



MARKSCHEME

November 2000

HISTORY - AFRICA

Higher Level

Paper 3

Notes on Individual Questions

These notes must be read in conjunction with the current marks bands.

- 1. Explain the causes and analyse the results of any *one* ‘jihad’ which took place before 1900.**

Causes

Whichever ‘jihad’ is chosen a general point which could be made is that Islamic empires in Africa had been in decline since the late sixteenth century. Late in the eighteenth century a broad movement of Islamic reform began which affected large parts of Sudanic Africa under leaders like Uthman dan Fodio, Al-Hajj-Umar and Muhammed Ahmad (The Mahdi). These reforms were fed by Islamic brotherhoods like the Qadiriyya and the Tijaniyya. Each of the three ‘jihads’ under leaders mentioned above also had specific causes, some religious but many social and/or political. The most powerful motive was the desire to ‘purify’ Islam and gain new adherents. Explanations of both types of cause, general and specific, should be included in good answers.

Results

All ‘jihads’ resulted in the creation of new states (the Sokoto Caliphate, the Tukolor Empire, and the Mahdist State), the strengthening of Islam and increased trading activities. Some details of these results will also be needed in answers meriting a ‘good’ or ‘very good’ mark, **[14-16 marks]** or above. Answers which omit either causes or results will probably score about **[8 marks]** at best. Those that are thin on both parts but explain some causes and identify some results could be worth **[8-10 marks]**, and with more detail **[11-13 marks]**.

- 2. With reference to *either* East or West Africa assess the relative importance of the factors that helped the campaign against the sea-borne slave trade and those that obstructed its progress.**

The key phrase here is ‘assess the **relative** importance’. Answers which do not make a real effort to respond to this instruction will not deserve to reach a mark of **[14 marks]** and above. Good answers will probably concentrate on the relative importance of religious/moral factors on the one hand and economic factors on the other. Both parts of the question must be answered for a mark of **[12 marks]** or above. Note also that material used in answers must be restricted to **either** East **or** West Africa. Narrative accounts might reach **[8-10 marks]** with implicit assessment and **[11-13 marks]** with more explicit analysis.

3. Compare and contrast the contributions of Johannes IV and Menelik II to the unity, modernisation and security of Ethiopia.

Compare/contrast questions are most effectively answered by a running, point by point answer, not by two end-on accounts of the work of the two rulers with a token reference to similarities and differences tacked on at the end of the answer. Both rulers made major contributions to unity and security in different ways. Menelik, after unity and security had been largely ensured, made the biggest contributions to modernisation in many fields. Candidates are not explicitly asked to assess the relative importance of the contributions of the two men, but there will be no harm in including an attempt to do this as part of the conclusion. For a mark of *[14+ marks]* look for accurate knowledge, some balance between comparison and contrast, and an understanding of the finer points of the skilful diplomacy of the two men in averting confrontations and provocations between 1872 and 1889. Seriously unbalanced answers which concentrate too heavily on one or other of the two rulers might score *[8-10 marks]*, and better end-on accounts with an adequate section bringing out the similarities and differences *[11-13 marks]*. If only Johannes IV or Menelik II is addressed *[8 marks]* cannot be reached.

4. Account for the emergence of the Ndebele state under Mzilikazi and analyse its main features.

This requires a two part answer. The first part requires a factual answer with appropriate explanations of the Ndebele migration northwards from Natal led by Mzilikazi to escape the wrath of Shaka Zulu. The largely successful outcome was explained by the advantages resulting from the fact that the Ndebele had adopted the military and other reforms that had made the Zulu state such a formidable force in Southern Africa.

The second part of the answer requires an analysis of the main features of the Ndebele state. The dominant military nature of the state should emerge clearly, and the political, economic and social features should receive reasonably balanced treatment. If all the requirements are adequately met answers will deserve a mark in the *[14-16+ mark]*; *[8-10 marks]* might be awarded to narrative accounts which have implicit analysis and *[11-13 marks]* to those which do explain the emergence of the state and give more explicit analysis of its main features.

