third World a voice in world affairs. The movement allowed the poorer nations to speak with weight upon the world stage. Together they could press their views upon the great powers. It gave a hearing to those who had long had none. Their numbers lent them influence in bodies such as the United Nations. This was among its chief achievements.

It supported the struggle against colonialism. The movement lent its voice and its support to peoples still under foreign rule. It kept the cause of freedom firmly before the world. It helped in this way to hasten the end of empire. It gave the liberation movements moral and diplomatic backing. Anti-colonialism was a field of real success.

It helped its members avoid entanglement in the Cold War. Many states kept their freedom by standing outside the two blocs. They avoided being drawn into quarrels that were not their own. Non-alignment thus shielded them from the worst of the rivalry. It spared them the dangers of taking sides. In this the movement served its members well.

It promoted peace and cooperation among the new states. The movement worked to ease tensions and to bind the Third World together. It called for peace and for a fairer world order. It fostered among its members a real spirit of solidarity. It gave them a forum in which to meet and consult. These were worthy, if modest, achievements.

Yet it was weakened by internal divisions. Its members differed widely in their interests and their politics. They often could not agree upon a single common course. Some were even at war with one another at times. These divisions sapped the movement's strength and unity. Disunity was its greatest and most persistent weakness.

Some members leaned toward one bloc or the other. Though pledged to non-alignment, certain states favoured one superpower in practice. Their leanings weakened the movement's claim to true neutrality. Genuine non-alignment was not always faithfully kept. Aid from a patron often bought a quiet loyalty. This inconsistency undermined the movement's purpose.

It lacked the power to enforce its wishes. The movement could pass resolutions but could not compel the great powers. Its words carried little force in a world ruled by strength. It could persuade and appeal, but it could not command. It had neither armies nor sanctions at its disposal. Weakness sharply limited what it could achieve.

Its economic goals were largely unfulfilled. The movement failed to win the fairer world economy that it sought. The poorer nations remained poor and dependent as before. Its calls for a new economic order went largely unheeded. The rich nations would not surrender their advantages. Here its ambitions plainly outran its power.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The Non-Aligned Movement did indeed give the weak a voice but not a sword, for it allowed the poorer nations to speak with weight upon the world stage, to support the struggle against colonialism, and to keep clear of the rivalry, yet it was weakened by internal divisions and had no power to compel the great powers. Its achievements were real but its economic goals went largely unfulfilled. It was a voice for the weak, but it could not overcome its own weakness.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the movement won a voice but lacked the power to enforce it.

The trap is to praise the movement without facing its divisions and weakness, or the reverse.

The top band roots the movement's limits in its internal divisions and its lack of enforcing power.

Question 58

Though the Cold War was a time of deep hostility, the superpowers also took steps to lessen its dangers. The statement holds that the terror of Cuba taught the powers the wisdom of restraint, and this is largely just, for the narrow escape of 1962 spurred them to seek ways of reducing tension. Fear became the spur to caution. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The Cuban crisis spurred the search for safety. The narrow escape from nuclear war in 1962 deeply sobered both powers. It taught them the peril of pushing their rivalry too far. They resolved to take steps to reduce the danger between them. The memory of those days steadied their later conduct. Fear thus became the spur to caution.

A hotline linked Washington and Moscow. A direct line of communication was set up between the two capitals. It allowed the leaders to speak at once in any crisis. This reduced the risk of a war by accident or misunderstanding. It gave the powers a means to step back from the brink. The hotline was a first step toward safety.

Treaties limited the testing of nuclear weapons. In 1963 the powers agreed to ban the testing of nuclear bombs in the atmosphere. This checked both the spread of poison and the growth of arsenals. It marked a first real agreement to restrain the arms race. It showed that the two sides could reach accord. The test-ban treaty was a genuine advance.

The policy of détente relaxed relations in the 1970s. The powers sought a general easing of their long rivalry. They opened talks, trade and contact between the two blocs. Hostility gave way for a time to a wary cooperation. Summit meetings replaced threats and confrontation. Détente was the high point of the search for peace.

The SALT agreements limited nuclear arms. The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks set bounds to the numbers of certain weapons. They were the first agreements actually to cap the arms race. They showed that the powers could bargain seriously over arms. They slowed, though they did not end, the competition. SALT was a landmark of the whole détente.

The Helsinki Accords eased tensions in Europe. In 1975 the powers agreed to accept the borders of post-war Europe and to respect human rights. This eased the dangerous confrontation on the continent. It brought a measure of trust between the rival blocs. It seemed to settle the quarrels left by the war. Helsinki was a further step toward peace.

Trade and contact grew between the blocs. The easing of tension allowed a greater exchange of goods, visits and ideas. The two worlds were drawn a little closer together. Such contact softened the hostility of the long rivalry. It built small bridges across the divide. It was among the real fruits of détente.

Yet détente broke down over Afghanistan in 1979. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan shattered the mood of cooperation. Tension swiftly returned and the arms race resumed. The measures had eased but not truly ended the Cold War. A new and colder phase now opened. Détente proved a pause rather than a lasting peace.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The terror of Cuba did indeed teach the powers the wisdom of restraint, for the narrow escape from nuclear war in 1962 sobered both sides and drove them to reduce the danger. From it flowed the hotline, the test-ban treaty, and in time the policy of détente, with its arms-limitation agreements and the Helsinki Accords. Yet the restraint proved fragile, for détente broke down over Afghanistan in 1979. Fear had taught caution, but the caution did not last.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the Cuban crisis spurred the powers toward restraint and détente.

The trap is to list treaties without showing that they sprang from the fear of nuclear war.

The top band shows détente as a real but fragile easing that broke down over Afghanistan.

Question 59

The Cold War came to an end around 1990 with the collapse of communism in eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The statement holds that the rivalry ended less through the strength of the West than through the weakness of the East, and this is largely just. For it was the economic failure of the Soviet system and the reforms it drove that brought the Cold War to its close. The claim may therefore be weighed as follows.

The Soviet Union was crippled by economic weakness. The communist economy had fallen far behind that of the West. It could no longer meet the needs of its people or the demands of the rivalry. This deep weakness undermined the whole Soviet position. Shortages and stagnation bred discontent at home. Economic failure lay at the very root of the end.

The arms race had ruined the Soviet economy. The endless effort to match American arms drained the Soviet Union of its wealth. It could not long bear the crushing cost of the competition. The burden of the arms race broke its strength at last. Guns had been bought at the price of butter. The rivalry had exhausted the weaker power.

Gorbachev launched the reforms of glasnost and perestroika. A new Soviet leader sought to reform the failing system through openness and restructuring. His reforms loosened the tight grip of the communist state. They set in motion great changes that he could not control. Free speech exposed the failings of the regime. Gorbachev's reforms opened the way to the end.

He sought to end the costly rivalry with the West. Gorbachev wished to turn from the arms race to the urgent tasks of reform at home. He sought agreement and even friendship with the West. He drew back deliberately from the confrontation of the Cold War. He signed treaties to reduce nuclear arms. His change of course helped greatly to end the rivalry.

He withdrew Soviet support from eastern Europe. Gorbachev let it be known that the Soviet Union would no longer prop up the communist regimes of eastern Europe. Without Soviet backing those unpopular regimes could not stand. The satellite states were left at last to their own fate. The threat of Soviet tanks was lifted. This withdrawal doomed the whole communist bloc.

The communist regimes of eastern Europe fell in 1989. One after another the peoples of eastern Europe threw off their communist rulers. In a single remarkable year the whole bloc collapsed. The Soviet empire in Europe dissolved almost without bloodshed. Poland, Hungary and the rest regained their freedom. The fall of these regimes ended the divided continent.

The Berlin Wall came down in 1989. The great symbol of the divided world was breached by joyful crowds. Its fall proclaimed the end of the Cold War in Europe. Germany at once began to move toward reunion. The most hated barrier of the age was thrown open. The Wall's collapse was the emblem of the whole change.

The Soviet Union itself dissolved in 1991. The reforms could not in the end save the Soviet state itself. It broke apart into its many separate republics. The great rival of the West thus passed out of existence. The red flag was lowered over the Kremlin. The Soviet collapse brought the rivalry to its final close.

The United States emerged as the sole superpower. With its great rival gone, the United States stood alone at the summit of world power. The bipolar world gave way to an American age. The long contest had ended in a clear western victory. One superpower now stood where there had been two. The world was remade by the outcome.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The Cold War ended above all through the weakness of the Soviet Union, worn down by economic failure and the ruinous burden of the arms race, so that Gorbachev's reforms loosened the communist grip and let the satellites fall. The firmness and strength of the West played their part in the outcome, but it was the collapse of the weaker power, rather than any victory of arms, that ended the rivalry. The Cold War was lost by the Soviet Union more than it was won by the West.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires Soviet weakness weighed against Western strength as the cause of the end.

The trap is to narrate the events of 1989 without judging why the Soviet side gave way.

The top band ranks Soviet economic failure and Gorbachev's reforms above any victory of the West.

Question 60

The Cold War dominated world affairs for nearly half a century and left a deep mark upon every continent. The statement holds that it ended in no true victory and that its costs fell upon all mankind, and there is much truth in it, though the West did in the end prevail. Its arms race, its proxy wars and its constant danger were borne by the whole world. The claim may be assessed as follows.

It divided the world into two hostile blocs. For two generations the nations were ranged around one or other of the superpowers. The whole globe was split between East and West. This deep division shaped the politics of the entire age. Even neutral states were pressed to lean one way or another. The world lived under the long shadow of the rivalry.

It burdened the world with a ruinous arms race. The powers poured vast wealth into weapons of ever greater destruction. Resources that might have served mankind were spent instead on arms. The whole world bore the heavy cost of the rivalry. Poorer nations too were drawn into buying weapons. The arms race was a grievous burden upon all.

It brought humanity to the brink of nuclear war. More than once, as in the Cuban crisis, the world came close to catastrophe. The threat of universal ruin hung constantly over the age. Mankind learned to live under the fear of the bomb. A single misjudgement might have destroyed civilisation. The Cold War held the world in constant danger.

It caused destructive proxy wars in the Third World. The rivalry was fought out in wars in Korea, Vietnam and many other lands. These conflicts brought death and ruin to whole nations. The poorer peoples paid the price of the superpowers' quarrel. Their development was wrecked and their divisions deepened. Proxy war was the Cold War's bloody legacy.

It shaped the process of decolonisation. The superpowers courted the new nations and drew them into their rivalry. The end of empire was thus bound up with the Cold War. The choices of the new states were shaped by its pressures. Independence often brought a fresh dependence on a patron. Decolonisation unfolded under the watchful eye of the great powers.

It gave rise to the Non-Aligned Movement. The wish to escape the rivalry drew the Third World together. The Non-Aligned Movement was in large part the fruit of the Cold War. It gave the poorer nations a voice of their own. It offered a path between the two great blocs. Out of the division there came a new solidarity.

It drove great advances in science and space. The fierce competition spurred swift progress in arms, rockets and space travel. The conquest of space sprang directly from the rivalry. Much of modern technology was in truth its by-product. Satellites and computers owed much to the contest. Science was among the true gainers from the struggle.

It ended in the triumph of the West. The collapse of communism left the United States supreme in the world. The long contest closed in a clear western victory. The world passed from two superpowers to a single one. Capitalism and democracy seemed for a time to have prevailed. The Cold War reshaped the whole balance of world power.

It left a legacy of conflict and division. Divided nations, scattered arms and old grievances outlived the rivalry itself. The scars of the Cold War remained long after its end. Old quarrels lingered on in many troubled lands. Weapons poured out in its course fed later wars. Its legacy troubled the world that followed.

Yet it kept a wary peace among the great powers. For all its dangers, the Cold War saw no direct war between the superpowers. The terror of the bomb held them back from the final brink. In this grim and paradoxical sense it preserved a kind of peace. No general war engulfed the great powers for decades. The balance of terror was also a strange restraint.

The statement is therefore only partly valid. The Cold War did end in a victory, for the collapse of communism left the West and the United States supreme. Yet its costs were paid by everyone, for the whole world bore the burden of a ruinous arms race, the terror of nuclear war, and the destructive proxy wars of the Third World. If the West won, it was at a price shared by all mankind, and the wary peace the rivalry preserved was bought with constant danger. The significance of the Cold War lies as much in its universal cost as in its final outcome.

Examiner's Note

"Discuss" requires the effects weighed and the claim of no victory and universal cost tested.

The trap is to list effects without judging who won and who paid.

The top band concedes the Western victory while showing the cost fell upon the whole world.

Question 61

The new threats to world peace and security are the non-military dangers that have risen since the Cold War. The statement holds that they wear no uniform and respect no border, and this is largely just, for they spring from non-state actors and cross frontiers freely. They are unlike the wars of states in their very nature. The claim may be weighed as follows.

They are largely the work of non-state actors. The new threats spring not from governments and their armies but from groups, networks and individuals. Terrorists, criminals and hackers, rather than states, are their chief agents. This makes them hard to identify and harder still to deter. They cannot be answered by the old methods of diplomacy and war. Their non-state character is their first distinctive feature.

They are transnational and cross borders freely. The new threats pay no heed to the frontiers of states. Terrorism, crime and disease pass easily from one country to another. No single nation can shut them out by guarding its borders alone. They are global in reach and in effect. Their borderless nature sets them apart from older dangers.

They take many and varied forms. The new threats are not military alone but economic, environmental, social and criminal. They range from terrorism and drug trafficking to climate change and pandemics. This great variety makes them difficult to grasp as a whole. Each demands its own particular remedy. Their diversity is among their defining features.

They are asymmetric and unconventional. The new threats do not meet states in open and equal battle. A small group can strike a great power by surprise and stealth. The weak can thus wound the strong through terror and subversion. Conventional strength offers little defence against them. This asymmetry is a mark of the new dangers.

They are fed by globalisation and modern technology. The open borders, swift travel and instant communications of the modern age serve the new threats. Criminals move money and goods, and terrorists spread their message, across the world in moments. The very tools of progress have become the tools of danger. Globalisation has given these threats their reach. Technology is their constant ally.

They threaten people as much as states. The new threats endanger the lives, health and welfare of ordinary people directly. A pandemic or a famine may kill more than a war. Security has thus come to mean the safety of people, not of states alone. This idea of human security is a fruit of the new threats. They have widened the very meaning of security.

They are difficult to combat by force alone. The new threats cannot be defeated by armies and weapons in the old way. Bombs cannot cure a disease or halt a changing climate. They require cooperation, law, development and patient effort. No single state can overcome them by its own strength. Their resistance to force is a key feature.

They demand international cooperation to overcome. Because they cross borders, the new threats can be met only by nations working together. No state, however powerful, can defeat them alone. They call for shared intelligence, common laws and united action. Cooperation has become the first condition of security. This need for common effort marks the new age.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The new threats do indeed wear no uniform and respect no border, for they are the work of terrorists, criminals and other non-state actors rather than of armies, and they pass freely from one country to another. Terrorism, crime, disease and environmental ruin belong to no nation and can be shut out by none. Non-state in their agents and transnational in their reach, the new threats have transformed the very meaning of security.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim by showing the new threats to be non-state (no uniform) and transnational (no border).

The trap is to list examples of new threats without drawing out their common features.

The top band explains why the new threats need cooperation rather than force, and widen "security" to people.

Question 62

Threats to world peace may be divided into the traditional and the new. The statement holds that the wars of states have given way to the threats of shadows, and this is largely just, for the danger has passed from the open armies of nations to the hidden work of non-state actors. Insecurity has changed its very nature. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Traditional threats came from states; the new from non-state actors. The old dangers sprang from governments and their armies, as one state made war upon another. The new threats spring from groups, networks and individuals such as terrorists and criminals. The agent of insecurity has changed from the state to the group. This shift is the first great difference between them. It changes how the threats must be met.

Traditional threats were military; the new are varied. The old dangers took the form of armies, weapons and open war. The new threats are also economic, environmental, social and criminal. Insecurity is no longer a matter of arms alone. It now includes disease, poverty and a changing climate. The nature of the threat has greatly widened.

Traditional threats respected borders; the new ignore them. Wars between states were fought over and along fixed frontiers. The new threats cross borders freely and belong to no one country. A frontier that

could stop an army cannot stop a virus or a hacker. The new dangers are truly global in their reach. They cannot be shut out by guarding a border.

Traditional threats were symmetric; the new are asymmetric. States once met in open and roughly equal battle, army against army. The new threats are asymmetric, as a small group strikes a great power by stealth. The weak can now wound the strong through terror and surprise. Conventional strength no longer guarantees safety. This asymmetry marks the new age of threats.

Traditional threats endangered states; the new endanger people. The old wars threatened the survival and borders of states. The new threats endanger the lives, health and welfare of ordinary people directly. Security has thus come to mean the safety of people, not of states alone. The idea of human security has arisen from this change. The focus has shifted from the state to the person.

Traditional threats could be met by force; the new cannot. The old dangers were answered by armies, alliances and the balance of power. The new threats cannot be defeated by force alone. Bombs cannot cure a disease or mend a ruined climate. They require law, development and patient cooperation. The old remedies no longer suffice.

Traditional threats were open; the new are often hidden. Wars between states were declared and fought in the open. The new threats work in secret, through terror, crime and subversion. They strike without warning and hide among the innocent. This makes them far harder to foresee and to prevent. Their hidden nature is a further difference.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The wars of states have indeed given way, in large measure, to the threats of shadows, for where insecurity once came from the open armies of nations, it now comes from terrorists, criminals and other hidden hands. The new threats are non-state where the old were state, transnational where the old respected borders, and hidden where the old were open. Yet the wars of states have not wholly vanished, and the old threats survive beside the new.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim by contrasting the open wars of states with the hidden new threats.

The trap is to describe traditional threats and then new threats without drawing the contrast.

The top band pairs each feature of the old threats against its opposite among the new.

Question 63

The new threats to world peace and security have risen greatly in prominence since the end of the Cold War. The statement traces them to globalisation, the opening and joining of the world, and there is much truth in the claim. The freer movement of people, goods, money and ideas that has enriched the world has also served the terrorist and the criminal. Yet globalisation is not the sole cause, for poverty, weak states and old grievances have played their part. The claim may therefore be weighed as follows.

The end of the Cold War left power vacuums and loose weapons. The collapse of the old order removed the tight control the superpowers had kept over their spheres. Whole regions were left unstable, and vast stocks of weapons fell into other hands. These conditions gave terrorists and criminals their opportunity. The passing of the Cold War thus opened the way to the new threats. Its end was a starting-point for the new dangers.

Globalisation opened the borders of the world. The freer movement of people, goods and money across the world served the new threats. Criminals and terrorists could now travel, trade and communicate with ease. The very openness that aided trade also aided crime and terror. Threats could spread as swiftly as commerce. Globalisation gave the new dangers their reach.

Modern technology gave the threats new tools. The internet, mobile phones and swift transport became weapons in the hands of the wicked. Terrorists spread their message and criminals moved their money in moments. Technology multiplied both the reach and the speed of the threats. The tools of progress became the tools of danger. Advances in technology fed the new threats.

Poverty and inequality bred grievance and recruits. The great gulf between rich and poor filled many with anger and despair. The poor and the hopeless became ready recruits for crime and terror. Misery gave the new threats their foot-soldiers and their cause. Want was thus a deep root of the danger. Poverty nourished the new threats.

Weak and failed states gave the threats a haven. Many states could not control their own territory or borders. In these ungoverned spaces terrorists and criminals found safe refuge. The weakness of states was the opportunity of the threats. Where government failed, danger flourished. Failed states became the nurseries of the new threats.

Religious and ideological extremism supplied a motive. Intolerant and violent creeds moved many to acts of terror. Extremism gave the new threats a cause for which to kill. It turned grievance into a holy or righteous mission. Belief thus became a driver of violence. Ideological extremism was a powerful cause.

Porous borders eased the movement of threats. Many frontiers were poorly guarded and easily crossed. Weapons, drugs and people passed over them with little hindrance. This ease of movement served the transnational threats. Borders that could not be held could not keep out danger. Porous frontiers helped the threats to spread.

The huge profits of crime drew many in. The trade in drugs, arms and people brought enormous wealth. This lure of profit drew countless people into transnational crime. Greed, as much as grievance, fed the new threats. The riches to be won made the danger self-sustaining. Profit was a constant spur to the threats.

Old grievances and conflicts fuelled the threats. Long-standing political, ethnic and territorial disputes lingered on unresolved. These grievances drove some to terror and armed struggle. The threats fed upon quarrels that had never been settled. Unhealed wounds gave them a lasting cause. Old conflicts nourished the new dangers.

The statement may therefore be largely accepted. The new threats are indeed in great part the dark side of globalisation, for the open borders, swift travel and instant communications that serve trade also serve terrorism and crime, and technology has armed the wicked with new tools. Yet globalisation is not their sole cause, for the vacuums left by the Cold War, the poverty and weakness of many states, and the extremism and grievances of the age were also needed. Globalisation gave the new threats their reach; other forces gave them their motive.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires globalisation weighed against the other causes of the new threats.

The trap is to praise or blame globalisation without testing it against poverty and weak states.

The top band shows globalisation giving the threats their reach while other causes give them their motive.

Question 64

The world today is troubled less by wars between states than by terrorism, crime, disease and environmental ruin. The statement holds that these new threats are more dangerous than the traditional wars of states. There is real force in the claim, for the new threats are elusive, global and hard to defeat. Yet the traditional threats, and above all the danger of great-power war, remain grave. The claim may therefore be weighed as follows.

The new threats are harder to identify and defeat. Unlike the armies of states, the new threats are hidden and elusive. They strike from the shadows and hide among the innocent. They cannot be met by the old methods of war and diplomacy. This makes them in some ways more dangerous than open enemies. Their very elusiveness is a peril.

They cross borders and threaten the whole world. The new threats belong to no one country and respect no frontier. A virus, a terror network or a criminal trade may touch every nation at once. No state can shut them out by its own strength. Their global reach makes them a danger to all. This universality is a mark of their gravity.

They endanger people directly and daily. The new threats reach into the ordinary lives of people everywhere. Disease, crime and terror may strike anyone, anywhere, at any time. They bring insecurity into daily life as war did not. In this constant reach lies much of their danger. They touch far more lives than most wars.

They cannot be deterred as states could be. A hostile state could be deterred by the threat of retaliation. A terrorist or a virus cannot be deterred in this way. The old logic of deterrence fails against the new threats. This leaves the world with fewer defences against them. Their immunity to deterrence is a real danger.

Yet the traditional threat of great-power war remains grave. The danger of war between great powers has not vanished from the world. Such a war, fought with nuclear weapons, could destroy civilisation itself. No new threat carries so total a peril. The traditional threat therefore keeps its terrible weight. It cannot be dismissed as a thing of the past.

Traditional threats can still kill on the largest scale. A single war between states may kill more than years of terrorism. The world wars slew tens of millions in a few years. Against such destruction the new threats seem, at times, the lesser evil. The scale of traditional war remains unmatched. Its capacity for ruin is unequalled.

The two kinds of threat are in truth intertwined. The new threats and the old are not wholly separate but feed upon each other. Weak states breed terror, and terror may draw in the armies of states. Crime funds war, and war breeds crime and refugees. To rank one above the other is to miss their connection. They are best seen as parts of a single insecurity.

The danger of each depends upon time and place. In one age or region the wars of states loom largest, in another the new threats. For a poor and unstable country, terror and disease may be the graver peril. For the great powers, the risk of war may still weigh most. The greater danger cannot be fixed for all times and places. It shifts with circumstance.

The statement is therefore only partly valid. The new threats are indeed dangerous in ways the old were not, for they are elusive, global, undeterrable and reach into daily life. Yet the traditional threat of great-power war remains the gravest of all, for it alone could destroy civilisation, and no war has yet been matched by terrorism for sheer scale of death. The two kinds of threat are moreover intertwined, and the greater danger shifts with time and place. The new threats are not simply more dangerous, but dangerous in a new and different way.

Examiner's Note

"How far" demands a weighed verdict, not the wholesale acceptance or rejection of the claim.

The trap is to praise the new threats' novelty while forgetting the surviving danger of nuclear war.

The top band concedes the new dangers yet insists on the peril of great-power war and their intertwining.

Question 65

Terrorism is among the most feared of the new threats to world peace and security. The statement calls it the theatre of fear, played for an audience of millions, and there is much truth in the image, for terrorism seeks above all to spread fear through the spectacle of its violence. Its true target is the watching world. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It is the use of violence to spread fear. Terrorism seeks above all to strike terror into a population. It uses bombings, shootings and hostage-taking to frighten and to coerce. The fear it spreads is often its true weapon and its aim. The violence is a means to a wider terror. This spreading of fear is its essential nature.

It is directed against civilians and the innocent. Terrorism strikes not armies but ordinary and defenceless people. It attacks markets, trains, offices and places of worship. By harming the innocent it shocks and horrifies the world. This deliberate targeting of civilians is a defining mark. It sets terrorism apart from ordinary war.

It is driven by political, religious or ideological aims. Terrorism is not mere crime but violence in the service of a cause. Its agents seek to change governments, to spread a faith or to advance an idea. The motive is always some larger political or ideological goal. This purpose distinguishes it from common violence. It is violence with a message.

It is the work of non-state actors. Terrorism is carried out by groups, networks and individuals, not by states. Bodies such as Al-Qaeda and its like are its chief agents. This non-state character makes it hard to identify and to punish. It cannot be answered as the aggression of a state would be. Its agents hide among the people.

It chooses symbolic and public targets. Terrorists strike at targets that carry meaning and command attention. Great buildings, capital cities and crowded places are their chosen marks. The aim is to make each attack a message to the world. The target is chosen for its symbolism as much as its harm. This use of symbols is a key feature.

It seeks the attention of the media and the world. Terrorism depends upon publicity for its effect. Each attack is staged to be seen and reported across the globe. The terror is spread by the news of the deed as much as the deed itself. Without an audience the act would lose its purpose. Terrorism is in part a theatre of fear.

It is often transnational in its reach. Modern terrorism crosses borders in its members, its money and its targets. Networks in one land may strike in another far away. This global reach makes it a threat to the whole world. It cannot be confined within a single country. Its transnational nature multiplies its danger.

It strikes by surprise and stealth. Terrorism gives no warning and observes no rules of war. It strikes suddenly, from hiding, against the unprepared and the unsuspecting. The victim can never know when or where the blow will fall. This constant uncertainty spreads a fear far wider than the attacks themselves. Its stealth and surprise are among its most fearful features.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Terrorism is indeed the theatre of fear, played for an audience of millions, for it uses violence against the innocent, staged at symbolic targets and spread by the media, to terrify and to coerce a watching world. Its true weapon is the fear it spreads rather than the harm it does, and without an audience its acts would lose their purpose. It is a theatre of terror, in which the many are frightened by the suffering of the few.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim by defining terrorism as the spreading of fear before a wide audience.

