



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2009**

**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 IB Cardiff.*

**1. For what reasons did traditional religions survive the impact of Islam and Christianity in the nineteenth century?**

In some areas in the nineteenth century traditional religions began to give way to Islam and Christianity. Islam had made considerable inroads into West Africa and the coast of East Africa long before 1840, but the early nineteenth century saw considerable Islamic expansion. The impact of Christian missionary activity was quite limited except in Buganda and among the Yoruba. In many areas it mainly appealed to outcasts from traditional society. Even where missionaries seemed to be welcome in the pre-colonial period, they were largely used by African rulers for their own ends and as intermediaries, *e.g.* Mutesa of Buganda and Mosheshwe of Lesotho. The southern two-thirds of the continent remained attached to traditional religions, which proved strong and adaptable. There is growing evidence that they could transcend ethnic barriers. The Mwari cult, with its institution of a High God, spread from the Shona to the Ndebele invaders and thus became a territorial cult related to a particular area rather than to one ethnic group. It was a factor in the Ndebele resistance to the European invasion in 1897. African traditional religions were, at the end of the century, followed by an overwhelming majority of Africans. Some cults were, however, so closely related to the political system that they declined once the political systems began to disintegrate. The Mbona cult of the Maganja was eclipsed during the mid-nineteenth century by the upheaval in Malawi.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague generalizations or inadequate knowledge.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptions of traditional religions which may overstate the impact of Islam and Christianity.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit analysis of the survival of traditional religions.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focused, balanced analysis both of the survival of traditional religions and the impact of Islam and Christianity.

*[17+ marks]* for depth and insight into the strength and adaptability of traditional religions.

**2. Compare and contrast the achievements of Tewodros II and Menelik as modernizers of Ethiopia.**

Like other nineteenth century African modernizers, Tewodros II created a national standing army. Justice was reformed. Tewodros tried to reform the church. He wanted some of its wealth to pay the army and modernize the country. He saw the importance of modern technology and bought many guns from Europe and hired European engineers. But his achievements were more illusory than real. The provincial nobles did not share his vision of a unified and modernized government. He lacked a bureaucracy on which to build a national administration. Thousands of soldiers deserted him and his attack on the privileges of the church alienated the priests. He abolished the slave trade on his accession, but it revived in the conditions of civil war in the 1860s. His attempts to industrialize arms production came to nothing. The huge mortars built by the missionary artisans immobilized his army at Magdala, and they were deserted by their gunners when the British stormed the fort in 1868.

Menelik was undoubtedly more successful, especially in communications. A modern bridge was built over the Awash River and the railway line from Addis Ababa to Djibouti was begun. Modern roads linked Addis Ababa with Harar and Jimma. Postal and telegraph services were established and a state printing press was opened. There were other reforms in education, health, administration, banking and currency. Modern schools and hospitals were opened. There was a national currency, a central bank and the beginnings of a modern cabinet system. Menelik's attempts to modernize were constrained by limited capital resources and skilled manpower. But it is doubtful if he would have gone much further even if the time, money and manpower were available. He did not want a social and economic revolution, but to preserve a traditional and privileged way of life for the emperor and the nobility by adopting those aspects of modernisation that would preserve and strengthen, rather than destroy it.

*N.B.* If only one ruler is discussed, award a maximum of **[7 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for inadequate, perhaps partially irrelevant narratives.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives with implicit analysis.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit comparisons of modernizing policies.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focused, balanced analysis of the modernizing policies of the two rulers in a comparative structure.

**[17+ marks]** for depth and insight into the limits of modernization.

**3. Analyse the reasons for the emergence of centralized states among the Hehe and the Nyamwezi in the nineteenth century.**

In 1855, the Hehe people were divided into numerous small political units based on clans. The incursions of the Ngoni and the growth of the ivory trade inspired Munyigumba to build a strong, united state from the scattered Hehe political units. He used profits from the ivory trade to build up an army along Ngoni lines, and used it successfully to resist Ngoni raids into Uhehe. His son Mkwawa quickly emerged as one of the most powerful rulers of the new states in eastern Africa. He made provincial rulers subject to appointment and dismissal by him and thus increased the strength of the central government and the unity within the state.

The Nyamwezi people of West-Central Tanzania developed as long distance traders and their strategic position along the central routes from Zanzibar to the interior was a vital factor in their development. They built on their existing trade in salt, ironwork, copper, grain and livestock and entered the international ivory trade. They also, like the Hehe, adopted new military techniques from the Ngoni, who reached Unyamwezi in the 1850s. The economic expansion and new military structure resulted in the formation of 3 centralized states out of the 150 chiefdoms in the area. One was Urambo, founded by Mirambo and named after him. He learnt the Ngoni language and built an army of men from many different ethnic groups.

*N.B.* If only the Hehe or the Nyamwezi are discussed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for inadequate knowledge.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives with implicit analysis.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of the reasons for the emergence of centralized states.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focused, balanced analysis of the emergence of centralized states among the Hehe and the Nyamwezi.

**[17+ marks]** for depth and insight into the differences between the states.

**4. Compare and contrast the reasons for the rise of the Sokoto caliphate and the Tukolor Empire in West Africa in the nineteenth century.**

The political map of western Africa in the nineteenth century was dramatically changed as a succession of Islamic Jihads swept the region and led to the rise of the Sokoto caliphate and the Tukolor Empire. The jihadist leaders were mostly of Fulbe pastoralist origin. The leader and inspirer of the Sokoto Jihad was Usman dan Fodio, son of a Fulbe Muslim teacher in the northern Hausa state of Gobir. Usman dan Fodio's jihad was primarily a religious movement. He was an educated Muslim scholar who sought to convert Fulani pastoralists. He attacked the Hausa rulers for combining Islam with traditional African religious practices. It was a series of simultaneous local risings against which the Hausa rulers failed to unite. The pastoral Fulani supported the risings partly out of resentment of Hausa taxation of their cattle. Centuries of interstate rivalry proved to be the undoing of the Hausa rulers. Usman's brother Abdullahi and his son Muhammad Bello were able to create a huge new Sokoto caliphate, which showed greater respect for Islamic law and ensured greater justice for the general Hausa population.