5. Explain why any one state in West Africa became powerful and efficient in the pre-colonial period.

The key instructions here are ‘explain...’; and the restriction of the answer to the pre-colonial period. The content of answers will depend on the candidate’s choice of state. The most likely choices will probably be Dahomey, Asante, or the Mandinka Empire. Whatever the choice, answers should include: reference to quality of leadership; efficiency of administration; economic and military strength with appropriate details to explain the power and efficiency of the chosen state. Where all these elements are included and adequately and accurately documented a mark of *[14+ marks]* will be in order. A narrative account where supporting assessment is inadequate *[8-10 marks]* and *[11-13 marks]* for adequate factual accounts with explanations.

6. Compare and contrast Shaka Zulu (c. 1787 to 1828) and Mosheshwe (c. 1785 to 1870) of the Sotho as state builders.

See the note at the beginning of question 3 about the most acceptable approach to compare/contrast questions. The most significant difference between Shaka and Mosheshwe as state builders is that the former was an aggressive state builder and the latter a defensive one. Both were helped by, or took advantage of, the Mfecane and of relations with traders and/or missionaries from outside Africa. Both depended heavily on military strength and Shaka introduced radical military reforms. In Shaka's case these were accompanied by social and political reforms. In contrast Mosheshwe was assisted by the mountainous character of the terrain in defending and consolidating his country. Mosheshwe provided a refuge for those fleeing from Shaka. The latter expanded and strengthened Zululand by attacking and absorbing others along with their lands.

Reward candidates who have the right approach to this type of question and who identify correctly similarities and differences between the two men as state builders, with a mark of **[14-16 marks]** or higher. Candidates who give two separate accounts with little active comparison/contrast beyond a short conclusion will barely deserve to pass: **[8-10 marks]** depending on the quality of the conclusion but with a strong conclusion perhaps **[11-13 marks]**. If only one is addressed **[8 marks]** cannot be reached.

7. Assess the importance of the contribution of two of the following in the European 'scramble' for Africa: the activities of Leopold II in the Congo Basin; the British occupation of Egypt; the Berlin West Africa Conference.

The key phrase here is: 'Assess the importance...'. The best candidates might use the introduction to point out how, before the 1880s, most European powers were reluctant, for reasons of expense, to annex African territory. They were content to make profits by trading with Africa - the concept of 'informal empire' or of 'profit without responsibility'. This approach was rendered difficult or impossible by developments between *circa* 1875 and 1885. These included the three listed in the question. A chain of events was set in motion which ended only when almost the whole of the African continent had been colonised. Answers which explain these events and the way in which they were interlinked and show how they accelerated the momentum for annexation will deserve a high mark. Candidates who ignore the key phrase and make little attempt to assess the importance of the two they have chosen will probably score **[8-10 marks]**, **[11-13 marks]** might be obtained by factual accounts with some emphasis on importance, and **[14-16+ marks]** for structured answers which assess the importance of the two chosen events.

8. 'The response of Africans to European penetration and conquest had little or no influence on the treatment of Africans by the colonial powers.' How far is this claim confirmed by events in any one region of Africa between 1890 and 1910?

Some historians have claimed that Africans who collaborated with Europeans received better treatment than those who resisted. 'Collaborators were gainers; resisters were losers.' It should not be difficult, however, to dispute this view and confirm the claim contained in the title by showing how sometimes those who resisted were 'gainers' and those who collaborated were 'losers'. The question is, however, open-ended and answers that attempt to dispute the claim should be judged on their merit. Answers that present a well argued, persuasive case based on accurate evidence from examples of different African responses and subsequent treatment by Europeans will deserve a mark of **[14-16+ marks]**. Additional credit may be deserved when the evidence given relates to different colonial powers. Basic narrative answers of perhaps two colonies could score **[8-10 marks]**, and with more focus on African response **[11-13 marks]**.

- 9. What were the similarities and differences between the Hehe and Maji Maji Risings in German East Africa? Reference should be made to the causes, and results of the *two* risings.**

Again see the note at the beginning of question 3 on the most acceptable approach to questions of this type. Candidates who adopt a running, point by point approach, will deserve more marks than those who write two end-on sections, one on the Hehe and one on the Maji Maji, ending with a token attempt to identify similarities and differences. Answers of this type will deserve to reach the *[8-10 marks]* or *[11-13 marks]* with a very good concluding section.

