

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2013 series

9697 HISTORY

9697/32

Paper 32, maximum raw mark 100

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2013 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Band	Marks	Levels of Response
1	21–25	<i>The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material and ideas. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument.</i>
2	18–20	<i>Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that a good solid answer has been provided.</i>
3	16–17	<i>Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence.</i>
4	14–15	<i>Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively.</i>
5	11–13	<i>Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced.</i>
6	8–10	<i>Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question.</i>
7	0–7	<i>Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments that do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent.</i>

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697

Section A

- 1 President Makarios was the reason why the UN found it difficult to restore peace in Cyprus in 1964.' How far do Sources A – E support this view?

L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO VALID USE OF SOURCES [1–5]

These answers will write about the Cyprus problem of 1964 and might use the sources. However, candidates will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. If sources are used, it will be to support an essay-style answer to the question.

L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [6–8]

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation/interpretation in context.

L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [9–13]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and to disprove it. However, sources are still used only at face value.

L4 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [14–16]

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at their face value.

L5 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [17–21]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

L6 AS L5, PLUS EITHER (a) EXPLAINS WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE/SUPPORT IS BETTER/PREFERRED, OR (b) RECONCILES/EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN THE EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED [22–25]

For (a) the argument must be that the evidence for agreeing/disagreeing is better/preferred. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but also why other evidence is worse.

For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to **modify** the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support/contradict) in order to improve it.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697

Context

Cyprus gained independence from Britain in 1960. Its constitution was complicated, and designed as a compromise between the Greek Cypriot majority and the Turkish Cypriot minority. Neither community was happy with the compromise; it quickly became clear that the government was unable to make decisions because of on-going disputes between the two groups. Makarios proposed amendments to the constitution which were seen by Greek Cypriots as vital for effective government, but viewed by the Turkish Cypriot community as a means of removing them from the power-sharing arrangement. When the amendments were implemented, Turkish Cypriot activists rebelled and there was violence between the two communities. This led to the involvement of the UN in 1964, largely because of the threat posed to international peace and security. A measure of the difficulties facing the UN in 1964 is the fact that no permanent solution has yet been found for the Cyprus problem, despite numerous UN resolutions and other international attempts at mediation. Makarios' role in the problem has been a matter of dispute. There is little doubt that he incited Greek Cypriot violence against the Turkish Cypriot community, but how far did he exploit and undermine UN attempts to bring peace to the island?

Source A

Context: Extract from a report to the UN by the Government of the Republic of Cyprus. The Republic of Cyprus is the only internationally recognised state in Cyprus, although, in reality, its government controls only the southern part of the island predominantly populated by Greek Cypriots. Turkish-Cypriots control northern parts of the island; they refer to it as the Turkish Republic of Cyprus, but this is not recognised by international bodies.

Face Value: It was Turkish Cypriots who made the constitution of Cyprus unworkable by exploiting those elements of it which had been designed to safeguard their interests. Makarios had no choice but to suggest amendments. Turkish Cypriots rejected these. Turkey exploited this situation by encouraging Turkish Cypriots to rise against the government. Turkey did this out of a desire for territorial expansion. It was the revolt by Turkish Cypriots which forced the UN to become involved to prevent further violence. Turkey resented UN involvement and rejected the UN Mediator's proposals. **(N – Turkey and Turkish Cypriots, not Makarios, were responsible for the problems).**

Beyond Face Value: The source is a report by the Government of the Republic of Cyprus, which is likely to be biased against Turkish Cypriots. The source claims that Makarios suggested constitutional changes because Turkish Cypriots had made the 1960 constitution unworkable. Source B claims that Makarios did this to take away the rights of Turkish Cypriots and exclude them from government (**X-Ref A and B**). The source claims that Turkey became involved because of its aims of 'territorial aggrandisement'. Source E suggests that Turkish involvement was to protect Turkish Cypriots who were being attacked (**X-Ref A and E**). Source D implies that the inter-communal violence was caused by the Turkish Cypriot insurrection, encouraged by Turkey. Sources B and E suggest that it was violence by Greek Cypriots which led to the problems and involvement of Turkey (**X-Ref A with B, D and E**). The same argument applies to the involvement of the UN. Source A implies that Makarios cooperated with the UN but this is contradicted in Source E (**X-Ref A and E**). While a government report to the UN might be expected to be reliable, in this case there are reasons to be sceptical. **(N – but the source cannot be seen as fully reliable).**

Source B

Context: Extract from an article by two Turkish-Cypriot academics, 2007.

