

# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2004**

**HISTORY – AFRICA**

**Higher Level**

**Paper 3**

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of IBCA.*

**1. Assess the relative importance of economic and other factors that contributed to the abolition of the slave trade from *either* West Africa *or* East Africa.**

The key phrase here is “assess the relative importance of”, and answers which do not make an effort to respond to this instruction will not deserve to reach a mark of **[8]**, particularly if they do not identify other factors (*e.g.* moral/religious/strategic/humanitarian) besides economic ones that promoted abolition. Note also that material in answers should be from either West or East Africa **not** both.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative answers with only implicit reference to relative importance.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers with more explicit reference to relative importance of economic and other factors.

**[14+ marks]** for answers with a good balance of material and some detailed evidence to support conclusions on relative importance.

**2. Compare and contrast the achievements of Tewodros II and Johannis IV as rulers of Ethiopia.**

The best approach will take the form of a running comparison/contrast between the two rulers with references to various aspects of their work and achievements, point by point. Answers which write two separate accounts of their work and leave the task of comparing and contrasting to the examiner will deserve much less credit. A summary of the aims of each would make a good introduction. These were very similar: the need to revive and consolidate the power of the Emperor and to create and maintain a large, well equipped standing army to defend the country from foreign and domestic enemies – but Johannis was much more successful in the execution of these aims. The fact that Johannis learned much from Tewodros’ mistakes points to contrasts between the two: Johannis replaced a centralized system with a federal one; he used diplomacy and marriage alliances and negotiated compromises rather than force to win the support of the provincial Rases; he avoided confrontations with the church and repaired the damage done by Tewodros’ church reforms. Above all Johannis used his army against external enemies – the Egyptians, the Mahdists and the Italians with great success. The conclusion might emphasize the relative stability of Johannis’ legacy to Menelik in contrast to the chaos and insecurity and the disputed succession left by Tewodros’ suicide.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for unbalanced answers showing little knowledge of one of the rulers and giving two end-on accounts.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers which show a more balanced and comparative approach.

**[14+ marks]** for well balanced, well documented answers focused on point by point comparison/contrast.

**3. Explain the rise and fall of the Mahdist state in the Sudan.**

**Rise**

The establishment of the Mahdist state could not have happened without the religious fervour stirred up by the charismatic leadership of the Mahdi. This lay at the core of the movement. Like all Jihads, however, it also attracted much support from those who hated foreign (Egyptian) rule in principle, and objected to attempts to suppress the slave trade and the heavy taxes imposed by the Egyptians.

**Fall**

Abdallahi, who succeeded the Mahdi in 1885 and attempted to set up a secular state, was never fully successful. His state suffered from a very inefficient financial system and an over ambitious foreign policy. Heavy taxation needed to finance the army in its aggressive foreign ventures led to increasing unpopularity which was also fuelled by the collapse of the country's agriculture and resulting food shortages. The regime's strict enforcement of Islamic law further alienated the people and the final blow came with the Anglo–Egyptian invasion and conquest in 1898–99.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative answers with merely implicit explanation of rise and fall.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers with more explicit analysis of reasons for rise and fall.

*[14+ marks]* for focused, balanced answers with in depth analysis of reasons for rise and fall.

**4. Account for the expansion and importance of the kingdom of Buganda between circa 1750 and 1884.**

Buganda's dominance in the Inter-lacustrine region of East Africa began in the late eighteenth century under Kabaka Kyabagu and his son, Kabaka Semakokiro. Its main rival, Bunyoro, to the north, overreached itself at that time and Buganda seized its chance. By 1800 it had more than doubled its size at the expense of its neighbours, mainly to the south and west. The expansion, and Buganda's importance, continued into the nineteenth century under two of its greatest kabakas, Suna, 1832–1856 and Mutesa I, 1856–1884. Among the reasons for its dominance and importance were:

- a highly centralized system of administration based on royal officials and clan heads (Batangole). Under Mutesa I, all were appointed by the Kabaka and rewarded with grants of land
- a system of succession which made disputes and civil war rare: Kabakas were appointed by the Katakiri or Prime Minister and the Mugama, the senior clan chief
- its military strength, based on a royal bodyguard, virtually a standing army, and a navy of war canoes on Lake Victoria
- a rich economy based on its very fertile and productive soil, reliable rainfall, plentiful crops (especially bananas), and on lucrative trade with its neighbours and regular trading links with Arabs and Swahili from the coast from 1844 (slaves, barkcloth, ivory, firearms), levies on goods and tribute from subject peoples.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for sketchy narrative answers on the rise of Buganda with no real attempt at explanation and little or no reference to importance.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers with some, but limited, focus on expansion and importance.

*[14+ marks]* for comprehensive, balanced answers focused on the key requirements and identifying a range of relevant political, economic and military factors in the period 1750–1884.

