

# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2003**

**HISTORY – AMERICAS**

**Higher Level**

**Paper 3**

**1. Compare and contrast the impact of European mercantilism in British North America and Spanish Latin America.**

Spanish mercantilist policies, until the mid-eighteenth century, were rigorously regulated in the New World. British mercantilist policies, by contrast, were not systematically applied. For both colonial powers, (Spain and England) the Seven Years War brought changes in policies. While Spain gradually loosened the rigid economic controls in their colonies, England changed to strict enforcement of the laws.

**Impact:** In the British North America colonies, although British regulations imposed obstacles to manufacturing, some industries such as shipbuilding prospered. Since the British government was often lax, the colonies particularly in the North, developed manufacturing and extractive industries, which exploited the natural resources of the continent, and established a significant commerce and trade system. By the mid-1760s the hardening regulations of the Crown set the stage for the revolution. In the Spanish American colonies, the Spanish were more successful than the British in extracting great surface wealth – gold and silver – from the colonies. Thus they concentrated less energy on making agriculture and commerce in their colonies. Furthermore, Spain’s strict and inflexible policies not only hampered the economic development and production of the colonies, it also weakened the incentive to promote domestic economic growth, produced inflation and discouraged industry. The time arrived when Spain could not longer supply the manufactured goods that the colonists demanded. When reforms were introduced to promote better revenues, this loosened the rigid controls on commerce and promoted new economic opportunities in the colonies, but also helped to precipitate the collapse of the empire.

Answers should follow a compare/contrast approach. Candidates must define mercantilism and recognize the fact that, in theory, it was similar for all the European powers at the time. How it actually functioned, however, was different and therefore its impact was different. Both areas should be included in the answer.

*N.B. If only one is mentioned mark out of [12].*

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for some discussion of mercantilism and limited discussion of impact.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more detailed arguments about impact.

*[14 to 15 marks]* for detailed arguments and well-developed analysis.

*[17+ marks]* for answers that define mercantilism, analyse its impact and show a clear compare/contrast approach.

**2. Explain how conflicts and rivalries among European nations both helped and hindered the struggle for independence in *one* area of the region.**

United States: The French and Indian War, between Great Britain and France, brought a fundamental change in the relationship between the colonies and the British government. Foremost was the change in how the British saw the colonies and how the colonists viewed their home government. These views and the policy changed from “salutary neglect” to enforcement of regulations and the demands for new revenues caused the American colonists to become more “attentive to their liberties”. Candidates might argue that American society had changed before the war with Great Britain therefore the policy changes were only the “trigger” in the struggle for independence. Mention should be made of French aid (money, troops and navy) to the American cause, as well as the loans obtained from Holland and Spain. Other nations of Europe in 1780 formed the League of Armed Neutrality against England because of its abuses of commercial rights of neutral nations. All of these were indispensable to American victory.

Spanish America: the conflict of interests between Spain and its colonies was expressed in the cleavage between the Creoles and the peninsular Spanish, which was reflected in the growth of Creole nationalism during the nineteenth century. The gradual decline of Spain, due to its wars first against the British, and later against the French, culminated with Napoleon’s invasion to Spain and the forced abdication of the Spanish king. For the Creoles this was an opportunity to take power in “the name of the Spanish king”. However, the hopes for independence were limited by fighting between royalists and patriots. The struggles for independence were further prolonged by the events in Europe. The fall of Napoleon in 1814 brought Ferdinand (the Spanish king) back to the throne. Rejecting the prospects of independence for Spanish America, the king released Spanish troops for use in the area, thus increasing Creole nationalism, destroying loyalty to Spain and the King, prolonging the struggle, devastating the area and “hindering” the process of independence. In contrast, the French invasion of Portugal in 1807, followed by the flight of the Portuguese court to Brazil, brought major benefits to Brazil. Indeed, the transfer of the court in effect signified the achievement of Brazilian independence, therefore it helped the process.

Do not expect or demand full coverage of all the above issues. Candidates are not required to discuss the specific European conflicts.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for narrative, unsupported answers.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a rather general discussion but some explicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answer establishing a background to the conditions in the colonies and ability to discuss its impact although not very specifically.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for detailed arguments and well-developed analysis.