The trap is to narrate particular attacks instead of defining terrorism and drawing out its features.

The top band ties every feature to terrorism's central aim of coercion through fear.

Question 66

Terrorism has become one of the gravest threats to peace in the modern world. The statement holds that the terrorist is the product of conditions rather than of nature, and this is largely just. Grievance, poverty, extremism and the weakness of states shape the men who turn to terror. No one is born a terrorist; the conditions of the age make him. The claim may therefore be weighed as follows.

Political grievances and oppression drive men to terror. Where people feel wronged, oppressed or denied a voice, some turn to violence. Terrorism becomes the weapon of those who despair of peaceful change. Real or imagined injustice thus feeds the terrorist cause. Grievance is among the deepest roots of terror. Oppression breeds the will to strike back.

Religious and ideological extremism supplies a motive. Intolerant and violent creeds move some to kill in the name of a faith or an idea. Extremism turns grievance into a holy or righteous mission. It offers the terrorist a cause worth dying and killing for. Belief thus becomes a powerful driver of violence. Fanaticism is a common source of terror.

Poverty and unemployment provide recruits. The poor, the idle and the hopeless are easily drawn into terrorism. It offers them purpose, belonging and sometimes payment. Misery makes the young ready to follow those who preach violence. Want thus supplies the terrorist with his foot-soldiers. Poverty is a fertile ground for recruitment.

Foreign occupation and intervention breed resentment. The presence of foreign armies and the meddling of great powers anger many peoples. Terrorism is often a response to what is seen as invasion or humiliation. Resentment of the foreigner drives some to strike back by terror. Intervention thus feeds the very violence it seeks to end. It is a frequent spark of terrorism.

Ethnic and nationalist struggles turn to terror. Peoples seeking their own state or freedom from another sometimes take up terror. Where their cause seems hopeless by peaceful means, they turn to violence. Nationalist and separatist quarrels thus breed terrorism. The struggle for a homeland becomes a campaign of fear. Such conflicts are a lasting source of terror.

Weak and failed states give terrorism a haven. Where governments cannot control their territory, terrorists find safe refuge. In these ungoverned spaces they train, arm and plan in freedom. The weakness of states is thus the opportunity of terror. Failed states become the bases of terrorist networks. Their disorder nourishes the threat.

Funding from crime sustains terrorist groups. Terrorism is costly, and its groups turn to crime for their money. The trade in drugs, arms and hostages fills their coffers. This wealth allows them to arm, train and strike. The link with crime makes terrorism self-sustaining. Its funding is a cause of its persistence.

Modern technology and media spread and inspire it. The internet allows terrorists to preach, recruit and plan across the world. Their message and their methods spread swiftly to distant lands. Publicity magnifies each attack and inspires imitation. Technology thus feeds and multiplies the threat. The modern world has given terror new wings.

The failure of peaceful means of redress. Where lawful and peaceful channels of change are blocked, some turn to violence in despair. When protest and politics bring no redress, terror can seem the only recourse left. The closing of peaceful avenues thus breeds the resort to force. Frustration with fruitless struggle drives the desperate to the bomb. The absence of hope in peaceful change is itself a cause of terror.

Marginalisation and injustice deepen the grievance. Groups that feel excluded, despised or denied justice may turn to terror. The sense of being shut out breeds anger and alienation. From this bitterness some are drawn into violence. Marginalisation thus prepares the soil for terrorism. Exclusion feeds the terrorist cause.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The terrorist is indeed made rather than born, for it is political grievance and oppression, religious and ideological extremism, poverty and marginalisation, and the havens of weak states that turn men to terror. The conditions of the modern world, not any inborn wickedness, breed the terrorist and supply his recruits. To understand terrorism is therefore to understand the conditions that make it, and to combat it is to address them.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the making of the terrorist by conditions weighed as the causes of terrorism.

The trap is to describe attacks instead of the conditions that breed the terrorist.

The top band separates the grievances and beliefs that motivate from the weak states that enable.

Question 67

Terrorism does great harm far beyond the immediate victims of its attacks. The statement holds that the bomb in the market place strikes not only the dead but the living who fear to follow, and this is largely just, for the deepest effect of terrorism is the fear it leaves among the living. Its harm outreaches its casualties. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It causes loss of life and injury. Terrorism kills and maims great numbers of innocent people. Its bombings, shootings and attacks leave death and suffering in their wake. Each outrage destroys lives and shatters families in a single moment. The wounded are often left to bear their scars for many years. This direct harm to life and limb is the first and gravest of its effects.

It spreads fear and insecurity. Terrorism fills whole populations with dread of the next attack. People come to fear crowds, travel and public places. This constant fear disturbs the peace of ordinary life. The sense of security that people once enjoyed is lost. Terror is the very aim and effect of terrorism.

It damages economies. Terrorism wrecks trade, tourism and investment wherever it strikes. Attacks frighten away visitors and drive up the heavy cost of security. Whole industries such as travel and hospitality may be ruined by a single outrage. Businesses close and jobs are lost far beyond the scene of the attack. The economic harm often far exceeds the immediate damage done.

It causes political instability. Terrorism can shake and even topple weak governments. It sows division and fear and may provoke harsh and unpopular measures. Sustained campaigns of terror may unsettle whole nations and regions. Rulers who cannot protect their people lose authority and legitimacy. The order and stability of nations are thus undermined by terror.

It erodes civil liberties. In answering terrorism, states often curtail the freedoms of their people. Surveillance, detention and restriction increase in the name of security. The threat thus harms liberty even where it does not kill. Free societies are changed by their own defences. This erosion is a lasting effect.

It strains relations between states and peoples. Terrorism breeds suspicion between nations and between communities. It may set religions and races against one another. States quarrel over blame, harbouring and response. The threat thus poisons relations across the world. It divides where it does not destroy.

It provokes wars and military intervention. Terrorism may draw states into war, as the attacks of 2001 drew America into Afghanistan. The response to terror can be as destructive as the terror itself. Whole regions may be plunged into conflict. The threat thus multiplies violence far beyond its acts. It can turn terror into war.

It hinders development and drives migration. Terrorism ruins the peace on which development depends and drives people to flee. Resources go to security rather than to progress. Refugees swell as people escape the violence. The threat thus deepens poverty and displacement. It sets back whole nations.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The bomb in the market place does indeed strike not only the dead but the living who fear to follow, for beyond the loss of life terrorism spreads a fear that disturbs the peace of whole societies. It wrecks economies, breeds political instability, erodes liberties and strains relations between peoples, and it may even provoke wars. The harm of terrorism thus reaches far beyond its casualties, into the fears and the very freedom of the living.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the chief effect of terrorism is the fear it spreads among the living.

The trap is to stop at loss of life and neglect the economic, political and international effects.

The top band links terrorism's effects to the wider peace, from lost liberties to provoked wars.

Question 68

The rise of terrorism has driven states and the world to seek ways of combating it. The statement holds that these measures may contain the threat but cannot destroy it, and there is much truth in it. For the measures have foiled many plots and broken many groups, yet terrorism has proved stubborn and adaptable, rising again in new forms. The claim may be assessed as follows.

Military action has struck at terrorist bases. States have used their armies to destroy the havens and leaders of terror. Such action has broken up groups and denied them safe ground. Yet force alone has often

bred fresh resentment and new recruits. It has struck the branches while the roots remained. Its successes have been real but incomplete.

Improved intelligence has foiled many plots. The gathering and sharing of intelligence has become the first line of defence. Many attacks have been prevented by timely warning. Good intelligence strikes at terror before it can act. This has proved among the most effective of measures. Knowledge is a powerful weapon against terror.

Law enforcement and stronger laws have been used. States have passed new laws and strengthened their police against terror. Suspects are pursued, tried and imprisoned under these powers. This brings terrorists to justice within the rule of law. Yet such laws may also threaten the liberties of the innocent. Their use must be carefully weighed.

Cutting off funding has weakened terrorist groups. States have moved to block the money that terror needs to live. Banks are watched and criminal funds are seized. Starved of money, groups find it harder to arm and act. This attack on their finances has borne real fruit. It strikes at a vital nerve of terror.

Border and transport security has been tightened. States have greatly strengthened the guard on their borders, airports and ports. Passengers and cargo are searched, watched and screened as never before. This makes it far harder for terrorists to move and to strike. Many plots have been foiled at the frontier and the airport gate. Yet such security also burdens honest travel and trade with delay and cost.

International cooperation has been strengthened. Because terror crosses borders, states have joined in common effort against it. The United Nations and bodies such as Interpol coordinate the response. Shared intelligence and united action have struck at global networks. Cooperation has become essential to success. No state can defeat terror alone.

Efforts have been made to address root causes. Some measures seek to remove the poverty and grievance that breed terror. Development, education and justice are used to dry up recruitment. This attacks the threat at its source rather than its symptoms. Yet such efforts are slow and their results uncertain. They are the wisest but the hardest measures.

Yet terrorism has proved stubborn and adaptable. Despite all these measures, terrorism has not been defeated. Groups change their methods and rise again in new forms. The threat adapts as fast as the defences against it. This persistence shows the limits of the response. Terror remains a grave and living danger.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The measures taken against terrorism have achieved real success, for military action, intelligence, law enforcement, the cutting of funds and international cooperation have foiled many attacks and broken many groups. Yet they have contained rather than defeated the threat, for terrorism has proved stubborn and adaptable, changing its methods and rising again in new forms. Only the slow work of removing its root causes offers the hope of a lasting victory; until then, terrorism can be contained but not destroyed.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the measures weighed and the claim of containment without defeat tested.

The trap is to list measures without judging whether they can defeat or merely contain terror.

The top band shows force containing terror while only the removal of root causes could defeat it.

Question 69

Transnational organised crime is among the gravest of the new threats to world peace and security. The statement calls it a dark business that keeps no borders and pays no taxes, and there is much truth in the image, for it is crime run for profit across the frontiers of states. It is an enterprise of the lawless. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It is crime organised for profit. Transnational organised crime is the work of structured groups seeking wealth. Unlike ordinary crime, it is planned, disciplined and lasting. Profit is its purpose and its guiding motive. It runs its trades like a dark business. This pursuit of gain is its essential nature.

It operates across the borders of states. Such crime is not confined within one country but spans many. Its networks move goods and money from land to land. No single state can master a crime that crosses so many frontiers. Its transnational reach is its defining feature. It belongs to no one country and to all.

Drug trafficking is among its chief forms. The trade in illegal drugs is the richest branch of organised crime. It moves narcotics from the lands that grow them to the lands that buy them. Its profits are vast and its harm immense. It funds and sustains the wider criminal world. Drug trafficking is the flagship of organised crime.

Human trafficking and smuggling are grave forms. Organised crime trades in human beings for labour and for sex. It smuggles migrants and enslaves the vulnerable for profit. This trade in people is among the cruellest of its works. It turns human misery into criminal wealth. Human trafficking is a modern slavery.

Arms trafficking spreads the tools of violence. Criminal networks trade illegally in guns and weapons. They arm rebels, terrorists and gangs across the world. This trade feeds wars and multiplies violence. It puts the means of killing into many hands. Arms trafficking is a direct threat to peace.

Money laundering hides the profits of crime. Organised crime must disguise its illicit wealth as lawful money. Through money laundering it cleans and hides its gains. This allows crime to enjoy and reinvest its profits. It also corrupts the banks and businesses it uses. Laundering is the lifeblood of criminal wealth.

Smuggling and counterfeiting cheat states and peoples. Criminal groups smuggle goods to evade duties and laws. They also flood markets with false and pirated goods. These trades rob states of revenue and endanger consumers. They undermine honest business and lawful trade. Smuggling and counterfeiting are widespread forms of the crime.

It threatens states through corruption and violence. Organised crime buys officials and terrifies its opponents. Its wealth corrupts governments and its guns defy them. In this way it undermines the very authority of the state. Where it grows strong, lawful order grows weak. Its corruption and violence are its deepest danger.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Organised crime is indeed a dark business that keeps no borders and pays no taxes, for it is the work of structured groups seeking wealth across the frontiers of states, through the trafficking of drugs, people and arms, through money laundering and smuggling. Run for profit yet answerable to no law, it undermines states through corruption and violence. It is a criminal enterprise, global in its reach and beyond the control of any single state.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim by showing organised crime to be a borderless, lawless business.

The trap is to describe one form, such as drugs, and neglect the range of the others.

The top band links the forms to the crime's threat to states through corruption and violence.

Question 70

Drug trafficking is the richest and most powerful branch of transnational organised crime. The statement holds that it turns the misery of the poor into the wealth of the wicked, and this is largely just, for it grows rich upon the ruin of its victims and the poverty of its growers. It profits from misery. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The great demand for drugs sustains the trade. In the wealthy nations there is a constant and hungry market for narcotics. This demand keeps the whole trade alive and profitable. So long as buyers exist, sellers will supply them. Demand is thus the root cause of the traffic. The market draws the drugs across the world.

The vast profits draw many into the trade. Drug trafficking brings wealth beyond that of most lawful business. This lure of profit tempts countless people into the trade. The riches to be won outweigh, for many, the risks. Greed is a powerful engine of the traffic. Profit makes the trade self-sustaining.

Poverty drives the growers and carriers. The poor farmers who grow the drug crops have few other ways to live. The couriers who carry the drugs are often driven by sheer want. For the desperate, the trade offers a living where none else can be found. Poverty thus supplies the traffic with its growers and its carriers alike. Want feeds the trade at its very base and beginning.

Weak law enforcement and corruption ease the trade. Where police are weak or officials corrupt, the traffic flourishes. Bribes open borders and buy protection for the trade. The failure of the law is the opportunity of the trafficker. Corruption is both a cause and a fruit of the traffic. Weak states cannot hold it back.

It spreads addiction and ruins health. The drugs it carries destroy the health and the lives of their users. Addiction wrecks individuals, families and whole communities without mercy. Disease, crime and early death follow closely in the wake of the trade. The human cost of the traffic is immense and beyond all counting. This ruin of health and life is among its gravest effects.

It funds crime and terrorism. The vast wealth of the drug trade flows into other crimes and into terror. It arms gangs, buys officials and finances terrorist networks across the world. In this way it multiplies violence and disorder far beyond itself. The traffic is a purse from which the wicked everywhere may draw. Its profits thus endanger the peace of the whole world.

It breeds violence and corruption. The struggle for the trade breeds terrible violence among its gangs. Whole regions are torn by the wars of rival cartels. The trade also corrupts police, judges and governments. It thus undermines both peace and lawful order. Violence and corruption follow it everywhere.

It corrupts the young and blights the future. The trade preys especially upon the young, drawing them into use and crime. It robs whole generations of their health, their promise and their peace. The future of nations is blighted by the spreading ruin of drugs. Schools and families alike are undermined by its long reach. This harm to the young is among the deepest of its wounds.

It undermines states and economies. Where the drug trade grows strong, it can defy and even capture the state. It distorts economies and drives out lawful business. Its laundered wealth corrupts the whole financial system. Nations may be brought to the edge of ruin. The traffic is a threat to the state itself.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The drug trade does indeed turn the misery of the poor into the wealth of the wicked, for it draws its growers and carriers from the poverty of the desperate and destroys the health of its users, while enriching the traffickers and funding crime and terror. Spread by demand and greed and shielded by corruption, it breeds violence and undermines whole states. It coins the misery of the many into the wealth of the few.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the drug trade enriches the wicked upon the misery of the poor.

The trap is to describe the drugs themselves rather than the causes and effects of the trade.

The top band links the demand and profit that drive the trade to its funding of crime and its threat to states.

Question 71

Human trafficking is among the cruellest of the new threats to world peace and security. The statement calls it the slavery that the modern world pretends to have abolished, and there is much truth in it, for it holds millions in a bondage as real as the slavery of old. It is slavery under a new name. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Poverty and unemployment drive the victims. The poor and the jobless are the readiest prey of the traffickers. Desperate for work, they are lured by false promises of a better life. Poverty leaves them with

little choice and less protection. Want thus delivers the victims into the traffickers' hands. It is the deepest root of the trade.

The demand for cheap labour and for sex sustains it. There is a constant market for forced labour and for prostitution. This demand keeps the cruel trade alive and profitable. So long as buyers exist, the traffickers will supply them. Demand is thus a driving cause of the traffic. The market draws the victims across borders.

Conflict and displacement expose the vulnerable. War and disaster drive people from their homes and their protectors. The displaced and the fleeing are easily seized and exploited. Their disorder is the opportunity of the trafficker. Conflict thus feeds the trade with fresh victims. The uprooted are peculiarly at risk.

Deception and false promises ensnare the victims. Traffickers lure their prey with false offers of work, marriage or study abroad. The innocent are deceived and then trapped far from home and from all help. By the time the lie is discovered, escape has become impossible. Debt, threats and violence are then used to bind the victim fast. Deception is thus the trafficker's chief and cruellest weapon.

Weak laws and corruption allow the trade. Where laws are weak and officials corrupt, the traffic flourishes unchecked. Borders are crossed and victims held with little fear of the law. The failure of the state is the freedom of the trafficker. Corruption shields the trade from justice. Weak enforcement is a standing cause.

It inflicts terrible human suffering. The victims are enslaved, abused and robbed of their freedom and dignity. They endure forced labour, violence and unspeakable exploitation. Their lives and health are often destroyed. This suffering is the gravest effect of the trade. It is a crime against the person.

It spreads disease and funds crime. The trade in people spreads sickness among its abused victims. Its profits flow into the wider world of organised crime. It thus harms both the body and the order of society. It enriches the criminal and endangers the community. Its effects reach far beyond the victims.

It violates human rights and undermines society. Human trafficking denies its victims the most basic of rights. It corrupts officials and mocks the rule of law. It undermines the trust and safety on which society rests. A trade in human beings shames the whole world. It is an affront to human dignity.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Human trafficking is indeed the slavery that the modern world pretends to have abolished, for it trades in human beings for labour and for sex, holding its victims in a bondage of debt, deception and violence. Sprung from poverty and demand and shielded by weak laws, it inflicts terrible suffering and violates the most basic of rights. Slavery was outlawed but not ended, for in human trafficking it lives on, hidden, in the modern world.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that human trafficking is a modern form of slavery.

The trap is to describe the victims' plight without explaining the causes that drive the trade.

The top band links poverty and demand as causes to the suffering and the crime that follow.

Question 72

The uncontrolled spread of small arms is among the deadliest of the new threats to world peace. The statement holds that the cheap gun in many hands has done more killing than the great bomb in few, and this is largely just, for it is the plentiful small weapon, not the rare great one, that feeds the world's wars. The claim may be weighed as follows.

They are cheap, portable and easy to use. Small arms are inexpensive and simple enough for anyone to wield. They can be carried and hidden with ease by their users. Even children may be armed with them and sent to fight. This accessibility makes them the weapon of countless conflicts. Their very simplicity is a danger.

The end of the Cold War left vast stocks loose. The collapse of the old order released great quantities of weapons. Arms once held by states passed into other and darker hands. These loose weapons flowed into the world's conflicts and crimes. The Cold War's end thus armed the new disorders. Its legacy was a flood of guns.

An illicit trade spreads them across borders. Criminal networks trade illegally in small arms across the world. They move weapons from land to land beyond the reach of the law. This traffic arms rebels, gangs and terrorists everywhere. The illegal trade is the channel of proliferation. It defies the control of any single state.

They fuel and prolong armed conflicts. The ready supply of guns feeds the wars that trouble the world. Conflicts once begun are prolonged by the flow of weapons. What might have been a brief quarrel becomes a lasting war. Small arms thus deepen and lengthen every conflict. They are the fuel of modern warfare.

They arm criminals and terrorists. The same weapons that feed wars also arm the criminal and the terrorist. Gangs and networks obtain them easily through the illicit trade. This makes crime and terror far more deadly. The spread of guns strengthens every violent hand. It endangers ordinary peace and order.

They make societies violent and insecure. Where guns are plentiful, disputes turn readily to killing. Whole societies are made fearful and unsafe by the flood of arms. Ordinary life is troubled by the ease of violence. The spread of weapons corrodes the peace of nations. It leaves communities in fear.

They hinder development and recovery. Countries awash with weapons cannot easily rebuild after conflict. The guns remain to feed banditry and renewed war. Peace and development are undermined by the lingering arms. Recovery is delayed while the weapons stay. Proliferation thus prolongs poverty and disorder.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The cheap gun in many hands has indeed done more killing than the great bomb in few, for while the terrible weapons of mass destruction have seldom been used, the small arms that flooded the world after the Cold War have armed its every war, crime and rebellion. Cheap, portable and easily traded, they fuel and prolong conflicts and make whole societies violent and insecure. It is the many small weapons, not the few great ones, that have done the world's daily killing.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that small arms have killed more than weapons of mass destruction.

The trap is to list types of weapons instead of explaining how their spread endangers peace.

The top band links the loose weapons of the Cold War's end to the fuelling of modern conflicts and crime.

Question 73

Maritime piracy has returned in the modern age as a threat to world peace and security. The statement holds that an ancient crime has returned to trouble the sea lanes of the modern world, and this is largely just, for piracy, long thought dead, has revived to endanger the trade of nations. The old crime lives again. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It is the robbery and hijacking of ships at sea. Piracy is the seizing of vessels and their crews for plunder and ransom. Armed men attack ships far from the protection of the law. They rob their cargoes and hold their crews hostage. This lawless violence at sea is the heart of piracy. It revives an ancient crime in a modern form.

It springs from weak and failed coastal states. Piracy flourishes where governments cannot control their coasts, as off Somalia. The disorder of failed states gives the pirates their bases. Where the law is absent at sea and on shore, piracy grows. Weak states are thus the nurseries of the crime. Their failure is the pirates' opportunity.

Poverty drives men to piracy. The deep poverty of the coastal peoples pushes many toward the trade. With few other ways to earn a living, they turn to robbery at sea. The lure of a great ransom outweighs the

risk for the desperate. Young men without work or hope are easily drawn into piracy. Want is thus a powerful and constant root of the crime.

It threatens the world's trade routes. Piracy strikes at the sea lanes through which the world's commerce flows. Attacks in vital straits and gulfs endanger global trade. Ships must be diverted or guarded at great cost. The freedom and safety of the seas are imperilled. This threat to trade is piracy's widest effect.

It raises the cost of shipping and insurance. The danger of attack drives up the price of carrying goods by sea. Insurance and security add heavily to the cost of trade. These burdens are passed on to consumers across the world. Piracy thus taxes the commerce of nations. Its cost is borne far from the sea.

It endangers the lives of seafarers. Pirates seize, threaten and sometimes kill the crews of the ships they take. Sailors may be held for many months in fear, hardship and captivity. The peril of the seafarer is a grave and human cost of the crime. Their families ashore endure long agonies of dread and uncertainty. Piracy thus puts many innocent lives in real and daily danger.

It funds crime and disorder ashore. The ransoms won by the pirates flow into wider crime and conflict on land. This wealth strengthens the very disorder from which piracy first springs. The crime thus feeds and sustains itself in a vicious circle. Warlords and criminals grow rich upon the plunder taken at sea. Its profits endanger the fragile peace of whole regions ashore.

The statement is therefore largely valid. An ancient crime has indeed returned to trouble the sea lanes of the modern world, for piracy, springing from the poverty and disorder of failed coastal states such as Somalia, has revived to seize ships and crews for ransom. It threatens the world's trade routes, raises the cost of shipping and endangers the lives of seafarers, while its ransoms fund crime ashore. An old evil in a modern guise, piracy troubles once more the freedom of the seas.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that a revived ancient crime now threatens modern trade.

The trap is to narrate particular hijackings without drawing the wider effects on trade and security.

The top band links piracy to failed states and poverty as causes and to world trade as its chief victim.

Question 74

Cyber crime is among the newest and fastest-growing of the threats to world peace and security. The statement holds that the thief now steals without breaking a lock, from the other side of the world, and this is largely just, for the cyber criminal strikes remotely and invisibly through the computer. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It is crime committed through computers and networks. Cyber crime uses the computer and the internet as its weapon and its field. It includes hacking, fraud, theft and the spreading of harmful programs. The criminal need never meet or even see the victim. This new form of crime belongs wholly to the digital age. It is the crime of a connected world.

It crosses borders instantly and freely. Cyber crime pays no heed to the frontiers of states. A criminal in one land may strike a victim in another in an instant. No border can stop an attack that travels through the wires. This global reach makes it exceedingly hard to police. Its borderless speed is a defining feature.

It is often anonymous and hard to trace. The cyber criminal hides behind screens and false identities. The source of an attack may be concealed or disguised with ease. This anonymity makes the wrongdoer hard to find and punish. It emboldens the criminal and frustrates the law. Concealment is the cyber criminal's shield.

It threatens banks and the financial system. Much cyber crime is aimed at the theft of money and data. Banks, businesses and individuals are robbed through fraud and hacking. Vast sums may be stolen without a shot or a break-in. The wealth of the world is thus placed at risk. Finance is a chief target of the threat.

It endangers vital infrastructure. Modern power, water, transport and defence depend upon computers. An attack upon these systems could bring a nation to a halt. Cyber crime and cyber war thus threaten the very fabric of society. The more connected the world, the greater the danger. Infrastructure is a perilous point of attack.

It is used for espionage and theft of secrets. States and companies use cyber means to steal one another's secrets. Sensitive information and designs are taken through hacking. This cyber espionage threatens both security and prosperity. It carries the old spying into a new and swifter age. Secrets are no longer safe from the network.

It shades into cyber-terrorism and cyber-war. Terrorists and states may use cyber attacks to spread fear and harm. An attack on infrastructure could kill as surely as a bomb. Cyber crime thus reaches toward terror and even war. The line between crime and warfare grows blurred. This makes it a threat to peace itself.

It grows with the world's dependence on technology. As life comes to rest ever more upon computers, the threat grows greater. Each new connection is a new door for the criminal. The danger multiplies with the spread of the network. There is no returning to a world without computers. The threat will grow with the age.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The thief now does indeed steal without breaking a lock, from the other side of the world, for cyber crime is committed through computers and networks, crossing borders in an instant and hiding in anonymity. It strikes at banks, at vital infrastructure and at secrets, and it shades into cyber-terrorism and cyber-war. Borderless, remote and elusive, cyber crime is among the most modern and challenging of the new threats to the peace of the world.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that cyber crime steals remotely and across borders without a physical break-in.

The trap is to list types of computer crime without linking them to security and even to war.