5. **Explain the development of the House System in the states of the Niger Delta and analyse its effects on the region.**

**Reasons for development**

The House System developed in the Delta states to meet the changing trading situation in the early nineteenth century *i.e.* the transition from the slave trade to legitimate trade. “Houses” were in effect companies whose main function was organizing trade and their members, who were skilled in commercial matters, often made better leaders than traditional chiefs. Some rose from humble origins as ex-slaves and broke away from their original states to form new ones. Outstanding examples of these “new” men were JaJa who left Bonny to form the state of Opobo; and Olomu and his son Nana in Itsekiriland. These men were very successful and highly competitive in the palm oil trade, the main export from the area. They established their own fleets of war canoes.

**Effects on the region**

The house system revolutionized the political, economic and social life of the Delta states. House heads became involved in power struggles with their traditional chiefs. They were jealous and protective of local culture and tried to resist European encroachment. JaJa was so successful that he posed a threat to British commercial aims in the region and stimulated the imperialist aims of the British who finally removed him from power.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative answers with little explanation or analysis. Also a maximum mark for answers on only one part of the question.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers with some focus on application and analysis and reference to more than one state.

**[14+ marks]** for balanced, well documented answers covering both parts of the question and focused on its key requirements.

**6. Compare and contrast the reasons for the decline of the Asante and Mandinka Empires.**

See comments at the beginning of notes on Question 2 which apply to all compare/contrast questions. There are likely to be more similarities than differences in answers to this question so that balance between points of comparison and contrast should not be expected.

**Points of comparison** might include:

- the clash between the ambitious rulers of Asante (Prempeh I) and Mandinka (Samori Toure) and the European powers. There was no room for two “Empire builders” in the same area. Any military confrontation between Africans and Europeans was likely to end in defeat for the Africans
- both Asante and Mandinka faced hostility from African neighbours: the Asante from the Fante; and the Mandinka from the Tukolor Empire and Sikasso. Prempeh and Samori also both failed to persuade any African neighbours to join them in opposing the British and the French. Instead the Fante supported the British, and Sikasso, Samori’s enemy, collaborated with the French.

**Points of contrast** might include:

- the time scale of the decline was much longer in the case of the Asante Empire. Its great days belonged to the late eighteenth century and its decline began before the imperialist Europeans appeared on the scene, whereas Samori’s empire was only built, unfortunately for him, as the European “scramble” began
- the decline of Mandinka resulted partly from Samori's own policy decisions: his attack on Sikasso was a mistake as were his long retreat and scorched earth tactics in the 1890s.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for unbalanced answers showing little knowledge of one of the empires and only a limited attempt at comparison.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for reasonably balanced answers which make an attempt to compare/contrast.

*[14+ marks]* for well balanced, well documented answers with an analytical approach and a focus on the need for a running point-by-point comparison.

**7. Compare and contrast Mosheshwe of the Sotho and Shaka Zulu as nation builders.**

See the comments at the beginning of notes on Question 2 for the best approach to “compare/contrast” questions. There is ample scope here for a point-by-point approach identifying similarities and differences between the two rulers. The most significant general difference between the two is that Shaka was an aggressive state builder and Mosheshwe a defensive one. Mosheshwe provided a refuge in his mountainous kingdom for those fleeing from Shaka. The latter expanded and strengthened Zululand by attacking and absorbing neighbours along with their lands. Both depended heavily on military strength, and Shaka introduced revolutionary military reforms. Both took advantage of the Mfecane in different ways and of relations with foreign traders and, in Mosheshwe’s case, with missionaries. Expect some evidence to support such points.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for unbalanced answers showing little knowledge of one of the rulers or giving two end-on accounts which ignore the need for comparison/contrast.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers with a more balanced, comparative approach.

*[14+ marks]* for well balanced, well documented, analytical answers, focused on the need for a running point-by-point comparison/contrast.

**8. “Between 1876 and 1886 a chain of events in Europe and Africa led to the European “scramble” for Africa.” To what extent do you agree with this assertion?**

The focus of answers here must be on the “chain of events between 1876 and 1886” which led to the “scramble” for Africa. Before 1876, European powers were mainly interested in “informal Empire”, in “profit, through trade, without responsibility”. After the Brussels Conference of 1876, called by Leopold II of Belgium this approach to Africa became increasingly difficult. Nothing short of colonizing Africa would ensure profit through trade. The chain of events could include: the adoption of protectionism; the activities of Leopold II in the Congo Basin; De Brazza’s treaty with Makoko, made in 1880 but not ratified until 1882; Britain’s occupation of Egypt in 1882; the Berlin West Africa Conference and the impact of its decisions; Bismarck’s annexations of African territories in 1884–85. Answers should not stray outside the prescribed dates.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for answers based on general motives for colonization which ignore the phrases “chain of events” and the question “how valid is this claim”.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers which identify some of the relevant events and show some understanding of their link with the “scramble”.