Face Value: Makarios proposed changes to the constitution in order to deny Turkish Cypriots their rights. As a result, Turkish Cypriots were unable to take part in the government. Greek Cypriots used violence to ensure this was the case. **(Y – Makarios' attempts to change the constitution and his encouragement of violence against the Turkish Cypriot community are the main cause of the problems facing the UN).** However, the source also states that the UN made a mistake when determining Security Council Resolution 186 by consulting the government (which consisted of Greek Cypriots only). The UN made no attempt to consult the Turkish Cypriot community about sending a peacekeeping force to Cyprus **(N – UN's problems largely caused by its own mistake).**

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697

Beyond Face Value: The source claims that the main reason for UN involvement was the violence by Greek Cypriots against Turkish Cypriots. Source E seems to support this, while Source A challenges it (**X-Ref B with A and E**). (**Y – Makarios was determined to gain Greek Cypriot supremacy over Turkish Cypriots by whatever methods he could**). The source argues that the UN has been less than impartial in its involvement in Cyprus (**X-Ref with C**). The UN did not consult with the Turkish Cypriot community and, the source claims, was thus in breach of international law. (**N – UN caused the problem by inadequate consultation but Makarios exploited it – Y**). The source is biased towards the Turkish Cypriot viewpoint. It claims that the UN sided with the Greek Cypriots, giving credibility to the Greek Cypriot take-over of the constitution and government (**N – UN to blame**). It is implicit throughout that Makarios exploited this situation (**Y**).

Source C

Context: Cartoon from a British newspaper in 1964, shortly after the arrival of the UN peacekeeping force.

Face Value: The UN supports Makarios in his attempt to put down the revolt by Turkish Cypriots. (**N – UN and Makarios were working together**).

Beyond Face Value: The cartoon is sarcastic and critical of Makarios, who is depicted as aggressive, using the UN as a shield for his actions. Sources B and E (and, to a certain extent, D) support the view that Makarios and the Greek Cypriots used violence against Turkish Cypriots (**X-Ref C with B, D and E**). The source is also critical of the UN – the soldier is depicted as bored and inept and the cartoon implies that the UN was not fair in its dealings with the two communities, an allegation also made in Source E (**X-Ref C and B**). Since Britain had been the colonial power in Cyprus until independence in 1960, the British public would have had an interest in events on the island. The cartoon suggests that Makarios had duped the UN, and was using it for his own ends. (**Y – Makarios exploited the presence of the UN peacekeeping force to further his aims of enhancing the position of Greek Cypriots at the expense of the Turkish Cypriot population**).

Source D

Context: Extract from a letter written in June 1964 to the Turkish Prime Minister by US President Johnson.

Face Value: Johnson is concerned that Turkey is planning to invade Cyprus in support of Turkish Cypriot attempts to partition the island. The US feared that this could lead to war between Greece and Turkey and to intervention by the USSR. A Turkish invasion would undermine the work of the UN. It would also cause anger amongst the Greek Cypriot community, leading to violence and making the UN impotent to prevent a high death toll, not least of Turkish Cypriots. (**N – Turkey caused the UN problems by threatening to escalate the issue into a full-scale war, possibly involving the superpowers. This would cause further violence and prevent the UN maintaining peace. The source makes no mention of Makarios**).

Beyond Face Value: Johnson claims that a Turkish invasion to protect Turkish Cypriots is unnecessary because the UN has stopped inter-communal violence. Johnson admits that the UN's task is difficult, but claims that it has successfully reduced violence. This contradicts Source E (**X-Ref D and E**). Johnson's claim that a Turkish invasion would lead to Turkish Cypriot deaths suggests that the UN was inadequate to prevent Greek Cypriot violence against the Turkish Cypriot community. Johnson implies that the reason for Turkish involvement is not 'territorial aggrandisement', but to protect the Turkish Cypriot community (**X-Ref with Source A, Turkey's intention was to expand, and with Sources B, C and E, implying that the UN was not protecting the Turkish Cypriot community**). While the source makes no mention of Makarios, the threat violence against the Turkish Cypriot community is implicit – Johnson underplays this because of the USA's interest in preventing war (**Y – violence against Turkish Cypriots by Makarios and his Greek Cypriots is the root of the problem facing the UN**).