The emergence of the caliphate and the Tukolor Empire both depended partly on the weakness and failure of existing states and specific grievances of particular communities especially those in Futa Jalon and Futa Toro. They can also be attributed to the skills and charismatic appeal of the Jihad leaders and their ability to attract support and create and organize new states. Al Hajj Umar created the Tukolor Empire by building up a standing army of 30 000 and conquering Bambara states. He was inspired by the success of Usman's Jihad. He spent several years in Sokoto. He joined the Tijaniyya brotherhood which attracted men of action, businessmen, the young and members of inferior social groups excluded from the rival Qadiriyya brotherhood, whose political power Umar managed to eliminate. Unlike the spontaneous risings encouraged by Usman, Umar's Tukolor jihad followed a more deliberate pattern of military conquest and state creation.

*N.B.* If only one empire is discussed, award a maximum of **[7 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for inadequate narratives or vague generalisations.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives with an implicit sense of reasons for rise, with little comparison or contrasts.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of the reasons for the rise of the caliphate and the empire.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focused, balanced analysis of the reasons for the rise of Sokoto and the Tukolor Empire in a comparative structure.

**[17+ marks]** for depth and insight.

**5. Assess the effects of French intervention on Dahomey and the Mandinka Empire in the nineteenth century.**

The Mandinka Empire is likely to be better known than Dahomey. In 1881, Samori Toure had his first clash with the French, who were expanding their colonial control westwards from upper Senegal. He was France's single most formidable military opponent in western Africa. As a temporary tactic, the French concluded treaties with Samori in 1886 and 1887. He then made the serious military error of attempting to capture Sikasso. The French supplied his enemies and incited some of his people to revolt.

He avoided direct confrontation with the French and was able to resist them for over a decade, but had no real answer to the vastly superior weaponry of the French. They were as ruthless in their atrocities against civilians as he was in his scorched earth policy. The French invaded from the north in 1881 and overran his empire by 1894. He escaped, conquered and founded an entirely new empire on the northern borders of modern Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana. But Samori was now a foreign conqueror facing the internal opposition of a subject people. He surrendered to the French in 1898.

King Glele of Dahomey (1858–1889) had no intention of placing himself under French influence. He was ready to grant small concessions to the French trader Regis but sought recognition of his sovereignty and diplomatic equality with France. Dahomey was later conquered by a French Senegalese army in 1892–1894 and the old central province was divided into several cantons. The French found a brother of the displaced king to occupy his throne. In 1894 General Dodds handed power to a French civilian government, which gradually set about building administrative posts and collecting taxes.

*N.B.* If only one country is discussed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for narratives with little or no reference to the impact.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives with only an implicit sense of the impact.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of the impact on each country.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for well-focused, balanced and supported analysis of the effect of intervention in French Dahomey and the Mandinka Empire.

**[17+ marks]** for answers with depth of knowledge and critical analysis of the impact.

**6. Analyse the impact of British rule at the Cape on southern Africa up to 1850.**

The incorporation of the Cape Colony into the British Empire from 1806 greatly affected social, economic and political relations in the area. Economic growth was encouraged by British investment and immigration. The climate, social infrastructure and success of early missions encouraged an expansion of missionary activity in the colony. The head of the London Missionary Society campaigned successfully against the legal disabilities especially of the Khoisan, which were removed by Ordinance 50 in 1828. In December 1834 all slaves in the Cape were freed. British rule led to a series of wars with the Xhosa in the Eastern Cape who struggled in vain to keep their land and independence. Several thousand Boer families trekked northwards in 1835 mainly because of their hostility to British policies at the Cape. They had a succession of grievances dating back to the introduction of circuit courts in 1812. Their initial settlement was concentrated in areas temporarily depopulated by the upheavals of the Mfecane. The further expansion of settlement was slow and largely dependent on the extent and nature of African cooperation and resistance. The Boers set up the republic of Natalia but this was annexed by the British in 1845. The British went on to annex the area between the Orange and Vaal rivers in 1848. This was partly because many of the Trekboers who had settled in this region still regarded themselves as British subjects and demanded protection against powerful African rulers like Moshweshwe, some of whose land they were busy occupying. Britain also wanted a stable government on the northern frontier of the Cape and believed that an extension of the frontier was the easiest way to bring this about. British rule thus led indirectly to a massive increase in the extent of Southern Africa dominated by people of European descent and was thus one of the crucial events in the formation of South Africa.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague narratives or descriptions of British rule.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives which may be limited to the reasons for the Great Trek or have an implicit sense of the impact of British rule.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit analysis of the impact of British rule.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for in-depth analysis of the impact of British rule in Southern Africa as a whole.

*[17+ marks]* for depth of understanding of the direct and indirect impact of British rule in the period.



7. **“Without the British occupation of Egypt, there is no reason to suppose that any European scrambles for Africa would have begun when they did.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The British Prime Minister Gladstone sent the British fleet to bomb Alexandria and defeat the Egyptian nationalist revolt led by Urabi and sent Lord Cromer to administer Egypt until Egyptian debts had been paid. He thus unwittingly accelerated European imperial activities all over Africa. The French, who had joint supervision over Egyptian finances since 1878, resented British control of Egypt and looked for compensation elsewhere in Africa. The immediate result was the ratification of the De Brazza-Makoko Treaty and a new French colony in the Congo. King Leopold of Belgium and Stanley then stepped up their activities in the Congo and the Congo Free State was established in 1884. Rivalry over the Congo was an important reason for Bismarck calling the Berlin West Africa Conference at the request of Portugal. In the short-term this led to the division of the Congo and Niger basins between European powers. But it also gave impetus to the partition. It established the ideas of “spheres of influence” which had to be supported by effective occupation. This accelerated European invasion on the ground in order to make good the claims made on maps. The quotation in the question is from Robinson and Gallagher’s *Africa and the Victorians* (1961). It can be said to have been an overstatement. The scramble had already begun in the Congo and Bismarck accelerated the scramble in eastern and southern Africa through the Berlin conference and German annexations at that time.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague generalizations about the partition.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives with implicit sense of the impact of the British occupation of Egypt.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit analysis of the impact of the British occupation of Egypt.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for in-depth analysis of the impact of the British occupation of Egypt and of other causes of the partition of Africa.

*[17+ marks]* for understanding of the historiographical debate or insight into the complexity of the causes of the partition.