*[14+ marks]* for answers which identify all or most of the events given above and show a clear understanding of their link with the “scramble”.

**9. Who lost by and who gained from the Buganda Agreement of 1900?**

This question will be answered accurately only by candidates who know the main terms of the Buganda Agreement.

The Agreement settled the affairs of Buganda after sixteen disturbed and revolutionary years since the death of Mutesa I in 1884. These years had destroyed much of the traditional social and administrative structure of the country. The following points might be made about who lost and who gained from the Agreement:

- Buganda’s position in the Uganda protectorate was strengthened as a reward for the loyalty of the new class of Christian leaders, members of Apolo Kagwa’s Protestant Party. The Agreement confirmed the annexation of several counties from Bunyoro. Baganda agents were used to rule non-Ganda parts of the Protectorate.
- The old absolute power of the Kabaka was permanently weakened when the British deposed Mwanga in 1897 and replaced him by the infant Daudi Chwa and three pro-British regents: Apolo Kagwa, the Katikiro (Prime Minister); the Chief Justice; and the Treasurer. The Kabaka retained his title and his right to appoint “bataka” clan chiefs; but he lost his independent revenue from tribute and taxation. Above all he lost his power of patronage previously held through his right to distribute “community” land.
- The main gainers from the Agreement were the “bakungu” chiefs who had risen to power during the religious revolution (1887–1894). Their new, dominant position was due to the land tenure reform in the Agreement. All occupied land was granted to the occupier in freehold, a new concept in Buganda. The Christian “bakungu” were the main beneficiaries of the distribution of “mailo estates” and the new distributors of patronage. They were also the dominant political group who were dependent on Britain in order to retain control of government against their potential rivals, the Kabaka and the old “bataka” clan chiefs. They also became government agents in much of non-Ganda Uganda.

Therefore, Buganda as a province retained its special status within the Protectorate; but within Buganda power had shifted. The main gainers were the Protestant converts, the “bakungu” hierarchy of Saza chiefs, who became the allies and agents of the British colonial authorities. The losers were the old traditional hierarchy who included the Kabaka and the “bataka” chiefs whose power and influence had been weakened.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers which show little accurate knowledge of the Buganda Agreement that they fail to effectively identify the losses and gains.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers whose knowledge of the Buganda Agreement enables them to identify some of the losers and gainers.

**[14+ marks]** for answers based on comprehensive knowledge of the Buganda Agreement which leads to a full, accurate analysis of losers and gainers.

**10. Why, and with what results, did Lobengula resist the British, and Lewanika seek their protection?**

The key to a good answer here will depend mostly on the candidate's ability to avoid a crude contrast between Lobengula, the "resister" and Lewanika, the "collaborator". Good candidates will make it clear that for many years Lobengula, realizing the likely result of using force against the British, tried hard to avoid armed resistance against the European concession seekers who came to his court. He turned to armed resistance reluctantly and only when nothing else could prevent loss of his sovereignty. Lewanika deliberately sought British protection early (reasons for this should be given) but without realizing the full and long term consequences of his decision. Look for some explanation of the various agreements made by the two leaders with the Europeans. Both Lobengula and Lewanika were deceived and misled in negotiations with the Europeans.

The consequences of their actions were that both rulers lost their independence, but the path to this ultimate outcome was much less unpleasant and violent for Lewanika and the Lozi than for Lobengula and the Ndebele. Lewanika did retain a measure of authority and control over his subjects and country until his death. Ultimately resistance did not pay.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative answers containing an implicit awareness of causes and results.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers with a more explicit analysis of causes and results.

*[14+ marks]* for balanced, focused answers which explain with detailed supporting evidence the reasons for, and results of, the different policies of the two rulers.

**11. How, and with what consequences, did Cetshwayo come into conflict with both the Boers and the British?**

**How**

When he became king in 1872 with Zulu military strength at a high level, Cetshwayo had no intention of fighting either the Boers or the British. He favoured an anti-Boer alliance with the British because of land disputes with the Boers on his northern border. The British feared a strong Zulu nation on their northern border and wanted to persuade the Boers to join them in a White Confederation to guard against the danger of an African victory over a white state. British fears were realized in 1876 when the Bapedi defeated the Transvaal Boers. The British annexed the Transvaal hoping the Boers would be grateful for protection.

Cetshwayo was faced with a dilemma following the British action. After the Bapedi victory the Zulu army wanted war with the Transvaal but Cetshwayo refused unless attacked by the Boers. Frere, the British High Commissioner at the Cape chose this moment to decide the time had arrived to crush the Zulus to remove the threat to Natal's borders. Cetshwayo accepted Frere's ultimatum except the demand for the disbandment of the Zulu army. The British invaded Zululand. Their defeat at Isandhlwana was reversed by victories at Rorke's Drift and Ulundi. Cetshwayo who had a quarrel with the Boers over disputed land was forced against his wishes to fight the British.