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697

Source E

Context: Extract from an article in a US magazine, August 1964.

Face Value: Makarios incited violence against Turkish Cypriots, leading to retaliation by Turkish fighters. Makarios obeyed the UN call for a ceasefire, but blockaded Turkish Cypriot villages and prevented UN attempts to provide them with water. Makarios is seen as agreeing with everything UN personnel say, but then ignoring it and going his own way. (**Y – Makarios is ignoring and subverting UN efforts to bring peace**). The UN peacekeeping force is too small to carry out its task. (**N – UN struggled to restore peace due to lack of manpower**).

Beyond Face Value: The source implies criticism of the UN (**N – UN’s inefficiencies caused the problem**) (**X-Ref with Source C**). The UN Commander in Kokkina is unable to carry out his task. Although the source comes from a US magazine, there is no evidence of bias; it seems to be reporting events rather than making comment. It makes no mention of wider issues and does not refer to the political concerns of President Johnson (**X-Ref with D**). The implication that Makarios and the Greek Cypriots are using aggression against Turkish Cypriots runs through the source (**Y – Makarios exploits UN weaknesses to continue his actions against Turkish Cypriots. X-Ref with B**).

Conclusion

In supporting the hypothesis, it could be argued that Source B blames Makarios for trying to change the constitution in order to heighten Greek Cypriot power at the expense of the Turkish Cypriot minority, against whom he encouraged violence. Source C depicts Makarios exploiting the UN presence for his own ends. Source D implies that Greek Cypriots used violence against the Turkish Cypriot community and, if Turkey invaded to protect them, would escalate this violence regardless of the UN presence. Source E implies that Makarios was determined to destroy the Turkish Cypriot community, and undermined the UN’s attempts to restore peace. In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that Source A blames Turkey (and the Turkish Cypriots) for causing inter-communal violence. Makarios was merely trying to make the constitution work. Source C shows the UN working together with Makarios in an attempt to end the inter-communal violence. Source D suggests that the threat of a Turkish invasion was the main problem facing the UN.

There are many reasons why the UN found it difficult to restore peace to Cyprus in 1964. The nature of the problem meant that both the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities had legitimate arguments. In having to deal with the government of Cyprus, the UN was in a position where it could be accused of bias towards the Greek Cypriot community. The UN’s primary concern was to avoid war between Greece and Turkey, which would have seriously de-stabilised the Mediterranean area at a key time in the globalisation of the Cold War. In addition the UN had to be mindful of the views of the USA, Britain and the Soviet Union. The UN peacekeeping force was inadequate to restore peace given the strong feelings in both Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities. To some extent, Makarios could be accused of manipulating the UN and using its presence to further his own ambitions.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697

Section B

- 2 **'Between 1945 and 1949, Truman's main aim in Europe was to make the continent politically and economically dependent on the USA.'** How far do you agree?

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that in 1945 the USA was the most powerful nation in the world, both politically and economically. The only nation with the atom bomb, it had not suffered the economic ravages of war that afflicted the former great powers of Europe. Continued economic growth was dependent on maintaining and extending its markets. A return to isolationism, largely blamed for the Great Depression, was no longer acceptable, while communism was perceived as the gravest threat to the USA's capitalist expansion. The Truman Doctrine was devised as a means of preventing further communist gains and keeping European nations firmly in the capitalist system which the USA effectively controlled. The Marshall Plan enabled European nations to rebuild their own economies so that they could be maintained and extended as markets for US goods. Such political and economic dependency on the USA meant that European nations were less likely to succumb to communism.

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that the Truman Doctrine was a defensive measure designed to protect the USA's European allies from Soviet expansionism, in line with the stark warnings given in Kennan's 'Long Telegram' and Churchill's 'iron curtain' speech. Similarly, the Marshall Plan could be seen as a genuine attempt by the USA to support its European allies in rebuilding their economies and defending themselves against communism expansionism. This reflects the views of traditional/orthodox historians that Truman was merely reacting defensively to Stalin's aggressive policies in Eastern Europe.