The top band shows how cyber crime threatens infrastructure and shades into cyber-terrorism and cyber-war.

Question 75

The spread of weapons of mass destruction is among the gravest of all threats to world peace and security. The statement holds that the dread of the age is the ultimate weapon in the hands of those who cannot be deterred, and this is largely just, for the deepest fear is of such weapons reaching terrorists beyond all deterrence. The claim may be weighed as follows.

They can kill on a catastrophic scale. Weapons of mass destruction can slay whole populations at a single stroke. A nuclear, chemical or biological attack could kill untold thousands. No other weapons carry so terrible a power. Their sheer destructiveness is the heart of the threat. They endanger civilisation itself.

Their spread to more states multiplies the danger. As more nations acquire such weapons, the risk of their use grows. Each new possessor adds a new source of peril to the world. Rivalries armed with such weapons become deadly beyond measure. Proliferation thus spreads the danger ever wider. More hands mean more risk.

Rogue states may use or threaten them. Some states beyond the restraints of the world seek these weapons. In reckless or desperate hands they become especially dangerous. Such states may use them or hold the world to ransom. Their possession of the weapons alarms all nations. Rogue states are a grave source of the threat.

They may fall into the hands of terrorists. The dread of the age is that such weapons might reach non-state groups. A terrorist armed with them could not be deterred as a state might. An attack by such a group would be a catastrophe. This fear drives much of the world's alarm. Terror and mass destruction together are the ultimate danger.

They provoke arms races and rivalry. The weapons of one state spur its rivals to acquire their own. This breeds regional arms races and deepens hostility. The spread of the weapons thus feeds the very tensions it threatens. Proliferation and rivalry drive each other on. The danger grows with every response.

They are hard to control and to verify. The materials and knowledge for these weapons are hard to guard. Treaties to limit them are difficult to enforce and to verify. States may build them in secret despite the world's watch. This difficulty of control makes the threat persistent. The weapons resist the efforts to contain them.

They undermine the treaties meant to restrain them. The spread of the weapons weakens the agreements built to prevent it. When some acquire them, others lose faith in restraint. The whole framework of non-proliferation is thus endangered. Each breach makes the next more likely. Proliferation erodes its own remedy.

They hold the whole world in fear. The mere existence of these weapons casts a shadow over mankind. The world lives with the knowledge that a single act could bring disaster. This fear is itself a burden upon the peace. It poisons trust between the nations. The threat weighs upon all humanity.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The dread of the age is indeed the ultimate weapon in the hands of those who cannot be deterred, for while a hostile state might be held back by the threat of retaliation, a terrorist armed with a nuclear, chemical or biological weapon could not. Able to kill on a catastrophic scale, and spreading to more states and, it is feared, to non-state hands, such weapons hold the whole world in fear. The gravest danger is that the ultimate weapon should fall to those who cannot be deterred from using it.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the gravest danger is a weapon of mass destruction reaching undeterrable hands.

The trap is to narrate the history of the bomb instead of examining the danger of its spread.

The top band ranks the fear of terrorist acquisition and the failure of control as the gravest dangers.

Question 76

Environmental degradation and climate change have risen to be among the gravest of the new threats to world peace and security. The statement calls a changing climate the quiet multiplier of every other danger, and this is largely just, for it worsens and deepens almost every other threat to peace. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Climate change is warming and disturbing the earth. The burning of fuels has warmed the world and unsettled its climate. Storms, droughts and floods have grown more frequent and severe. The very conditions of life are being altered across the globe. This great change is the root of the environmental threat. It endangers the whole of mankind.

It breeds conflict over scarce resources. As water, land and food grow scarce, peoples fall to quarrelling over them. Nations and communities compete for the shrinking gifts of nature. Such competition may turn to violence and to war. Scarcity is thus a seed of conflict. The environment becomes a cause of war.

It causes disasters that ruin and displace. Floods, droughts and storms destroy homes, crops and livelihoods. Whole regions may be laid waste by a single disaster. The ruin they bring undermines the peace and order of nations. Disaster is a growing effect of the changing climate. It leaves misery in its wake.

It drives mass migration and creates refugees. As lands become barren or drowned, their peoples are forced to flee. Climate refugees swell the movement of the desperate across borders. Their coming may strain and unsettle the lands that receive them. Migration is thus a fruit of environmental ruin. It spreads the disorder more widely.

It threatens food and water security. The changing climate wrecks harvests and dries up the sources of water. Hunger and thirst follow the ruin of land and rain. The very sustenance of life is placed in danger. Food and water shortages breed unrest and conflict. This threat strikes at the base of survival.

It harms health and spreads disease. A warming world spreads the diseases of heat and of dirty water. Pollution poisons the air and the land that people depend on. The health of whole populations is thus endangered. Sickness follows the ruin of the environment. This harm to health deepens the threat.

It falls hardest on the poorest nations. The poor countries, least able to bear it, suffer the environmental threat most. They lack the means to guard against disaster or to recover. The threat thus deepens the inequality of the world. It strikes the weak while sparing the strong. This injustice sharpens its danger.

It acts as a multiplier of every other threat. Environmental ruin worsens poverty, migration, conflict and disease alike. It feeds and deepens almost every other threat to the peace of the world. Rarely a sole cause, it makes each of the other dangers still worse. A drought may breed famine, and famine may breed war and flight. This is why it is rightly called a threat multiplier of the age.

The statement is therefore largely valid. A changing climate is indeed the quiet multiplier of every other danger, for the warming and disturbing of the earth breeds conflict over scarce resources, drives mass migration, threatens food and water, and deepens poverty and disease. Rarely a sole cause, it makes each of the other threats worse, and it falls hardest upon the poorest nations. Slow but relentless, environmental ruin magnifies the perils of the age and endangers the peace of the whole world.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that climate change acts as a multiplier of every other threat.

The trap is to explain the science of warming without linking it to conflict, migration and insecurity.

The top band presents climate change as a "threat multiplier" that worsens poverty, migration and conflict.

Question 77

Diseases and pandemics have shown themselves among the gravest of the new threats to world peace and security. The statement holds that a disease born in one land may in days trouble the whole earth, and this is largely just, for in an age of swift travel sickness spreads across the world with fearful speed. The claim may be weighed as follows.

They can kill on a vast scale. A great pandemic may slay more people than a war. Diseases such as influenza, AIDS and the recent pandemic have killed by the million. Their toll of death is among the heaviest that mankind can suffer. This power to kill is the heart of the threat. Disease is a mighty destroyer.

They spread swiftly in a connected world. The swift travel of the modern age carries disease across the globe in days. A sickness born in one land may soon touch every nation. The very ease of movement that aids trade also spreads infection. Globalisation has made the whole world one field of contagion. Distance no longer shields the nations.

They overwhelm health systems and economies. A great outbreak may swamp the hospitals and doctors of a nation. As the sick multiply, the means to treat them fail. Economies too are wrecked as work and trade are halted. The disorder spreads far beyond the disease itself. Pandemics strain the whole fabric of society.

They cause fear, disorder and instability. The spread of a deadly disease fills whole populations with dread. Fear may breed panic, disorder and the breakdown of services. Governments may be shaken by their failure to cope. The peace and order of nations are thus disturbed. Disease is a threat to stability as well as to life.

They fall hardest on the poor and the weak. The poor nations, with the feeblest health systems, suffer the most. They lack the medicines, doctors and means to fight the disease. Pandemics thus deepen the inequality of the world. They strike the weak harder than the strong. This injustice sharpens the threat.

They disrupt trade, travel and daily life. To halt a disease, borders are closed and movement is stopped. Trade, travel and ordinary life are all thrown into disorder. The remedy itself brings hardship and loss. Whole economies may be brought to a standstill. The disruption is among the gravest effects.

They demand international cooperation to overcome. Because disease crosses borders, no nation can defeat it alone. The world must share knowledge, medicines and effort to prevail. Bodies such as the World Health Organisation coordinate the response. Cooperation is thus the key to meeting the threat. Disease can be beaten only together.

The statement is therefore largely valid. A disease born in one land may indeed in days trouble the whole earth, for the swift travel of the modern age carries contagion across the globe before it can be checked. A great pandemic may kill more than a war, overwhelm health systems and economies, and breed fear, disorder and instability, falling hardest upon the poor. Because disease crosses every border, it can be met only by the cooperation of all, and it stands among the most universal of the new threats.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that disease spreads swiftly across the world to become a threat to security.

The trap is to narrate a particular disease without drawing out its effects on stability and security.

The top band links the swift spread of disease to instability and the need for international cooperation.

Question 78

Poverty, underdevelopment and forced migration lie at the root of much of the world's insecurity. The statement holds that these quiet threats of want and flight underlie the louder ones of war and terror, and this is largely just, for they breed the grievance and disorder on which the other threats feed. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Poverty breeds grievance and unrest. The misery of the poor fills them with anger and despair. This grievance may break out in unrest, rebellion and violence. The gulf between rich and poor is a standing danger to peace. Want is a seed from which conflict grows. Poverty unsettles the order of nations.

It provides recruits for crime and terror. The poor and the hopeless are readily drawn into crime and terrorism. These offer them purpose, belonging and a means to live. Poverty thus supplies the other threats with their foot-soldiers. Misery is the recruiting ground of the wicked. Want feeds the violence of the age.

Underdevelopment weakens states and order. Poor and undeveloped states lack the means to keep order and to serve their people. Their weakness leaves them prey to crime, terror and disorder. Underdevelopment thus breeds the failed states in which threats flourish. Poverty and weak government feed each other. The undeveloped state is a fragile one.

It deepens inequality and division. The great and growing gulf between rich and poor divides the world. This inequality breeds resentment between nations and peoples. It sets the have-nots against the haves in a lasting quarrel. Division is a threat to the peace of the world. Inequality is a source of conflict.

Conflict and disaster force people to flee. War, persecution and disaster drive great numbers from their homes. The forced movement of peoples is a growing mark of the age. The displaced flee in search of safety and of bread. Migration is thus a fruit of the world's disorders. It carries the trouble across borders.

Mass migration strains the lands that receive it. The sudden coming of great numbers burdens the states that receive them. Resources, services and tempers are stretched by the influx. Tension may arise between the newcomers and the native people. Migration thus spreads insecurity to new lands. It troubles the peace of host and stranger alike.

Refugees may destabilise whole regions. Great flows of refugees can unsettle entire regions. Camps may become the breeding-grounds of crime and militancy. The movement of peoples may spread conflict across borders. Whole neighbourhoods of nations may be destabilised. Forced migration is thus a threat to regional peace.

These threats feed and worsen one another. Poverty drives migration, and migration deepens poverty and division. Underdevelopment breeds conflict, and conflict breeds more flight and want. The three threats are bound together in a vicious circle. Each makes the others worse. Together they undermine the peace of the world.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The quiet threats of want and flight do indeed underlie the louder ones of war and terror, for poverty breeds the grievance and supplies the recruits of crime and terrorism, while underdevelopment weakens states and mass migration destabilises whole regions. Bound together in a vicious circle, these root conditions feed the more violent threats above them. No lasting peace can be built while want and flight remain, for they are the soil from which war and terror grow.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that poverty and migration are the root threats underlying war and terror.

The trap is to treat them separately without showing how they feed one another.

The top band presents them as the root conditions that breed and worsen the other new threats.

Question 79

Africa, poor and in many places weakly governed, has suffered greatly from the new threats to world peace and security. The statement traces this suffering to the continent's own weakness, and there is much truth in it. Its poverty, porous borders and feeble states have laid it open to terrorism, crime, disease and environmental ruin alike. The claim may be assessed as follows.

Terrorism has struck several African regions. Groups such as Boko Haram and Al-Shabaab have brought terror to parts of Africa. They have killed, kidnapped and driven whole populations from their homes. Their campaigns have destabilised nations and regions. Terrorism has thus become a grave African danger. It troubles the peace of the continent.

Piracy has troubled its seas. Piracy off the coasts of Somalia and in the Gulf of Guinea has endangered shipping. It has sprung from the poverty and disorder of failed coastal states. The trade and seafarers of Africa and the world have suffered. Piracy has thus become an African threat. It troubles the freedom of its seas.

Crime and trafficking have spread across the continent. Drug, human and arms trafficking have flowed through Africa's porous borders. Its weak states have offered the criminals a ready passage and haven. This crime has corrupted governments and enriched the wicked. Trafficking has thus deepened Africa's disorder. It undermines its states and societies.

Small arms have flooded its conflicts. Africa has been awash with the small arms loosed upon the world. These weapons have fuelled and prolonged its many wars. They have armed rebels, bandits and child soldiers alike. The flood of guns has made its conflicts deadlier. Small arms have been a curse to the continent.

Disease and pandemics have ravaged its peoples. Africa has borne a heavy burden of disease, from AIDS to Ebola. Its weak health systems have struggled to meet these outbreaks. Millions have died and its development has been set back. Disease has thus been among Africa's gravest threats. It has taxed the continent grievously.

Climate change has hit its lands hard. Drought, desertification and flood have struck the lands of Africa. The Sahel and other regions have suffered from the changing climate. Failing harvests have bred hunger, migration and conflict. Africa, least to blame, has suffered much from the threat. Climate change has deepened its troubles.

Poverty and weak states have left it exposed. The poverty and weak governance of much of Africa have laid it open to the threats. Its states have often lacked the means to guard against them. This weakness has been the opportunity of every danger. Africa's poverty has magnified its vulnerability. Its conditions have invited the threats.

Refugees and displacement have swelled. The wars and disasters of Africa have driven millions from their homes. Great flows of refugees have crossed and burdened its fragile borders. Camps have strained the lands and the states that receive them. Displacement has spread the disorder from one country to its neighbours. The uprooting of whole peoples has deepened the distress of the continent.

The threats have deepened its conflicts and hindered its development. Together the new threats have worsened the wars and poverty of Africa. They have diverted its scarce resources from progress to survival. They have set back the development the continent so needs. Africa's advance has been hindered by their weight. The threats have deepened its long struggle.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The weakness of Africa has indeed made it the softest target of the new threats, for its poverty, porous borders and feeble states have laid it open to terrorism, piracy, trafficking and the flood of small arms, while its want of means has left it prey to disease and to the ravages of a changing climate. Falling upon a continent already burdened and weakly governed, the new threats have deepened its conflicts and hindered its development. Africa suffers most because it can defend itself least.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the impact weighed and the claim about Africa's weakness tested.

The trap is to describe one threat without linking Africa's suffering to its weakness.

The top band roots Africa's peculiar vulnerability in its poverty and weak states.

Question 80

The new threats to world peace and security have driven states, regions and the world to seek ways of overcoming them. The statement holds that their deepest lesson is that security can no longer be won by any nation alone, and this is largely just. Because the threats cross borders, they can be met only by common effort, and this necessity has remade the very practice of security. The claim may be weighed as follows.

States have strengthened their laws and security forces. Nations have passed new laws and armed their police and agencies against the threats. They have tightened the guard on their borders, airports and ports. Intelligence has been gathered and shared to foil the wicked. These national measures are the first line of defence. Each state must guard its own people.

Regional bodies have joined in common effort. Regions have banded together to meet threats that no state can face alone. In Africa the African Union and bodies such as ECOWAS have acted against terror and crime. Joint forces have fought Boko Haram and Al-Shabaab. Regional cooperation has become essential to security. Neighbours must stand together.

International cooperation has been strengthened. Because the threats are global, the world has united to meet them. The United Nations, Interpol and many treaties coordinate the response. States share intelligence, laws and effort across the globe. International cooperation is the heart of the answer. The threats can be met only together.

The financing of the threats has been attacked. States and bodies have moved to block the money that terror and crime require. Banks are watched and illicit funds are seized and traced. Starved of money, the threats find it harder to act. This attack on their finances strikes a vital nerve. It weakens the threats at their root.

Efforts have been made to address root causes. Some measures seek to remove the poverty and grievance that breed the threats. Development, education and justice are used to dry up their sources. This attacks the danger at its root rather than its symptoms. It is the wisest, though the slowest, of the measures. Lasting security must remove the causes.

The very idea of security has been widened. The new threats have forced the world to think of security afresh. It now means the safety of people, not of states alone. This idea of human security shapes the

modern response. It is among the deepest significances of the new threats. They have changed how security is understood.

Yet the measures face grave challenges. The response to the threats is hindered by many obstacles. States guard their sovereignty and are slow to cooperate fully. Resources are scarce and the threats adapt swiftly. The root causes prove stubborn and hard to remove. These challenges limit the success of the measures.

Intelligence has been shared across borders. States have learned to share their intelligence against the common threats. Warnings passed between nations have foiled many attacks and crimes. Bodies such as Interpol now knit the world's police forces together. The secret knowledge of one country becomes the shield of all. Shared intelligence has become a vital weapon of the modern age.

Civil society and the media play their part. The struggle is not left to governments alone but shared by many hands. Non-governmental bodies, the media and ordinary citizens all aid the effort. They spread awareness, relieve suffering and hold the powerful to account. A whole society is thus enlisted against the new threats. Their part shows that security is now the work of all.

The threats have made cooperation the condition of security. The chief significance of the new threats is the lesson that no nation is safe alone. Security now depends upon the common effort of all. The threats have bound the fate of nations together. They have made cooperation not a choice but a necessity. This is their deepest mark upon the world.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The measures taken against the new threats, at the national, regional and international levels alike, have all been driven toward cooperation, for the financing of the threats can be blocked and their root causes addressed only by common effort. Their deepest significance is indeed the lesson that no nation is safe alone: the threats have widened the very idea of security to embrace people, not states only, and made the cooperation of all the first condition of the safety of each. The new threats have taught the world that its security is now indivisible.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the significance weighed and the lesson of cooperation tested.

The trap is to list measures without drawing out the significance the question demands.

The top band shows the deepest significance to be the indivisibility of security and the necessity of cooperation.

Question 81

A civil war is an armed conflict fought between organised groups within a single state. The statement holds that it is a nation that has turned its weapons upon itself, and there is much truth in the image, for a civil war sets a country's own people against one another. It is a nation at war with itself. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It is fought within the borders of one state. A civil war takes place inside a single country rather than between nations. The parties to it are all citizens or residents of the same state. The whole struggle unfolds within one set of borders. This internal character is what makes the war a civil one. It is a nation turned against itself.

It is fought between organised armed groups. A civil war is not mere riot or disorder but a struggle of organised forces. Governments, rebel armies and militias field disciplined and armed bodies of men. Each side is led, supplied and directed for war. This organisation distinguishes civil war from ordinary violence. It is warfare, not simple lawlessness.

It is a struggle for power, territory or secession. The parties fight to control the state, to rule a region, or to break away from it. Some seek to seize the government, others to win independence for their people. The prize is power or territory within the state. This contest for control is the heart of the war. It is a fight over who shall rule.

It divides a nation against itself. A civil war sets countrymen, neighbours and even families against one another. The bonds that hold a people together are torn apart by the fighting. Society is split into hostile and warring camps. This division of a nation is among the war's saddest marks. It wounds a country from within.

It is often long and hard to end. Civil wars tend to drag on for many years without a clear result. Neither side can easily destroy the other, and hatred deepens with time. The absence of a foreign enemy makes reconciliation harder. Such wars often smoulder and flare again and again. Their length is among their cruellest features.

It falls heavily upon civilians. In civil war the ordinary people suffer as much as the fighters, or more. Their homes, farms and towns become the battleground of the war. They are killed, driven out and robbed of their livelihoods. The line between soldier and civilian grows blurred. Civilians bear the chief burden of the war.

It may draw in foreign powers. Neighbouring states and great powers often intervene in a civil war. They arm and support the side that serves their interests. This foreign meddling widens and prolongs the conflict. A local war may thus become a regional one. Outside interference is a common feature of civil war.

It leaves deep and lasting wounds. A civil war leaves behind hatred, ruin and a broken society. The bitterness it breeds may endure for generations after the fighting. Reconstruction and reconciliation are slow and difficult. The scars of such a war are not easily healed. Its legacy troubles a nation long after the guns fall silent.

The statement is therefore largely valid. A civil war is indeed a nation that has turned its weapons upon itself, for it is fought within one state, between organised groups of its own people, for the control of the state or a part of it. It divides a nation against itself, tends to be long and hard to end, and falls most heavily upon the civilians caught within it. A country turned against its own, the civil war is among the gravest dangers to the peace of nations.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim by defining a civil war as a nation turned against itself.

The trap is to name particular civil wars instead of defining the term and drawing out its features.

The top band stresses the internal character and the heavy burden borne by civilians.

Question 82

An ethnic war is a conflict in which the warring sides are divided along the lines of ethnic identity. The statement holds that where men fight as peoples rather than as parties, the war is hardest to end, and there is much truth in it, for the ethnic war springs from identity and hatred that admit of no easy compromise. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It is fought along the lines of ethnic identity. In an ethnic war the fighters are divided by tribe, race, language or religion. Men take up arms as members of a people rather than of a party. The fault line of the war is one of identity and blood. This mobilisation along ethnic lines is its defining feature. It is a war of peoples, not merely of parties.

It is driven by deep hatreds and fears. Ethnic wars are fed by old grievances, suspicions and fears between peoples. Each group comes to see the other as an enemy to be destroyed. These hatreds run deeper than ordinary political quarrels. They make the fighting especially bitter and cruel. Ancient enmities give the war its ferocity.

It is marked by atrocities against whole communities. Ethnic wars often bring massacre, expulsion and the cleansing of whole peoples. Civilians are attacked not for what they do but for who they are. Villages may be destroyed and their inhabitants slaughtered together. Such atrocities are a grim mark of ethnic conflict. It targets the group rather than the soldier.

It may descend into genocide. At its worst an ethnic war becomes an attempt to destroy a whole people. The killing of the Tutsi in Rwanda was such a genocide. This is the most terrible extreme to which ethnic war can fall. No civil war of mere faction reaches so far. Genocide is the darkest possibility of ethnic conflict.

It differs from a civil war in its basis. A civil war may be fought over politics, power or region among a single people. An ethnic war is fought specifically along the lines of identity. Not every civil war is ethnic, though many are both at once. The basis of the ethnic war is blood rather than mere party. This is its first great difference.

It differs from an inter-state war in its arena. An inter-state war is fought between separate and sovereign nations. An ethnic war is fought within a single state between its peoples. The one crosses borders, the other tears a country apart from within. The arena of the ethnic war is internal, not international. This is a further key difference.

It is harder to resolve than other wars. Because it springs from identity and hatred, an ethnic war is peculiarly hard to end. One cannot easily compromise upon who a people is. The wounds it leaves poison relations for generations. Reconciliation is slower and more difficult than after other wars. Its roots in identity make it the more intractable.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Where men fight as peoples rather than as parties, the war is indeed hardest to end, for the ethnic war is fought along the lines of tribe, race and religion, driven by deep hatreds and marked by atrocities that may descend into genocide. Unlike a quarrel of mere party, one cannot easily compromise upon who a people is, and the wounds poison relations for generations. Rooted in identity rather than in interest, the ethnic war is the cruellest and the most intractable of conflicts.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim, defining the ethnic war and showing why it is hardest to resolve.

The trap is to define an ethnic war but fail to draw the two distinctions the question requires.

The top band shows that a war may be both civil and ethnic, and that identity makes ethnic war hardest to resolve.

Question 83

Genocide is the most terrible extreme to which ethnic conflict can fall. The statement holds that it is the point at which ethnic hatred ceases to seek victory and seeks only extermination, and this is largely just, for genocide aims not to defeat a people but to destroy it. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It is the deliberate destruction of a whole people. Genocide aims not merely to defeat but to exterminate a group. Its purpose is the wiping out of a people as a people. This deliberate intent to destroy is what defines the crime. It goes beyond any ordinary aim of war. The end sought is annihilation itself.

It targets people for who they are, not what they do. In genocide the victims are chosen for their identity alone. Men, women and children are killed simply for belonging to a group. Their guilt or innocence in any act is beside the point. This targeting of the group is the essence of the crime. It condemns a people by their very birth.

It is the extreme to which ethnic hatred can lead. Genocide grows from the hatreds and fears that feed ethnic conflict. When these are inflamed to their utmost, they end in the wish to destroy. It is the darkest fruit of the demonising of a people. Ethnic war carried to its extreme becomes genocide. Hatred without limit ends in extermination.

It is often planned and organised by the state or its agents. Genocide is rarely a spontaneous outburst but a directed campaign. Governments, parties or militias plan and carry out the killing. Propaganda prepares the people, and lists mark the victims. This organisation makes genocide the more terrible and complete. It is murder made into a policy.

It employs propaganda to prepare and justify it. Before the killing, the victims are dehumanised in the minds of the people. They are branded as vermin, enemies or a danger to be removed. This propaganda makes ordinary people willing to kill. In Rwanda the radio urged the slaughter of the Tutsi. Words prepared the way for the machetes.

It brings death on a vast and rapid scale. Genocide kills in numbers and at a speed that stagger the mind. In Rwanda some eight hundred thousand died in but a hundred days. Whole communities were wiped out in a matter of weeks. Few crimes can match its scale of slaughter. Its toll of death is beyond all ordinary war.

It leaves wounds that endure for generations. The survivors of genocide carry its horror for the rest of their lives. The hatred and grief it leaves poison a society for generations. Trust between the peoples is destroyed and slow to rebuild. Justice and reconciliation are painfully hard to achieve. Its scars outlast the lives of those who saw it.

It is condemned as a crime against humanity. The world has named genocide the gravest of all crimes. International law forbids it and courts have been set up to punish it. Yet the world has too often failed to prevent it in time. The promise of "never again" has been broken more than once. Genocide remains a standing reproach to mankind.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Genocide is indeed the point at which ethnic hatred ceases to seek victory and seeks only extermination, for where ordinary war seeks to defeat an enemy, genocide seeks to wipe out a whole people for who they are. Planned by states or their agents and prepared by propaganda, it brings death on a vast and rapid scale, as in Rwanda in 1994. It is ethnic hatred carried to its uttermost, no longer content with victory but bent upon annihilation.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that genocide is ethnic hatred bent on extermination rather than victory.

The trap is to narrate one genocide without linking it to the nature of ethnic hatred.

The top band shows how organised planning and propaganda turn ethnic hatred into deliberate extermination.

Question 84

Civil and ethnic wars have become the commonest and cruellest conflicts of the modern age. The statement holds that Africa's wars spring from a meeting of old grievance and present greed, and there is much truth in it, for both the wounds of the past and the hunger for wealth drive the continent's conflicts. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The legacy of colonialism divided many states. Colonial rule drew arbitrary borders that split and merged peoples without regard to identity. It favoured some groups over others and ruled by dividing them. These divisions were inherited by the new states at independence. They became the fault lines along which later wars were fought. Colonialism thus planted the seeds of much conflict.