In both sections - causes and results - differences are likely to outnumber similarities. The most basic difference to be noted is that the Hehe Rising was an initial primary resistance whilst the Maji Maji Rising was a post-pacification primary resistance. Under each section it should be possible to note both differences and similarities but the former will tend to dominate answers. It is important, however, that the two risings should receive balanced treatment. Answers in which material on one of the two risings is too dominant will not get beyond the *[11-13 mark]* band. If only the Hehe or the Maji Maji are tackled, *[8 marks]* cannot be reached. Answers with an acceptable approach and accurate identification of similarities and differences under each section will deserve a high mark *[14-16+ marks]*.

- 10. In what ways and for what reasons was Ashante a troubled region during the nineteenth and early twentieth century?**

Troubles and problems for Ashante included: wars against the Fanti; the abolition of the slave trade; wars against the British largely because of the slave trade, in 1831 and in 1874. Disturbances 1895 to 1896 ended in the establishment of a British protectorate, the exile of Prempeh I and in 1901 Britain annexed Ashante. Prempeh was allowed to return in 1924. The rule of Prempeh, 1888 to 1896, and 1926 to 1931, could be considered.

A narrative of the region and timescale could score *[8-10 marks]* with at least implicit attention to a 'troubled region', and *[11-13 marks]* with explicit focus within the narrative of the nature of and reasons for, the problems. *[14-16+ marks]* answers should be more structural and analytical. Some candidates may concentrate on Prempeh, allow this, but demand mention of some earlier material, *e.g.* the slave trade for answers in the higher bands.

11. For what reasons and with what success did Lewanika of the Lozi collaborate with the British?

Reasons for collaboration could include

- the hope of gaining European support and protection in the event of (a) further internal trouble after he had recovered his power in 1885; and (b) against attacks from the Ndebele, the Portuguese and the Boers;
- the expectation that European missionaries would provide education and other western skills to his country;
- the advice he had sought and received from Khama of Bechuanaland who had placed himself and his country under British protection in 1885. Khama was left initially to rule his country without interference.

With what successes might include that in some respects Lewanika was misled about his new relationship with the British. In 1890 he believed that he was negotiating with a representative of Queen Victoria, but discovered that Lochner was acting for the British South Africa Company. In 1900 Lewanika finally negotiated a new treaty by which he was recognised as Paramount Chief of the Lozi over whom he was to exercise considerable power until his death in 1916. By then, however, his authority had been reduced and most of the promises of help from the Company had not materialised. It can be argued, however, that as a result of the defeat of the Ndebele by the British he was not again attacked by the Ndebele and was safe from threats from the Boers and other European powers. Though the final outcome was that his country lost its independence he and his people had reached this position by a less painful route than Lobengula and the Ndebele. When both parts of the question are reasonably balanced and answered accurately [*14-16+ marks*] could be scored. A narrative account without balance and accuracy might not reach [*8 marks*], but if accurate [*8-10 marks*], and [*11-13 marks*] for answers with adequate focus on collaboration and success.

12. Explain the relationship between any *one* African people south of the Zambezi and any European power between 1879 and 1907.

The most likely choices here are the Ndebele or the Zulus, though others are available. Note the time frame. The terminal date is chosen to include the Zulu Rising of 1906. Given the wide choice open to candidates the general criteria should be used for guidance in marking this question with basically narrative answers with implicit explanation [*8-10 marks*], more explicit explanation [*11-13 marks*], and [*14-16+ marks*] with focus, structure and analysis.

13. How and why did relations between the Afrikaners (Boers) and the British deteriorate between 1877 and 1899?

A narrative approach would be acceptable for [*8-10 marks*], and providing it is interspersed with explanations of the developing relations in the period between the British occupation of the Transvaal in 1877 and the outbreak of the Second Boer War in 1899 [*11-13 marks*]. A brief summary of the state of relations immediately before 1877 with an explanation of the British occupation/annexation of the Transvaal in that year would be relevant and deserve some credit as an introduction. [*14-16+ marks*] could be awarded for comprehensive coverage, accurate material and quality explanations.

14. Analyse the similarities and differences between the French system of association and the British system of indirect rule.