**8. Why did Mwanga resist the British in Buganda while Kagwa collaborated with them?**

Mwanga became Kabaka of Buganda in 1884 and a few years later civil war in his kingdom coincided with the arrival of the agents of British imperialism.

Buganda was recognized as a British sphere of influence in 1890 and a protectorate in 1894. Lugard established British authority in Buganda by supporting the Protestant chiefs in their struggle for power over the Catholics. In turn they supported him against Mwanga when he attempted to assert his independence and rebel against British rule. Mwanga led a revolt in 1897 because he fiercely distrusted European colonial rule. He objected to the stopping of tribute from the Basoga, which had been a major source of income, to a law which ended his prerogative as the sole giver of land and to interference with his court appointments by chiefs backed by the British administration. He wanted the restoration of his old political power and recognition of his right to appoint his own servants. When he began a revolt in the mainly Catholic province of Buddu he received the support from thousands of Baganda of all religious parties and sections of the population. But the leading Catholics and Protestants who held senior government posts like Kagwa and Mugwanya resolutely opposed his rebellion and allied with the British whose Maxim guns carried the day. Mwanga fled to German East Africa but was later captured and deported to the Seychelles where he died. He was replaced as Kabaka by his infant son.

Kagwa was now the leading negotiator, along with Sir Henry (Harry) Johnston over the Buganda Agreement of 1900 which defined the basis of the British colonial system in Buganda and rewarded the senior Christian leaders for their loyalty to the British by a new system of land tenure. The Agreement represented a blow to traditional political forces in Buganda and completed the revolution of Christian chiefs in Buganda which Kagwa led since 1887.

***N.B.*** If only Mwanga or Kagwa are discussed, award a maximum of ***[12 marks]***.

***[0 to 7 marks]*** for inadequate narratives or vague generalizations.

***[8 to 10 marks]*** for narratives with an implicit sense of reasons for the different responses.

***[11 to 13 marks]*** for a more explicit comparison of motives.

***[14 to 16 marks]*** for balanced, focused, in-depth analysis of reasons for resistance and collaboration.

***[17+ marks]*** for insight into the nature of Kiganda society and the revolutionary impact on it of missionary activity.

**9. Analyse the changing relations between Lobengula and the British.**

From 1870 to 1890, Lobengula consistently pursued a well thought out strategy to protect the interests of his people. Although he had offered mining concessions to two foreign companies in 1870, these did not at first endanger his sovereignty. He restricted immigration and skilfully pitted European countries, companies and individuals against each other. In the long-term he sought a military alliance or protectorate status with the British government to counter the threat of Portuguese expansion from the east and from the Afrikaners in Transvaal to the south. Lobengula tried to make enough concessions to the British to avoid the loss of independence. In the end he failed because a number of factors made it almost inevitable that the Ndebele nation would be destroyed. It lay on the direct route from the south, and was an obvious target for Rhodes' expansion. He and his associates were determined by whatever means to exploit the region between the Limpopo and Zambezi rivers considered to be rich in gold, fertile and suitable for white settlement. His kingdom's geographical position made it an obvious target for the Cape's expansion. In 1889 Lobengula was outwitted by Rhodes whose agent Rudd deceived him into granting a concession which resulted rapidly in the loss of his country's independence. He repudiated the agreement in 1890 but Rhodes granted a royal charter for the British South Africa Company and his pioneers occupied Matabeleland against the will of Lobengula and later raised the British flag in Salisbury (Harare). Lobengula refused to let his army attack the Company for fear of provoking a revenge attack. But the British were now determined to provoke a war and Jameson incited Lobengula to armed resistance by murdering his peace envoys. The Ndebele were destroyed by Maxim guns in the war of 1893. Lobengula fled north to escape the advancing forces but died, probably of smallpox, in January 1894.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for insufficient knowledge.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives with an implicit analysis.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit analysis of changing relations.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focused evaluation of the reasons for changing relations.

*[17+ marks]* for depth of knowledge which may include an appreciation of how difficult Lobengula's position became in the late 1880s.

**10. Why did Khama survive as a ruler in southern Africa while Cetshwayo lost his kingdom?**

Khama, ruler of the Bamangwato from 1875 to 1923, survived as a ruler of his people long after the partition of Africa because he and two other Tswana rulers chose to ask for British protection in 1885, after their territory had been declared a British sphere of influence at the Berlin West Africa Conference. This wise choice was made due to the knowledge that the British were anxious to pre-empt a Boer or a German move to take over the territory. Britain declared Bamangwato a protectorate in 1890. Khama travelled to London in 1895 to persuade the Colonial Secretary to confirm the protectorate rather than come under the rule of the British South African Company. His diplomatic skills impressed all who met him on his visit. Although the British appointed a Resident Commissioner, Khama was effectively allowed to operate as an independent ruler. This was also partly because British administrators approved his policies of promoting Christianity and education and developing agriculture and trade. He preserved his kingdom and people at a time of considerable external threat and managed to increase the power of the Ngwato monarchy in the community by using British officials against internal rivals.

Cetshwayo had a very different fate. He had succeeded his father Mpande in 1873 when Zulu military strength was at its height. This was to prove a disadvantage. He favoured an anti-Boer alliance with the British but they did not want a strong Zulu nation on their Natal border. They also wanted to persuade the Boer authorities in the Transvaal to join them in a confederation partly to guard against a possible African victory over a white state. The new British High Commissioner at the Cape, Bartle Frere, decided that the Zulu posed a continuing threat to British interests and must be crushed. He sent an ultimatum to Cetshwayo, who accepted all but the disbandment of the Zulu army. The British invaded Zululand and after an initial defeat conquered and destroyed the Zulu kingdom. Cetshwayo was captured and exiled. Zululand was destroyed as a united state when the British divided it into 13 small provinces. Cetshwayo was recalled from exile in 1883 but forced to flee during the civil war and died in 1884. Zululand lost its separate identity.

*N.B.* If only one ruler is discussed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for insufficient knowledge of either ruler.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives of both rulers with an implicit sense of differences.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of differences.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focused, balanced analysis of the fate of the two rulers, perhaps in a comparative structure.