Ethnic and religious divisions bred hatred and fear. Deep differences of tribe, race and religion set peoples against one another. Old grievances and suspicions were easily inflamed into hatred. Where groups distrusted and feared each other, war lay close at hand. These divisions gave many conflicts their bitter ethnic character. Division of identity was a fertile source of war.

Bad governance and dictatorship provoked rebellion. Corrupt, oppressive and unjust governments drove their peoples to revolt. Where rulers denied rights and excluded whole regions, rebellion followed. Tyranny and misrule bred the anger from which civil war grew. The failure of government was thus a powerful cause. Bad rule was a spur to armed resistance.

The struggle for power set factions at war. The contest to seize or hold the state often turned violent. Rival leaders and factions took up arms to win or keep power. Where power could not be shared or peacefully transferred, war resulted. Ambition for rule was a frequent cause of conflict. The prize of power drew men to war.

Poverty and inequality bred grievance. The misery of the poor and the gulf between rich and poor fed unrest. Groups that felt cheated of their share turned to violence. Economic injustice gave the fighters their cause and their recruits. Want and inequality thus underlay many wars. Poverty was a deep root of conflict.

Competition for natural resources fuelled conflict. The struggle to control oil, diamonds, minerals and land bred war. Such resources gave the fighters both a prize and the means to fight. In the Congo and Sierra Leone, wealth in the ground fed the killing. Greed for resources thus fuelled and prolonged conflict. Riches became a curse rather than a blessing.

Weak states could not keep order. Where governments were feeble, they could not hold their territory or their peoples. In these weak and failing states, rebellion and disorder flourished. The absence of strong authority left a field for war. Weakness at the centre invited conflict at the edges. Feeble states were prey to civil war.

External interference widened and prolonged wars. Foreign powers and neighbouring states meddled in the quarrels of others. They armed and backed the factions that served their interests. This outside support turned local wars into wider ones. Interference made conflicts harder to end. The hand of the foreigner deepened many wars.

The proliferation of arms made war easy. The flood of cheap weapons into troubled regions armed every faction. Guns were plentiful and easily obtained by any group. This ready supply of arms made rebellion and killing simple. Weapons turned grievance quickly into war. The spread of arms was a constant spur to conflict.

The manipulation of identity by leaders inflamed wars. Ambitious leaders stirred up ethnic hatred to win power and support. They set group against group for their own advantage. This deliberate playing upon identity turned difference into war. Ordinary people were roused to kill their neighbours. The cynical use of ethnicity was a potent cause.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Africa's wars do indeed spring from a meeting of old grievance and present greed, for the divisions and grievances left by colonialism and bad governance meet the struggle for power and the plunder of resources. Grievance supplies the cause and the recruits, and greed the prize and the funding, while weak states, loose arms and the manipulation of ethnicity turn division into war. It is the meeting of old grievance and present greed, rather than either alone, that breeds the conflicts of the continent.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that grievance and greed together cause Africa's wars.

The trap is to give only ethnic hatred and neglect governance, resources and the colonial legacy.

The top band separates the grievances and prizes from the enabling conditions such as weak states and loose arms.

Question 85

Many of Africa's civil and ethnic wars are traced back to the rule of the colonial powers. The statement holds that these wars were, in effect, drawn upon the maps the colonisers left behind, and there is much truth in it. The arbitrary borders, the policy of divide and rule, and the favouring of some peoples over others planted the divisions along which later wars were fought. Yet the failings of the independent age also bear their share. The claim may be assessed as follows.

It imposed arbitrary borders across Africa. The colonial powers drew frontiers to suit themselves, not the peoples of Africa. Single peoples were split between colonies, and hostile groups were forced together. These artificial borders became the shape of the new states. They joined enemies and divided kinsmen within one country. This arbitrary map was a deep source of later conflict.

It ruled by dividing the peoples. The colonial powers set group against group to make their rule secure. This policy of divide and rule deepened the divisions among peoples. It taught them to see one another as

rivals and enemies. The habit of division outlived the colonial rulers themselves. It left a legacy of distrust between the peoples.

It favoured some groups over others. The colonial rulers raised up certain peoples and pressed down others. In Rwanda they favoured the Tutsi over the Hutu, sharpening the divide. Such favouritism bred resentment and a thirst for revenge. The privileged and the excluded became future enemies. This inequality planted the seeds of ethnic war.

It created artificial states without unity. The colonies became nations that had never been peoples or united before. They lacked a common identity to bind their many groups. The new states were fragile and prone to division from birth. Holding such states together proved a hard and often violent task. Their artificial unity was a standing weakness.

It left weak institutions at independence. The colonial powers departed leaving little in the way of strong government. The new states inherited feeble institutions and few trained rulers. This weakness left them unable to manage their divisions peacefully. Fragile government could not keep the peace among its peoples. The gap left by the colonisers invited conflict.

It left uneven development between regions. Colonial rule developed some regions and neglected others entirely. This unevenness bred jealousy and grievance between the parts of a country. The neglected regions felt cheated and marginalised. Such inequality became a cause of rebellion and war. Uneven development was a lasting colonial legacy.

Yet post-colonial leaders also bear the blame. The rulers of independent Africa often deepened rather than healed the divisions. They practised corruption, tyranny and the favouring of their own peoples. Ethnic hatred was inflamed by ambitious men for their own ends. The failures of these leaders were not the fault of colonialism alone. Post-colonial misrule was a cause in its own right.

And other causes have shared in the wars. Poverty, the struggle for resources, and the flood of arms have all fuelled Africa's wars. The Cold War and foreign interference added their part. These causes cannot all be laid at the door of the colonisers. Colonialism prepared the ground, but others sowed the seed. Its role, though great, was not the whole.

The statement is therefore largely valid, though not the whole truth. Africa's wars were in great part drawn on the maps of the colonisers, for the arbitrary borders, the policy of divide and rule, and the favouring of some peoples planted the divisions and the artificial states from which later conflict grew. Yet the map alone did not make the wars, for the corruption, tyranny and manipulation of ethnicity by post-colonial leaders were needed to set the peoples fighting. Colonialism drew the fault lines; the failures of the independent age lit the fire.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the colonial role weighed against the failings of the independent age.

The trap is to blame colonialism wholesale and ignore post-colonial misrule.

The top band accepts the colonial map as the fault line while giving weight to the later manipulation of ethnicity.

Question 86

Bad governance and the struggle for power lie at the heart of many of the world's civil wars. The statement holds that where the ballot is denied, the bullet is taken up, and this is largely just, for it is the closing of peaceful politics that drives men to armed rebellion. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Dictatorship and oppression provoke rebellion. Where rulers govern by force and deny their people freedom, resentment grows. Oppressed peoples may at length take up arms against their tyrants. The denial of liberty is a powerful spur to revolt. Dictatorship breeds the anger from which civil war springs. Tyranny invites armed resistance.

Corruption breeds anger and discontent. Rulers who plunder the state for themselves rob and anger their people. The theft of public wealth deepens poverty and injustice. This corruption breeds a bitterness that may turn to violence. The people rise against those who have cheated them. Corruption is a fertile source of conflict.

The exclusion of groups and regions feeds grievance. Governments that favour some and shut out others breed deep resentment. Marginalised peoples and neglected regions feel cheated of their share. This exclusion gives them a cause for rebellion. Denied a place in the state, they take up arms against it. Marginalisation is a common root of civil war.

The denial of rights drives people to revolt. Where the rights of citizens are trampled, peaceful redress becomes impossible. Denied justice and a voice, people turn to violence in despair. The closing of lawful avenues opens the way to war. Rebellion becomes the last recourse of the oppressed. The denial of rights breeds armed resistance.

The struggle to seize power turns violent. The contest for control of the state often ends in armed conflict. Rival leaders and factions fight to take the government by force. Where power is a prize worth killing for, war follows. Ambition for rule sets faction against faction. The seizing of power is a frequent cause of civil war.

The refusal to surrender power breeds conflict. Rulers who cling to power against the will of their people provoke revolt. Rigged elections and the refusal to step down spark rebellion. Where power cannot be peacefully transferred, it is fought over. The clinging of tyrants to office breeds civil war. The refusal to yield is as dangerous as the grasping.

The absence of fair institutions leaves force the only recourse. Where there are no fair courts, elections or means of redress, disputes turn to violence. Peaceful ways of settling quarrels are wanting. Force becomes the only means of gaining or keeping power. The lack of just institutions thus breeds war. Weak institutions leave the sword as the only judge.

Together these failings turn discontent into war. Bad governance and the struggle for power feed upon one another. Misrule breeds grievance, and grievance breeds the fight for power. Where both are present, civil war is close at hand. Together they turn the discontent of peoples into armed conflict. Political failure is the road to civil war.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Where the ballot is denied, the bullet is indeed taken up, for dictatorship, corruption and the exclusion of peoples breed the grievance from which rebellion grows, and the denial of rights and of fair elections leaves force as the only recourse. The struggle to seize or to keep power then turns to violence, and civil war follows. Where peaceful change is shut off, the sword becomes the only judge, and the failure of politics becomes the road to civil war.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the denial of peaceful politics drives men to armed rebellion.

The trap is to treat only tyranny and neglect the violent contest for power itself.

The top band shows how misrule and the fight for power reinforce each other to produce war.

Question 87

Many of Africa's civil wars are fought along ethnic lines, and ethnic hatred is often blamed as their chief cause. The statement holds that this hatred, more than any other factor, breeds the continent's wars. There is real force in the claim, for ethnicity is the fault line of many conflicts. Yet ethnic hatred is often the vehicle rather than the root, and deeper causes lie beneath it. The claim may therefore be weighed as follows.

Ethnicity is the fault line of many African wars. A great many of Africa's conflicts are fought between tribes and peoples. The warring sides mobilise and identify themselves by ethnic group. Rwanda, Sudan

and Nigeria all saw war along such lines. Ethnicity plainly shapes the form that these wars take. In this the statement has real truth.

Ethnic hatred makes the wars especially cruel. Where hatred between peoples is deep, the fighting becomes savage. Whole communities are massacred for who they are. Such hatred can descend into ethnic cleansing and genocide. This ferocity marks the ethnic character of the wars. Hatred gives the conflicts their peculiar cruelty.

Ethnic loyalty binds the fighters together. Men fight readily and fiercely for their own people and kin. Ethnic loyalty gives the war its recruits and its solidarity. This bond of blood makes the fighters willing and determined. Ethnicity thus supplies the armies of these wars. It is a powerful force in the conflicts.

Yet ethnic hatred is often manipulated by leaders. Ambitious men stir up ethnic feeling to win power and support. They inflame old differences for their own advantage. The hatred is roused deliberately rather than arising of itself. Ethnicity is thus a tool in the hands of leaders. The manipulation, not the hatred alone, drives the war.

Bad governance and the struggle for power lie beneath. Beneath the ethnic quarrel often lies a contest for power and rule. Tyranny, corruption and exclusion breed the grievance that seeks a vehicle. Ethnicity gives that grievance its form, but not its root. The true cause is frequently political rather than tribal. Misgovernment underlies much ethnic strife.

Poverty and resources fuel the wars as much as hatred. The struggle for land, wealth and resources drives many conflicts. Poverty and inequality breed the anger that turns to war. In the Congo and Sierra Leone, greed for riches fed the killing. Economic causes lie beside, or beneath, the ethnic ones. Want and greed are powerful causes in their own right.

The colonial legacy created the divisions. The borders and favouritism of colonial rule set the peoples against one another. The ethnic fault lines were largely the work of the colonisers. The hatred of today often has its roots in that past. Colonialism, not ethnicity alone, prepared the ground for war. The divisions were made before the hatred was inflamed.

Ethnicity is thus a vehicle more than a root. Ethnic hatred carries and shapes many of Africa's wars. But it is most often the channel through which deeper grievances flow. Power, poverty and colonial division lie beneath the ethnic surface. To call hatred the main cause is to mistake the form for the root. Ethnicity is the vehicle of war rather than its source.

The statement is therefore only partly valid. Ethnic hatred is indeed the fault line of many African wars, giving them their cruelty and their recruits, and in this sense it is a real and powerful cause. Yet more often it is the vehicle than the root, for it is manipulated by ambitious leaders and rests upon deeper causes of bad governance, poverty, the struggle for resources and the colonial legacy. Ethnicity shapes the form of Africa's wars, but power and greed, rooted in a divisive past, are their deeper source.

Examiner's Note

"How far" demands a weighed verdict, giving ethnicity its weight yet testing it against deeper causes.

The trap is to accept the claim wholesale and treat ethnicity as a natural, self-standing cause.

The top band shows ethnicity as a manipulated vehicle for grievances of power, poverty and colonial division.

Question 88

Africa has suffered more than its share of civil and ethnic wars since independence. The statement holds that no continent has been so troubled by war within its own borders, and there is much truth in it, for the frequency of these conflicts has been a peculiar affliction of Africa. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The colonial borders divided and joined peoples wrongly. The frontiers drawn by the colonisers paid no heed to African realities. They split single peoples and forced hostile groups together within one state.

These artificial borders became the fault lines of conflict. Almost every African state inherited such divisions. The colonial map was a standing invitation to war.

The states are weak and their institutions fragile. Many African states are feeble and their governments unable to keep order. Their institutions are young, weak and often distrusted. Such states cannot manage their divisions or hold their territory. Weakness at the centre invites rebellion at the edges. Fragile states are peculiarly prone to civil war.

Great ethnic diversity provides many fault lines. Africa is home to a vast number of peoples, tribes and tongues. This diversity, though a richness, offers many lines of division. Where groups distrust one another, war lies close at hand. The sheer number of peoples multiplies the chances of conflict. Diversity mismanaged became a source of war.

Bad governance and misrule provoke rebellion. Corrupt, tyrannical and exclusive governments have driven many to revolt. The denial of rights and the favouring of some peoples bred grievance. Misrule turned the discontent of peoples into armed resistance. Bad governance has been a frequent spark of African war. Tyranny and corruption invited rebellion.

Poverty and inequality breed grievance and recruits. The widespread poverty of Africa fills many with anger and despair. The poor and the hopeless are readily drawn into rebellion. Economic injustice gives the wars their cause and their soldiers. Want and inequality underlie much of the strife. Poverty is a deep and constant root of conflict.

The wealth of resources fuels and prolongs wars. Africa's riches in oil, diamonds and minerals have fed its wars. Such resources give the fighters both a prize and the means to fight. In the Congo and Sierra Leone, wealth in the ground fed the killing. Greed for resources has fuelled conflict after conflict. Riches became a curse to the continent.

The flood of arms makes war easy to wage. Cheap weapons have poured into Africa since the Cold War. Guns are plentiful and easily obtained by any faction. This ready supply of arms turns grievance quickly into war. Rebellion is made simple where weapons abound. The spread of arms has multiplied the continent's wars.

Foreign interference has stirred and prolonged conflicts. Great powers and neighbouring states have meddled in Africa's quarrels. They armed and backed the factions that served their interests. This outside interference widened and prolonged many wars. The Cold War in particular fed the continent's conflicts. The hand of the foreigner deepened Africa's strife.

The manipulation of ethnicity by leaders inflames wars. Ambitious leaders have stirred up ethnic hatred to gain power. They set group against group for their own advantage. This cynical use of identity turned difference into war. Ordinary people were roused to fight their neighbours. The playing upon ethnicity has bred conflict after conflict.

The statement is therefore largely valid. No continent has indeed been so troubled by war within its own borders as Africa, for the arbitrary colonial borders, the weakness of its states and its great ethnic diversity provided the fault lines, while bad governance, poverty and the struggle for resources supplied the grievance and the prize. The flood of arms, foreign interference and the manipulation of ethnicity then turned division into war after war. The frequency of Africa's internal conflicts sprang from the meeting of a difficult inheritance and the failures of the new states.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim by accounting for the peculiar frequency of internal war in Africa.

The trap is to give only ethnic diversity and neglect governance, resources and the colonial legacy.

The top band shows the colonial inheritance and weak states as the ground on which the other causes work.

Question 89

The Rwandan genocide of 1994 was among the most terrible crimes of the twentieth century. The statement holds that its hatreds were sown and armed by others rather than springing from the people themselves, and there is much truth in it. The colonial rulers had hardened the divide, ambitious leaders inflamed it, and the world stood by as the killing raged. The claim may therefore be weighed as follows.

Colonial rule had sharpened the Hutu-Tutsi divide. The Belgian rulers favoured the Tutsi minority over the Hutu majority. They hardened a loose social difference into a rigid ethnic divide. Identity cards fixed each Rwandan as Hutu or Tutsi for life. This colonial favouritism bred deep and lasting resentment. It planted the seeds of the later slaughter.

The struggle for power set the groups against each other. Power passed to the Hutu majority at independence, reversing the old order. The Tutsi were now the excluded and the feared minority. The contest for control of the state deepened the ethnic quarrel. Political power and ethnic identity became dangerously entangled. The struggle for rule fed the coming violence.

The invasion by the Tutsi exiles heightened fear. In 1990 the Tutsi-led Rwandan Patriotic Front invaded from abroad. Their war roused the fears of the Hutu government and people. The Tutsi within were branded as traitors and enemies within. This invasion sharpened the hatred and the sense of threat. Fear of the Tutsi was inflamed into a readiness to kill.

Propaganda prepared the people for slaughter. Hutu extremists used the radio to preach hatred of the Tutsi. The Tutsi were branded as vermin and as a deadly enemy. This propaganda made ordinary people willing to murder their neighbours. Lists of victims were drawn up and militias were armed. Words and preparation paved the way for the genocide.

Extremist militias were armed and organised. The Hutu extremists formed and armed the Interahamwe militias. These bands were trained and made ready for the slaughter to come. They became the chief instruments of the coming genocide. Their organisation made the killing swift, thorough and inescapable. Armed and directed militias turned hatred into systematic massacre.

The killing of the president was the trigger. In April 1994 the Hutu president's aeroplane was shot down. His death was the signal for the genocide to begin. Within hours the killing of the Tutsi had started across the land. The trigger long awaited had at last been pulled. This murder set the slaughter in motion.

The genocide killed some eight hundred thousand in a hundred days. In a few weeks the Tutsi were slaughtered with terrible speed. Neighbours killed neighbours with machetes and clubs. Whole families and communities were wiped out together. The scale and swiftness of the killing were beyond belief. It was among the fastest genocides in history.

The world failed to intervene. The United Nations and the great powers stood aside as the killing raged. The small UN force was withdrawn rather than reinforced. The world's failure to act allowed the genocide to run its course. This inaction remains a lasting shame. The promise of "never again" was broken.

It left Rwanda devastated and its neighbours destabilised. The genocide left Rwanda ruined, grieving and full of orphans. Millions of Hutu fled into the neighbouring Congo in fear. Their flight helped to spark the terrible wars of the Congo. The whole Great Lakes region was destabilised by the catastrophe. Its effects spread far beyond Rwanda's borders.

It led to trials, reconciliation and slow recovery. After the genocide, courts were set up to try its authors. Rwanda used both international tribunals and its own gacaca courts. The nation began the painful work of justice and reconciliation. Slowly it sought to rebuild trust between its peoples. Recovery was long, hard and far from complete.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The Rwandan genocide was in great part the harvest of hatreds sown and armed by others: the colonial rulers had hardened the Hutu-Tutsi divide, ambitious leaders inflamed it with propaganda and armed the militias, and the world failed to intervene as the slaughter raged. Yet the hands that wielded the machetes were Rwandan, so that the genocide was also the work of those who chose to kill. It was the harvest of seeds long sown, reaped at last by a people set upon each other.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the sowing of the hatred by others weighed against the choice of those who killed.

The trap is to describe the horror without explaining the colonial and political roots or the world's failure.

The top band links the colonial legacy and manipulated fear to the slaughter while conceding the killers' own guilt.

Question 90

The civil wars in the Democratic Republic of Congo were among the deadliest conflicts since the Second World War. The statement holds that the tragedy of the Congo was that its great wealth became its curse, and there is much truth in it, for the country's riches fed and prolonged its wars. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The corrupt rule of Mobutu had ruined the state. For decades Mobutu plundered and misgoverned the vast country. His corruption hollowed out the state and impoverished its people. By the 1990s his rule was crumbling and his authority gone. This weak and rotten state was ripe for collapse. Misrule prepared the way for the wars.

The Rwandan genocide spilled over the border. The genocide of 1994 drove millions of Hutu into eastern Congo. Among them were the very militias that had carried out the killing. Their presence brought war and disorder across the border. Rwanda pursued its enemies into the Congo itself. The genocide thus helped to ignite the Congo wars.

The struggle for power drew in rival leaders. Laurent Kabila rose in rebellion and overthrew Mobutu in 1997. But the victors soon fell out, and war broke out afresh in 1998. The contest for control of the state fuelled the fighting. Rival leaders and factions struggled for the great prize. The fight for power kept the country at war.

Many African states intervened in the war. The Congo war drew in the armies of many neighbouring states. Rwanda, Uganda, Angola, Zimbabwe and others took opposing sides. So many nations fought that it was called Africa's world war. This foreign intervention widened and prolonged the conflict. The Congo became the battleground of a continent.

The plunder of resources fuelled the fighting. The Congo's vast wealth in minerals became a prize and a curse. Armies and militias fought to control its gold, diamonds and coltan. The plunder of these riches funded and prolonged the war. Greed for resources kept the fighting alive. The country's wealth fed its own destruction.

Ethnic conflict deepened the violence. Old ethnic quarrels, as between the Hema and Lendu, fed the war. The fighting took on a bitter ethnic character in the east. Militias formed along the lines of tribe and people. These local hatreds deepened the wider conflict. Ethnicity added its cruelty to the struggle.

Millions died from war, famine and disease. The Congo wars cost an estimated five million lives or more. Most died not in battle but from the famine and disease the war brought. Whole regions were laid waste and their people ruined. The scale of death was among the greatest since 1945. The human cost was almost beyond counting.

It displaced great numbers and bred lasting instability. The wars drove millions from their homes into flight and misery. Refugees and displaced persons filled the region. The eastern Congo remained troubled by militias long after. The fighting left a legacy of disorder and weakness. Instability outlasted the formal end of the wars.

It left the state weak and the east in turmoil. Even after peace was declared, the Congo remained fragile and divided. The eastern provinces continued to suffer from armed groups. The state could not control its own territory or wealth. The wars left the country broken and its recovery slow. Turmoil in the east endured for years.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The tragedy of the Congo was indeed that its great wealth became its curse, for the struggle to control its gold, diamonds and coltan drew in many African states and funded the fighting of armies and militias. Yet the wars sprang also from the collapse of Mobutu's corrupt state and the spillover of the Rwandan genocide, deepened by ethnic conflict. The country's wealth, which should have blessed it, instead fed its destruction, in a war that cost some five million lives.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the Congo's wealth fuelled and prolonged its wars.

The trap is to describe the foreign armies without explaining the resource plunder and the Rwandan spillover.

The top band links the genocide, the resource wealth and the many interveners to the catastrophic death toll.

Question 91

The civil war in Somalia is among the most complete collapses of a state in modern times. The statement holds that Somalia showed the world what it means for a state wholly to cease to be, and this is largely just, for the country was left for years without any working government. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The fall of Siad Barre in 1991 destroyed the government. The dictator Siad Barre was overthrown by rebel clans in 1991. His fall left no government able to take his place. The central authority of the state simply collapsed. Somalia was left without a working government for years. This collapse was the beginning of the long disorder.

The country broke apart into warring clans. With the government gone, Somalia dissolved into its rival clans. Each clan and its militia fought the others for power and land. The nation was shattered into warring pieces. Clan loyalty replaced any loyalty to the state. Somalia became a patchwork of hostile fiefdoms.

Warlords ruled by force in place of government. Armed warlords seized control of towns and regions by the gun. They ruled their territories by force and plunder. No lawful authority stood above their private power. The country was divided among these armed chiefs. Warlordism took the place of government.

Famine followed the fighting and disorder. The war wrecked farming, trade and the ordinary life of the country. Terrible famine struck the land as food and order failed. Hundreds of thousands died of hunger amid the fighting. The disorder turned drought into catastrophe. Famine was among the war's cruellest effects.

Foreign intervention failed to restore order. The United States and the United Nations sent forces to relieve the famine. But their intervention became entangled in the fighting and failed. After losses they withdrew, leaving the disorder behind. The world's effort to help came to little. Somalia was left once more to its warlords.

The collapse bred piracy off its coasts. The absence of government left the Somali seas unguarded. Pirates arose from the poverty and disorder of the coast. They preyed upon the shipping of the world for ransom. The collapse of the state thus troubled the seas beyond. Piracy was a fruit of Somalia's ruin.

It gave terrorism a foothold. The lawless land became a haven for extremist groups. The terrorist movement Al-Shabaab arose and seized wide territory. From Somalia it struck at its neighbours and far beyond. Foreign fighters were drawn to the ungoverned spaces of the land. The failed state thus became a nursery of terror that endangered the whole region.

It left Somalia broken and slow to recover. Efforts to rebuild a Somali government proved long and difficult. The new authorities struggled to control the country. Clan rivalry and terrorism hindered every recovery. Decades of disorder could not swiftly be undone. Somalia remained fragile and troubled for many years.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Somalia did indeed show the world what it means for a state wholly to cease to be, for the fall of Siad Barre in 1991 destroyed the government and broke the country into warring clans ruled by warlords. Famine came with the fighting, foreign intervention failed, and the

collapse bred piracy off its coasts and gave terrorism a foothold. Left for years without any working government, Somalia stands as the clearest example in the modern world of the total collapse of a state.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that Somalia is the clearest case of the total collapse of a state.

The trap is to describe the fighting without showing how state collapse bred famine, piracy and terror.

The top band links the fall of the government to clan warfare and to the wider effects of a failed state.

Question 92

The civil wars in Sudan were among the longest and bloodiest in Africa. The statement holds that Sudan's long war ended not in peace but in the parting of its peoples, and this is largely just, for the conflict closed in the secession of the south rather than in any true reconciliation. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Sudan was divided between an Arab north and an African south. The country joined two very different peoples within one state. The north was Arab and Muslim, the south African and Christian or traditional. This deep divide of race and religion set them apart. The two had little in common and much to quarrel over. The division was the root of the wars.

The north sought to dominate and to impose its ways. The Arab-led government in the north ruled over the whole country. It sought to impose Islam and the Arabic language upon the south. The southerners resented this domination and this imposition. Their fear of being ruled and remade bred rebellion. Northern domination provoked the southern revolt.