- 3 **How far did détente in the 1970s achieve a genuine relaxation of tensions between the USA and the USSR?**

It could be argued that little substantial was achieved during the period of détente. Armaments increased and many of the signed agreements were ignored (e.g. Helsinki Agreement, SALT II). Tension between the USSR and China remained high. Conflict increased in the Third World. The USSR extended its influence during détente (e.g. Iran, Angola and Afghanistan). Those on the political right in the USA increasingly viewed détente as a sign of US weakness in the face of communist expansionism and as allowing the USSR to continue the Cold War without US interference. The development of renewed superpower rivalry can be seen as early as 1976. Even during détente the USSR was encouraging communist movements across the world, while the USA was increasing the supply of arms to anti-communist groups (e.g. El Salvador, Nicaragua). The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 was the final straw.

In order to achieve balance, it could be argued that détente was a welcome relief from the dangerous confrontations of the 1960s and did much to reduce tensions. The USSR had achieved virtual parity with the USA in nuclear weapons, and it suited both superpowers to contemplate arms limitations agreements. The USSR saw détente as an opportunity to restore its flagging control over Eastern Europe, to gain access to western technologies to boost her industry, to maintain better relations with the USA at a time when Sino-Soviet relations were poor and to divert resources away from arms and into social and economic ventures. The USA was coming to terms with failure in Vietnam and the realisation that it could no longer police the world. The oil crisis of 1973 added impetus to the need to seek mutual understanding. The SALT Treaties and the Helsinki Agreement signified better relations. In 1972, West Germany accepted the existence of East Germany. Thus, while détente ended with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, vital work had been done to improve relations between the USA and the USSR; work which was to help pave the way for future agreements and the eventual ending of the Cold War.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697

4 Should the outcome of the Korean War be seen as a victory or a defeat for the USA?

Arguments which imply victory might include that the USA's original aim of protecting South Korea from communism had been achieved. Truman was able to claim that communism had been successfully contained in Korea, and that this, together with US rearmament, would dissuade world communism from further aggression. The USA gained international prestige at the height of the Cold War by claiming to have worked together with the UN to reverse an act of communist aggression.

Arguments which imply defeat might include that 'roll-back' had clearly failed, and led to fundamental splits in the US leadership regarding policy. Many Republicans claimed that the USA had missed an opportunity to destroy communism in China; this contributed to some of the later excesses of McCarthyism. China had prevented the unification of Korea and was now clearly a world power. The fact that the PRC was still denied a seat at the UN seemed even more unreasonable now. The outcome of the Korean War brought a new dimension to the Cold War. US relations were now permanently strained with China as well as the USSR. This posed future threats to US interests in Asia, forcing the USA to establish SEATO. China also posed a new threat to US interests in Europe, Africa and Latin America. Fuel had been added to the USSR's claim that the UN was merely a 'tool of the capitalists'. The USA had taken little account of the desires of the Korean people themselves.

5 'Nationalist uprisings in Eastern Europe in the 1980s were an effect not a cause of the disintegration of the Soviet Union.' Discuss.

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that the main reason for the disintegration of the USSR was long-term economic stagnation, and political inertia under elderly and ineffective leaders. Moreover, the hard-line adopted by Ronald Reagan and the West, together with an enhancement of the USA's nuclear programme which the USSR was economically unable to match, encouraged Gorbachev to seek improved relations with the West. In a desperate attempt to address these problems, Gorbachev instituted a series of reforms, in particular glasnost and perestroika. In providing extra freedoms, these reforms encouraged latent nationalist movements both in Eastern Europe and within the Soviet Union itself, while also contributing to political upheaval within the Communist Party. It was Gorbachev's abandonment of the Brezhnev Doctrine, primarily for reasons of economic necessity, which gave added impetus to the nationalist uprisings in Eastern Europe, enabling them to proceed largely unchallenged.

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that nationalist uprisings in Eastern Europe were largely due to increasing exposure to Western culture, technology and propaganda. Eastern Europeans were able to compare their own economically disadvantaged situation with the prosperity of Western Europe. The speed with which changes occurred throughout Eastern Europe following the success of Solidarity in Poland in 1988 was the key factor in hastening the collapse of the USSR. Communist governments were quickly removed in Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Romania. This encouraged nationalist uprisings within the Soviet Union itself (e.g. Nagorno-Karabakh, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia). The USSR's inability to respond decisively and effectively led to political divisions within the Communist Party, and it was these which led to the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697