**[17+ marks]** for depth of understanding of the reasons for the contrasting British policies in the two kingdoms.

**11. Assess the impact of Cecil Rhodes on the history of southern Africa up to 1902.**

In 1870, at the age of 17, Cecil Rhodes moved to South Africa due to health reasons and made an early and massive fortune as a mining businessman on the Kimberley diamond fields. By 1889 his company, De Beers Consolidated, had bought out all its rivals and obtained a complete monopoly, to keep down wages. The mineral revolution in which Rhodes played a leading role had great social, economic and political consequences. It led to rapid urbanization, the growth of migrant labour, the development of a cash economy and provided a ready market for agricultural produce. It also led to an increasing level of conflict between white and black peoples. Rhodes sought to amalgamate the white controlled states of southern Africa into a new British-dominated federation. One of his companies dominated the gold-mining revolution at Witwatersrand in the Boer republic of Transvaal led by President Kruger.

Rhodes used his wealth to achieve political power. He became Prime Minister of Cape Colony in 1890 with Afrikaner support. His political career was destroyed by his attempt to overthrow the Transvaal government, which lost him Afrikaner backing. He and his business associates, who invested in Transvaal gold mining, planned to seize power in the Transvaal and prevent Kruger from strengthening his independence. His actions around the Jameson Raid in 1895 were driven by a wish to create a Transvaal fit for capitalism, to extend British hegemony and to unload the cost of the northern adventures in Zambia and Zimbabwe of his British South Africa Company onto a united South Africa. But he made a serious error of judgment in assuming the Uitlanders would rise up in revolution against Kruger. The failure of the Jameson Raid ruined his political career but it also directly led to British intervention against Transvaal and to the South African Anglo-Boer war of 1899–1902

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague, general narratives.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives with an implicit sense of impact only.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit analysis of impact.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for balanced, well supported analysis of the impact of Rhodes on the economic and political history of Southern Africa up to 1902.

*[17+ marks]* for depth and insight into Rhodes' role and the impact of the mining revolution culminating in the war of 1899–1902.

**12. “African societies benefited from economic development in the colonial period.” With reference to *two* countries, to what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Essays should not be vague diatribes against colonial exploitation, and arguments must be supported by specific reference to two named countries. There are too many different types of colonial economies to discuss here. The colonial economies of Ghana, Nigeria, Senegal, the Congo, Mozambique, Tanganyika, Uganda and Kenya all had different features and would all provide suitable examples.

Both economic growth and exploitation took place in the African economy and in South-Eastern Nigeria, for example, European trading firms ruined the Delta middleman traders but peasant production of export crops became profitable. Many areas of Africa were hardly touched by the colonial economy and were based on subsistence farming throughout the colonial period. Technological change was limited. Most African farmers “went into colonialism with a hoe and came out with a hoe”, though often a better hoe. Modern development could go hand in hand with exploitation. Railways facilitated the export of minerals and cash-crops and reduced transport costs, but allowed European cotton goods and iron tools to be sold much more cheaply in the interior, to the detriment of African craftsmen and manufacturers.

It has been claimed that Europe exploited Africa by deliberately failing to industrialize the continent. But this was also prevented by a lack of local capital and skills as well as low local incomes hindering the purchase of goods. Firstly Africa had to supply the world market with agricultural produce and raw materials so as to expand its domestic market and purchasing power and make industrialization viable.

*N.B.* If only one country is discussed award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for vague generalizations without reference to a country.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for descriptions of two colonial economies with implied analysis.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of the impact of economic development on African societies.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focused, balanced analysis of colonial economies in the context of development and exploitation.

**[17+ marks]** for depth of understanding which may select contrasting examples to bring out the diversity of the economies and the complexity of the issues.

**13. Analyse the reasons for the rise of the African Independent Church Movement in the colonial period with specific reference to *three* countries.**

A major reason for the rise of independent churches was the desire to escape Western domination and to protest against the slow progress made by mission-controlled churches in ordaining Africans to the priesthood and promoting them in the hierarchy. The issue of leadership was the major cause for the earliest independent churches breaking away from the European-dominated Anglican, Methodist, Lutheran, Presbyterian and Catholic churches. The independent churches appealed to those who sought the opportunity to preserve some of their own culture and traditions in a Christian context and wished to develop an African Christian theology. They also appealed to those who were otherwise deprived of the opportunity to express their political or social opinions.

Candidates are expected to make specific reference to three countries. South Africa, Malawi, Cote d'Ivoire or Nigeria are the likely, but not the only choices. In South Africa, the independent churches were strongly influenced by conditions of life there, including racial segregation, alienation of land and problems of a migrant labour economy. They drew inspiration from African Americans and from Ethiopia as an African Christian empire, which had triumphed over the Italians at Adowa in 1896. Independent churches in Malawi were especially associated with protests against colonial rule. The main leaders were Eliot Kamwana and his Watch Tower Movement, Charles Domingo, who also established many independent schools, and John Chilembwe, ordained a priest in 1900. He was the most anti-colonial of all, and set up the Baptist Independent Mission and the Natives' Industrial Union.

The rise of independent churches depended on charismatic leaders like Wade Harris in Liberia and Agbebi in Nigeria. Harris, a Liberian Protestant evangelist, moved to Cote d' Ivoire in 1913, where he soon made over 60 000 converts. He tolerated polygamy and unlike the Catholic missionaries was not associated with the hated French regime. All the independent churches advocated education as a means of promoting higher living standards in Africa and believed that Christianity in Africa must come to terms with African culture.

***N.B.*** If only two countries are discussed, award a maximum of **[14 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for discussion of only one country, vague generalizations or a list of independent churches.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives with an implicit analysis of reasons.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for explicit analysis of reasons related to three countries.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focused, balanced, well-supported analysis.

**[17+ marks]** for answers which bring out a variety of factors by analysing the growth of African churches in the specific context of each of the three countries.

**14. Compare and contrast the reasons for, and impact of, military intervention in the politics of the Sudan and Ethiopia from 1958 to 1991.**

The first military intervention in the Sudan took place in 1958, only two years after independence. The prime minister, Khalil, may have connived at his own replacement in a military coup by General Abboud. When the British withdrew from the Sudan in 1956 they left serious unresolved problems. They left a mainly Arabic speaking and almost entirely Muslim north confronting a mainly animist south led by a small missionary educated elite. The far stronger north tried to assimilate the southerners by force. From 1958 Sudan was ruled by a succession of generals including Nimeiry and el-Bashir. There were only eight years of civilian rule and almost constant civil war. The military rulers' policies of Arabization and their attempts to achieve a military solution aggravated the problems and provoked southern resistance, led by the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA) under John Garang.