**Consequences**

- Cetshwayo was captured and exiled
- Zululand was destroyed as a united state when the British divided it into thirteen small "kingdoms" which fought each other
- in 1883 Cetshwayo was recalled to restore law and order but was forced to flee and died in 1884
- Britain's initial defeat by the Zulus at Isandhlwana encouraged the Transvaal Boers to fight for independence (1880–1881) and to refuse to join the British project for Confederation.

*[7 marks]* and below for answers which show little understanding of the circumstances which trapped Cetshwayo into conflict with Boers and British.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative answers showing implicit awareness of causes and consequences of conflict.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more analytical answers with some explicit understanding of causes and consequences.

*[14+ marks]* for answers with analysis of causes and consequences given in depth.

**12. Analyse the results before 1900, for South Africa and its people, of the discovery of diamonds and gold.**

Results might conveniently be analyzed under three headings

**Political:**

- increased tension between Boer and British states particularly in the case of Boer policy against Uitlanders after the discovery of gold. This issue was a major cause of war in 1899
- the balance of power between the Boer and British states was shifted in favour of the Boers
- these developments diminished the chance of the Boer states joining a White Confederation.

**Economic:**

- transformed the essentially agricultural Boer economies into economies with an important industrial sector
- created a need to improve the transport systems of the Boer states, particularly the railways, to facilitate the export of their products;
- discovery of gold tipped the balance of economic power in South Africa in favour of the Transvaal
- created a big demand for unskilled labour which was met by the migrant labour system.

**Social**

- the development of the migrant labour system had serious social consequences: it speeded up the process of racial segregation in the growing industrial, urban areas and led to the disruption of family life as African males went to work in the mines and the women were left behind in the rural areas; it turned the native reserves into pools of cheap labour; it increased the gap between white and black workers.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for largely narrative answers which are limited in coverage of results.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more analytical answers which are fuller in coverage of results in at least two of the above areas.

*[14+ marks]* for focused, balanced answers giving comprehensive coverage of results in all three of the above areas.

**13. “Despite their defeat in the South African War (1899–1902) the Boers emerged in a strong position by 1910.” How and why did this happen?**

The most effective way of answering the question would be to analyse the main terms of the Peace of Vereeniging in 1902 and of the South Africa Act of 1910 and show how these gave the Boers a commanding position by 1910. The terms of both favoured the economic interests and promoted the political influence of the Boers.

**Peace of Vereeniging:**

- the grant of self-government for the two Boer Republics was promised at an early date
- no decision about the franchise was to be taken before Afrikaans was to be recognized as an official language along with English
- £3 000 000 to be paid to Boer farmers for resettlement of their farms.

**South Africa Act**

- there were to be no voting rights for non-whites in either of the two Boer Republics
- there were to be no non-white candidates for election to the Union Parliament
- the constituency boundaries were drawn to favour, and give maximum influence and weight to, Afrikaner voters in rural constituencies.

Only on the issue of excluding the three Protectorates of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland from the Union of South Africa did the arrangements go against the wishes of the Boers.

These arrangements ensured that political power would remain in the hands of the Boers or Afrikaners.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for largely narrative answers which show little understanding of the influence and significance of the Peace of Vereeniging and of the South Africa Act.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more analytical answers showing fuller awareness of the Peace and the Act.

**[14+ marks]** for answers which focus on an in depth analysis of the reasons for the transformation of the Boer position between 1902 and 1910 with emphasis on the role of the Peace and the Act.

**14. Analyse the reasons for, and the impact of, the establishment of the African Independent Church Movement in *two* countries.**

**Reasons for**

- On the religious side Africans wanted to protest about the slow speed of the ordination and promotion of African priests in mission controlled churches and of Africanisation of religion generally
- Africans also wanted a means of protesting against certain aspects of colonial rule: land alienation; imposition and collection of taxes; the use of forced labour.

**Impact**

The impact varied from church to church and depended on the leader of the local movement. All led protests against the outside influence and control of churches. Only Chilembwe and his movement in Malawi carried protest to the point of open rebellion. Most leaders (*e.g.* Kamwana in Malawi and Agbebi in Nigeria) opposed the use of violence. All were strong advocates of education and the provision of schools as a means of improving living standards and promoting progress generally. All believed in the Africanisation of Christianity and Christian churches and the need for these to come to terms with African culture. They provided many examples of early African nationalism led by the African elite.

The best choice of two countries for illustrating the establishment and work of Independent African churches would be Nigeria and Malawi.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers which are largely descriptive but show an implicit understanding of reasons and impact and have limited knowledge of the African Independent Church Movement.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers which contain an explicit analysis of reasons and impact but this is incomplete and/or limited to one country.