The note at the beginning of question 3 applies also to this question. There are more differences than similarities between the two systems. They were similar only in the sense that, in both, Africans worked alongside Europeans and the Europeans were in control. The British, as far as possible, used traditional African rulers/chiefs and institutions in the administration of their territories. The French, in principle, believed it was best to use Europeans. In practice Europeans were often not available and the French were forced to use Africans, preferably educated Africans. Since there were fewer educated Africans in French than in British territories they sometimes used traditional rulers. The French, however, did this in the last resort and usually only for filling the less important posts. The British did it by choice because they believed it to be the 'best' and cheapest system. The British deliberately excluded the educated élite from the administration. In the system of association, traditional rulers, when used, exercised their authority not by right of their traditional role but as appointees of the French. It should be remembered that both systems had to be flexible and take into account local circumstances. In some areas (*e.g.* in Iboland in South East Nigeria) no traditional chiefs existed. Here the British appointed or 'invented' them and called them 'warrant chiefs'. In these circumstances the two systems became very similar.

Candidates who show an accurate, sophisticated understanding of the two systems will deserve marks in the top bands [**14-16+ marks**]. Those who are aware of some of the differences will deserve a mark in the [**8-10 marks**] or [**11-13 marks**]. Those with still less understanding and sweeping generalisations will probably not reach [**8 marks**].

15. Why and to what extent did the Second World War promote African nationalism?

The main reasons were:

- the war brought Africans into contact with the people of Britain or France as serving soldiers in greater numbers than ever before. This exploded the myth of the superiority of white people over black people. Defeats inflicted on the colonial powers by non-white people (*e.g.* the Japanese) had the same effect.
- Africans serving in allied armies travelled to European countries and had the opportunity to learn about the systems of government in those countries. Many returned home after the war knowing something about democracy and political parties. After the war politics in the colonies of France and Britain began to change rapidly with the emergence of mass political parties led in many cases by very able African leaders.
- For their part the morale of the colonial powers had been dealt severe blows, sometimes by the non-white peoples of Asia, particularly the Japanese. In addition their economies had been severely weakened by the cost of the war and they were in no position to support large colonial empires any longer.
- After the war the USA and Russia, who had been allies of Britain and France vied with each other in denouncing colonialism. This attitude of the two great powers encouraged Africans to campaign for independence and thus fuelled African nationalism.

Candidates who develop these points and illustrate them with specific examples will deserve [**14-16+ marks**]. At least two, well developed and illustrated, will be required for a mark in the [**11-13 mark**] band, and narrative/descriptive answers which only use general ideas, might score [**8-10 marks**].

16. Evaluate the factors that helped and those that hindered progress to independence in Tanganyika and Kenya.

In Tanganyika the factors that helped progress were dominant; in Kenya the reverse was true.

Tanganyika

Factors that helped:

- the existence of a single, dominant nationalist party, TANU;
- the able leadership of Nyerere who pursued a peaceful, nonconfrontational campaign for independence through TANU;
- the absence of serious tribal rivalry;
- the absence of a large settler population in the country;
- the UN Trusteeship status of the territory which required Britain to report on progress towards independence annually.

Factors that hindered:

- the poverty of the country and lack of economic development which, coupled with the limited number of educated adults, raised questions about the country's ability to run its own affairs.

Kenya

Factors that hindered:

- the violent episode of MauMau which began in 1952. Britain refused to hold any independence negotiations until the emergency was over;
- the emergency resulted in the imprisonment of Kenyatta, the most able leader, from 1953 to 1959 and led to rivalries in leadership amongst the nationalists who were free;
- the rivalry between the two largest tribes, the Kikuyu and the Luo, and the remaining smaller tribes represented respectively by KANU and KADU;
- the presence of a large settler population reluctant to surrender their power to the African majority;
- Britain feared Civil War between the two rival political parties, KANU and KADU.

In these circumstances Tanganyika became independent in 1962, a year before Kenya. Candidates who identify some of these factors and understand that the situation in the two countries was very different should gain a mark of **[14-16 marks]** and higher band if many are evaluated. **[8-10 marks]** answers will tend to narrate and evaluation will be implicit, but with explicit evaluation award **[11-13 marks]**.

17. Examine the factors which led to independence for French colonies in West Africa in the second half of the twentieth century.