The south was marginalised and neglected. The government developed the north and neglected the south. The southerners felt cheated of their share of power and wealth. This marginalisation deepened their grievance against the centre. Denied a fair place, they took up arms. Neglect was a powerful cause of the wars.

Oil sharpened the quarrel over wealth. Much of Sudan's oil lay in the south but was controlled by the north. The struggle over this wealth embittered the conflict. Each side sought to command the riches of the ground. Oil gave the war a prize and a fuel. The quarrel over wealth deepened the fighting.

The wars cost millions of lives. The long conflicts killed some two million people and more. Many died not in battle but of the famine and disease the war brought. Whole regions were laid waste and their peoples utterly ruined. The fighting dragged on for decades, renewing the slaughter again and again. The human cost of the wars was immense and almost beyond all counting.

The wars displaced great numbers of people. Millions were driven from their homes by the fighting. Refugees and displaced persons filled the south and the neighbouring lands. Their flight brought misery and strained the region. Displacement was among the gravest effects of the wars. The people were uprooted on a vast scale.

The wars ended in the secession of South Sudan. A peace agreement in 2005 promised the south a vote on its future. In 2011 the south chose independence and became a new nation. The long quarrel ended in the division of the country. South Sudan was born out of the wars. Secession was their final outcome.

Yet peace did not follow, and new wars came. The new state of South Sudan soon fell into civil war itself. Its own peoples, the Dinka and the Nuer, turned upon each other. The Darfur region of the north also suffered its own genocide. The birth of South Sudan did not bring lasting peace. Fresh conflicts followed the old.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Sudan's long war did indeed end not in peace but in the parting of its peoples, for the quarrel between the Arab north and the African south, sharpened by domination, marginalisation and the struggle over oil, closed in the secession of South Sudan in 2011. And even that parting brought no peace, for the new state fell into its own civil war and Darfur suffered its own genocide.

The war ended in division rather than in reconciliation, and the sorrows of Sudan continued beyond the parting of its peoples.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the war ended in secession rather than in a true peace.

The trap is to treat only religion and neglect the marginalisation of the south and the quarrel over oil.

The top band notes that secession did not bring peace, for South Sudan fell into its own civil war.

Question 93

The Nigerian civil war, often called the Biafran war, was one of the gravest conflicts of newly independent Africa. The statement holds that Biafra was starved into a unity it had sought to leave, and this is largely just, for the eastern region was forced back into Nigeria by blockade and famine. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Nigeria was divided among rival peoples and regions. The country joined the Hausa-Fulani, the Yoruba and the Igbo, among others. These great peoples distrusted and competed with one another. The federal state was fragile and its unity uncertain. This division was the deep root of the war. Nigeria was a nation of uneasy parts.

Coups and counter-coups deepened the divisions. In 1966 two military coups upset the balance among the regions. Each was seen as the work of one people against another. The coups bred suspicion and fear between the groups. They shattered what trust remained in the federation. Political violence prepared the way for war.

Massacres of the Igbo drove the east to secede. After the coups, many Igbo living in the north were massacred. The survivors fled home to the east in fear and grief. The Igbo came to feel that they had no safe place in Nigeria. This persecution drove them toward secession. The massacres were the immediate spark of the war.

The east declared itself the state of Biafra. In 1967 the eastern region proclaimed its independence as Biafra. Its leader Ojukwu led the breakaway from the federation. The federal government refused to accept the loss of the region. War broke out to keep Nigeria one. Secession met the resolve of the centre.

Oil made the quarrel over the east the sharper. Much of Nigeria's oil lay in the eastern region that sought to secede. The federal government would not surrender this great wealth. The struggle over oil embittered the war for the east. Riches gave the conflict a further prize. Oil deepened the determination to hold the region.

The war brought famine and mass death. The federal forces blockaded Biafra and cut off its food. Terrible famine struck the trapped and starving population. Perhaps a million or more died, most of them of hunger. The images of starving children shocked the world. Famine was the war's cruellest effect.

Biafra was defeated and Nigeria kept one. After nearly three years of war, Biafra was starved into surrender. The secession failed and the country remained united. The federal government had held Nigeria together by force. The war ended with the defeat of the breakaway. Unity was preserved at a terrible cost.

Reconciliation followed under "no victor, no vanquished." The federal government sought to heal the nation after the war. It proclaimed a policy of no victor and no vanquished. The Igbo were received back into the Nigerian state. This mercy helped to bind the wounds of the war. Reconciliation, rather than revenge, followed the fighting.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Biafra was indeed starved into a unity it had sought to leave, for the eastern region, driven to secede by coups, massacres and the fear of persecution, was blockaded by the federal forces until famine broke its resistance. Perhaps a million or more died, most of them of hunger, before Biafra surrendered and Nigeria was kept one. The secession was defeated by starvation, and the

nation's unity preserved at a terrible cost, though softened afterwards by the policy of no victor and no vanquished.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that Biafra was forced back into Nigeria by blockade and famine.

The trap is to describe the fighting and neglect the massacres, the oil and the famine.

The top band links the ethnic divisions and massacres to secession, and the blockade to the famine.

Question 94

The break-up of Yugoslavia in the 1990s brought the worst fighting to Europe since the Second World War. The statement holds that ethnic cleansing returned to Europe within living memory of the last time, and this is largely just, for the atrocities of the Yugoslav wars revived horrors the continent had hoped never to see again. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Yugoslavia joined many rival peoples in one state. The federation united Serbs, Croats, Bosniaks, Slovenes and others. These peoples differed in nation, religion and history. Old rivalries and memories divided them beneath the surface. The state held together many uneasy parts. This mixture of peoples was the root of the conflict.

The death of Tito removed the unifying hand. The leader Tito had held the federation together by his strength. After his death the bonds of the state began to loosen. No leader of his authority arose to replace him. The peoples drifted toward their separate nationalisms. His passing opened the way to break-up.

The end of the Cold War loosened the federation. The fall of communism removed the ideology that had bound the state. The old order that held Yugoslavia together collapsed. The republics began to seek their own independence. The end of the Cold War thus hastened the break-up. The federation came apart as communism fell.

Nationalist leaders stirred up ethnic hatred. Ambitious men such as Milošević roused their peoples against the others. They inflamed old fears and grievances for their own power. This deliberate stirring of hatred turned difference into war. The peoples were set against one another by their leaders. Manipulated nationalism drove the conflict.

The republics broke away and war followed. Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia declared their independence in turn. Serbia and the Serb minorities resisted the break-up by force. War spread across Croatia and then Bosnia. The unravelling of the state was drenched in blood. Secession and resistance brought on the wars.

The wars brought ethnic cleansing and atrocity. The fighting was marked by the expulsion and killing of whole peoples. Ethnic cleansing drove communities from their homes by terror. Camps, massacres and mass rape returned to Europe. These atrocities shocked the watching world. The wars revived the horrors of an earlier age.

The massacre at Srebrenica was a genocide. In 1995 Bosnian Serb forces murdered thousands of Muslim men at Srebrenica. It was the worst atrocity in Europe since the Second World War. The killing was later judged a genocide by the courts. The world's failure to prevent it was a lasting shame. Srebrenica became a byword for the horror of the wars.

Foreign intervention at last ended the fighting. The powers and NATO intervened to halt the wars. Air strikes and diplomacy brought the fighting to an end. Peace agreements divided the land among its peoples. International courts were set up to try the guilty. Outside force finally imposed an uneasy peace.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Ethnic cleansing did indeed return to Europe within living memory of the last time, for the break-up of Yugoslavia, driven by nationalist leaders who stirred up hatred, brought the expulsion and massacre of whole peoples and the genocide at Srebrenica in 1995. The horrors of camps, massacre and mass rape returned to a continent that had known them a generation before. The Yugoslav

wars showed that ethnic war and its atrocities were the affliction not of Africa alone but of the modern world.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that ethnic cleansing and atrocity returned to Europe in the 1990s.

The trap is to describe the break-up without showing the manipulation of ethnicity and the atrocities.

The top band links the loosening of the federation to nationalist manipulation and to ethnic cleansing.

Question 95

Civil and ethnic wars fall most heavily upon the ordinary people in whose lands they are fought. The statement holds that it is the child, the woman and the villager who pay the heaviest price, and this is largely just, for it is the defenceless civilian, not the fighter, who bears the chief burden of these wars. The claim may be weighed as follows.

They cause great loss of civilian life. In civil and ethnic wars the civilians die in vast numbers. They are killed in massacres, in fighting and by the disorder of war. Often more perish than among the fighters themselves. The ordinary people bear the chief cost of the war. Their death is the gravest of the humanitarian effects.

They bring famine and disease. The wars wreck farming, trade and the ordinary means of life. Famine follows as food fails and fields are abandoned. Disease spreads among the weakened and the displaced. Many die of hunger and sickness rather than of battle. Famine and disease are among the deadliest effects.

They drive people from their homes. The fighting forces great numbers to flee for their lives. They become refugees abroad or displaced within their own land. Their homes, farms and livelihoods are lost behind them. Camps of the uprooted spread across the region. Mass displacement is a grievous effect of the wars.

They tear apart families and communities. The wars scatter families and destroy the bonds of community. Parents are lost, children orphaned, and neighbours set against neighbours. The social fabric that holds a people together is torn. Trust between the peoples is destroyed. The wars wound society at its very roots.

They bring sexual violence against women. In many of these wars women suffer terrible violence and abuse. Rape is used deliberately as a weapon to terrorise and to humiliate. This cruelty leaves deep and lasting wounds of body and of mind. The victims are often shamed and abandoned by their own communities. Sexual violence is among the darkest and most enduring effects of the wars.

They use children as soldiers. The armies and militias seize children and force them to fight. Boys and girls are made into soldiers, servants and killers. They are robbed of their childhood and brutalised by war. In Sierra Leone, Liberia and the Congo this evil was widespread. The use of child soldiers is among the war's greatest shames.

They scar the survivors in mind and body. Those who live through the wars carry deep and lasting wounds. The maimed bear their injuries for life, and all bear the trauma. Children who fought or fled are marked forever by what they saw. The healing of these scars is slow and hard. The survivors suffer long after the fighting.

They ruin the means of life and recovery. The wars destroy schools, hospitals, roads and farms. The means of health, learning and livelihood are laid waste. Recovery is slow and painful once the fighting ends. A ruined society cannot easily rebuild itself. The wars set back the welfare of whole generations.

They leave a legacy of trauma and hatred. The horrors of the wars poison a society for generations. Grief, fear and hatred outlast the fighting itself. The desire for revenge may kindle new wars in time. The wounds of the mind are the hardest to heal. This legacy of trauma is a lasting humanitarian effect.

The statement is therefore largely valid. In civil war it is indeed the child, the woman and the villager who pay the heaviest price, for the ordinary people die in vast numbers, suffer famine and disease, and are driven from their homes, while women endure terrible violence and children are seized and made into soldiers. The line between soldier and civilian blurs, and the defenceless bear the chief cost of the fighting. Scarred in body and mind, it is the innocent, not the armed, who suffer most in civil and ethnic wars.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the defenceless civilian bears the heaviest cost of civil war.

The trap is to list military effects and neglect the human suffering the question asks for.

The top band gives full weight to child soldiers, sexual violence and the lasting trauma of survivors.

Question 96

Civil and ethnic wars are fed not only by grievance but by the weapons and the wealth that make them possible. The statement holds that behind every long war stands someone who profits from its continuance, and this is largely just, for the arms dealers and the plunderers of resources gain from the fighting. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The military-industrial complex profits from war. The alliance of arms makers, armies and governments has an interest in conflict. War means profit for those who produce and sell weapons. This complex therefore gains from the continuance of fighting. It has little interest in a lasting peace. Its profit motive helps to feed the world's wars.

The arms trade floods conflict zones with weapons. The dealers in arms supply weapons to any who will pay. Guns pour into troubled regions through this trade. Every faction can arm itself with ease. This flood of weapons makes rebellion and killing simple. The arms trade puts the means of war into many hands.

Cheap small arms make war easy to wage. The cheapness and plenty of small arms fuel the fighting. Even the poorest faction can equip itself with guns. Children can be armed and sent to fight. This ready supply turns grievance quickly into war. Small arms are the fuel of modern conflict.

Natural resources give the fighters a prize. Wealth in oil, diamonds and minerals is a prize worth fighting for. Factions struggle to control the riches of the ground. The hope of such wealth draws men to war. Resources give the conflict an object beyond mere grievance. Riches become a cause of war.

Resources fund and prolong the fighting. The wealth seized in war pays for the weapons that continue it. Diamonds and minerals are sold abroad to buy yet more arms and men. In this way the fighting funds itself and drags on for years. The factions gain an interest in prolonging so profitable a war. The plunder of resources thus keeps the conflict cruelly alive.

"Blood diamonds" and mineral plunder fed African wars. In Sierra Leone diamonds funded a terrible rebellion. In the Congo the plunder of minerals fed a vast war. These "blood" resources paid for weapons and atrocity. The wealth of the ground became a curse to the people. Resource plunder fuelled some of Africa's worst wars.

Foreign interests share in the plunder. Foreign companies and powers profit from the resources of war-torn lands. They buy the plundered wealth and sell the weapons. Their interest lies in access rather than in peace. This foreign hand deepens and prolongs the conflicts. Outside greed feeds the wars of the poor.

Together they turn grievance into lasting war. The weapons and the wealth turn a quarrel into a durable war. What grievance begins, arms and resources sustain. The conflict becomes profitable and therefore permanent. Those who gain have no wish to see it end. Together these forces make wars long and hard to stop.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Behind every long war there does indeed stand someone who profits from its continuance, for the military-industrial complex and the arms trade grow rich by supplying the weapons, and the plunder of natural resources both funds the fighting and rewards it. Foreign interests

share in the profit, buying the plundered wealth and selling the arms. What grievance begins, weapons and wealth sustain, and those who gain from the war have little wish to see it end.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that those who profit from war help to sustain it.

The trap is to treat the three separately without showing how weapons and wealth together prolong war.

The top band links resource plunder to the funding of war and to the profit that makes conflict lasting.

Question 97

Civil and ethnic wars are seldom the work of the warring peoples alone, for foreign powers have often played a large part in them. The statement holds that this part has been more often to inflame than to end the wars, and there is much truth in it. The powers have armed the factions and taken sides for their own interests, though they have at times also made peace. The claim may be assessed as follows.

They arm and finance the warring factions. Foreign powers supply weapons, money and advisers to the sides they favour. This support gives the factions the means to fight on. Wars are prolonged by the aid that flows from abroad. The foreign hand keeps the fighting alive. Arming the factions is a common foreign role.

They take sides for their own interests. The powers back whichever side serves their own advantage. They seek influence, resources or strategic gain from the war. Their interest, not the good of the people, guides their choice. This self-interested meddling deepens the conflict. Foreign powers pursue their ends in others' wars.

They turn local wars into wider ones. The intervention of many states widens a local quarrel. The Congo war drew in the armies of a whole region. What began within one country became a war of nations. Foreign involvement thus enlarges the scale of conflict. It turns civil wars into regional ones.

They prolong wars that might otherwise end. Outside support allows a losing faction to fight on. Wars that might have ended quickly are dragged out for years. The flow of foreign aid frustrates any settlement. Intervention makes conflicts harder to conclude. Foreign powers lengthen the wars they join.

During the Cold War they fed African conflicts. The superpowers backed rival sides in the wars of the Third World. Their rivalry fed and armed conflicts across Africa. Local wars became battlegrounds of the wider Cold War. This interference deepened the continent's strife. The Cold War fuelled many an African war.

Yet foreign powers may also help to make peace. Not all foreign involvement feeds the fighting. Powers and bodies have also mediated and kept the peace. Foreign forces have separated combatants and relieved suffering. Intervention can end as well as prolong a war. The foreign role is not wholly a harmful one.

Their intervention is often self-interested even when helpful. Even when they help, foreign powers pursue their own ends. Their aid may come with conditions and hidden purposes. Peace is sought where it suits the intervener's interest. The good they do is seldom without self-interest. Their role is thus a mixed and uncertain one.

The statement is therefore largely valid. In Africa's wars the foreigner has more often fanned the flames than quenched them, for the powers have armed and financed the factions, taken sides for their own interests, and turned local quarrels into wider wars, as the Cold War did across the continent. They have at times also mediated and kept the peace, so that their role has not been wholly harmful. But on balance the hand of the foreigner has deepened Africa's wars more often than it has healed them.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the foreign role weighed for harm and for help, ending in a judgement.

The trap is to treat foreign powers as wholly harmful, or wholly as peacemakers.

The top band concedes the peacemaking role while judging the net effect to be the fanning of the flames.

Question 98

The resolution of civil and ethnic conflicts is among the hardest tasks of the modern world. The statement holds that it is easier to end a war than to build the peace that must follow, and this is largely just, for the silencing of the guns is only the beginning of the harder work of peacebuilding. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Negotiation and mediation seek a peaceful settlement. Talks between the warring sides seek to end the fighting by agreement. Mediators, often foreign, help the parties toward a settlement. Many wars have been ended by such patient negotiation. This peaceful method is the first and best resort. Mediation has brought peace to many conflicts.

Peace agreements and power-sharing divide the spoils. Settlements often share power among the former enemies. Rival groups are given a place in a common government. This power-sharing seeks to remove the cause of the fighting. It offers each side a stake in the peace. Such agreements have ended many civil wars.

Peacekeeping forces separate the combatants. Neutral forces are placed between the warring sides to keep the peace. They monitor ceasefires and protect the civilians. Their presence helps to hold a fragile peace together. Peacekeeping has stilled the guns in many lands. It is a common method of ending war.

Disarmament reintegrates the fighters into society. The former fighters are disarmed and returned to civilian life. Their weapons are collected and their soldiers given new livelihoods. This removes the means and the men of war. Disarmament is vital to a lasting peace. It turns soldiers back into citizens.

Justice and reconciliation seek to heal the wounds. Courts and truth commissions confront the crimes of the war. Rwanda's gacaca and South Africa's truth commission sought both. Justice punishes the guilty while reconciliation restores the peace. This healing is needed to prevent renewed war. Justice and mercy together rebuild a society.

The United Nations mediates, keeps peace and gives aid. The United Nations sends peacekeepers and mediators to troubled lands. It gives humanitarian aid to the victims of war. It has helped to end and to ease many conflicts. Yet it failed terribly in Rwanda and at Srebrenica. Its record is one of both success and failure.

The African Union and regional bodies act nearer home. The African Union and bodies such as ECOWAS act in Africa's wars. They have mediated, kept the peace and sent forces to conflicts. ECOWAS intervened in Liberia and Sierra Leone. These regional efforts bring African solutions to African problems. They share the burden of keeping the peace.

Yet peacebuilding faces grave and lasting challenges. The healing of a war-torn society is slow and difficult. Hatred, poverty and weak institutions frustrate the peace. Agreements may break down and wars flare again. The peacemakers often lack the means and the will. These challenges limit the success of every method.

The statement is therefore largely valid. It is indeed easier to end a war than to build the peace that must follow, for while negotiation, peacekeeping and disarmament may silence the guns, the deeper work of justice, reconciliation and reconstruction is slow and difficult. The United Nations and the African Union have laboured at both, with mixed success, but hatred, poverty and weak institutions frustrate the building of a lasting peace. To stop the fighting is hard; to build the peace that must follow is harder still.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that building peace is harder than ending the fighting.

The trap is to list methods without assessing the mixed record of the UN and the AU.

The top band pairs the methods with the bodies that apply them and notes the failures as well as the successes.

Question 99

Tanzania has long played an honoured part in the search for peace in Africa. The statement calls it a patient friend to a troubled continent, and there is much truth in it, for from the days of Nyerere Tanzania has laboured as a mediator, host and peacemaker. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It has mediated in the conflicts of its neighbours. Tanzania has often stood between the warring parties of the region. Its leaders have laboured to bring enemies to agreement. Nyerere himself mediated in the civil war of Burundi. This patient mediation has helped to end conflicts. Tanzania has been a peacemaker among its neighbours.

It has hosted peace talks on its own soil. The town of Arusha has become a byword for peace in Africa. There the agreements for Rwanda and Burundi were negotiated. Tanzania offered a neutral ground for the settling of quarrels. Its hospitality served the peace of the region. Arusha became a home of African peacemaking.

It has sheltered great numbers of refugees. Tanzania has opened its borders to those fleeing the wars of its neighbours. Refugees from Rwanda, Burundi and the Congo found shelter there. This generosity relieved the suffering of the displaced. Tanzania bore the burden of others' wars. Its welcome to refugees was a work of peace.

It has contributed to peacekeeping forces. Tanzanian soldiers have served in peacekeeping missions across Africa. They have helped to keep the peace in troubled lands. This contribution shared the burden of the continent's security. Tanzania gave its men to the cause of peace. Its soldiers served the peace of others.

It gave leadership through Nyerere and his successors. The moral authority of Nyerere lent weight to Tanzania's peacemaking. His stature made him a trusted mediator in African quarrels. His successors continued this tradition of peacemaking. Tanzania's leaders were respected across the continent. Their leadership served the peace of Africa.

It supported the liberation of southern Africa. Tanzania was a frontline state in the struggle against colonialism and apartheid. It hosted and aided the liberation movements of the south. This support helped to free southern Africa from white rule. Its stand for freedom was a work of peace and justice. Tanzania served the liberation of the continent.

It has stood for African unity and peaceful solutions. Tanzania has upheld the cause of African unity and cooperation. It has favoured peaceful solutions to the quarrels of the continent. Its steady support for the African Union and its forebears is well known. Tanzania has been a friend to the peace of Africa. Its example has served the whole continent.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Tanzania has indeed been a patient friend to a troubled continent, for it has mediated in the conflicts of its neighbours, hosted the peace talks at Arusha, sheltered great numbers of refugees, and contributed to peacekeeping across Africa. Through the leadership of Nyerere and his successors, and its support for liberation and for African unity, it has served the peace of the continent. A steady friend to a troubled Africa, Tanzania stands as a model of what one nation may do for the peace of others.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim by showing Tanzania's part as mediator, host and peacemaker.

The trap is to praise Tanzania vaguely without naming its mediation, its hosting of talks and its refugees.

The top band links Arusha, Nyerere's mediation and the sheltering of refugees to concrete peacebuilding.

Question 100

Civil and ethnic wars have become the characteristic conflicts of the modern age. The statement holds that their deepest lesson is that difference among peoples need not lead to war, and this is largely just. For these

wars have shown that it is the manipulation of difference, not difference itself, that breeds division and slaughter. The claim may be assessed as follows.

They are the commonest form of modern conflict. Since 1945 wars within states have far outnumbered wars between them. It is in civil and ethnic strife that most modern fighting occurs. This shift has changed the very nature of war. The old wars of armies have given way to internal ones. Their frequency is their first significance.

They have caused immense death and suffering. These wars have killed and displaced many millions of people. The Congo, Rwanda and Sudan alone cost countless lives. Their toll of suffering rivals that of the great wars. The scale of their destruction is among the greatest of the age. Their human cost gives them a terrible significance.

They have destabilised whole regions. A civil war seldom stays within the borders of one state. Refugees, arms and fighting spill over into neighbouring lands. The Great Lakes region was destabilised by such spillover. These wars endanger the peace of whole regions. Their reach is wider than the country of their birth.

They show the danger of manipulated ethnicity. Again and again, leaders have stirred up ethnic hatred for power. The lesson is that difference becomes deadly when it is inflamed. Ethnicity itself is not the cause, but its manipulation is. The world must beware those who play upon identity. This is among the gravest lessons of the wars.

They reveal the importance of good governance. The wars have shown that misrule and exclusion breed rebellion. Just, inclusive and accountable government is a barrier against war. Where all have a fair place, the causes of war are weakened. Good governance is the surest foundation of peace. This is a central lesson of the conflicts.

They teach the need to address root causes. Force alone cannot end wars that spring from deep grievance. Poverty, injustice and division must be tackled at the root. Lasting peace requires the removal of the causes of war. This is the hardest but the wisest lesson. Peace must be built, not merely imposed.

They show the need for justice and reconciliation. After such wars, the wounds of a society must be healed. Justice for the guilty and reconciliation among the peoples are needed. Without them the hatred endures and war may return. Rwanda and South Africa sought this healing. Reconciliation is essential to a lasting peace.

They call for timely international action. The failures in Rwanda and Bosnia taught the cost of standing by. The world learned that it must act in time to prevent catastrophe. Yet the will and the means to act are often wanting. The duty to protect the victims of such wars is now urged. Timely action is a lesson too often unlearned.

They warn of the fragility of the state. The complete collapse of Somalia showed how a state may wholly fail. These wars reveal how fragile the order of nations can truly be. A state once broken is hard, slow and costly to rebuild. The disorder of a failed state endangers its neighbours as well. The lesson is to guard the institutions that alone can keep the peace.

They shape the security thinking of the age. The prevalence of these wars has changed how the world thinks of security. Peace is now seen to depend upon justice within nations. The idea of human security has grown from these conflicts. The world's efforts turn increasingly to preventing internal war. They have reshaped the security agenda of the age.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The deepest lesson of Africa's wars is indeed that difference need not mean division, for it is the manipulation of ethnicity by ambitious leaders, and not the mere existence of many peoples, that breeds the slaughter. Where governance is good and all have a fair place, difference may be a richness rather than a cause of war. The wars teach that peace rests upon justice, inclusion and the removal of grievance, and that timely action is needed to prevent catastrophe. Their significance lies in this hard-won knowledge, bought at a terrible price.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the lessons weighed, and the claim that difference need not mean division tested.

The trap is to describe particular wars instead of drawing out their wider lessons.

The top band shows manipulated ethnicity, not difference itself, as the true cause, and good governance as the remedy.

Question 101

Development is the improvement of the whole life of a people, and it is often confused with mere economic growth. The statement holds that a nation may grow richer while its people remain poor, and this is largely just, for growth in wealth does not of itself better the lives of the many. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Development is the improvement of the whole life of a people. Development means the bettering of the wellbeing and quality of life of a people. It is not wealth alone but health, learning, freedom and dignity. It touches every side of human life, not the economy only. It aims at the full flourishing of the people. This broad betterment is the true meaning of development.

Economic development raises production and incomes. Economic development is the growth and transformation of a country's economy. It means more production, higher incomes and a change from farming to industry. It builds the wealth on which other progress may rest. But it is only one part of the whole. Economic advance is a means rather than the end.

Social development improves welfare and services. Social development is the bettering of health, education and welfare. It means schools, hospitals, clean water and the relief of poverty. It raises the condition of the ordinary people directly. It is the human side of development. Social progress measures development in lives improved.