Military intervention in Ethiopia had quite different reasons and results. There was a short-lived coup in 1960, provoked by discontent with the rule of Haile Selassie. After the attempted coup opposition became more open and mass-based. But the emperor was surrounded by such a cult of personality that he was oblivious to growing discontent. In the face of widespread opposition his government saw no need for reform. Finally its own soldiers rose successfully against the regime in 1974. A provisional military council, known as the Dergue, seized power and by 1976 Mengistu emerged at the head of a military dictatorship after executing rivals within the regime. Tens of thousands were killed or tortured as he wiped out the opposition and imposed his own vision of Marxist-Leninism. He failed to achieve widespread support or to respond adequately to the Eritrean, Tigrayan and Oromo nationalist movements. The country was further weakened by the catastrophic famine of 1984–1985. The military situation deteriorated after 1988. Disillusion grew in the army. As opposition Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) forces closed in on Addis Ababa in February 1991, Mengistu fled to Zimbabwe.

*N.B.* If only one country is discussed, award a maximum of **[7 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for inadequate relevant knowledge.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for sequential narratives with implicit comparison.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit comparison.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for a focused and balanced analysis of reasons for and impact of military intervention in a comparative structure.

**[17+ marks]** for insight into the very different historical contexts of the two countries.



**15. Assess the contribution of political parties to the achievement of independence in any two East African countries.**

Candidates are most likely to choose Tanganyika and Kenya, and to discuss the role of Tanganyika Africa National Union (TANU), Kenya African National Union (KANU) and Kenya African Democratic Union (KADU). If they choose Uganda they would have to discuss the more complicated role of the Buganda royalist party, the Kabaka Yekka, and the two main parties, the Protestant dominated Uganda People's Congress (UPC), and the mainly Catholic Democratic Party (DP). The ethnic and religious rivalries reflected in these parties contributed to Uganda achieving independence later than Tanganyika.

Whichever parties are chosen, candidates are expected to show the contribution to the achievement of independence made by its organization, leadership, political programme and by the degree of support it was able to command among different interest groups. The absence of serious tribal rivalry and of a large settler population and the unifying of Kiswahili all helped TANU to emerge as the single dominant nationalist party in Tanganyika. It pursued a peaceful non-confrontational campaign for independence in cooperation with the British governor and the UN Trusteeship Council. A crucial factor in TANU's success was the leadership provided by the charismatic Nyerere. He helped to build TANU into a party that won the trust of all ethnic racial groups and had such mass appeal that it won the most overwhelming victory of any African political party before independence.

In Kenya, by contrast, the presence of a large settler community, British reaction to the Mau Mau, inter-ethnic and leadership rivalry until Kenyatta's release from prison were all obstacles that limited the effectiveness of political parties in Kenya until a few years before independence. KANU was not really effective until Kenyatta's release from prison. He failed to bring Kenya's political interests together and his party was dominated by the Kikuyu and related tribes and the Luo. Whereas TANU was a highly organized active mass party, KANU was only active at election time and its victory in 1963 was due to the appeal of its leaders and the fact that the ethnic groups which supported it and voted on strictly ethnic lines outnumbered the smaller ethnic groups like the Maasai, the Luhya, and the people of the coast who supported KADU.

*N.B.* If only one country is discussed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for vague generalizations.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for descriptive/narrative answers with an implicit analysis of the role of political parties.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of the contribution of the two political parties.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focused, balanced analysis of the role of political parties in the achievement of independence.

**[17+ marks]** for depth and insight.

**16. Analyse the factors that helped and hindered the achievement of independence in Ghana (the Gold Coast) in 1957.**

Since Ghana was the first sub-Saharan country in Africa to achieve independence, it is reasonable to assume that there were more positive than negative factors so do not expect a balanced answer.

Ghana's rapid and relatively peaceful transition to independence might not have been predicted in February 1948 when riots broke out in Accra and the British arrested Nkrumah for suspected communist sympathy; but the Coussey Constitution enabled his Convention People's Party (CPP) to win a large majority in the National Assembly in 1951. Nkrumah left prison to become leader of government business. Nkrumah had returned to the Gold Coast to become secretary of the United Gold Coast Convention (UGCC) in 1947, but soon became critical of the elitist membership and moderate policies and formed his own CPP. Its leadership, organization and political programme contributed to the achievement of independence. Another key factor was the charisma and energy of Nkrumah. He was a brilliant speaker, tireless campaigner and party organizer, with a radical agenda demanding freedom now and justice with equality for all. He succeeded partly because of the economy and social position of the Gold Coast, its relative prosperity, its network of schools and number of graduates, its professional middle-class and businessmen. The British were ready to initiate a policy of decolonization in the absence of a settler community needing protection. The African cocoa farmers could be expected to continue to trade with Britain and there was a generally good relationship between African and expatriate civil servants. Nkrumah had a very good relationship with Governor Sir Charles Arden Clarke. An important contribution to the speed of change was made by market women, wage-workers, war pensioners and ambitious young school leavers.

The main obstacle to the achievement of independence came from tribes opposed to a unitary state, notably the Asante; they founded a regionally based party, the National Liberation Movement. In the 1954 election the CPP won a reduced majority and lost control of the north. But Arden Clarke continued to support Nkrumah in his determination to achieve independence for Ghana as a unitary state which was accomplished in March 1957. Another potential obstacle to the achievement of independence was the disaffected cocoa farmers of Asante, who resented the way Nkrumah's government still maintained marketing boards which restricted the prices paid to farmers.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague generalizations or inadequate narratives.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives with an implicit sense of help and hindrance.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit analysis, especially of how certain factors facilitated the achievement of independence. May be limited discussion of hindrances to independence.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focused analysis covering both positive and negative factors.

*[17+ marks]* for depth and insight.