*[17+ marks]* for answers with focus, analysis and detail.

**3. How and why did the Constitution replace the Articles of Confederation in the United States?**

**How:** In the 1780s economic troubles and political unrest caused many Americans to doubt whether the recently created nation could survive under a weak central government. To deal with various problems, the Congress, although reluctant to initiate any change, in 1787 issued a call for a convention at Philadelphia for the purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation. The Convention consisted of 55 delegates from all the states except Rhode Island. They were mainly lawyers, large landowners, bankers and merchants. They were well-educated people, widely read in history, government and law and many had considerable political experience: George Washington, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton and Benjamin Franklin.

**Why:** The delegates agreed that the Articles were inadequate and the majority in the convention were persuaded by James Madison to replace the existing plan of government (the Articles) and proceeded to draw up a new constitution, thus turning the meeting into a constitutional Convention. Although the delegates disagreed sharply on some issues: representation, slavery and trade, each conflict at the convention was resolved through compromise. The Constitution created a central government that was considerably stronger than the original US government under the Articles. The new plan differed from the Articles in this respect: a separate executive branch, a separate judicial branch, a two house legislature, greater power for the Congress, federal in form (not confederate). In September 1787, the delegates who framed the constitution submitted it to the states for their approval. A great debate followed on whether or not the new plan of government should be substituted for the Articles of Confederation. Favouring the ratification were the Federalists, opposing it were the Antifederalists. After considerable debate and further compromises the Federalists won and the Constitution was ratified in June 1788.

Candidates are expected to answer both parts of the question: how and why. A comparison between the Articles and the Constitution is not necessary but if it is done it will enhance the answer.

**N.B. *If only one part of the question is answered mark out of [12].***

***[0 to 7 marks]*** for descriptive answers which ignore the requirements of the question.

***[8 to 10 marks]*** for answers which give more emphasis to one of the demands of the question but address the other demand although in a limited way.

***[11 to 13 marks]*** for answers that address both demands but the analysis is limited.

***[14 to 16 marks]*** for well-focused answers with some analysis.

***[17+ marks]*** for focused, well-informed, analytical answers.

4. **To what extent do you agree that “Caudillismo was inevitable, and even necessary in nineteenth-century Latin America”? Explain your answer by discussing the rule of *one* caudillo in *one* country.**

Although there are many issues that can be discussed in this topic, some that could be outlined are:

Conditions after the wars of independence contributed to the phenomenon of the “caudillo”: a charismatic leader who advanced his interests through a combination of military and political skills, and was able to build up a network of clients by dispensing favours and patronage. Based, as it was on personal charisma and military skill, “caudillismo” was one of the few careers actually open to talent in the post-independence period and it represented a way up for ambitious men of mixed blood. But “Caudillismo” existed at all levels of national life and “caudillos” were from all social classes. Usually, the caudillo ruled with the aid of lesser caudillos, each supreme in his region. Whatever their methods, caudillos generally displayed some regard for republican ideology and institutions. “Caudillismo” was not a new phenomenon as such, however, and represented traditional ways of dealing with political unrest such as in sixteenth century Spain and Portugal. The emergence of “caudillos” in the nineteenth century suggests that a reversion to political conditions had occurred analogous to those in the sixteenth century.

The wars of independence created economic, political and social chaos. The discipline previously maintained by the Spanish administrators had gone. No significant middle class had yet emerged, to provide stability, and there was no organized public opinion. In the cities the creole elite took control of the government and drew up liberal constitutions and laws which they were unable to enforce, since the idealists’ theories conflicted with the real state of the affairs to which they were to be applied. As lawlessness increased, effective political power passed into the hands of personal leaders – caudillos, who in many cases had led armies in the wars. Wealthy landowners (and the Catholic Church was the greatest of these) were satisfied that authoritarian rule should continue.

Everywhere, from Mexico to Argentina the Spanish Americas had to pass through the Age of “Caudillos”. There are plenty of examples for instance: Mexico (Santa Anna, Juárez, Díaz); Argentina (Juan Manuel Rosas *etc.*). But any caudillo from any country is acceptable providing that it is from the nineteenth century.