Political development builds good and stable government. Political development is the growth of just and stable institutions. It means good governance, the rule of law and the freedom of the people. It gives development a firm and orderly foundation. Without it, other progress is easily lost. Sound government is a part of true development.

Sustainable development guards the future. Sustainable development meets the needs of the present without ruining the future. It uses resources so that later generations too may prosper. It joins progress to the care of the environment. It has become a central aim of the modern age. Lasting development must not exhaust the earth.

Economic growth is only an increase in output. Economic growth means simply a rise in a country's production or income. It is measured by the growth of the national wealth. But growth may occur without bettering the lives of the people. It counts the quantity of wealth, not its use. Growth alone is a narrow and partial measure.

Growth can occur without true development. A country may grow richer while its people remain poor. The new wealth may go to a few while the many are neglected. Where growth brings no better lives, there is no real development. Oil wealth has enriched some states without developing them. Growth without welfare is growth without development.

Development is thus wider and deeper than growth. Development includes growth but goes far beyond it. It asks not only how much wealth there is but how it is shared and used. It measures progress in the welfare of the people, not in output alone. It is the fuller and truer goal. Development is growth turned to the good of all.

The statement is therefore largely valid. A nation may indeed grow richer while its people remain poor, for economic growth is only an increase in output, and its new wealth may go to a few while the many are neglected, as oil wealth has enriched some states without developing them. True development, by contrast,

is the bettering of the whole life of a people, in health, learning and dignity as well as wealth. Growth without welfare is growth without development, and the two must not be confused.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim by distinguishing development from mere economic growth.

The trap is to define development but fail to draw the distinction from growth the question requires.

The top band shows that growth may occur without development, wealth rising while lives do not improve.

Question 102

The African states that won their freedom around 1960 inherited a difficult and burdensome legacy. The statement holds that the new states inherited the flag of freedom and the chains of a colonial economy, and this is largely just, for political independence brought them no economic freedom. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The new states were poor and underdeveloped. Africa emerged from colonial rule poor and economically backward. Its people lived largely by farming and had little wealth or industry. Poverty was widespread and the standard of living low. The new states began their journey from a low base. This poverty was the first great challenge.

Their economies were shaped for colonial extraction. The colonial economy had been built to serve the rulers, not the ruled. It produced raw materials for export and few goods for its own people. This lopsided economy was ill-suited to true development. It bound Africa to the sale of cheap primary goods. The inherited economy was a lasting handicap.

They depended on the export of a few raw materials. Most states relied on one or two crops or minerals for their wealth. This dependence left them at the mercy of falling world prices. A single bad season or price fall could ruin a country. Such narrow economies were dangerously fragile. Dependence on primary exports was a heavy burden.

They had little industry of their own. Colonial rule had left Africa almost without factories or industry. The states had to import the manufactured goods they needed. They could not process their own raw materials for profit. This want of industry kept them poor and dependent. The lack of industry was a grave weakness.

They suffered a shortage of skills and trained people. Colonial rule had educated few Africans for the tasks of government or industry. The new states lacked doctors, engineers, teachers and administrators. This shortage of skilled manpower crippled their early efforts. They had to rely on foreigners or do without. The want of skills was a serious challenge.

They had poor infrastructure and social services. The colonial powers had built little for the good of the African people. Roads, schools and hospitals were few and served the rulers' needs. The new states inherited a want of the means of health and learning. This poor infrastructure hampered every effort at development. The lack of services was a heavy burden at independence.

They inherited weak institutions and arbitrary borders. The new states were left with feeble governments and few strong institutions. Their borders had been drawn by the colonisers without regard to peoples. These artificial states joined rival groups within one country. Holding them together was a hard and often violent task. Weak institutions and false borders bred instability.

They were divided by ethnic and regional differences. The many peoples within each state distrusted and competed with one another. Colonial rule had deepened these divisions rather than healed them. National unity had to be built where little existed. These divisions threatened the peace and progress of the states. Disunity was a constant danger.

They remained economically dependent on the former rulers. Political freedom did not bring economic freedom to the new states. They still depended on the former colonisers for trade, capital and markets. This

continued dependence became known as neo-colonialism. True independence remained to be won in the economy. Economic dependence was among the deepest challenges.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The new states did indeed inherit the flag of freedom and the chains of a colonial economy, for though they gained their political independence, they remained bound to economies shaped for colonial extraction, dependent on a few raw materials and almost without industry. They faced too a shortage of skills, weak institutions and arbitrary borders, and a continued dependence on the former rulers. Free in name but bound in fact, the new states began their journey burdened by the colonial inheritance.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that independence brought political freedom but economic bondage.

The trap is to describe colonial rule instead of the condition and challenges of the new states.

The top band links the extractive economy and weak institutions to the later struggle for development.

Question 103

Underdevelopment is the condition in which most African states have found themselves since independence. The statement holds that it is not the absence of progress but the presence of exploitation, and there is much truth in it, for many hold underdevelopment to be made, not natural. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Underdevelopment is a state of poverty and dependence. Underdevelopment is the condition of a poor and dependent economy. It is marked by low incomes, want and a reliance upon richer nations. It is not simple backwardness but a particular and lasting state. Many hold it to be the result of past exploitation. This poverty and dependence is its essence.

It shows itself in widespread poverty. The clearest mark of underdevelopment is the poverty of the people. Low incomes, hunger and want are widespread across the continent. Many live without the basic needs of a decent life. This mass poverty is the human face of underdevelopment. It is felt in every village and town.

Its economies depend on primary exports. The underdeveloped economies live by selling raw materials abroad. They export crops and minerals and import manufactured goods. This dependence on a few primary exports keeps them poor. It leaves them at the mercy of the world market. Reliance on raw materials is a key feature.

They have little industry and low productivity. Underdeveloped states have few factories and produce little of their own. Their farming and industry alike are of low productivity. They cannot make the goods their people need. This want of industry keeps them dependent and poor. Low productivity marks the whole economy.

They suffer poor infrastructure and services. Underdevelopment shows in poor roads, power, schools and hospitals. The means of transport, health and learning are weak and few. This want of infrastructure holds back all progress. It leaves the people ill-served and the economy hampered. Poor services are a plain feature of the condition.

They are marked by illiteracy and disease. High illiteracy and widespread disease afflict the underdeveloped states. Many people cannot read, and sickness shortens countless lives. These burdens sap the strength and skill of the people. They keep the human resources of Africa weak. Illiteracy and disease are marks of underdevelopment.

They remain dependent on the rich nations. The underdeveloped states rely upon the rich for trade, aid and capital. They cannot stand upon their own resources and efforts. This dependence keeps them weak and subordinate. It is the political side of underdevelopment. Reliance on the wealthy nations is a defining feature.

They suffer inequality between and within countries. Underdevelopment brings a great gulf between the rich world and the poor. Within the poor states too, a few are rich while the many are poor. This inequality marks the whole condition of underdevelopment. It divides the world and the nation alike. Inequality is a further feature of the state.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Underdevelopment is indeed better understood as the presence of exploitation than as the mere absence of progress, for it is a particular state of poverty and dependence, marked by reliance on primary exports, little industry, and subordination to the rich nations. Held by many to be the fruit of past exploitation rather than of simple backwardness, it is a condition that was made, not merely inherited. Underdevelopment is not a starting-point but a product, the shadow cast by the development of others.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that underdevelopment is made by exploitation rather than mere backwardness.

The trap is to treat underdevelopment as simple backwardness rather than a state of poverty and dependence.

The top band notes that many see underdevelopment as the result of exploitation, not mere lack of progress.

Question 104

After independence some African states followed the capitalist road to development. The statement holds that this road brought Africa growth but bound it the tighter to the West, and this is largely just, for capitalist growth came at the price of deepened dependence. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It relied on the free market and private enterprise. The capitalist states left development largely to the market and to private business. Individuals and companies were free to invest and to profit. The state guided rather than owned the economy. Enterprise was the engine of this development. The market was trusted to bring progress.

It welcomed foreign investment and capital. The capitalist states opened their doors to foreign firms and money. They sought the capital and technology that they lacked at home. Foreign investment built industries, farms and mines. This partnership with the West was central to the approach. Outside capital was made the servant of development.

It kept close ties with the former colonial powers. The capitalist states remained bound to the Western economies. They traded with, borrowed from and depended upon their former rulers. These ties gave them markets, aid and investment. But they also kept them within the Western sphere. Partnership with the West was the mark of the approach.

It integrated Africa into the world capitalist economy. The capitalist states joined the global market as producers and traders. They exported their crops and minerals and imported manufactures. This integration bound them to the world economy. It shaped their development along Western lines. They sought progress within the capitalist order.

It brought real economic growth to some states. The capitalist road brought genuine growth to countries such as Kenya and the Ivory Coast. Their economies expanded and their exports grew. New industries, farms and towns arose. For a time these states were held up as models. Growth was the achievement of the approach.

Yet it deepened dependence on the West. The capitalist states remained tied to the former colonial powers. Their prosperity depended on Western markets, capital and firms. This dependence was a form of neo-colonialism. True economic independence was not achieved. The approach kept Africa within the Western grip.

It widened inequality between rich and poor. Capitalist growth enriched a few while the many remained poor. A wealthy class arose beside the mass of the people. The gains of development were unequally shared. This inequality was a grave weakness of the approach. Growth did not reach all the people.

It left the profits flowing largely abroad. Much of the wealth produced flowed out to foreign firms and investors. The profits of development enriched the West as well as Africa. The continent's surplus was drained away abroad. This outflow limited the good that growth could do. The approach served foreign interests as well as African.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The capitalist road did indeed bring Africa growth while binding it the tighter to the West, for states such as Kenya and the Ivory Coast, relying on the free market and foreign investment, achieved real economic growth. Yet that growth kept them tied to the former colonial powers for markets, capital and firms, deepened their dependence, and widened the gulf between rich and poor. The road brought wealth to some, but at the cost of the independence that true development required.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the capitalist road brought growth but deepened dependence.

The trap is to describe capitalism in general rather than its use as an African development strategy.

The top band weighs the real growth it brought against the dependence and inequality it deepened.

Question 105

After independence some African states chose the socialist road to development. The statement holds that this road sought justice and self-reliance but found decline, and this is largely just, for the socialist states gained in fairness and welfare while their economies faltered. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It placed the economy under the control of the state. The socialist states took the commanding heights of the economy into public hands. They nationalised banks, industries and large farms. The state, not private business, was to direct development. Public ownership was the foundation of the approach. The state became the engine of progress.

It relied on planning rather than the market. The socialist states directed their economies by central plans. The government decided what should be produced and how. Planning was to replace the blind working of the market. This gave the state control over the pace of development. Deliberate planning was a mark of the approach.

It aimed at equality and social justice. The socialist road sought to share wealth fairly among the people. It aimed to prevent the rise of a rich class over the poor. Equality and justice were its guiding purposes. It sought development for all, not for a few. Fairness was the heart of the approach.

It stressed self-reliance and independence. The socialist states sought to develop by their own efforts and resources. They aimed to break free from dependence on the West. Self-reliance was to bring true and lasting independence. They would build their nations with their own hands. Independence was a central aim of the approach.

It expanded education, health and social services. The socialist states poured resources into schools, clinics and welfare. They spread literacy and health among the ordinary people. These social gains were a real achievement of the approach. The people benefited in learning and in health. Social services were among its true successes.

It sought to build upon African communal traditions. The socialist states looked to the old communal life of Africa. They held that socialism suited African ways of sharing and cooperation. Nyerere's Ujamaa drew upon this village tradition. African socialism was to grow from African roots. Tradition was made a foundation of the approach.

Yet it often brought economic decline. The socialist economies frequently faltered and fell into difficulty. State enterprises proved inefficient and production declined. Food shortages and shrinking output followed in many states. The economic results were largely disappointing. Decline was the weakness of the approach.

It failed to end dependence on foreign aid. Despite the aim of self-reliance, the socialist states leaned on foreign aid. Their faltering economies could not stand alone. Dependence on the outside world was not overcome. The goal of self-reliance remained unfulfilled. The approach fell short of its own ideal.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The socialist road did indeed seek justice and self-reliance and find decline, for states such as Tanzania placed the economy under the state, aimed at equality and independence, and drew upon African communal traditions, winning real gains in education and health. Yet their economies often faltered through the inefficiency of state enterprises, and their goal of self-reliance was never reached, so that they leaned still upon foreign aid. The road achieved much in fairness and welfare, but it brought decline rather than the prosperity its founders had hoped for.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that the socialist road sought justice and self-reliance but brought decline.

The trap is to describe socialism in general rather than its use as an African development strategy.

The top band weighs the social gains in welfare against the economic decline and unfulfilled self-reliance.

Question 106

The Arusha Declaration of 1967 was the blueprint of Tanzania's path to socialism and self-reliance. The statement holds that Arusha proclaimed that a nation could not be built upon the wealth of others, and this is largely just, for self-reliance was the very heart of the policy of Ujamaa. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It proclaimed socialism and self-reliance as national policy. The Arusha Declaration made socialism and self-reliance the guiding aims of Tanzania. It rejected both capitalism and dependence on the West. The nation was to develop by its own efforts and resources. These twin ideals became the heart of Ujamaa. They set the course for the years that followed.

It nationalised the commanding heights of the economy. The Declaration brought the banks, major industries and large firms into public hands. The state took control of the chief means of production. Private wealth was to give way to public ownership. This nationalisation was the economic core of the policy. The state became the master of the economy.

It made agriculture and the peasant the foundation. Nyerere held that Tanzania must build upon its farming and its peasants. Agriculture, not industry, was to be the base of development. The energy of the rural people was to be the engine of progress. The land and its tillers were placed at the centre. Farming was made the foundation of Ujamaa.

It established the Ujamaa villages. The policy gathered the scattered rural people into communal villages. In these Ujamaa villages the people were to live and work together. Cooperation was to replace the isolation of the peasant. Services could be brought more easily to the gathered people. The villages were the chief instrument of the policy.

It rested upon African communal traditions. Ujamaa, meaning familyhood, drew upon the old communal life of Africa. Nyerere held that socialism suited the sharing ways of the African village. The policy was to grow from African roots, not foreign models. This gave Ujamaa its distinctive African character. Tradition was made the ground of the new society.

It required equality and a code of leadership. The Declaration demanded fairness and forbade the leaders to grow rich. A leadership code barred officials from private wealth and exploitation. The rulers were to serve, not to enrich themselves. Equality was to reign between leaders and people. This code was meant to guard the socialist ideal.

It stressed education for self-reliance. Nyerere reshaped education to serve the needs of the nation. Learning was to fit the people for useful work and self-reliance. Schooling was tied to the land and to practical life. Education was made a servant of development. It was to build a self-reliant and equal society.

It rejected dependence upon foreign aid. The Declaration warned that development bought with foreign money was no true freedom. It held that a nation could not be built upon the wealth of others. Self-reliance meant trusting to the people's own hands and land. Foreign aid was not to be the foundation of development. Reliance on Tanzania's own effort was the guiding principle.

It sought to build a just and independent nation. The whole aim of the Declaration was a fair and self-reliant Tanzania. It sought to free the nation from poverty, exploitation and dependence. It looked to a society of equals building their own future. This vision guided the nation for a generation. A just independence was the goal of Ujamaa.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Arusha did indeed proclaim that a nation could not be built upon the wealth of others, for the Declaration made socialism and self-reliance its guiding aims, nationalised the commanding heights of the economy, and made agriculture and the peasant the foundation of development. Through the Ujamaa villages, a leadership code and an education for self-reliance, and drawing upon African communal traditions, it sought to build a just and independent nation by its own efforts. Self-reliance, the trust in the people's own hands rather than in foreign wealth, was the very soul of the Arusha Declaration.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that Arusha made self-reliance, not foreign wealth, the basis of development.

The trap is to assess success and failure here; the question asks for the policy, not its results.

The top band links the ideals of socialism and self-reliance to the concrete measures such as the villages and the leadership code.

Question 107

The policy of Ujamaa guided Tanzania for nearly twenty years after the Arusha Declaration of 1967. The statement holds that it succeeded in its ideals and its human aims while failing in its economics, and this is largely just. For Ujamaa built a just and united society but could not build a prosperous one. The claim may be assessed as follows.

It built a strong national unity. Ujamaa forged a united nation out of many peoples and tribes. Nyerere's policy of equality left no room for ethnic favouritism. Tanzania escaped the tribal conflicts that tore other African states. This national unity was among the policy's greatest successes. It gave the country a lasting peace.

It spread education and raised literacy. Ujamaa poured resources into schools and adult learning. Literacy rose dramatically as reading spread among the people. Tanzania became a leader in Africa in the teaching of its people. This spread of education was a real and lasting gain. Learning reached the ordinary villager.

It improved health and social services. The policy brought clinics, clean water and health to the rural people. Services once found only in towns reached the villages. The health and welfare of the people were improved. These social gains touched millions of lives. Better welfare was a success of Ujamaa.

It preserved equality and prevented exploitation. The leadership code and the socialist ethos held back the rise of a rich class. Tanzania avoided the great gulf between rich and poor seen elsewhere. Fairness was largely preserved among the people. This equality was a genuine achievement. The policy kept its promise of justice.

It gave Tanzania dignity and independence of spirit. Ujamaa gave the nation a proud sense of its own worth and path. Tanzania stood as a respected model of self-reliance in Africa. It refused to be a mere client of the great powers. This dignity was among the policy's finer fruits. It won the country honour in the world.

Yet its economy declined and production fell. The economic record of Ujamaa was largely one of failure. State enterprises proved inefficient and farm output fell. Food shortages and shrinking production troubled

the land. The economy stagnated where it should have grown. Economic decline was the policy's great failure.

Its state enterprises proved wasteful and inefficient. The industries and farms taken over by the state were often ill-run. Managers appointed for loyalty lacked the skill to run them well. Losses mounted, and the enterprises drained rather than fed the treasury. This inefficiency was a chief cause of the economic decline. Poorly run state firms were a serious failure of Ujamaa.

The villagisation was often coercive and disruptive. The gathering of the peasants into villages was frequently forced. People were moved against their will and their farming disrupted. The compulsion bred resentment and harmed production. What was meant as cooperation became coercion. Forced villagisation was a serious failure.

It failed to achieve genuine self-reliance. Despite its central aim, Ujamaa left Tanzania dependent on aid. The faltering economy leaned ever more on foreign help. Self-reliance remained an unfulfilled ideal. The nation could not stand upon its own resources. The policy fell short of its own guiding aim.

Its economic failure led to its abandonment. By the 1980s the economic crisis forced a change of course. Tanzania at length turned from Ujamaa toward the market. The policy was quietly set aside after a generation. Its economic failure had proved decisive. Ujamaa was abandoned though its social gains endured.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Ujamaa was indeed a triumph of the heart, for it built a strong national unity, spread education and health, and preserved an equality rare in Africa. But it was a failure of the head, for its economy declined, its villagisation was often coercive, its state enterprises proved inefficient, and its goal of self-reliance was never reached. A noble experiment in justice and welfare, Ujamaa succeeded in building a good society but failed to build a prosperous one.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires successes and failures weighed, and the claim of heart and head tested.

The trap is to praise the social gains and ignore the economic failure, or the reverse.

The top band judges Ujamaa a success in unity and welfare but a failure in the economy and self-reliance.

Question 108

After independence the African states chose between two great paths to development, the capitalist and the socialist. The statement neatly opposes their results, and there is much truth in it, for the one brought wealth without fairness and the other fairness without wealth. Both shared the goal of development, yet each failed in its own characteristic way. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Both sought to develop the newly independent states. Each approach aimed at the progress and prosperity of Africa. Both wished to raise their peoples from poverty and dependence. They differed in method but shared this common goal. Development was the aim of capitalist and socialist alike. In purpose the two were one.

The capitalist road trusted the market; the socialist the state. The capitalist states left development to private enterprise and the market. The socialist states placed it in the hands of the government. The one relied on profit, the other on planning. This was the first great difference between them. Market and state were their opposing engines.

The one welcomed the West; the other sought self-reliance. The capitalist states embraced foreign investment and Western ties. The socialist states sought to break free and stand alone. The one looked outward for capital, the other inward. Their attitudes to the West were opposite. Dependence and self-reliance divided them.

The one accepted inequality; the other pursued equality. The capitalist road allowed a rich class to rise above the poor. The socialist road sought to share wealth fairly among all. The one prized growth, the other justice. Their views of equality were sharply opposed. Fairness divided the two approaches.

The capitalist road brought growth but deepened dependence. The capitalist states such as Kenya achieved real economic growth. But their prosperity kept them tied to the West. Growth came at the price of continued dependence. The road brought wealth to some but not independence. Its gains were mixed with a lasting weakness.

The socialist road brought welfare but economic decline. The socialist states such as Tanzania advanced in education and health. But their economies often faltered and production fell. Welfare was gained at the cost of prosperity. The road brought fairness but not wealth. Its gains too were mixed with failure.

Both largely failed to transform Africa. Neither road brought the full development that Africa sought. The capitalist kept the continent dependent, while the socialist brought decline. Both left Africa poor and struggling against underdevelopment. Neither approach wholly succeeded in its own aims. In the end both fell short of the promise of true development.

The statement is therefore largely just. The capitalist road, as in Kenya, brought real growth but left dependence and a wide gulf between rich and poor, so that it gave wealth without justice. The socialist road, as in Tanzania, brought equality and welfare but economic decline, so that it gave justice without wealth. Both shared the goal of development, and both fell short of it, each failing in the opposite way. Neither growth without justice nor justice without growth was the true development that Africa sought.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the two systems weighed, and the neat opposition of the claim tested.

The trap is to describe the two approaches separately without drawing the comparison.

The top band shows both sharing the goal of development yet each failing in its own characteristic way.

Question 109

The African states have often been judged by their failures, yet since independence they have also achieved much. The statement holds that Africa has been judged too often by its failures and too seldom by its achievements, and there is much truth in it, for its genuine gains have too often been overlooked. The claim may be weighed as follows.

They won and secured their political independence. The African states threw off colonial rule and became sovereign nations. They took their own affairs into their own hands. This winning of freedom was itself a great achievement. It ended centuries of foreign domination. Political independence was the first and greatest success.

They built nations out of divided peoples. The new states forged unity among many tribes and tongues. Some, such as Tanzania, built a strong national feeling. Where they succeeded, they held their countries together in peace. This building of nations was a hard-won achievement. Unity was created where little had existed.

They greatly expanded education. The African states spread schooling far beyond what the colonisers had allowed. Literacy rose and universities arose across the continent. Millions who would have remained unlettered were taught. This expansion of education was a lasting gain. Learning was carried to the people.

They improved health and social services. The states built clinics, hospitals and water supplies for their peoples. Diseases were fought and many thousands of lives were lengthened. Services once denied to Africans under colonial rule were now provided. The welfare and health of the ordinary people were much improved. Better health and social services were a real achievement of independence.

They developed infrastructure and towns. The African states built roads, ports, dams and new cities. Industries and towns arose in places where none had stood before. The means of transport, power and trade

were greatly extended. This growth of infrastructure aided the wider development of the continent. The very face of Africa was changed by the building of the independent age.

They built African institutions and unity. The states created the Organisation of African Unity and later the African Union. They joined in regional bodies for cooperation and trade. Africa gained a common voice in the world. These institutions were an achievement of the independent age. Unity was pursued across the continent.

They helped to free the rest of the continent. The independent states supported the liberation of those still under foreign rule. They aided the struggle against colonialism and apartheid. Southern Africa was freed with their help. This solidarity was a proud achievement. Freedom was carried to the whole continent.

They advanced, in time, toward democracy. After years of one-party rule and dictatorship, many states turned to democracy. Multi-party elections and freedoms spread in the later decades. Governance improved in a number of countries. This democratic advance was a later achievement. Freedom grew within the nations as well as between them.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Africa has indeed been judged too often by its failures and too seldom by its achievements, for from a low and difficult starting-point the new states won and secured their freedom, built nations out of divided peoples, and greatly expanded education, health and infrastructure. They created African institutions, helped to free the rest of the continent, and advanced in time toward democracy. Though their troubles have been many, these real achievements deserve to be set beside their failures in any fair judgement of the independent age.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that Africa's genuine achievements have been unfairly overlooked.

The trap is to drift into the problems of Africa instead of examining its genuine gains.

The top band balances political, social and continental achievements from a difficult starting-point.

Question 110

Despite its efforts and its achievements, Africa has remained poor and underdeveloped since independence. The statement holds that its underdevelopment was begun by external forces but completed by internal ones, and there is much truth in it. The colonial legacy and neo-colonialism laid the foundation abroad, while corruption, instability and misrule built upon it at home. The claim may therefore be weighed as follows.

The colonial legacy left distorted economies. Colonial rule left Africa with economies built for extraction, not development. The states inherited dependence on a few primary exports and little industry. This distorted inheritance was hard to overcome. It bound Africa to a subordinate place in the world. The colonial legacy was a deep and lasting hindrance.

Neo-colonialism kept Africa dependent. Political freedom did not bring economic freedom to the continent. The former powers kept control through trade, aid and investment. This neo-colonialism drained Africa's wealth abroad. It held the continent in a continued dependence. Indirect domination hindered true development.

Poor leadership and corruption wasted resources. Many African rulers plundered and mismanaged their states. Corruption ate up the wealth that should have served the people. Dictators enriched themselves while their nations grew poorer. This bad leadership squandered Africa's resources. Corruption was a grievous hindrance to development.

Political instability, coups and civil wars destroyed progress. Frequent coups and wars tore many African states apart. They destroyed infrastructure, killed and displaced the people, and frightened away investment. Resources went to arms rather than to development. This instability wrecked the plans of nations. Conflict was a great enemy of progress.

The burden of foreign debt crippled the states. African states borrowed heavily and fell into a crushing debt. The repayment of debt drained the wealth needed for development. The structural adjustment programmes that followed cut services and deepened poverty. Debt kept the continent in bondage to its creditors. The debt burden was a heavy hindrance.

Unfair international trade impoverished the continent. Africa sold cheap raw materials and bought dear manufactured goods. The terms of trade ran steadily against the continent. Falling prices for its exports robbed it of its earnings. This unfair trade kept Africa poor and dependent. The world market hindered its development.

Disease, poverty and rapid population growth sapped its strength. Africa was burdened by disease, want and a swiftly growing population. Sicknesses such as malaria and AIDS weakened the people. Rapid population growth outran the growth of resources and services. These burdens sapped the strength of the continent. Poverty and disease held back its progress.

It lacked capital, technology and skilled manpower. Africa wanted the money, machines and trained people that development needs. It had little capital of its own and few skilled workers. It depended on foreign technology and expertise. This want of the means of development hampered every effort. The lack of capital and skills was a constant hindrance.