**[14+ marks]** for analytical answers which give a comprehensive and accurate analysis of reasons for, and impact of, the African Independent Church Movement in two countries.

15. **“As Regent and Emperor he created a state which was stable, united, and partially modernized.” How accurate is this as a summary of Haile Selassie’s achievements in Ethiopia?**

This is an open ended question in which candidates have more than a fifty-fifty chance of challenging the accuracy of the quotation in the title. Their conclusion will depend on the evidence produced. During his Regency, between 1916 and 1930 Haile Selassie spent much of his time pacifying the country and introducing modernizing reforms mainly in health and education. These continued, along with attempts to modernize and centralize government, after he became emperor in 1930, but were interrupted by the Italian invasion and occupation (1936–1941). After his return he gained a reputation as a respected elder statesman in Africa and became involved in moves to bring about a form of African unity as African colonies became independent. One of his great achievements was to host the conference of African states in Addis Ababa which founded the Organization of African Unity in 1963. Modernization of government continued and the emperor learned to delegate more authority to new ministries and educated civil servants. New judicial codes were introduced and an elected chamber of deputies played a growing and critical role. He never succeeded, however, in meeting the social needs of the mass of the population and there were regular clashes between the government and junior civil servants and army officers from the mid 1960s onwards. The situation became more dangerous in the early 1970s when a serious drought, followed by a disastrous famine, led to widespread strikes and revolts. In 1974 he was deposed and imprisoned in a coup led by young, left-wing army officers.

This record of his reign can hardly be reconciled with the summary in the quotation of the title and it seems that the best conclusion for answers would be to challenge its accuracy at least in some respects.

Acceptance of the accuracy of the quote as it stands would be difficult to support by the facts and unlikely to reach **[6 to 7 marks]** or at most **[8 to 10 marks]**.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers which reach this conclusion but with inadequate evidence.

**[14 to 16 marks]** or **[17 to 20 marks]** for answers which reach this conclusion with accurate and persuasive evidence and arguments.

**16. Compare and contrast Julius Nyerere and Jomo Kenyatta as nationalist leaders in their countries' struggle for independence.**

Note that the question is limited to the achievement of independence in the two countries. Material on the two leaders after independence will be irrelevant here. There are likely to be more points of contrast than of comparison. In Tanganyika the struggle for independence was far more peaceful and less confrontational than in Kenya and this had much to do with the personalities of the two men. Nyerere, unlike Kenyatta, believed in avoiding confrontation with the British authorities. In 1958 he accepted a Tripartite electoral system though he believed in non-racial policies and he made it work in favour of his party, TANU. In the same year he struck up a friendly working relationship with Governor Turnbull which smoothed the progress to independence. He remained free throughout the independence struggle and led his party with great skill. He took full advantage of his country's status as a Trusteeship territory of the UNO. Tanganyika became independent in December 1961 after a nationalist campaign that was peaceful throughout.

Kenyatta, in contrast, confronted the British authorities as leader of the Kenya Africa Union, founded in 1946. Progress towards increased African participation in government was slow and in 1952 the Mau Mau resistance movement began amongst the Kikuyu, Kenyatta's own tribe. He protested his innocence but was tried and imprisoned. He remained in prison until 1959 but was banned from active politics until 1961. He nevertheless remained de facto leader of the independence struggle and was elected President of the Kenya African National Union (KANU) whilst still in prison. Negotiations for Kenyan independence took two years after Kenyatta's release. The gap of two years between the achievement of independence in the two countries was explained by:

- the absence in Tanganyika of the serious tribal rivalry which existed in Kenya
- the complications caused in Kenya by the large white settler population in contrast to Tanganyika's smaller white and Asian communities.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for unbalanced and mainly narrative answers showing limited knowledge of one of the leaders and little attempt at comparison of their roles as nationalist leaders.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more balanced and more analytical answers which make a real attempt to compare/contrast.

**[14+ marks]** for answers which blend a chronological summary of the two independence struggles with an ongoing analysis of differences and similarities between the roles of the leaders.

**17. Explain how Sekou Toure opened the way to independence for France's West African colonies.**

Until 1958 French colonial policy was wedded to the idea that colonial territories should retain a permanent connection with France as members of some organization like the French Union formed in 1946 and modified by legislation like the Loi Cadre. This was all changed by General de Gaulle's referendum in 1958 which offered to the territories in French West and French Equatorial Africa either self-government within a proposed new French Community or complete independence with all links with France cut. He expected all to choose the first option; but Guinea under Sekou Toure chose complete independence. Sekou Toure's bold and unexpected challenge left other leaders, under pressure from their people, with no choice but to follow his lead and all French territories in the two Federations had become independent by the end of 1960. General de Gaulle had also to change future colonial policy to one of decolonization. It has to be said that other factors played a part in this change of policy *e.g.* The Second World War had seriously weakened France's ability to prolong her old policy and Britain's commitment in 1951 to a policy of decolonization for her colonies undermined France's position. The crucial factor, however, was Sekou Toure's and Guinea's response to De Gaulle's referendum. This must be the focus of any answer which merits a mark in one of the two top bands. Reference to the context of these events and to "other factors" would clinch a mark in the top band.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for answers which fail completely to recognize the crucial role of the referendum and Sekou Toure's response to it.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers which show some awareness of the above and the background to it.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers which show a clearer understanding of the above.