**17. Why was independence in Malawi and Zambia achieved under majority rule in 1964 while Rhodesia declared independence under minority rule in 1965?**

Answers should cover all three countries and can be expected to begin with an analysis of the reasons for the collapse of the Central African Federation. The Federation had been pushed through in 1953 by the British government and white settlers. It was a deliberate attempt to pre-empt the emergence of African independence movements. The enlarged state would be economically powerful enough to resist moves towards African majority rule. But new racist legislation in 1956 led to a series of strikes, boycotts and demonstrations in the northern territories. This led to the banning of political parties and the imprisonment of their leaders and the formation of new parties and more protests. The British Conservative government of Harold Macmillan then accepted the “winds of change” blowing across Africa. The transfer of power to African nationalist leaders in Zambia and Malawi was achieved through peaceful negotiations. Banda, head of the Malawi Congress Party, and Kaunda, head of the United National Independence Party, were released from prison. The Monckton Report brought British acceptance of the right to secede from the Federation which Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia did in 1962 and 1963. In 1964 they became the independent states of Malawi and Zambia led, under majority rule, respectively by Presidents Banda and Kaunda.

In Southern Rhodesia, however, white settlers remained firmly in control, determined to resist all movements towards African majority rule. Southern Rhodesia had been self-governing since 1923. There were two major African nationalist parties, Zimbabwe African People’s Party (ZAPU) and Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), but lack of ability in planning and regional rivalries reduced their effectiveness during the crucial time of the break-up of the Federation. In November 1965 Ian Smith, leader of the new white Rhodesian Front Party, made a Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI). He thereby illegally declared white ruled Rhodesia to be an independent state, free from any British control. He rightly concluded that Britain would not use military force against its own “kith and kin”. The British government protested but took little action to stop him.

*N.B.* If only one country is dealt with, award up to a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for inadequate knowledge.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives with an implicit sense of why two countries achieved independence under majority rule while Rhodesia did not.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focused, balanced analysis of the situation in all three countries.

**[17+ marks]** for depth and understanding of the historical context of each of the three countries.

**18. Compare and contrast the contributions to the nationalist struggle in South Africa of Albert Luthuli and Nelson Mandela.**

Mandela may be the much better known but there should be balanced coverage of the two leaders, both of whom were winners of the Nobel Peace Prize. A former teacher and Zulu chief, Luthuli was elected president of the African National Congress (ANC) in 1952 and became famous as the leader of non-violent opposition to apartheid. He was involved in the Defiance Campaign of 1952. In 1954 he was banned from taking part in political meetings but contributed to the preparation of the Congress of the People, held outside Johannesburg in 1955, including its Freedom Charter. He continued to denounce apartheid including the establishment of Bantustans. After the Sharpeville Massacre he took the decision to accept the need for a separate armed wing of the ANC, Umkhonto we Sizwe. He watched helplessly under a banning order as eight ANC colleagues including Mandela were sentenced to life imprisonment at the Rivonia Trial. He died in 1967 after years of ill-health, house arrest and humiliation; his non-violent methods had failed to bring change but his perseverance, courage and integrity made him an internationally respected figure.

By 1960 Nelson Mandela had gained great prominence as a member of a new generation of young, educated Africans including Tambo and Sisulu. In 1963, after several successful sabotage attacks, the leadership of Umkhonto we Sizwe including Mandela was arrested, tried and sentenced for at least a decade. After 1964 the ANC virtually ceased to exist but it revived as a political force in the 1980s and Mandela came back to prominence from being an almost forgotten prisoner to becoming the focus of the Free Mandela Campaign. He became increasingly involved in unofficial contacts with the South African government and even met President Botha. External and internal pressures led De Klerk to unban the ANC and Mandela was released from prison in February 1990. Four years of intensive negotiations led to the first non-racial elections in South Africa in 1994. Mandela helped to transform the ANC from a liberation movement into a political party with a coherent organizational structure. He ensured the party's moderation, inclusiveness and mass appeal, and against a background of violence including Inkatha, government security forces and the Afrikaner AWB, won elections in 1994 and became president of South Africa and a worldwide symbol of endurance and unimpeachable moral authority.

*N.B.* If only one leader is discussed, award a maximum of **[7 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for inadequate knowledge.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives with implicit analysis.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit comparisons.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for balanced analysis of the contribution of both leaders in a comparative structure.

**[17+ marks]** for depth and insight into their contributions in the changing context of South African history.

**19. Why was Obote overthrown as president of Uganda in 1971 and again in 1985?**

Obote had become prime minister at independence in an unstable coalition of his UPC and the Buganda royalist party, relations between him and the Kabaka became increasingly tense. He used the army to depose the Kabaka and assume the presidency. In the later 1960s detentions and armed repression became increasingly common. A “move to the left” was introduced which increased central power. However Obote, who had used the army to prop up his own regime, failed to maintain army loyalty and was to be ousted by that same army under the command of Amin. The takeover occurred in January 1971 while Obote was in Singapore.

Obote got a second chance to become president when Amin’s bloodstained rule ended when he provoked a Tanzanian invasion in 1979. His UPC contested elections in 1980 and won them in notoriously rigged elections. His second term as president lacked legitimacy from the beginning, and the dissatisfaction that resulted from the doubts over the elections led to a number of groups going into the bush where they carried out a guerrilla war. The best organized was the National Resistance Army (NRA), which enjoyed popular support around its bases to the west of the capital, precipitated by deep-rooted hatred of Obote’s regime and was fuelled by its violent counter-insurgency operations. The NRA benefited from the weakness of Obote; and especially from the death in a helicopter crash in 1983 of General Oyite Ojok. This threw the army into confusion and eventually resulted in the overthrow of Obote in 1985, not by Museveni’s NRA but by another military coup led by Tito Okello in 1985. It was an ethnic division in the army, which was largely made up of Acholi and Langi, that led to an Acholi-led coup. Obote fled to Kenya and from there to Zambia. Obote II, as his second regime is known, had failed to unite the country, heal ethnic and religious divisions, revive the economy or keep the army in check.

*N.B.* If only 1971 or 1985 is dealt with, award up to a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for inadequate narratives.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives with an implicit analysis of reasons for the overthrows.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of reasons.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for balanced, focused analysis of the political situation in Uganda in 1971 and 1985.

**[17+ marks]** for depth and insight into the similarities and differences in reasons for the overthrows.

**20. “Kenyatta was a more successful president than Nyerere.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

This controversial judgement gives candidates the opportunity to weigh up the merits and demerits of the domestic and foreign policies of the two leaders. As many may disagree with the judgement as agree with it.