Ethnic divisions and weak institutions bred disorder. The divisions and weak governments inherited at independence bred instability. Ethnic quarrels and feeble institutions undermined the states. They made steady development difficult to pursue. Disorder at home hindered progress. Weak foundations held the continent back.

Dependence and the outflow of wealth drained its resources. Africa's surplus flowed abroad through trade, debt and foreign firms. The continent produced wealth that enriched others more than itself. This drain of resources left little for its own development. Dependence bled Africa of the means to grow. The outflow of wealth was a deep and lasting hindrance.

The statement may therefore be largely accepted. Africa's underdevelopment was in great part made abroad, for the colonial legacy left its economies distorted and dependent, and neo-colonialism, debt and unfair trade continued to drain its wealth. But it was perfected at home, for corruption, misrule, political instability and civil wars wasted the continent's resources and wrecked its progress. External forces laid the foundation of Africa's underdevelopment, and the failures of its own leaders completed the work.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the external causes weighed against the internal ones.

The trap is to blame only colonialism, or only African leaders, and neglect the other.

The top band balances the external legacy of dependence with the internal failings of corruption and conflict.

Question 111

Much of Africa's failure to develop is traced back to the rule of the colonial powers. The statement holds that the continent's poverty is above all the legacy of that colonial past, and there is much truth in it. Colonialism left the economies, borders and institutions from which underdevelopment grew. Yet the failings of the independent age have also kept Africa poor. The claim may therefore be weighed as follows.

It left economies built for extraction, not development. The colonial economy was made to serve the rulers, not the ruled. It drew raw materials out of Africa and gave little back. The new states inherited this lopsided and dependent economy. It was ill-suited to the true development of the people. This distorted inheritance was a deep hindrance.

It bound Africa to the export of a few raw materials. Colonial rule tied each colony to one or two crops or minerals. This narrow dependence left the states at the mercy of world prices. They could not easily escape the mould the colonisers had made. Dependence on primary exports kept them poor. The pattern of trade hindered development.

It left Africa almost without industry. The colonisers discouraged industry that might rival their own. Africa was kept a producer of raw materials and a buyer of manufactures. The new states inherited economies without factories. This want of industry kept them dependent and weak. The absence of industry was a lasting handicap.

It drew arbitrary borders that bred division. The colonial frontiers were drawn without regard to African peoples. They split some groups and forced others together within one state. These artificial borders bred the divisions and conflicts that hindered progress. Holding such states together consumed their energies. The colonial map was a source of instability.

It left weak institutions and few trained people. The colonisers built little government fit for African hands. They educated few Africans for the tasks of rule or industry. The new states inherited feeble institutions and a shortage of skills. This weakness crippled their early efforts at development. The want of trained people was a grave legacy.

It left uneven development between regions. Colonial rule developed some regions and neglected others entirely. It built where its own interests lay and left the rest untouched. The new states inherited this unevenness and the jealousies it bred. The neglected regions felt cheated and grew restless and discontented. Uneven development was a lasting and divisive colonial legacy.

It created the dependence known as neo-colonialism. Political freedom left the economic ties to the former rulers unbroken. Africa still depended on the West for trade, capital and markets. This continued dependence was the direct fruit of colonialism. It kept the continent subordinate after independence. Neo-colonialism was rooted in the colonial past.

Yet post-colonial failings also hindered development. The rulers of independent Africa often deepened rather than healed the wounds. Corruption, tyranny and mismanagement wasted the continent's resources. These failings were the work of Africans, not of the colonisers. The colonial legacy cannot bear the whole blame. Later misrule was a cause in its own right.

And other causes shared in the hindrance. Debt, unfair trade, disease and rapid population growth all held Africa back. The Cold War and foreign interference added their part. These cannot all be laid at the door of the colonisers. Colonialism prepared the ground, but others worsened the harvest. Its role, though great, was not the whole.

The statement is therefore largely valid, though not the whole truth. Africa's poverty is in great part the legacy of its colonial past, for colonialism left economies built for extraction, bound to a few raw materials and almost without industry, together with arbitrary borders, weak institutions and the dependence known as neo-colonialism. Yet the colonial legacy is not the sole cause, for post-colonial corruption and misrule, debt and unfair trade have also kept the continent poor. Colonialism laid the foundation of Africa's poverty, but the failures of the independent age built upon it.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the colonial legacy weighed against the failings of the independent age.

The trap is to blame colonialism wholesale and ignore post-colonial misrule.

The top band accepts colonialism as the deep root while giving weight to corruption, debt and misrule.

Question 112

Among the causes of Africa's underdevelopment, none has been more damaging than the failure of its own leaders. The statement holds that the peoples hoped for freedom and too often found their own rulers as harsh as the colonisers, and this is largely just, for bad leadership betrayed the promise of independence. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Corrupt leaders plundered the wealth of their states. Many African rulers used their power to enrich themselves. They stole public money and property on a vast scale. The wealth that should have served the

people lined the pockets of the few. This plunder robbed the nations of the means of development. Corruption at the top drained the continent.

Corruption spread through the whole of government. The example of corrupt leaders spread the vice through the state. Officials at every level demanded bribes and stole funds. Honest work was crowded out by graft and greed. This corruption ate away the strength of government. It made development halting and wasteful.

Dictators denied their peoples freedom and voice. Many rulers made themselves dictators and crushed all opposition. One-party states and tyranny replaced free government. The people were denied a voice in their own affairs. This tyranny bred resentment and instability. Dictatorship was an enemy of development.

Bad governance drove away investment. Corruption and misrule frightened away the capital Africa needed. Investors would not trust their money to lawless and unstable states. The want of good governance thus starved development of funds. Misrule cut the continent off from the resources of the world. Bad government drove away the means of growth.

Mismanagement wasted resources and opportunities. Even where wealth existed, it was often squandered by poor rulers. Grand and useless projects consumed the money of nations. Sound planning gave way to folly and favouritism. This mismanagement wasted Africa's chances of progress. Incompetence at the top ruined many an effort.

Patronage put loyalty above ability. Rulers rewarded their kinsmen and supporters rather than the able. Offices went to friends, not to those fit to hold them. This patronage filled the government with the unworthy. It weakened the state and its power to develop. Favour crowded out merit and skill.

The lack of accountability let the failings continue. Where rulers answered to no one, their misdeeds went unchecked. There were no free courts, press or elections to restrain them. This want of accountability let corruption and tyranny flourish. The failings continued because none could stop them. Unaccountable power was the root of the misrule.

Together these failings betrayed the hopes of independence. The peoples had hoped that freedom would bring a better life. Instead many found their own rulers as harsh as the colonisers. Poor leadership turned the promise of independence to disappointment. The failings of the leaders betrayed the trust of the people. Bad governance was a deep hindrance to development.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The peoples did indeed hope for freedom and too often find their own rulers as harsh as the colonisers, for corrupt and dictatorial leaders plundered the wealth of their states, denied their peoples freedom, and drove away the investment the continent needed. Mismanagement and patronage wasted its resources, and the lack of accountability let the failings continue unchecked. This betrayal by Africa's own leaders was as harmful to development as any external cause, and it turned the bright hopes of independence to disappointment.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that post-colonial misrule betrayed the peoples as harshly as colonial rule.

The trap is to blame only external causes and excuse the failings of Africa's own rulers.

The top band shows how corruption, tyranny and the lack of accountability together wasted the continent's resources.

Question 113

Since independence Africa has been troubled by a long succession of coups, rebellions and civil wars. The statement holds that where there is no peace there can be no development, and this is largely just, for the disorder of war has been among the greatest enemies of the continent's progress. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Coups overthrew governments and broke continuity. Africa suffered a great many military coups after independence. Governments were toppled again and again by the army. Each overthrow broke the

continuity of policy and planning. Development plans were abandoned with each change of rulers. This instability made steady progress impossible.

Civil wars destroyed lives and infrastructure. The many civil wars of Africa killed and displaced millions. They destroyed roads, factories, schools and farms. The work of years was undone in months of fighting. Whole regions were laid waste by the wars. This destruction set development back grievously.

Instability frightened away investment. Investors would not risk their money in unstable and warring lands. Capital fled from countries torn by coups and conflict. The want of investment starved development of funds. Disorder cut the nations off from the resources of the world. Instability drove away the means of growth.

Resources were diverted from development to arms. Governments at war spent their wealth on soldiers and weapons. Money that might have built schools went to buy guns. The needs of development were sacrificed to the needs of war. This diversion of resources impoverished the nations. War drained the funds of progress.

War drove away skilled people and bred a brain drain. The educated and the skilled fled the countries torn by war. Doctors, teachers and engineers sought safety abroad. This brain drain robbed the nations of the people they needed. Development was crippled by the loss of skills. War scattered the talent of the continent.

Instability undermined planning and continuity. Long-term development needs peace and steady government. The constant threat of coups and war made planning impossible. Rulers governed from crisis to crisis, not for the future. This want of continuity wrecked the efforts of nations. Instability was the enemy of all planning.

Refugees and displacement strained whole regions. The wars drove great numbers from their homes and lands. Refugees burdened the states that received them. The disorder spread from one country to its neighbours. This displacement deepened the poverty of the region. War spread its ruin across borders.

Together they trapped nations in poverty and disorder. Instability bred poverty, and poverty bred further instability. The nations were caught in a vicious circle of war and want. Each conflict made the next the more likely. This trap held whole regions in lasting underdevelopment. Disorder and poverty fed upon each other.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Where there is no peace, there can indeed be no development, for the coups and civil wars of Africa broke the continuity of government, destroyed lives and infrastructure, frightened away investment, and diverted resources from development to arms. War drove away the skilled, undermined all planning, and drove refugees across the region, trapping whole nations in a vicious circle of poverty and disorder. Without the peace and stability that development requires, much of the continent has been unable to build a lasting prosperity.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that instability and war have made development impossible.

The trap is to describe the conflicts without linking them to the failure of development.

The top band shows how instability and poverty feed each other in a vicious circle.

Question 114

Since the 1970s the weight of foreign debt has lain heavily upon the African states. The statement holds that Africa borrowed to develop and was crushed by the debt it could not repay, and this is largely just, for the burden of debt and its remedies alike hindered the continent's development. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The African states borrowed heavily to develop. The new states borrowed large sums to build their economies. They took loans for industries, roads and grand projects. For a time the money seemed a road

to progress. But the debts mounted faster than the wealth to repay them. Heavy borrowing laid the foundation of the crisis.

The debt grew into a crushing burden. Rising interest and falling export earnings swelled the debts. The states could no longer meet their mounting obligations. The burden of debt grew beyond their power to bear. It hung like a chain about the neck of the continent. The debt crisis broke upon Africa in the 1980s.

Debt repayment drained the wealth needed for development. The states had to spend their earnings on repaying their creditors. Money that should have built the nations flowed out abroad. The debt drained away the very means of development. Africa laboured to enrich its lenders rather than itself. Repayment starved the continent of resources.

The creditors imposed structural adjustment programmes. The lenders, above all the World Bank and the Fund, set conditions for further aid. These structural adjustment programmes demanded sweeping changes. States were made to cut spending and open their economies. The medicine was prescribed by the creditors, not the debtors. Adjustment was the price of new loans.

These programmes cut spending on services. The programmes forced deep cuts in government spending. Schools, clinics and subsidies were reduced or removed. The poor lost the services on which they depended. These cuts fell hardest upon the weakest. The programmes deepened poverty in the name of reform.

They demanded privatisation and liberalisation. The programmes required states to sell public enterprises and open their markets. Industries were privatised and protection was removed. Local businesses were exposed to foreign competition. Much that the states had built was undone. Liberalisation reshaped the economies by command of the creditors.

They often deepened poverty and dependence. For many states the programmes brought hardship rather than health. Poverty and unemployment grew as services were cut. The economies were opened the wider to foreign control. Dependence was deepened rather than relieved. The cure often worsened the disease.

Together debt and adjustment held back development. The burden of debt and the harshness of its cures crippled the continent. Resources were drained away and services were cut. Africa was kept in bondage to its creditors. Development was sacrificed to repayment and reform. Debt and adjustment were a heavy hindrance to progress.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Africa did indeed borrow to develop and was crushed by the debt it could not repay, for the loans taken to build its economies grew into a burden whose repayment drained the wealth it needed, while the structural adjustment programmes imposed by its creditors cut spending on services, demanded privatisation, and often deepened poverty and dependence. Together, debt and its harsh remedies held back the development of the continent and kept it in bondage to its lenders. What was borrowed to build instead helped to crush.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that debt and its remedies crushed Africa's development.

The trap is to describe the debt without examining the harsh effect of the adjustment programmes.

The top band shows how repayment and adjustment together drained resources and deepened poverty.

Question 115

Neo-colonialism is among the deepest obstacles to the development of independent Africa. The statement holds that the flag came down but the grip of the former ruler remained, and this is largely just, for political independence did not bring an end to foreign control. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It is indirect control after formal independence. Neo-colonialism is the domination of a state that is free in name only. The former rulers keep their power through economic rather than political means. The colony becomes independent in form but dependent in fact. This hidden control is the essence of neo-colonialism. Freedom on paper masks bondage in practice.

It works through trade, aid, investment and debt. The powers control Africa through the ties of the economy. They shape its trade, give it aid, own its industries and hold its debts. Through these bonds they guide the policies of the weaker states. The instruments are economic, but the effect is political. Neo-colonialism rules through money rather than arms.

It keeps Africa dependent on the former rulers. The neo-colonial ties bind Africa to the Western economies. The continent depends on the West for markets, capital and goods. This dependence keeps it weak and subordinate. It cannot chart its own course while so bound. Dependence is the very heart of neo-colonialism.

It drains Africa's wealth abroad. The profits of African industry and trade flow out to foreign firms. The continent's surplus enriches the West more than itself. This outflow of wealth robs Africa of the means to develop. It produces riches that others enjoy. The draining of wealth is a chief harm of neo-colonialism.

It controls the terms of trade against Africa. The powers set the prices of the goods Africa buys and sells. The terms of trade run steadily against the continent. Its cheap exports buy ever dearer manufactures. This unequal exchange keeps Africa poor. Control of trade is a weapon of neo-colonialism.

It works through multinational companies. Great foreign companies dominate the industries and resources of Africa. They take the profits and control the wealth of the continent. Their power often exceeds that of the states themselves. Through them the West keeps its economic grip. Multinationals are the agents of neo-colonialism.

It props up compliant regimes. The powers support the rulers who serve their interests. They aid and defend the friendly and undermine the defiant. This keeps in power those who will not challenge the West. Political control is thus added to economic. Neo-colonialism guards its own through client regimes.

It spreads foreign culture and values. Neo-colonialism works not through the economy alone but through the mind. It spreads the culture, tastes and values of the former rulers. This cultural domination weakens Africa's confidence in itself. It binds the continent to the West in spirit as well as in trade. Cultural influence is a subtle but powerful instrument of neo-colonialism.

It prevents genuine and independent development. While Africa is so bound, it cannot develop for itself. Its economy is shaped to serve others rather than its own people. True and independent development is held back at every turn. Neo-colonialism keeps the continent in underdevelopment. It is the great enemy of African progress.

The statement is therefore largely valid. The flag came down, but the grip of the former ruler did indeed remain, for through trade, aid, investment, debt and multinational companies the great powers kept their hold upon the economies of independent Africa. This neo-colonialism kept the continent dependent, drained its wealth abroad, controlled the terms of trade against it, and propped up compliant regimes. Free in name but bound in fact, Africa found that the departure of the coloniser's flag did not bring the departure of his power.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that foreign control survived the coming of independence.

The trap is to define the term but fail to show its concrete effects upon development.

The top band links the economic instruments of neo-colonialism to the draining of wealth and the blocking of true development.

Question 116

The dependency theory is one of the most influential explanations of African poverty. The statement holds that the wealth of the West and the poverty of the rest are two sides of one coin, and this captures the very heart of the theory, for it makes the two the linked products of a single system. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It sees the world as a core and a periphery. The theory divides the world into a rich core and a poor periphery. The core is the developed West, the periphery the poor nations. The two are bound together in a single system. Africa belongs to the exploited periphery. This division is the foundation of the theory.

It holds that the core exploits the periphery. The rich core grows wealthy by exploiting the poor periphery. It draws away the resources and wealth of the weaker lands. The prosperity of the West rests upon the poverty of the rest. This exploitation is the engine of the system. The core enriches itself at the periphery's expense.

It argues that development and underdevelopment are linked. The theory holds that the two are opposite sides of one process. The same system that develops the core underdevelops the periphery. Africa's poverty and the West's wealth are bound together. One cannot be understood without the other. They are joined in a single relationship.

It sees underdevelopment as made, not natural. Africa's poverty is not a natural or original state. It was created by the workings of the world system. The continent was actively underdeveloped by its exploiters. This is the theory's central and striking claim. Underdevelopment is a product, not a starting-point.

Rodney argued that Europe underdeveloped Africa. Walter Rodney gave the theory its classic African form. He held that Europe grew rich by robbing and exploiting Africa. The slave trade and colonialism drained the continent's wealth. Africa's poverty was thus the fruit of European gain. His work named the process for a generation.

It blames the world system rather than African failings. The theory looks outward for the cause of African poverty. It blames the unequal world order rather than the failings of Africans. Underdevelopment is the work of exploitation, not of backwardness. This shifts the blame from the victim to the system. It is a defence of Africa against its detractors.

It concludes that dependence must be broken. If exploitation is the cause, then dependence must be ended. The theory urges Africa to break its ties with the exploiting core. Only by escaping the world system can it truly develop. Self-reliance and delinking are its prescriptions. Liberation from dependence is its final aim.

The statement is therefore a fair statement of the theory. The wealth of the West and the poverty of the rest are, in the dependency theory, indeed two sides of one coin, for it holds that the rich core grew wealthy by exploiting the poor periphery, so that development and underdevelopment are the linked products of a single world system. Africa's poverty, on this view, is not natural backwardness but the made result of exploitation, as Walter Rodney contended in arguing that Europe underdeveloped Africa. The theory concludes that only by breaking its dependence can the continent truly develop.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim as the core of the dependency theory: the West's wealth and Africa's poverty are linked.

The trap is to give a vague account without the core-periphery model and Rodney's argument.

The top band presents underdevelopment as made rather than natural, and links it to the call for self-reliance.

Question 117

Faced with the burden of underdevelopment, the African states have tried many measures to promote their development. The statement holds that in unity the states of Africa sought the strength that single nations lacked, and this is largely just, for cooperation and integration have been central to their efforts. The claim may be weighed as follows.

The states have pursued regional cooperation and integration. The African states have joined together in regional bodies for strength. Groups such as the East African Community and ECOWAS unite their members. They seek larger markets and common projects through cooperation. Unity is to bring the strength that single states lack. Regional integration is a chief measure of development.

They have built larger markets through free trade. The states have sought to trade freely among themselves. The African Continental Free Trade Area joins the continent into one market. A larger market allows industry and trade to grow. It lessens dependence on the world beyond. Free trade among Africans is a road to development.

The African Union has taken up the cause of development. The African Union, successor to the OAU, works for the continent's progress. It seeks peace, cooperation and development among its members. It gives Africa a common voice and a common purpose. Through it the states pursue their shared goals. The Union is a chief instrument of African development.

NEPAD offered an African-led plan for development. The New Partnership for Africa's Development was framed by the states themselves. It set out a plan for good governance, investment and growth. It sought partnership with the world on Africa's own terms. It was development designed by Africans for Africa. NEPAD gave the continent a plan of its own.

They have invested in education and human resources. The states have poured resources into schooling and skills. They seek to build the trained people that development needs. Education is to overcome the shortage of manpower. A skilled people is the foundation of progress. Investment in human resources is a vital measure.

They have sought foreign aid and investment. The states have looked abroad for the capital and technology they lack. Aid and foreign investment bring the means of development. They fund industries, roads and services. Yet they must be sought without deepening dependence. Foreign capital is a double-edged measure of development.

They have pursued good governance and reform. Many states have turned to democracy and better government. Good governance is sought to attract investment and to serve the people. Reform of the economy and the state is undertaken. These changes aim to remove the failings that hindered progress. Better governance is a foundation of development.

They have sought to industrialise their economies. The states have tried to build the industries they lacked at independence. Factories are raised to process their own raw materials for profit. Industrialisation is meant to lessen dependence on imported goods. It seeks to add value to Africa's wealth within the continent. Building industry is a chief measure for lasting development.

They have drawn upon Pan-Africanism and unity. The ideal of African unity has inspired the search for development. Pan-Africanism urges the states to work together for strength. Unity is to give Africa a voice and a market of its own. The dream of a united continent underlies these efforts. Pan-Africanism is the spirit behind the measures.

The statement is therefore largely valid. In unity the states of Africa did indeed seek the strength that single nations lacked, for they pursued regional cooperation and integration, built larger markets through free trade, and worked through the African Union and the plan of NEPAD, drawing upon the spirit of Pan-Africanism. To these they added investment in education, the search for foreign capital, industrialisation and better governance. Knowing that single states were too weak to prosper alone, they sought in unity and common effort the strength to develop.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that Africa sought in unity and cooperation the strength to develop.

The trap is to list bodies without showing how they serve the goal of development.

The top band links regional integration, the AU and NEPAD to the wider struggle for self-reliant development.

Question 118

Among the measures for African development, education and foreign capital hold a central place. The statement holds that education builds the people, while foreign capital may build or bind them, and this is

largely just, for education is a sure good but aid and investment carry both promise and danger. The claim may be weighed as follows.

Education builds the skilled manpower development needs. Development requires trained doctors, engineers, teachers and workers. Education produces the skilled people that Africa so lacked at independence. It overcomes the shortage of manpower that crippled the new states. A learned people is the foundation of progress. Education is the first tool of development.

It spreads knowledge and raises productivity. Education spreads the knowledge and skill that make work productive. An educated people farms, trades and builds more efficiently. Learning lifts the whole level of the economy. It turns the people into a resource for development. Knowledge is a wellspring of prosperity.

It empowers the people and improves governance. An educated people can hold its rulers to account. Learning spreads the awareness and the demand for good governance. It equips citizens to take part in their own affairs. Education thus strengthens both society and the state. It is a foundation of freedom as well as wealth.

Foreign aid brings capital that Africa lacks. Africa wants the money that development requires and cannot raise. Foreign aid brings capital for roads, schools and industries. It funds projects that the poor states could not afford. In this way aid may hasten development. Foreign help supplies a want that Africa cannot meet alone.

Foreign investment brings technology and skills. Foreign firms bring the machines and methods that Africa lacks. Their investment builds industries and creates employment. They carry technology and skill into the continent. Where well used, this investment aids development. Foreign capital may be made a servant of progress.

Yet aid may deepen dependence. Foreign aid often comes burdened with conditions and hidden costs. It may bind the receiver to the giver in a new dependence. Aid can weaken the will and the habit of self-reliance. It may serve the interests of the donor as much as the receiver. Dependence is the constant danger that shadows the giving of aid.

And investment may drain profits abroad. Foreign firms take their profits out of the continent. The wealth they produce may enrich the West more than Africa. Investment may thus become a channel of neo-colonialism. Its gains must be weighed against its outflows. Profit sent abroad limits the good it does.

They must be used with care and for self-reliance. Education, aid and investment are tools that may help or harm. Used wisely, they build the strength and skill of the continent. Used carelessly, they deepen dependence and drain its wealth. They must be turned toward self-reliance, not away from it. Their value lies in how they are used.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Education does indeed build the people, for it produces the skilled manpower, spreads the knowledge, and empowers the citizens that development requires, and it is the surest foundation of lasting progress. Foreign aid and investment, by contrast, may build or bind, for they bring the capital and technology Africa lacks, yet they may also deepen dependence and drain profits abroad. Education strengthens Africa from within; foreign capital may serve it or subject it, according to the wisdom with which it is used.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim that education builds while foreign capital may either build or bind.

The trap is to praise aid and investment without noting the danger of dependence they carry.

The top band shows education as the surest tool and weighs the promise of foreign capital against its dangers.

Question 119

Tanzania offers one of the most instructive stories of development in independent Africa. The statement holds that it tried both the socialist road and the market, and learned hard lessons from each, and this is largely just, for its experience runs from Ujamaa to liberalisation. The claim may be weighed as follows.

It began with the socialism of the Arusha Declaration. After independence Tanzania chose the socialist road under Nyerere. The Arusha Declaration of 1967 proclaimed Ujamaa and self-reliance. The state took control of the economy and gathered the people into villages. This was the bold beginning of Tanzania's development. Socialism guided the nation for a generation.

It pursued equality and national unity. Tanzania made fairness and unity the heart of its policy. It refused ethnic favouritism and built a united nation. The country escaped the tribal conflicts that tore its neighbours. This unity was among its greatest achievements. Tanzania stood as a model of peace and equality.

It made great gains in education and health. Tanzania poured resources into schooling and health for the people. Literacy rose sharply and services reached the villages. The welfare of the ordinary people was much improved. These social gains were the true success of Ujamaa. Learning and health were carried to the poor.

Yet its socialist economy declined. The economic record of Ujamaa was largely disappointing. State enterprises proved inefficient and production fell. Food shortages and shrinking output troubled the land. The economy stagnated where it should have grown. Economic failure was the weakness of the socialist years.

It failed to achieve true self-reliance. Despite its central aim, Tanzania leaned upon foreign aid. The faltering economy could not stand upon its own resources. Self-reliance remained an ideal beyond its reach. The nation depended on the help it had hoped to refuse. The great aim of Ujamaa went unfulfilled.

It turned to market reforms after 1985. The economic crisis forced a change of course under Nyerere's successors. Tanzania liberalised its economy and opened it to the market. State controls were loosened and private enterprise encouraged. The nation left the socialist road it had long followed. Reform replaced Ujamaa as the path to development.

It later achieved renewed economic growth. In the years after reform the Tanzanian economy revived. Growth returned and new industries and investment arose. The nation shared in the wider recovery of Africa. This growth was the fruit of the change of course. Tanzania rebuilt its economy on new foundations.

Yet it still faces the challenge of widespread poverty. For all its progress, Tanzania remains a poor country. Much of its people still live in want and hardship. The gains of growth have not reached all alike. Poverty is still the great challenge before the nation. Development remains an unfinished task.

The statement is therefore largely valid. Tanzania did indeed try both the socialist road and the market, and learned hard lessons from each, for it began with the socialism of the Arusha Declaration, winning great gains in unity, education and health, yet suffering economic decline and failing to reach self-reliance. After 1985 it turned to market reforms and won renewed growth, though it still faces the challenge of widespread poverty. Its story, running from Ujamaa to liberalisation, shows both the achievements and the enduring difficulties of the African search for development.