The question does not demand a definition of Caudillismo, but candidates must demonstrate an understanding of the term, particularly in relation to the conditions in which the caudillo emerged. References to Spanish traditions and “personalism and individualism” are accepted, although negative stereotypes are not. Answers should clearly respond to the demand of “to what extent” and explain why. The issue of inevitability, however, is more complex, but mention of it, without cultural determinism, must be included. Similar suggestions about the “necessity” are applied. An affirmative or negative answer about this last point should include an explanation, particularly with regard to stability. Some candidates might argue that Bolívar was the first caudillo and this is acceptable. A similar suggestion is applied to Porfirio Díaz in Mexico although his rule spanned into the twentieth century. However, twentieth century figures such as Perón or Castro, are not acceptable.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for generalized, unsupported answers or those that use an inappropriate time frame.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative accounts that have explicit relevance and use clear examples.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers that respond to the demands of the question but with limited analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers that are focused, display knowledge, support the arguments but may not address all the demands of the question.

**[17+ marks]** for answers that display knowledge, analysis, balanced and well-supported arguments and address all the demands of the question.

**5. Analyse the arguments and activities of the Abolition movement in the United States from the 1830s to the 1860s.**

Abolitionism arose in the reform wave of the 1830s with societies which were concerned with ending slavery. Most abolitionists demanded immediate freeing of the slaves without compensation to their masters. The abolitionists argued that slavery: was morally wrong; it contradicted religious teachings and violated the Bible; it resulted in cruel and inhuman treatment of the slaves and families; it degraded slave owners and violated democracy as it was established in the Declaration of Independence.

To sway public opinion, the abolitionists conducted meetings and published newspapers. Some of those who lectured and wrote against slavery were: Theodore Parker, Wendell Phillips and Waldo Emerson. The emergence of William Lloyd Garrison, one of the best-known abolitionists and publisher of the leading antislavery newspaper, the *Liberator*, with his demand for immediate, universal abolition of slavery stimulated discussion. Militant and uncompromising, Garrison condemned the Constitution, because it permitted slavery, as “an agreement with hell”. Abolitionism had a particular appeal for the free black population in the North, who lived in appalling conditions. They found in Frederick Douglass, a former slave, a leader of their own. Douglass demanded not only freedom but full social and economic equality. Moderate abolitionists entered politics by founding the Liberty party. In 1840, it backed its first Presidential candidate – a former slaveholder, James Birney. The rise of abolitionism was a powerful force, but provoked powerful opposition as well since even in the North abolitionists were a small minority whom most whites viewed as radicals. The result was an escalating wave of violence. Candidates should recognize the internal divisions and strains that the abolitionist crusade was experiencing by the mid-1830s, as well as the change from moral appeals to political action, seeking to induce Northern states and the federal government to aid the cause. The Underground Railroad, the “Free-Soilers” are examples from this stage. The frustrations of political abolitionism drove some critics of slavery to embrace more drastic measures. A few advocated violence and supported John Brown’s uprising. Others attempted to arouse public anger through propaganda, the most powerful example was Harriet Beecher Stowe’s novel *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, published in 1852. It rocked the nation and brought the message of abolitionism to an enormous audience. Not only in the North but in the South her novel helped inflame sectional tensions to new levels.

The focus for the answers should be on arguments and activities of the abolitionist movements not necessarily in its impact. The question relates to the United States, ignoring this requirement should not be accepted, although allusions to other regions (*i.e.* Latin America) might be taken into account providing they do not include figures such as Father de Las Casas whose arguments are not valid either for the time period.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for answers that are general, narrative and do not address any of the demands of the question.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers that address only either arguments or activities.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers that address both the arguments and activities of the movement but do not provide clear specific evidence (examples) for the arguments.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers that address arguments, activities and show analytical insights.

**[17+ marks]** for answers that address all the demands of the question, are focused on the issue and demonstrate analytical skills.

**6. Why did the North win the Civil War in the United States?**

Some of the reasons for the Northern Victory were: superior manpower and equipment; industry able to supply war materials; transportation lines better developed; naval blockade of the Confederacy; and superior sea power. Aspects to be included: North: population 22–23 million; great industrial power; established government, all departments operating; recognized internationally as the legitimate government; sound monetary and credit policy; regular army and navy; controlled the water system around the Confederacy; well-developed transportation system.