In foreign affairs, despite his treatment by Britain during the Mau Mau emergency, Kenyatta sought good relations with Britain and the West. Nyerere played a much more active role in the liberation movements in Southern Africa and provided bases for the Liberation Front of Mozambique (FRELIMO) and the African National Congress (ANC) in exile. Some of his decisions, such as the recognition of Biafra and the 1979 invasion of Uganda which led to the overthrow of Amin, were controversial but can be defended. Some have questioned the legality and benefit to either party of the union with Zanzibar in 1964. Both rulers can be blamed for the break-up of the East African Community, but Nyerere can be said to have taken a principled stand in refusing to meet Amin.

Both rulers turned their country into one-party states but Kenya also had two notable assassinations in the Kenyatta era, of Tom Mboya and J M Kariuki. Parliament became increasingly sidelined in Kenya and was frequently prorogued without reason in the 1970s. But elections were regularly held in both countries and provided the opportunity to express discontent by rejecting MPs including cabinet ministers. Both rulers avoided military coups and maintained stability. There is a sharp contrast in the economic policies of the two rulers. The Kenyan economy did reasonably well, but at the expense of the mass of the population. There was a growing gap between rich and poor. Nyerere’s government was less corrupt than Kenyatta’s, but his Ujamaa policy of compulsory villagization was self-help imposed from above. By the time Nyerere stepped down as president in 1985, Tanzania was still one of the poorest countries in Africa. It had huge foreign debts and was still dependent on exporting agricultural raw materials, but it avoided the massive problem of landless rural poverty which characterized its more prosperous neighbour Kenya. Tanzania also succeeded in providing the mass of rural people with vastly improved welfare services such as clean water, free health and education facilities.

*N.B.* If only one ruler is discussed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for vague, unsupported generalizations.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for descriptive or narrative discussions of both rulers with implicit analysis.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit focus on success.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focused, in-depth assessments of both rulers, perhaps in a comparative structure.

**[17+ marks]** for perceptive assessments of Kenyatta and Nyerere which may challenge the statement.

**21. Analyse the rise and fall of Mobutu in Zaire.**

Mobutu took advantage in his rise to power of the political instability of the country, largely the result of the colonial legacy. Belgium's deliberate restriction of education to primary level and the exclusion of Africans from any share in administration left the country ill-prepared to undertake the responsibility for administering a vast country. This situation was exacerbated by the deep divisions between politicians who emerged at independence, Kasavubu, Lumumba and Tshombe.

Mobutu had served as an NCO in the Belgian Colonial Army and rose to become colonel and chief of staff in the Force Publique, the embryonic army of newly independent Congo. A series of crises between 1960 and 1965 gave him his chance to rise to power. A UN force sent to restore order after the secession of Katanga failed to prevent the slide into further unrest. Mobutu, now a general, put down mutinies in the army and by September 1960 overthrew the radical Prime Minister Lumumba, while retaining President Kasavubu. Lumumba was murdered in 1961 as Mobutu drew closer to the CIA and the US government. In November 1965 he took over the presidency in a bloodless coup.

Mobutu ruled for decades as the absolute ruler of a single-party state. The economy collapsed in the 1970s, but during the Cold War Mobutu's regime was propped up by Western support. When it ended he could no longer rely on external support. By 1990 there was mounting external and internal pressure for democratization. In April 1990 Mobutu conceded the right to form opposition parties but the very next month the police suppressed a student protest, killing eleven people. A national conference opened in August 1991 as a gesture towards political pluralism while Mobutu concentrated with some success on dividing his opponents. From 1992 the political and economic situation in Zaire continued to deteriorate. In failing health Mobutu could not change the habits of a dictator. A rebellion backed by Rwanda and Uganda and led by Laurent Kabila's Alliance of Democratic Forces advanced from the east and Mobutu's demoralized army could not prevent its rapid march on the capital, Kinshasa, in 1995. Mobutu's regime fell and he fled the country.

*N.B.* If only rise or fall is discussed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for generalized narratives.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives of the rise and fall with sufficient knowledge.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers with an explicit analysis of the rise and fall and detailed evidence.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for balanced, focused, well supported analysis of the rise and fall.

**[17+ marks]** for answers which place the rise and fall in their historical context and show understanding of how both internal and external factors affected the rise and fall of Mobutu.

**22. Why was Senegal more politically stable than Nigeria between 1960 and 1980?**

Senegal emerged into independence in 1960 with a highly respected, charismatic leader, sensitive to the need to maintain economic stability by promoting economic development and striving to reduce ethnic tensions. Senghor was a veteran politician who had served in French ministries and kept close links with France. The cultural homogeneity among ethnic groups, Wolof as the *lingua franca*, and the small population all made the task of government easier. But there were potentially divisive forces, especially in Casamance, which had to be kept in check by a firm and prudent government. Senghor also contained political dissent in Senegal by a mixture of repression and maintaining an ethnic balance in political appointments. The economy was relatively well managed and there was a relative lack of corruption. Senghor skilfully incorporated different sections of Senegalese society in one political party, L'union Progressiste Sénégalaise (UPS), and persuaded an opposition party to merge with this. Senghor managed a remarkably smooth transition of his country in 1977–1978 from a one-party to a multi-party state, his final contribution to Senegal's stability. He resigned as president in 1980, having nominated Abdou Diouf, the prime minister, as his successor several years earlier.

The stability in Senegal was in sharp contrast to the situation in Nigeria especially after 1966. The political instability there was related to the ethnic and regional tensions between the Muslim Hausa and Fulani north, and the largely Christian Yoruba west, and Igbo south east, and the parties that represented these regional interests, the Northern People's Congress (NPC), Action Group and National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons (NCNC). For numerical reasons the NPC dominated federal policies after independence. Fears of a change in the balance of power led to corruption and violence at elections. An Igbo-led coup in January 1966 raised suspicions that the Igbos were plotting to seize power. In May many of them were slaughtered in the north and General Gowon led a counter-coup in July. Further violence against Igbos led Colonel Ojukwu to proclaim an independent Biafra. The civil war which followed ended with the defeat of the Igbos in 1970. General Gowon was ousted in 1975 and replaced by General Mohammed and, after his assassination, by General Obasanjo who returned the country to civilian rule in 1979. Nigeria lacked a leader of the calibre of Senghor, was much less homogeneous, and military intervention in its politics sharpened ethnic rivalry and led to considerable loss of life and destruction in the civil war and delayed the development of multi-party democracy.