Examiner's Note

The demand is to weigh the claim by tracing Tanzania's experience of both socialism and the market.

The trap is to describe only Ujamaa and neglect the later turn to the market and its results.

The top band traces the arc from Ujamaa's social gains and economic decline to reform and renewed growth.

Question 120

After decades of struggle, the future of African development remains uncertain but not without hope. The statement holds that the continent's prospects depend above all upon its own choices, and this is largely just. For though Africa bears heavy burdens and faces old dangers, its greatest resources and its deepest remedies lie within itself. The claim may be assessed as follows.

Africa still bears heavy burdens of poverty and debt. The continent remains poor, indebted and dependent upon the world. Widespread poverty and want still afflict its peoples. The old burdens have not been wholly lifted. These weigh against the hopes of development. Poverty is still the great enemy to be overcome.

Poor governance and conflict still threaten progress. Corruption, misrule and conflict still trouble many states. Where these remain, development cannot prosper. The failings of the past are not yet everywhere overcome. They darken the prospects of the continent. Bad governance is still a danger to progress.

Dependence and unfair trade still hold it back. Africa still depends on the sale of cheap raw materials. The terms of trade continue to run against the continent. Neo-colonial ties still drain its wealth abroad. This dependence limits its hopes of development. The old unequal order is not yet broken.

Yet Africa possesses vast natural resources. The continent is rich in land, minerals and energy. These resources, if well used, could fund a great development. Africa's wealth in the ground is a ground for hope. Turned to its own good, it might transform the continent. Its riches are a promise for the future.

It has a young and growing population. Africa's people are many and young, a great potential workforce. This youth, if educated and employed, could drive development. A rising generation is a resource of enormous promise. Well used, it could be the making of the continent. The young are Africa's hope for the future.

Regional integration is building larger markets. The African states are joining their economies through free trade. The continental free trade area builds one great market. Larger markets allow industry and trade to grow. Integration promises the strength that single states lack. Unity is opening a road to development.

New technology offers a chance to leap forward. The spread of new technology may let Africa bypass old stages. Mobile telephones and the internet reach even the poor. Technology offers new ways to trade, learn and produce. It gives the continent a chance to leap ahead. Innovation is a bright prospect for development.

The spread of democracy improves the outlook. Better governance and democracy have spread across much of Africa. Where rulers are accountable, development may prosper. Reform is removing some of the failings of the past. This improvement in governance brightens the prospects. Good government is a foundation for future progress.

Much depends on good governance and self-reliance. The future rests on the choices of Africa's own leaders and peoples. Good governance, unity and self-reliance are the keys to development. Only by their own efforts can the states truly rise. The prospects depend on the will to reform and to unite. Africa's future lies chiefly in its own hands.

The prospects are therefore uncertain but hopeful. Africa faces great burdens but also great opportunities. Its resources, its youth and its unity offer real hope. Its poverty, dependence and misrule remain real dangers. The outcome is not fixed but depends on its choices. The prospects are uncertain, yet far from hopeless.

The statement may therefore be largely accepted. Africa still bears heavy burdens of poverty, debt and dependence, and these are not wholly of its own making. Yet its greatest hopes, its vast resources, its young people, its growing unity and its improving governance, lie within itself, and so do the remedies of good government, self-reliance and reform. The future of Africa is therefore uncertain but not fixed, and it depends above all upon the choices of its own peoples and leaders. In the end, the development of Africa lies chiefly in its own hands.

Examiner's Note

"How far" requires the dangers and the hopes weighed, and the claim about Africa's own hands tested.

The trap is to give only the problems, or only the opportunities, rather than weighing both.

The top band concludes that the outcome is not fixed but depends on governance, unity and self-reliance.

INDEX

A

African Union (AU), 119, 147–149, 152, 154, 168, 180–182, 186, 188, 279, 298–299, 310, 318. *See also* Organisation of African Unity
alliance system, 20, 23, 29, 33–35, 38–39, 190, 212, 214–215, 217–218, 220–221, 224–225. *See also* First World War
Al-Qaeda, 98, 100–101, 265. *See also* terrorism
Alsace-Lorraine, 15, 29, 35, 39, 212–213, 217, 221, 225
America, *see* United States
apartheid, 80, 82, 85–88, 168–169, 299, 310. *See also* South Africa
appeasement, 45, 47–49, 191, 227, 231–233. *See also* Chamberlain, Neville; Second World War
arms race, 22–23, 28–29, 33–35, 38, 60–93, 109, 197, 214–215, 217, 221, 224, 227, 229, 239, 244, 248–250, 257–260, 275. *See also* nuclear weapons; Cold War
  and deterrence, 23, 28–29, 34, 38, 64, 66, 68, 72–75, 78, 109, 217, 221, 244, 248, 259
  nuclear, 60, 65, 69, 72, 74–75, 78, 88–93, 109, 239, 244, 248, 257–258, 260
Arusha Declaration (1967), 147, 151–153, 161–162, 185, 195, 299, 306–307, 320. *See also* ujamaa
AU, *see* African Union
Austria-Hungary, 20, 27, 33–36, 41, 215, 221, 223
Axis Powers, 45, 47, 50, 52, 231, 235. *See also* Second World War

B

balance of power, 3, 9, 15, 18–20, 23–29, 190, 197, 204, 208, 210, 212, 216, 262. *See also* Congress of Vienna
  and the Congress of Vienna, 18, 23–27, 208, 210, 212, 216
  and the World Wars, 3, 15, 20, 23–28, 216, 262
Balkans, the, 3, 20, 26, 29, 33–36, 38–39, 61, 215–218, 221–222, 224–225. *See also* Eastern Question
Berlin, 3, 15, 26, 30–32, 44–45, 51, 65, 68–71, 90–91, 192, 197, 214–215, 219, 231, 238, 240, 244, 246–248, 259. *See also* Berlin Wall
Berlin Blockade and Airlift, 65, 68–71, 90, 246–247. *See also* Cold War
Berlin Wall, 68, 70, 91, 247, 259. *See also* Cold War
Biafra, *see* Nigerian Civil War
bipolarity, 238, 259. *See also* Cold War
Bismarck, Otto von, 13–14, 19–20, 31, 33, 197, 211–213, 219–220. *See also* German unification; balance of power
  alliance system of, 20, 33, 212, 220
  and German unification, 14, 19–20, 33, 197, 211–213, 220
Bolshevism, 37, 224. *See also* Lenin, Vladimir
Britain (England), 6, 11–13, 21, 25–27, 30–31, 33–35, 38–40, 42, 45, 47–50, 53, 55, 57–59, 61, 70, 72, 200, 206, 208, 210, 214–215, 217–218, 220–221, 224–225, 231–233, 240, 247

C

capitalism, 3–5, 21–22, 31, 37, 51, 58–60, 62–64, 70, 81–83, 92, 159–160, 164–165, 189, 195, 198–200, 214, 218, 220, 224, 234, 239–243, 251, 260, 304–306, 308–309. *See also* communism
Castro, Fidel, 77, 252. *See also* Cuba
Chamberlain, Neville, 48, 233. *See also* appeasement
Churchill, Winston, 52, 60, 62, 242
civil wars, 76, 80–82, 125–127, 129–140, 142, 144–145, 151, 167, 170, 172–173, 194, 220, 254, 280–286, 288, 290–293, 296–300, 310–311, 313–314. *See also* ethnic conflict; refugees
  effects of, 82, 131, 134–137, 139–140, 142, 144, 172–173, 291–292, 296, 300, 310, 314
Cold War, 51, 57, 59–97, 123–124, 133, 138, 144, 191–192, 234, 238–260, 262–263, 272, 285, 288, 294, 297, 312. *See also* arms race; Non-Aligned Movement
  and the arms race, 60–93, 96–97, 133, 192, 240, 244, 248, 250–256, 258–260, 262, 272, 288
  détente in, 78, 81, 86, 88–90, 253, 258
  end of, 60, 70, 75, 79–81, 87, 89–92, 94, 96–97, 138, 234, 239–242, 247, 256, 258–260, 262, 272, 294
  origins of, 60, 62–64, 66, 70–73, 76–80, 87, 89–93, 96, 133, 138, 191–192, 234, 239, 242–243, 251, 253–255, 257, 259, 262–263, 285, 294, 312
  proxy conflicts of, 60–61, 65, 67, 75–82, 89–90, 92–93, 144, 192, 240, 244, 251–255, 257–260
collective security, 38, 42–43, 46–47, 49, 53, 227–229, 231–232, 234–236, 246. *See also* League of Nations
colonialism, 9, 32, 55, 82, 84–88, 129–130, 132, 153–154, 157, 159–160, 169–171, 177–179, 185, 238, 255–257, 283–285, 287, 299, 303–

304, 310–312, 315–317, 319. *See also* imperialism; neo-colonialism
COMECON, 65–68, 244
Commercial Revolution, 4–5, 189, 198–200
communism, 37, 48, 51, 60, 62–71, 76–81, 91–92, 138–139, 192, 224, 229–230, 233–234, 239, 241–247, 251–254, 258–260, 294. *See also* Cold War; capitalism
Concert of Europe, 13, 23–28, 209–210, 216. *See also* Congress of Vienna
Congo (DRC), 31–32, 79–81, 129, 132–135, 141, 144–145, 152–153, 169, 194, 218–219, 240, 254–255, 284, 287–291, 295–297, 299–300
Congress of Vienna (1815), 13, 23–25, 189, 207–210. *See also* Metternich, Klemens von; balance of power
containment, 24, 62–63, 65–68, 78–79, 210, 242–246, 251–254, 268. *See also* Truman Doctrine
Crimean War, 3, 26–27, 197, 215–216. *See also* Eastern Question
Cuba, 75, 77–78, 80, 90, 93, 192, 252–253, 257–258. *See also* Cuban Missile Crisis
Cuban Missile Crisis (1962), 65, 77–78, 252. *See also* Cold War; Cuba

D

decolonisation, 51, 56–57, 59, 234, 236, 238, 259. *See also* nationalism
dependency theory, 174–175, 177, 179, 316–317. *See also* underdevelopment; neo-colonialism
détente, 78, 81, 88–90, 93, 253, 257–258. *See also* Cold War
deterrence, 25–26, 72–73, 248–249, 251, 264, 274. *See also* arms race; nuclear weapons
development, 8–9, 28, 52, 54, 61, 75, 80–87, 92, 95, 105, 112, 114–115, 117–120, 122, 124, 130, 140–142, 151, 153, 155–188, 195–196, 202–203, 220, 236, 250, 255–256, 259, 261–262, 267–268, 272, 277–279, 285, 301–321. *See also* underdevelopment; neo-colonialism
  and neo-colonialism, 81–82, 84, 158, 161–166, 169–170, 173–175, 177–180, 184–185, 195, 303–304, 307, 310–312, 315–319, 321
  obstacles to, 8–9, 28, 82, 105, 115, 117–118, 142, 153, 158–159, 166–167, 169–179, 181–182, 184–188, 195–196, 202–203, 220, 255, 267, 272, 277–279, 285, 303–304, 309–318, 320–321
  strategies for, 84, 159–166, 171, 173–183, 188, 304–310, 314, 316–318, 320–321
dictatorship, 37, 42–49, 58–59, 66, 80–82, 129–132, 134–135, 167, 170–172, 187, 191, 229–233, 254, 283, 285–286, 291, 310, 313
domino theory, 78, 253. *See also* Cold War; Vietnam War

E

East Africa, 32, 54, 83–84, 101, 108, 117, 169
East African Community, 83, 119, 166, 180–181, 317
Eastern Europe, 25, 41, 61–65, 67–69, 91, 215, 217, 221, 238, 240–243, 246, 258
Eastern Question, 3–4, 26, 29, 35, 215, 217. *See also* Ottoman Empire; Balkans, the
ECOWAS, 148–149, 180–181, 279, 298, 317
Egypt, 30, 84, 168, 218, 255. *See also* Suez Crisis
Eisenhower, Dwight D., 143
ethnic cleansing, 126, 138–139, 194, 294–295. *See also* genocide
ethnic conflict, 126, 128, 131–132, 138–139, 146–147, 158, 161, 163, 172, 185, 282, 290–291, 298. *See also* civil wars

F

fascism, 37, 55, 230, 237. *See also* Mussolini, Benito
First World War, 9, 15, 20, 23, 26–29, 33–41, 44, 48, 53–54, 58, 74, 85, 97, 190, 197, 213–214, 217, 221–224, 229, 233, 238, 253, 300. *See also* Treaty of Versailles; League of Nations
  causes of, 15, 20, 23, 26–29, 33–36, 38–39, 58, 190, 214, 217, 221–224, 300
  course of, 23, 33–34, 36–38, 54, 190, 217, 221–224
  effects of, 27, 37–39, 41, 44, 48, 53–54, 74, 190, 213, 229
foreign aid, 81–84, 161–166, 173, 180, 184–186, 297, 306–307, 318–320. *See also* neo-colonialism
France, 3, 6, 9–20, 24–27, 29–31, 33–36, 38–40, 42, 45, 47–50, 53, 55, 57–59, 61, 67, 70, 72, 200, 204–215, 217–218, 220–222, 224–227, 231–233, 240, 247
Franz Ferdinand, Archduke, 35. *See also* First World War
French Revolution, 3–4, 11, 15–19, 28, 189, 205–207. *See also* Napoleon Bonaparte

G

genocide, 51, 126, 128, 133–135, 148–149, 152–153, 194, 282–283, 287, 289–292, 294. *See also* Rwandan Genocide; ethnic cleansing
  causes of, 126, 128, 133–134, 152–153, 194, 282–283, 287, 289, 291, 294
  consequences of, 51, 126, 128, 133–135, 152, 283, 289, 291

in Rwanda, 126, 128, 133–135, 148–149, 152, 194, 282–283, 289–291
Germany, 3, 9–15, 18–21, 25, 27–31, 33–41, 43–50, 57–59, 61–64, 68–71, 91, 190, 197, 204–205, 208–209, 211–214, 217–218, 220–227, 229–234, 240–244, 246–248, 259
globalisation, 96–97, 124, 193, 214, 261–263, 276
Gorbachev, Mikhail, 89–91, 258–259. *See also* Cold War
Great Depression, 43–45, 47, 49, 58, 227, 229–230, 232. *See also* Second World War
Great Lakes region, 113, 117, 151–153, 289, 300. *See also* Rwandan Genocide
Great War, *see* First World War

H

Habyarimana, Juvénal, 133. *See also* Rwandan Genocide
Haile Selassie, 46
Hiroshima and Nagasaki, 49–50, 72, 234. *See also* nuclear weapons
Hitler, Adolf, 40, 45, 47–50, 58, 62, 226–227, 230–233, 241–242. *See also* Nazism; Second World War
Ho Chi Minh, 78, 253. *See also* Vietnam War
Holocaust, the, 51, 234. *See also* Nazism

I

imperialism, 3–4, 8, 20–23, 28, 30, 35, 38–39, 58, 84–86, 177, 190, 213–214, 217, 225, 237. *See also* colonialism
International Monetary Fund (IMF), 174. *See also* structural adjustment
iron curtain, 60, 62, 65, 67–70, 91, 234, 242–243. *See also* Cold War
Islamic State (ISIS), 98–101, 111, 116. *See also* terrorism
Italy, 3, 13, 18–21, 25, 27–28, 31, 33, 36–37, 42–47, 58, 67, 190, 197, 209, 211–212, 218, 220, 229–232

K

Kennedy, John F., 78, 252. *See also* Cuban Missile Crisis
Khrushchev, Nikita, 88, 252–253
Korea, 60, 65–66, 76–78, 90, 92–93, 109, 192, 239, 244–245, 251–252, 259. *See also* Korean War
Korean War, 76–77, 90, 251. *See also* Cold War

L

League of Nations, 38–43, 45–49, 51–54, 191, 223, 225–228, 232, 235–236. *See also* collective security; First World War
aims of, 38, 41–43, 46–47, 49, 51–54, 191, 223, 226–228, 232, 235–236
and collective security, 38, 43, 45–47, 49, 228, 232, 236
weaknesses of, 40, 42–43, 45–49, 51–53, 191, 228, 232, 235–236
Lenin, Vladimir, 21–22, 30, 58, 214, 218. *See also* Bolshevism

M

MAD (mutually assured destruction), *see* deterrence
Marshall Plan, 66–68, 240, 242, 244–245. *See also* Truman Doctrine; Cold War
Metternich, Klemens von, 24–25, 207, 209, 211. *See also* Congress of Vienna
Middle East, 36, 50, 65–66, 76, 223–224
militarism, 3–4, 22, 28–29, 33–35, 38–39, 44–45, 47–48, 202, 217–218, 221–222, 224–225, 231, 233. *See also* First World War
Mobutu Sese Seko, 80–81, 134–135, 290–291. *See also* Congo
Mussolini, Benito, 37, 43, 45–47, 229–231. *See also* fascism

N

Nagasaki, *see* Hiroshima and Nagasaki
NAM, *see* Non-Aligned Movement
Napoleon Bonaparte, 2–4, 11–15, 17–19, 23–25, 28, 189, 197, 207–213, 216. *See also* Napoleonic Wars
reforms of, 13, 18, 25, 207–209
Napoleonic Wars, 3–4, 11–13, 17, 28, 207–209, 211. *See also* Napoleon Bonaparte; Congress of Vienna
Nasser, Gamal Abdel, 84–85, 255–256. *See also* Suez Crisis; Non-Aligned Movement
nationalism, 2–4, 11–13, 15, 17–20, 23, 25–29, 32, 35–36, 38–40, 44, 47–48, 51, 55–59, 138–139, 162, 166, 191, 197, 206–212, 215, 217–218, 220–222, 224–225, 230, 237–238, 266, 294–295, 305–307
and the World Wars, 15, 23, 26, 29, 35–36, 38–39, 48, 55–59, 191, 215, 218, 220, 222, 225, 237–238
in Africa, 2–3, 23, 28, 32, 35, 38, 51, 55–59, 162, 166, 191, 209, 215, 220, 225, 237–238, 294, 307

NATO, 65–66, 68–69, 71, 139, 240, 244–246, 294. *See also* Warsaw Pact; Cold War
Nazism, 37, 40, 45–49, 51, 226–227, 232, 241. *See also* Hitler, Adolf
neo-colonialism, 158, 160, 169–170, 177–179, 185, 238, 303–304, 310–312, 315–316, 319, 321. *See also* underdevelopment; dependency theory
  and underdevelopment, 158, 177–179, 310–311, 315–316, 319, 321
NEPAD, 180–182, 318. *See also* development
Nigerian Civil War (Biafra), 136–137, 140, 194, 293–294. *See also* civil wars
Nkrumah, Kwame, 56, 84–85, 161, 177, 183, 255–256. *See also* Pan-Africanism
Non-Aligned Movement, 82, 84–89, 92–93, 168, 192, 255–257, 260. *See also* Cold War
  aims of, 84–87, 92, 255–256
nuclear weapons, 50–51, 60–63, 65, 69, 72–75, 77–78, 88–90, 92–93, 97, 109, 234, 239–242, 244, 248, 250–253, 256–260, 264, 274–275. *See also* arms race; deterrence
Nyerere, Julius, 56, 81, 83, 87–88, 147, 151–152, 161–163, 299, 305–307, 320. *See also* ujamaa

O

OAU, *see* Organisation of African Unity
Organisation of African Unity (OAU), 182–183, 310, 318. *See also* African Union
Ottoman Empire, 3, 26, 35–37, 41, 190, 197, 215–217, 221, 223, 228. *See also* Eastern Question

P

Pan-Africanism, 56, 180, 182–183, 237, 318. *See also* Organisation of African Unity
proxy wars, 60–61, 65–66, 75–76, 78, 81, 93, 144–145, 239–240, 244, 250–251, 253–254, 259–260. *See also* Cold War
Prussia, 11–12, 14–15, 19, 27, 190, 209–210, 212–213. *See also* Bismarck, Otto von

R

Reagan, Ronald, 90
refugees, 42, 68, 70, 97, 112–114, 117, 127–128, 133–134, 139–142, 148, 151–153, 228, 247, 264, 267, 275, 277, 279, 290, 292, 295, 299–300, 314. *See also* civil wars
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 52
Russia, 11–12, 25–27, 33–37, 191, 208, 210, 212, 215, 220–221, 223–224, 238, 240–241
Rwanda, 126–128, 131–135, 147–150, 152–154, 194, 282–283, 285–286, 289–291, 298–300. *See also* Rwandan Genocide
Rwandan Genocide (1994), 128, 133–135, 194, 289–291. *See also* genocide; Rwanda
Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), 133–134, 289. *See also* Rwandan Genocide

S

SADC, 148–149, 181
Scramble for Africa, 22, 190, 214, 218–219. *See also* imperialism
Second World War, 39–40, 42, 44–45, 47–52, 55–62, 67, 76, 134, 138–139, 153, 191, 226, 231, 233–235, 237–238, 240, 294. *See also* Treaty of Versailles; United Nations
  causes of, 40, 44–45, 47–50, 56, 58, 60, 62, 76, 134, 138, 191, 226, 231, 233–234
  course of, 48, 50, 52, 60, 237
  effects of, 40, 50–52, 60, 62, 67, 76, 134, 138–139, 153, 191, 226, 231, 234–235, 240
self-determination, 41, 52, 55, 226, 235, 237, 255. *See also* nationalism
self-reliance, 9, 161–165, 179–180, 185–186, 188, 195, 305–308, 317, 319–322. *See also* ujamaa
September 11, *see* September 11 attacks
September 11 attacks (2001), 100. *See also* terrorism; War on Terror
Seven Years' War, 200
socialism, 37, 41, 81–84, 160–166, 185–186, 195–196, 229, 237, 305–309, 320. *See also* communism; ujamaa
Somalia, 81, 96, 99, 101, 107–108, 117, 119, 135, 139–140, 148, 194, 272–273, 278, 291–292, 300
South Africa, 80, 85–87, 147, 149–150, 154, 168–169, 254, 292, 298, 300. *See also* apartheid
Soviet Union (USSR), 37, 41, 45, 50–51, 53, 55, 57, 59–81, 83, 88–93, 192, 234, 238–252, 258–259. *See also* Cold War; communism
Space Race, 65–66, 72–74, 240, 244, 249. *See also* arms race
Stalin, Joseph, 50, 62, 70, 88, 90, 232, 242–243, 247. *See also* Soviet Union
structural adjustment programmes, 114–115, 173–174, 185, 255, 303, 311, 315. *See also* International Monetary Fund
Sudan (Darfur), 113, 117, 127, 129, 136, 145, 148, 194, 286, 292–293, 300
Suez Crisis (1956), 21, 30, 218. *See also* Nasser, Gamal Abdel

T

Tanzania (Tanganyika), 81, 83–84, 87–88, 101, 107, 113, 117, 133, 142, 151–153, 160–166, 169, 180, 185–186, 195–196, 299, 306–309, 320. *See also* ujamaa
terrorism, 94–106, 108–111, 115–120, 122, 135, 187, 193, 230, 260–270, 272, 274–275, 277–279, 291–292, 295. *See also* September 11 attacks; War on Terror
  causes of, 94, 96, 98–102, 105, 108, 110, 115–118, 122, 230, 262–263, 265–268, 277–279, 291, 295
  forms of, 94–95, 97–102, 105, 109–111, 116, 122, 193, 260–261, 264–268, 274–275
  responses to, 94, 98–102, 105, 108, 110–111, 115–116, 118–120, 122, 261–262, 264, 266–268, 274–275, 278
Third World, 66, 82–83, 92, 159, 175, 179, 192, 234, 239–240, 244, 250–251, 255–256, 259–260, 297. *See also* Non-Aligned Movement
Thirty Years' War, 3, 9–11, 28, 80, 189, 197, 203–204
Tito, Josip Broz, 84–85, 255, 294. *See also* Non-Aligned Movement
Treaty of Versailles (1919), 14–15, 37–41, 44–45, 47–49, 190–191, 212–213, 223, 225–227, 229–233. *See also* First World War; Second World War
  terms of, 37, 39–40, 45, 49, 226, 230, 233
Triple Alliance, 33–34, 38, 217, 220–221, 224. *See also* First World War
Triple Entente, 33, 38, 217, 220–221, 224. *See also* First World War
Truman Doctrine, 62–63, 65–66, 242–246. *See also* containment; Cold War
Truman, Harry S., 62–63, 65–66, 242–246. *See also* Truman Doctrine

U

ujamaa, 161–164, 185–186, 195, 305–308, 320. *See also* Nyerere, Julius; Arusha Declaration
  Arusha Declaration and, 161–162, 185, 195, 306–307, 320
underdevelopment, 8–9, 28, 115, 158–159, 178–179, 195, 202, 220, 277–278, 302–304, 309–312, 314, 316–317. *See also* neo-colonialism; dependency theory
United Nations, 43, 51–59, 77, 83, 85–86, 88–89, 93, 101, 120, 133, 135, 139, 147–148, 154, 168, 191, 234–238, 251–252, 268, 279, 289, 291, 298. *See also* League of Nations
  and world peace, 43, 51–54, 58, 77, 88–89, 93, 120, 133, 135, 139, 147–148, 154, 234–236, 268, 279, 298
  organs of, 52–54, 120, 235–236
  peacekeeping by, 77, 135, 147–148, 236, 251, 289, 298
United States, 37–38, 40, 43, 50–51, 53, 55, 57, 59–67, 69–70, 72–80, 83, 89, 91–93, 100–101, 135, 183, 223, 226–229, 234, 236, 238–254, 259–260, 291
USSR, *see* Soviet Union

V

Versailles, Treaty of, *see* Treaty of Versailles
Vietnam, 60, 65–67, 78–79, 81, 92–93, 192, 239, 244–245, 251, 253–254, 259. *See also* Vietnam War
Vietnam War, 78–79, 192, 253. *See also* Cold War

W

War on Terror, 100. *See also* terrorism; September 11 attacks
Warsaw Pact, 65, 68–69, 240, 244, 246. *See also* NATO
weapons of mass destruction, 109, 272, 274
Weimar Republic, 40–41, 226–227, 229–230
West Africa, 101, 137–138, 149, 169, 201
Wilhelm II, Kaiser, 41
Wilson, Woodrow, 41–42. *See also* League of Nations
WMD, *see* weapons of mass destruction
World Bank, 174, 315. *See also* structural adjustment
World War I, *see* First World War
World War II, *see* Second World War

Y

Yugoslavia, 35, 37, 41, 84–85, 138–139, 148, 153, 222–223, 255, 294, 300

Z

Zaire, *see* Congo