Answers might follow a cause/effect or compare/contrast approach between North and South. Specific statistics are not required. Do not reward narrative accounts of the Civil War which discuss the differences between the North and the South without focusing on the particular issue of the question: “why”.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general narratives that discuss the Civil War but do not focus on the demands of the question.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for answers that are narrative or descriptive but address the issue of why the North won.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers which discuss why the North won but do not develop all the implications of the North’s advantages.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that display analysis and a focused approach but do not consider the advantages that the South had at the beginning of the conflict.

*[17+ marks]* for answers that are focused, analytical, supported by specific evidence and show considerable insights into the effects that time had on the efforts of the South.

**7. Examine the reasons for industrial expansion in the United States or Canada from 1865 to 1900.**

Answers will depend on the selected country. However, specific references should be made to some of the following aspects that made possible the industrial expansion: existence of raw materials, adequate labour, technological achievements, effective business leadership, nationwide markets, role of state and/or national government.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for answers that show a limited degree of accurate and relevant knowledge.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for answers that show satisfactory arguments and knowledge but limited supporting evidence.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers that show coherent arguments and knowledge and satisfactory evidence.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are focused, structured and well-supported but are somehow limited in their appreciation of how certain factors contributed the industrial development of the country.

*[17+ marks]* for analytical, structured and well-supported answers that show relevant and specific knowledge.

8. **For what reasons, and in what ways, did Latin America experience economic growth between 1880 and 1900? Support your answer with examples from *two* countries of the region.**

By the late nineteenth century, Latin America experienced a significant economic expansion: exports increased, cities grew, banks were founded, railroads pushed into the interiors, industrialization commenced, telegraphs and cable lines appeared and a middle class began to develop.

**For what reasons:** This economic expansion was brought about by the Industrial Revolution in Europe and industrial expansion in the United States that was increasingly demanding foodstuffs and raw material which Latin America was willing and able to provide. The rapid expansion of Latin America's economies was also supported and encouraged by the victory of the intellectual rationale of liberalism prevalent in Latin America at the time. Liberalism justified Latin America's integration into the world economy by what was perceived as a "comparative advantage".

**In which ways:** The development of these exports was accompanied by the importation of manufactured goods and foreign investments in the region. Thus was established, in the late nineteenth century, an "export-import" form of economic growth that stimulated development in the raw-material sectors of the Latin American economies but hampered the production of manufactured goods. The creation of this type of economy produced new wealth. Some people progressed but the great majority of people became even poorer and marginalized from these changes. These economic changes, moreover, strengthened the relationship with Europe and the US and consequently brought about an economic dependency, and eventually a political dependency, on these areas. Interesting examples: Mexico, Argentina, Brazil or Chile but any country can be used.

A question that requires an implicit understanding of several issues: growth versus development; nineteenth century liberalism; comparative advantage and dependency. Candidates must answer the two parts of the question and use two countries as examples. However, allow more emphasis on one country than the other. If only one country is used or only one part of the question's demands are developed, mark out of **[12]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for little understanding of the topic and the demands of the question.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers that use either only one country or attempt to use two but in a limited way.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for focused answers that comply with the demands of the question but are mainly narrative although may show some evidence of analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical answers where not all the implications of the issues are considered.

**[17+ marks]** for well-structured, analytical answers which show explicit knowledge of the economic development of the period.

**9. Why did the United States reject the Treaty of Versailles?**

Some of the circumstances might include: Wilson's mistakes before the Peace Conference (selection of a Democratic delegation; failure to consult senators; failure to understand European problems). Reason for hostility to the treaty in the US: opposition for idealistic reasons (Senator Robert La Follette); Wilson's enemies in both political parties (the President's aloofness had aroused some animosity); partisan political considerations by the Republicans; opposition by certain national groups within the US which reflected the loyalties and dislikes brought to the US by the various immigrant groups (opposition by Irish-Americans and German-Americans); traditional US attitude of avoiding involvement in the affairs of Europe. Ratification of the Treaty was also hampered by groups with different opinions in the Senate. One group believed, with Wilson, that the treaty should be ratified without changes or reservations; a second group, mostly democrats, although not following precise party lines, approved the treaty in general, but would accept moderate changes. Not entirely opposed to the treaty, but insisting on drastic changes and reservations, was a group of Republican senators led by Henry Cabot Lodge. The smallest group were of senators who were irreconcilably opposed to the treaty, and the US membership of the League on any terms. This group wielded an influence far out of proportion to its numbers but were able parliamentarians and effective speakers who strongly influenced public opinion. The Senate Foreign Affairs Committee recommended ratification, but included 42 amendments to the treaty, including reservations in deference to the traditional US position of isolation. The principal one was that which forbade the sending of US troops abroad.