***N.B.*** If only one country is discussed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for inadequate narratives, which in the case of Nigeria might be little more than just list of military rulers.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for discussion of stability/instability with implicit analysis and clear reference to both states.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit comparisons.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for balanced and focused analysis of both countries.

**[17+ marks]** for depth and insight into the political situation in both countries.



**23. Why was the United Nations intervention ultimately successful in both Namibia and Mozambique?**

Note the word “ultimately”. The UN sought to have an impact on Namibia, then South West Africa, when the mandated territory ruled by South Africa since 1919 became the responsibility of the UN Trusteeship Council. The Namibian issue was twice referred to the International Court of Justice, which in 1971 gave an advisory opinion that South Africa was in illegal occupation and should withdraw. From 1966 the General Assembly and the Security Council passed a series of resolutions which had little impact on the situation in Namibia. By the mid-1980s South Africa was prepared to give up Namibia, but only on the condition that Cuban troops were withdrawn from Angola. The end of the Cold War transformed the situation. The Security Council established a small mission to verify Cuban withdrawal from Angola, and in 1989 established the UN Transition Assistance Group, UNTAG. Eight thousand UN peacekeepers and civilians were deployed to organize and supervise elections and to monitor South African withdrawal. The whole operation was remarkably quick and free of incident. UNTAG organized the elections of November 1989 and Sam Nujoma became president of Namibia in 1990.

The UN could not end the civil war in Mozambique until both parties to the conflict were prepared to accept peace terms. As with Namibia, this was made easier by the end of the Cold War. South Africa had backed Renamo in Mozambique as part of a policy of destabilizing its African neighbour. When it withdrew support from Renamo, its leader Dhlakama was prepared to accept the UN’s role. The UN success depended on his cooperation, but crucially also on having a clear mandate from the Security Council and finances and personnel and equipment needed to accomplish it. The UN was involved in one of the biggest operations in its history which involved de-mining, the cantonment of militias, helping to rebuild the infrastructure, retraining the police force and organizing elections, which Renamo accepted despite its electoral defeat. Its success in Mozambique has similarities with Namibia but was in striking contrast to its failure in Angola, where it lacked the mandate, resources and goodwill of the rebel leader.

*N.B.* If only one country is discussed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for inadequate knowledge.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for accounts of UN operations in both countries with implicit analysis.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of reasons for ultimate success in both cases.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for balanced focused analysis of both UN interventions and accurate detailed evidence.

**[17+ marks]** for insight into the way that both operations were affected by the Cold War and the changing situation in South Africa.

**24. Assess the impact of urbanization on any *two* African countries since independence.**

There are plenty of examples to choose from and some generalizations would apply to most of them but candidates are expected to focus on two specific examples.

Rural urban migration, already important in the colonial period, was accelerated in the 1960s by education, population growth and employment opportunities in the city including the civil service. This involved the rapid growth of provincial centres as well as capitals. By the early 1990s, townspeople comprised nearly one third of the population of sub-Saharan Africa. Housing provision was inadequate and there was a rapid growth of slums. Urban earnings far exceeded rural earnings during the 1960s but wages fell over 30 % on average in real terms in the 1980s. Urban unemployment rose in many countries to over 20 % with the social consequences of rising crime rates, and problems like street children, prostitution and drug abuse. Survival in cities depended largely on the informal sector, which employed some 72 % of Nigeria's urban labour force in 1978. This was an important field for entrepreneurship. By the early 1990s there was a glaring disparity between the standard of living of a small but growing middle-class, and the poor and unemployed.

Capital cities were also important centres of political activity. Most had universities which became centres of student activism. The success of military coups depended on capturing key installations in the capital, as Amin did in Kampala in 1971, but Kenyan rebels failed to do in Nairobi in 1982. Urban riots often over food prices destabilized several governments, *e.g.* in Liberia, Sudan and Zambia. From the end of the 1980s it was largely urban groups which attacked one-party regimes weakened by economic crises and their Western backers' unwillingness to support authoritarian rule once the Cold War ended. This led to a dramatic rise in multi-party states. Mass urbanization, combined with population growth and economic decay, helped to create the armed youth who terrorized Mozambique, Liberia, Somalia and Sierra Leone.

*N.B.* If only one country is discussed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for vague generalizations about city life.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for descriptions of cities in two African countries with implicit sense of impact.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit focus on urbanization and more developed comment on impact.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for balanced, well supported assessments of the impact of urbanization on two countries.

**[17+ marks]** for insight into variations of the impact on two countries.

25. “African writers have been sharply critical in their plays and novels of African governments since independence.” With reference to *two* African writers chosen from different regions of Africa, examine the validity of this assertion.

There are plenty of writers to choose from; but they should not both be chosen, for example, from East or West Africa. Wole Soyinka’s *Kongi’s Harvest*, and Imbuga’s *Betrayal in the City* both satirized the cult of personality by some post-independence rulers. Ayi Kwei Armah’s *The Beautiful Ones Are Not Yet Born*, Ngugi’s *Petals of Blood*, and Achebe’s *Man of the People* and *Anthills of the Savannah* are all an indictment of aspects of corrupt authoritarian rule. Similar examples could be given of novelists and dramatists in Uganda or Zimbabwe or in Francophone Africa.

In examining the validity of the assertions it might be pointed out that not every novel or play has sought to make a political comment and that many writers have focused on social problems and the plight of individuals and families, especially in an urban setting. Such writing may only criticize governments implicitly.

This is a history essay and answers should set the work of writers clearly in the context of their country’s political history. The works of Ethiopian writers whose country only briefly experienced foreign occupation and South African writers writing under minority and/or majority rule can be considered.

**N.B.** If only one writer or region is discussed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for vague generalizations or plot summaries.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for implicit criticisms of independent governments.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of how and why two writers criticized their governments.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focused, balanced analysis of two writers linked to post-independence events.

**[17+ marks]** for in-depth analysis of writers in the regions, clearly set in the context of their country’s post-independence history.

---