**[14+ marks]** for answers which show a full understanding of the above but also acknowledge that other factors played a part in changing French policy.

**18. “The establishment of the Central African Federation was an attempt by white settlers to prolong their dominance in the region.” How far do you agree with this claim?**

There is overwhelming evidence to support this claim. From the outset of the campaign for a Federation of South Rhodesia, North Rhodesia and Nyasaland, the Africans in the region were against the project because they feared that this was the settlers’ objective. The British government eventually approved the scheme after receiving assurances that African interests would be respected. The course of events soon raised doubts about white assurances and confirmed Africans’ fears. The first changes made to African voting rights in the Federation were insignificant. The British government set up two Commissions under Lord Devlin and Lord Monckton in 1958 to report on the situation. Devlin reported that African opposition was “deeply rooted and almost universally held”. Monckton said that in the Federation promise of “partnership for Africans was a sham”. He also said that unless the review of the constitutions in the three territories due between 1960 and 1962 made “drastic changes” in the racial policies, the Federation should not be allowed to continue. No such changes were made in the South Rhodesian constitution. Dismemberment of the Federation began and Nyasaland and North Rhodesia became independent in 1964. A verdict of full agreement with the quote based on the kind of evidence given here will deserve a mark in the top band. Clear awareness of the two commissions and their reports alone will deserve a mark in the **[14 to 16 marks]** band. Answers which do not mention the commissions will struggle to reach the **[8 to 10 marks]** band.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers which agree with the claim but fail to mention the Devlin and Monckton Commissions as evidence for doing so.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers which agree with the claim and show some recognition of the role of the two commissioners in support of this conclusion.

**[14+ marks]** for answers whose agreement with the claim focuses on the reports of the two commissioners but also uses other evidence.

**19. To what extent did apartheid as developed in South Africa between 1948 and 1961 differ from segregation which preceded it?**

The main features of South Africa's racial policies were identifiable in the system practised before 1948: virtually no political rights for Africans; residential segregation of the races; exploitation of, and severe restrictions on the jobs available to, black workers. This system was built on a few key pieces of legislation: the Natives Land Act 1913; the Native Urban Areas Act 1923; the Mines and Works Act 1926 and Hertzog's Segregation Laws 1936. However, there were fundamental differences between apartheid and what had gone before:

- apartheid was presented as a new, positive ideology carefully developed to meet changed circumstances *e.g.* the existence of a mass opposition in the form of the new ANC
- apartheid was formalized and underpinned by massive new legislation which was constantly being updated to meet new threats.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers containing limited identification of differences based on inadequate knowledge of the two systems.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers with more comprehensive identification of differences based on fuller knowledge of the two systems.

**[14+ marks]** for answers in which identification of differences are based on a comprehensive knowledge of the two systems and are identified by specific examples of pre-1948 and 1948–1960 legislation.

**20. Explain the rise and fall of Idi Amin in Uganda.**

**Rise**

Ironically the rise of Idi Amin was prepared by Obote, the President who was overthrown by Amin in the coup in January 1971 whilst Obote was out of the country. Obote's relations with the Baganda and their Kabaka had been strained since independence and worsened in 1966 when the Kabaka went into exile. In the same year Obote, to make his position more secure, appointed Amin, one of his supporters in the army, to be Commander in Chief of the army and police. Amin's rise was therefore unexpected and was largely brought about by Amin's ambition and hunger for power and Obote's insecurity. After the coup Amin swiftly took steps to give himself absolute power. He dissolved Parliament and formed a Defence Council with himself as Chairman. For a time he also courted the support of the Baganda who had every reason to be grateful for the overthrow of Obote. He also favoured the Muslims in the north of Uganda and gained some international support from Britain and Israel.

**Fall**

However, his brutal purges of any suspected enemies and his corrupt mismanagement of the economy rapidly won him many enemies at home. Arbitrary actions against individual foreign nationals, and the mass expulsion of 40 000 Asians in 1972, a further blow to the economy, soon lost him support abroad. Infringements of the borders of neighbouring Kenya and Tanzania led to local clashes and finally in 1979 Tanzania, which had given shelter to Obote, mounted a full scale invasion. In eight months Amin's army surrendered. It had recently been seriously weakened and split by Amin's attempt to eliminate Obote's Lango and Acholi supporters in the forces and was no match for the invaders.