Key factors include: French weakened by World War Two; French policy of assimilation – weakened by British devolution declaration, 1951; French policies under de Gaulle, 1958 referendum; Guinea’s vote against referendum; growth of pan-Africanism inside colonies and as pressure on France; 1960 change of French policy to offer of international sovereignty; 1961 de Gaulle declared decolonization was French policy.

A chronological narrative of some of the above with implicit explanation could score **[8-10 marks]**, and **[11-13 marks]** with explicit examination of the factors. **[14-16 marks]** could be scored by a thorough analysis of most of the above factors, either in their chronological sequence, or structured under Africa, France and outside forces (*e.g.* United Nations, US influence). Those who are able to include the nationalist drive within individual countries could reach the top band.

18. Why did independence come to Nigeria three years later than to Ghana?

The following points played a part in the explanation and some should be expected in good answers:

- the granting of independence in Nigeria was delayed mainly by regional and tribal differences which were reflected in the existence of three political parties; the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons (NCNC), initially in favour of establishing a centralised, united Nigeria but eventually dominated by the Ibo people of the SE region; the Action Group, a Yoruba party based in the western region; the Northern People’s Congress representing the interests of the large northern region. Disagreement and mistrust between the parties about a centralised state or a loose Federation; the backward nature of the northern Islamic region compared with the more progressive western and eastern regions. Britain announced that there would be no independence until all three regions had attained self-government. Northern region independence in 1959 and Nigeria in 1960.

Ghana meanwhile, had already achieved independence in 1957. Her more rapid progress was explained by:

- Nkrumah’s skill as leader of the main nationalist party, the Convention People’s Party (CPP);
- the good understanding between Governor Arden-Clarke and Nkrumah;
- though ethnic differences existed between the Asante and the northern regions, and the southerners who dominated the CPP, these ethnic fears were not as serious as those in Nigeria. The Asante and the northerners set up a new party, the National Liberation Movement, and campaigned for a federal state instead of the unitary state favoured by Nkrumah and the CPP.

[8-10 marks] will probably narrate the independence of both, **[11-13 marks]** will have more focus on differences, hence the later date, and **[14-16+ marks]** will be gained by those who structure and focus their answers to explain the three year gap.

19. Explain the causes and analyse the results of any *one* African ‘war of liberation’.

Candidates have a choice of several options here including the wars in Algeria, Mozambique, Angola and Zimbabwe. The explanation of the causes and the analysis of the results will vary with the choice made. A mark in the top bands should be awarded only when there is a reasonable balance and analysis of the two parts of the answer. For an *[8-10 marks]* answer candidates may write all they know about their chosen war of liberation, *[11-13 marks]* ones will also contain explicit explanation of causes and results. For *[14-16 marks]* and higher answer should be structured and analytical.

20. How and why did the organisation, tactics and policies of the African National Congress (ANC) in South Africa change between 1945 and 1990?

At the outset candidates will need to set out the main features of the ANC before 1945. These were:

- it was small, elitist, and open only to educated Africans;
- committed to a policy of non-violence;
- membership restricted to Africans.

The catalyst for change was the National Party’s victory in the 1948 elections which heralded the establishment of full-scale apartheid backed by massive discriminatory legislation. The old tactics and organisation of the ANC had achieved no success in improving the position of Africans before 1948 and were even less likely to do so under the new regime. The main changes which developed were:

- under Albert Luthuli, a large party with mass appeal;
- adopted the tactics of large scale passive resistance from 1952;
- it welcomed support from non-Africans, both individuals and organisations (*e.g.* Asians and whites; Congress of the People, Freedom Charter 1955);
- Government response until 1980 was to pass more oppressive laws, the ANC under Nelson Mandela argued that non-violence should be abandoned;
- in the early 60s the ANC was banned. The leadership from exile was committed to the ‘armed struggle’ against apartheid, international support and attempts to make the African townships ungovernable.
- These tactics were succeeding and the government recognised that they could not win the armed struggle.
- Nelson Mandela released from prison in 1990 negotiations for constitutional reform lead to the end of apartheid and the creation of a non-racial state.

Do not expect all the above. Chronological narrative is acceptable with only implicit focus on how and why *[8-10 marks]*, more explicit *[11-13 marks]*, and analysis of change *[14-16+ marks]*.