6 How far did the threat of nuclear war recede during the 1960s?

In support of the view that the 1960s witnessed a reduction in the threat of nuclear war, it could be argued that the Cuban missile crisis had exposed the dangers of brinkmanship and the concept of mutually assured destruction (MAD) emerged. Both Kennedy and Khrushchev had been desperate to find a face-saving solution to the crisis in order to avoid nuclear war. Both the USA and the USSR appreciated the need for better relations to avoid the threat of future nuclear confrontation. The hot-line telephone link was established between leaders of USA and USSR in 1963 with the aim of preventing future misunderstanding. The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty signed by the USA, USSR and Britain in 1963 (attempts to sign a similar treaty in 1961 had been rejected by the USSR). Also the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 was designed to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear states.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that one of the reasons why Khrushchev had placed nuclear weapons in Cuba was his fear that the USSR lagged behind the USA in terms of nuclear weapons. MAD was based on the assumption that the USA and the USSR had sufficient nuclear weapons to ensure security – any development by one side necessitated a similar or improved development by the other. The USSR was determined to catch up with the USA – the increased development of Soviet ICBMs and SLBMs. The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was only a limited ban and did not prevent the testing of nuclear weapons. Likewise, the Non-Proliferation Treaty had significant limitations and did not prevent some countries developing their own nuclear capabilities. For instance, China tested its first nuclear weapon in 1964.

7 How far was Japan’s economic miracle dependent on the guiding role played by the Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI)?

It could be argued that the creation of MITI (Ministry of International Trade and Industry) in 1949 was vital to Japan’s economic miracle. Its mission was to address the problems of rising inflation and falling productivity by coordinating Japan’s international trade policy. By working closely with other key institutions, such as the Bank of Japan, MITI facilitated the early development of nearly all major industries by providing protection from import competition, technological intelligence, help in licensing foreign technology, access to foreign exchange and assistance in mergers. It provided industries with administrative guidance and other direction, both formal and informal, on modernisation, technology, investments in new plant and equipment, and domestic and foreign competition.

In challenging the view that Japan’s economic miracle was dependent on the role of MITI, it could be argued that political stability, provided by the Liberal Democratic Party from 1952 to 1993 was the key factor. Favourable external factors were also critical; for example support from the USA, which saw Japan as a bulwark against communism in Southeast Asia. Favourable trading arrangements were agreed between Japan and the USA, and while the USA provided security, Japan could concentrate on industrial investment. The Korean War also provided enhanced markets for Japanese products. The fact that much of Japan’s industry had been destroyed in WWII meant that it could rebuild with modern, high-tech equipment.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697

8 'That so many African states have found it difficult to achieve political and stability since independence is a consequence of colonialism.' How far do you agree

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that African politicians lacked experience in parliamentary democracy because of colonial rule. Most African leaders who had taken part in guerrilla campaigns before independence had been influenced by Marxist ideas, which often led them to set up one-party states. While this worked well in some states (e.g. Kenya, Tanzania), it often led to violence as the only way to oppose a government (e.g. military coup in Ghana). Many African states were economically under-developed with little industry. This had been deliberate policy by colonial powers, so that Africans would have to buy manufactured goods from Europe or the USA. The role of colonies was to supply food and raw materials. After independence, many African states relied on one or two commodities for export and were vulnerable to a fall in world prices. After independence, many African states remained dependent on Western European countries and the USA for markets and investments. African states often consisted of different tribes, which had been held together by colonial rulers. With independence, there was little to keep the tribes together, leading to inter-tribal violence and, in some cases, civil war (e.g. Nigeria, Congo/Zaire, Burundi and Rwanda).

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that the Cold War impacted on many African states, often leading to military intervention e.g. Angola. The leaders of many African states were corrupt, abused power and squandered development aid in order to enrich themselves and their followers. Many African states have found it difficult to extend control over countries with relatively low population densities and the population widely dispersed. This has made it difficult to construct states in the traditional European model. There was a decline in the international economy in the 1980s which hit all African states and led to a decline in demand for traditional African products such as copper and cobalt. African states suffered from the debt crisis, and were forced to economise by the IMF in return for further loans. This led to increased domestic food prices at a time when unemployment was rising. Since African states depended on exports, there were often shortages of food. Many states lacked capital and skills and many suffered from the severe drought of 1982–5, which led to crop failures, deaths of livestock and famine.