Shortly before the Senate committee reported on the treaty, Wilson went on a stumping tour around the country to secure public support for ratification. He believed that he could arouse sufficient favourable opinion to force the Senate to ratify the treaty. It is probable that in the summer of 1919 a majority of the people favoured ratification of the treaty, but not without some amendments and reservations-particularly with regard to participation in the League. The strain of the speaking tour, added to the tensions of the past seven months in Europe, proved too much. Wilson suffered a stroke and remained an invalid for most of his term.

Compromise might have secured the passage of the treaty on the third and last time it went to the vote, but it did not pass. Among those opposed to it were the "irreconcilables", and Wilson's personal friends who he had ordered to vote against it. Thus, Wilson himself was partly responsible for the defeat of the treaty and the failure of the US to join the League; had he not refused to compromise, the treaty would have been accepted by the Senate without basic alterations.

Do not expect all of the above and accept well-argued points of the candidate's choice. Answers should focus on the fight for the ratification of the Treaty in the US not problems at the Peace Conference.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for sweeping, unsupported generalizations or out of the topic discussions (*i.e.*: failures of the League).

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative but well-argued answers.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers that reveal knowledge but show limited analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers that show understanding and knowledge of the issues and good analytical skills.

**[17+ marks]** for answers which in addition of all of the above **[14 to 16 marks]** demonstrate awareness with different interpretations of the issues.

**10. Using specific examples, analyse the literary trends that emerged in Latin America between the 1850s and the 1920s.**

Two basic literary currents emerged in Latin America at this time: romanticism and modernism. Candidates may also identify subcurrents such as naturalism, realism, and positivism sometimes complementing, sometimes contradicting the basic currents. What is more significant is to identify that the literature of the period was concerned mainly with Latin American themes. Romanticism was an attempt at literary independence by breaking with Hispanic classical traditions and adopting as their models the great French and English writers of the romantic school. There are many authors that could be discussed each one reflecting their own country national experiences. (Argentina) Domingo Sarmiento and José Hernández, (Perú) Ricardo Palma and Clorinda Matto de Turner (the first great Indianista novel) (Chile) Francisco Bilbao. (Colombia) Jorge Issacs. Modernism, however, can be identified with the beginning of a true Latin American literature and as a reaction against the language and forms of romanticism. It also reflected the new social, political and economic changes of the period. Again, there are many opportunities here: Rubén Darío (Nicaragua) José Martí (Cuba) *etc.* in the area of realism: (Brazil) Machado de Assis and Euclides da Cunha; (Uruguay) José Enrique Rodó.

An opportunity to discuss intellectual and/or literary issues. Candidates should name the currents and provide at least one example for each current. The selection of the same country is acceptable providing that the analysis focuses on the time period. Although analysis should be evident in discussing the main characteristics of the currents, accept narrative accounts of the selected works, if that is the case.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for answers that show lack of knowledge about the issues and that show that this question was selected in “desperation”.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for discussions showing an understanding of the topic.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for informed, well-developed arguments with limited examples.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for coherent and well-structured answers which show relevant but limited, specific knowledge about particular authors.

**[17+ marks]** for focused, well-argued arguments that show a combination of narrative/analytical approach supported with specific examples.

**11. “The Good Neighbor Policy enhanced both diplomatic and economic relations between the United States and Latin America.” Assess the validity of this statement.**

During the 1930s, amid a severe economic depression, the policy of the United States toward Latin America was modified. The former policy of interventionism became an avowed “non intervention policy”: the “Good Neighbor policy”. This policy had its origins in the Hoover administration but is associated with Franklin D Roosevelt. The avowed purpose of the policy was to win Latin American good will by being a “good neighbor”.