21. 'The social, economic and political problems of Africa's newly independent states cannot be blamed solely on the legacy of the colonial period.' With reference to *one* state show how far you agree with this view.

Because of the wide choice available to candidates little guidance can be given on the content that might be expected. Again the general criteria should be used as a guide to the most appropriate mark. It would be difficult to argue persuasively against the view in the quote but attempts to do so should be judged on their merits. Narrative answers describing problems could score [8-10 marks], with more focus on blame [11-13 marks], and with specific detail and analysis of the causes of problems [14-16 marks].

22. Assess the achievements of *either* Gamal Abdul Nasser *or* Jomo Kenyatta.

For Nasser a suitable structure would be:

To divide his achievements into domestic and foreign and the latter into those in Africa and elsewhere.

Domestic achievements:

- He played a leading role in the Free Officers' Revolution which overthrew the monarchy, set up the Egyptian Republic, and became President from 1954 until his death in 1970.
- He consolidated the new republic by outlawing the conservative Muslim Brotherhood and imprisoning its leaders.
- He carried out a programme of social and economic reforms including:
 - land reforms at the expense of the great landowners;
 - industrial reforms;
 - nationalisation of banks, insurance companies and major industries;
 - nationalisation of the Suez Canal;
 - construction of the Aswan Dam which led to an extension of productive arable land.

Assessment:

A limited social and economic revolution but great inequalities still remained in Egyptian society.

Foreign achievements:

in Africa:

- he helped Africans to throw off the colonial yoke;
- he offered sanctuary and hospitality to the representatives of revolutionary governments in exile *e.g.* Algerians from the FLN.

Assessment:

He was looked up to as a liberator and a champion of Africans still under colonial rule.

Elsewhere:

- he followed a policy of nonalignment at the Bandung Conference in 1955;
- the anti-Western aspects of the nationalisation of Suez and the construction of the Aswan Dam added enormously to Nasser's and Egypt's prestige in the international field;
- 'Nasserism' enabled him to play a leading role in the Arab world and the Middle East as shown by the creation of the United Arab Republic with Syria and his support for Pan Arabism and for independence movements in North Africa;
- his one great failure was in 1967 in the Six Day War with Israel.

Assessment:

He became a world figure in international affairs.

Kenyatta

His achievements can be conveniently divided into those of the pre- and post-independence periods:

Pre-independence:

- he became a champion of protest against colonialism from the late 1920s and his long periods of residence abroad gave him rare insights into international politics. He became a prominent figure in Kenyan nationalism as President of the KAU on his return to Kenya in 1946.

In 1952 he was arrested and imprisoned at the beginning of the MauMau emergency. He was out of active politics until November 1961 (though he had been nominated as President of KANU whilst still restricted). He was elected as a member of the Legislative Council in December 1961 and played a leading part in negotiations leading to independence in December 1963.

Post-independence

- Kenyatta became Kenya's first Prime Minister. He showed magnanimity to the white settlers and sought good relations with Britain and the West generally;
- in 1964 Kenya became a one-party state when KADU dissolved itself (though a new party, the Kenya People's Union (KPU) was formed by the Luo leader Oginga Odinga);
- in 1967 Kenya joined Tanzania and Uganda in the East African Community to cooperate in economic, social and cultural fields. The Community split up in 1977, a year before Kenyatta's death, partly because of ideological differences between Kenyatta and Nyerere;
- the government became increasingly authoritarian and corrupt after the assassination of Tom Mboya, a Luo, in 1969;
- popular discontent with the government;
- Kenyatta died in 1978, one of the world's richest men in a country where many were living in poverty.

Assessment:

The verdict on Kenyatta's achievements must be mixed.

Contribution to Kenya's independence. His achievements after independence marred by his authoritarianism, his own and his party's corruption and the undermining of democracy. Claims to economic progress in a mixed economy were accompanied by a growing gulf between rich and poor.

Answers on either of the two leaders which cover some of the main achievements set out here and are accompanied by assessments, compatible with the evidence and noting weaknesses as well as strengths, will deserve **[14-16 marks]**, or higher when balanced, *e.g.* with failures. **[8-10 marks]** will perhaps narrate all they know and **[11-13 marks]** will have added comments of assessment.