Answers here may be mainly narrative based with explanations of Amin's rise and fall built into the two part story as above.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for seriously unbalanced two-part answers or largely narrative answers with lack of focus on explanation.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more balanced two-part answers with patchy analysis of reasons for rise and fall.

*[14+ marks]* for mainly analytical answers focused firmly on a comprehensive explanation of rise and fall.

**21. How successful was *either* President Mugabe of Zimbabwe *or* President Mobutu of Zaire in dealing with his country’s problems?**

**General points**

A good answer to this question will depend on an acceptable identification of the “country’s problems”. In both cases the problems were related largely to the management of the economy, directly or indirectly. The economy in both countries at the time of independence was heavily dependent on the presence of skilled white settlers or expatriates. In Zaire the all important mining industry was owned and run by Belgians; in Zimbabwe thriving agriculture was in the hands of British or, to a lesser extent, South African farmers.

**Mobutu**

Mobutu’s handling of the economy was sound until 1973 but after that his policy of “Zaireanization” threatened the so far thriving economy when he insisted on imposing local control on foreign-owned businesses. This led to a flight of foreign managers and their money and a reversal of this policy in 1976 came too late to check the disastrous economic decline. Zaire was the first African country to default on its international debt payments. Centralization of power in his own and his party’s hands (Zaire became a one-party state in 1971) led to an increase in corruption. In 1977 and 1978 there were rebellions in mineral-rich Shaba (Katanga) province and these were put down only with the help of foreign troops. Meanwhile the infrastructure began to collapse and the three main rail routes to Beira, Benguela and Tazara were closed and the country became dependent for exports and imports on the southern line through Zambia, Zimbabwe and South Africa. Agriculture was neglected and massive food imports became necessary; inflation reached three figures. The decline continued until and beyond Mobutu’s overthrow.

**Mugabe**

Zimbabwe’s economy was based largely on settler owned and managed farms and the handling of the land issue was clearly going to be one of the new government’s major problems. The country’s economic future depended on the way in which this was managed. Unfortunately twenty years after Mugabe came to power little had been done to organize a managed re-distribution of Zimbabwe’s richest land. Economic growth declined and a potentially rich agricultural country faced famine.

The answer to the question “How successful [...]” is that both presidents have been largely unsuccessful in handling their problems. It will be rather easier for most candidates to locate reliable sources to support this conclusion in the case of Mobutu.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for largely narrative answers which contain only a limited summary of problems of chosen country and little or no evaluation of success.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers with a more analytical approach, a clearer identification of problems and evaluation of success.

**[14+ marks]** for answers which give a well documented analysis of problems and conclude with a sound, balanced evaluation of success.

**22. Assess Kwame Nkrumah's strengths and weaknesses as Ghana's ruler between 1957 and 1966.**

When Nkrumah became Prime Minister of Ghana after leading the country to independence in 1957 he was a hero in his own country and in Africa as a whole. He was an advocate of socialism; he was outspoken against colonialism; favoured Pan Africanism (which he promoted in the Union of Ghana, Guinea and Mali, 1958–62) and hated the racist regime in South Africa. His popularity and prestige remained high until 1962. In that year he declared Ghana a one party state (she had become a republic in 1960 with Nkrumah now President) and from then on certain weaknesses appeared in his policies and his personal life style. These weaknesses continued to characterize his policies until his overthrow in a military coup in 1966. He began to rule in an increasingly arbitrary way, often interfering in the conduct of the judiciary. One of his few successes in the 1960s came with the establishment of the Organization of African Unity in 1963. In some respects events leading up to this showed his weakness and led to declining popularity in Africa. Many of the new African Heads of State suspected that his support for Pan Africanism was being used as a means of aspiring to leadership of a United Africa. Many members of his party were tainted with corruption and extravagance. Agriculture, the basis of Ghana's economy, was neglected whilst vast sums were spent (some would claim wasted) on prestige projects like a new Presidential Palace, a motorway to Accra airport and the Volta Dam. Nkrumah's style of government became increasingly intolerable as government extravagance and a slump in cocoa prices led to economic collapse and soaring inflation in 1965–66. He seemed to be increasingly detached from the needs of most Ghanaians and concerned only with his own personal ambitions.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for largely narrative answers with limited and unconvincing assessment of strengths and weaknesses.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers with a mainly analytical approach and a sounder assessment of strengths and weaknesses.

**[14+ marks]** for well documented analytical answers with a balanced and comprehensive assessment of strengths and weaknesses.

**23. Why was there a Civil War in Nigeria between 1967 and 1970 and why did the victory of the Federal Government fail to restore stability?**

The basic causes of the Nigerian Civil War lay in the country's tribal and regional rivalries which were reflected in the country's Independence constitution of 1960. This was a federal structure with separate regional constitutions for the Northern, Eastern and Western/Mid-Western regions. This exacerbated regional rivalries and tensions. The most bitter rivalry was between the Northern (Hausa and Muslim) Region and the Eastern (Igbo and Christian) Region. The North had the largest population but was poor and backward, especially educationally. The better educated Igbo exported their skills to the North and held many of the best paid jobs but felt insecure. A series of assassinations (Tafawa Balewa, a Northerner and Federal Prime Minister; the Premiers of the Northern and Western regions; Major-General Ironsi, another Northerner who had succeeded Balewa) and coups culminating in the massacre of Igbo, living and working in the North, heightened mistrust and suspicion amongst them. They were also unhappy about the way in which elections were rigged. When Lt Colonel Gowon, another Northerner, succeeded Ironsi as head of the Federal state, the Eastern Region refused to recognize him. Gowon's attempts to allay Igbo fears by creating twelve regions instead of four failed and Colonel Ojukwu, the Eastern Region's military governor, seceded from the Federation in May 1967 and the region was renamed Biafra.

The Biafran forces were crushed in 1970. The Federation was saved but the old causes of tension, suspicion and fear persisted. The vicious cycle of changes in regime, each triggered by an army coup and followed by a period of civilian rule, continued. Nigeria remained unstable after the war was over.

**[7 marks]** and below for answers which are narratives of the Civil War.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers which are narratives of events leading to Civil War with very limited explanation.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers which contain fuller analysis of causes but little reference to failure to restore stability.

**[14+ marks]** for answers which contain a full analysis of causes of war and of reasons for continued instability after the war. Maximum of **[16]** if there is no explanation of post war instability.

**24. Analyse the aims and achievements of *either* the East African Community (EAC) *or* the South African Development Cooperation Conference (SADCC).**

**EAC aims:**

- to promote economic and social development in the region by cooperation between the three member states *e.g.* in the fields of transport (railways and airlines); telecommunications and postal services; education (East African Examinations Council)
- to remove barriers to trade particularly in agricultural products
- to establish a common currency
- to establish an East African Development Bank

**Evaluation of success:**

Initially most of the above aims were achieved and working institutions set up in all the fields but the Community was disbanded in 1977 for the following reasons:

- ideological differences between members, particularly strong between Kenya and Tanzania
- personal differences between some Heads of State *e.g.* these were so severe between Nyerere and Amin that cooperation came to a halt
- differences in economic strength *e.g.* between Kenya and Tanzania leading to disputes about sharing profits/costs areas of economic cooperation *e.g.* Railways and airlines (disputes led to closure of frontiers)

**SADCC aims:**

- to implement changes that would free member states from their overwhelming dependence on South Africa especially for transport of imports and exports
- since economic and political dependence are inseparable the achievement of genuine independence by the front line state members should be considered a primary aim also. This would come with the overthrow of the apartheid regime in South Africa.

**Evaluation of success:**

- this is difficult because of the impossibility of knowing how far the activities of SADCC contributed towards the beginning of detente and negotiations between the SA government and the ANC (after Mandela's release in 1990)
- before this stage was reached success with the first aim was very limited because of the time it would have taken to construct new transport systems which could not be sabotaged by South Africa. Look for some evaluation of a complex situation in which SADCC's role and influence is uncertain.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for largely descriptive answers with limited analysis of aims and of evaluation of success.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers with a clearer and fuller analysis of aims and some attempt to assess success.

**[14+ marks]** for analytical answers with a firm focus on aims and a sound, balanced evaluation of success.

**25. “It is unrealistic to blame the post-independence problems of African states entirely on the legacy of colonial rule.” How far do you agree with this view?**

This is an open question though it will be easier to produce arguments in favour of accepting the view expressed in the quotation. Most candidates are likely to argue that the colonial legacy cannot be the full explanation for all post-independence problems. An analysis of the main problems facing most African countries after independence will be an essential starting point. These should include: **political problems** (suitability of European political models for African conditions); **economic problems** (economies depending on one or two products with prices dependent on the swings in world markets; wide-spread under-development or exploitation of colonial societies); **social problems** (the suitability of European education systems for African peoples).

Candidates should also identify other factors that have contributed to some or all of these problems. For example: the political inadequacies of some African leaders and politicians and administrators; the widespread political and economic corruption that exists in many African countries are factors that create or exacerbate political and economic problems and produce economic failure; tribal rivalry and conflict are other causes of the problems and of the failure to solve them.

It will be difficult to reject this view completely, but any answers that attempt to do so should be judged on their merits. Answers that do little more than list problems maximum of *[8 to 10 marks]*; answers that list problems and make some attempt to apportion blame *[11 to 13 marks]*; answers that list problems and focus on assessing where blame lies *[14 to 16 marks]* or *[17 to 20 marks]* depending on evidence and persuasiveness of arguments.

---