23. Assess the contribution of any *one* Central African ruler to the solution of his country's problems since independence.

The most likely choices here are Banda in Malawi; Kaunda in Zambia; Mobutu in Zaire. A necessary base for a good answer to this question will be an analysis of the chosen country's problems since independence. Political, economic and social problems should all be included if the answer is to be a full one. Some reference might be expected as to how far these problems were part of the colonial legacy, and how far they were created, or at least increased, by the ruler himself. None of the three rulers mentioned was more than partially successful in solving his country's problems and all three were responsible for stirring up increased opposition to their rule. In all three cases evaluations of the ruler's contribution to solving his country's problems should be critical of aspects of their work if answers are to deserve a mark in one of the top two bands. All three were ultimately rejected by their people in spite of the authoritarian nature of the regimes they had created. Allow any other ruler. Award **[8-10 marks]** for a narrative with implicit assessment of contribution to solution of problems, **[11-13 marks]** with explicit assessment and **[14-16+ marks]** with some depth of assessment in an answer fully focused on problems and solutions.

24. How do you account for the length and stability of the government of *either* Leopold Senghor in Senegal *or* Felix Houphouet-Boigny in the Ivory Coast?

Some factors are common to both leaders.

Common factors

- Both already had long established prestige in their respective countries as leaders in the struggle for independence.
- Both had served as members of the French Assembly, and Houphouet-Boigny as a member of the French cabinet (1956-59) after severing his links with the French Communist Party, hence both had close connections with France and French politicians. They were trusted as moderates by 1960 when, at independence, each became President of his country.
- After independence French expatriates continued to hold positions in many fields, particularly in education and commerce.
- France also continued to keep a military presence in each country (a military base in Dakar and garrisons in Ivory coast) and this helps to explain the survival of the two leaders in times of crisis which threatened their position of leadership. (In Senegal, Senghor's position was challenged in the early years after independence, whilst Houphouet-Boigny's position was challenged several times in the 1970s.

Different factors

- Senghor skilfully attracted much of the political opposition to switch allegiance to his own party (Union Progressive Sénégalaise) by 1966 and in the 1970s was secure enough to legalise the position of several opposition parties which were subsequently defeated in democratic elections but he was threatened by economic crises.
- Houphouet-Boigny banned all opposition parties and formed a one party state (Parti Démocratique de la Côte d'Ivoire). He has survived with an astute mixture of reconciliation and persuasion and suppressed serious opposition.

NB The question asks for one or the other - not both.

A narrative account may be worth **[8-10 marks]**, or **[11-13 marks]** with focus on longevity and stability. **[14-16+ marks]** will focus on these elements and analyse reasons for them.

25. Why was the East African Community established in 1967 and why did it break up in 1977?

Why set up in 1967

The AEC was the successor to two previous organisations: the East African High Commission (1948) and the East African Common Services Organisation (1961). Both were set up before any EA country became independent. Their purpose was to bring about closer unity and co-operation between the three member countries in customs, postal services, communications, higher education. The Phillip's Committee Report of 1967 recommended the setting up of the East African Community for co-operation in the following fields:

- Education/cultural, including school leaving examinations;
- transport: railways and airlines;
- telecommunications and postal services;
- banking; common currency;
- trade between the three countries, to include free trade in agricultural products.

Considerable progress until the mid 1970s when serious differences began to undermine the work of the Community.

Reasons for break up

- A growing feeling in Tanzania and Uganda that Kenya benefited most from the organisation and its activities. Most of the Community's offices were in Nairobi. Kenya's healthier and more diversified economic position brought her significant advantages.
- Differences in political/economic ideologies and personal differences between the three heads of state increased tension and made co-operation increasingly difficult, especially after the overthrow of Obote by Amin.
- A series of unilateral actions by member states in 1977 (*e.g.* the closure of the Tanzanian/Kenyan border by Tanzania disrupted the tourist trade) led to complete break down of the Community's work. If the two parts of the question are answered on these lines a mark of **[14-16 marks]** would be in order.

If only one part of the question is answered mark out of **[12 marks]**. Narrative accounts of the establishment and break up could score **[8-10 marks]** with implicit reasoning and **[11-13 marks]** with explicit explanations.