In order to assess the validity of the statement some issues that could be discussed are: the reasons for Latin American mistrust of the US; its objectives; practice and impact. Its objectives were (friendship, trade, defence). Its practices were: retreat from imperialism (*i.e.* 1934 marines out of Haiti, 1936 surrender rights to intervene in Panama; 1934 abrogation of the Platt Amendment in Cuba; 1938 Mexico); Pan-Americanization of the Monroe Doctrine at various Conferences (*i.e.* 1933, 1936, 1938); Strengthening economic ties (*i.e.* 1934 creation of the Export-Import Bank and the passing of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act); and strengthening social and cultural ties (*i.e.* the use by both areas of arts, music, literature and media and goodwill tours to promote a better understanding; the creation in 1941 of the Office of Interamerican Affairs). The war strengthened the political and economic links between the US and LA.

The Good Neighbor policy did not mean, however, the US had abandoned its influence in LA. On the contrary, it had simply replaced one form of leverage with another. Instead of military force, the US tried to use economic influence. The new reliance on economic pressures eased tensions between the US and its neighbours considerably by eliminating the most abrasive and conspicuous irritants in their relationship.

Answers to this question probably will agree with the validity of the statement. However, although not necessarily following the scheme described above, it must explain and sustain the assessment with examples. Furthermore, the question addresses US policy towards Latin America only up to 1945. Answers outside the context of the Good Neighbor policy should not be accepted.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for answers that are generalized and/or of a different time frame.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers that provide evidence of knowledge about the Good Neighbor policy but do not provide pertinent examples.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers that display knowledge and some examples but do not deal with most of the issues.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers that display knowledge, provide examples and satisfactorily address the significant diplomatic and economic issues.

**[17+ marks]** for answers that fulfil all the requirements of the above markband and display evidence of historiography and different interpretations by discussing the negative implications of the policy such as the support of dictatorships in the Caribbean.

**12. Evaluate the role of the “rise of expectations” in the outbreak of the Mexican Revolution in 1910.**

Candidates should demonstrate understanding of the term “rise of expectations” within the context of a revolution. This is the view that revolutions occur at times of improvement (political, social or economic) for the majority of people, a time that “raises the expectations,” but when continued improvement is threatened by government or some other actor, the revolution comes. Candidates must discuss the contradictions of the Porfiriato, Díaz’s efficient dictatorship (1876–1910): reaching material prosperity, based on the growth of railroads, mining, and commerce of unprecedented proportions, although the great mass of its people, especially rural labourers, were ground deeper into poverty. Mexico, a country previously known for its violence became a paragon of tranquillity, fiscal stability, and political order which attracted foreign investments, particularly Americans and British who promoted and developed economic modernization. The beneficiaries were the hacendados, the Catholic Church, the foreigners and the “científicos”. Díaz’s dictatorship came to an unexpected end in 1911. A recession in 1907–1908 bankrupted many businesses and left more than a million workers unemployed. Foreign owners, however, weathered the crisis and emerged with even more control in the economy. Declining standards of living provoked workers’ strikes, most of which were put down brutally by rural police. Class struggle reached alarming levels by 1910, but Díaz did not heed the warnings of anarchists, labour leaders, intellectuals, and even members of his government. The catalyst of the revolution was Díaz’s announcement, later denied, of his retirement. This opened the gates for Madero’s opposition and his Plan of San Luis Potosí. The plan did not propose radical reforms but spoke about democracy, made vague reference to restore lands to the Amerindians, decried the lack of schools, widespread illiteracy and promised a better administration. Still, it addressed some issues that mattered to millions of Mexicans and offered hope of some change. When Madero in his short rule was unable to fulfil his promises, the revolutionaries took matters into their own hands. The Mexicans’ expectations had been raised but not fulfilled.

The significance of the “rise of expectations” in the outbreak of the revolution depends on the candidate’s arguments and knowledge. But regardless of the degree of significance that it is given, the answers must deal with the issue, either to support or to deny it.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for narratives of the events of the Mexican Revolution without even mentioning the “rise of expectations”.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers that affirm or deny the role of the “rise of expectations” without supporting evidence.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers showing understanding of the issue and provide a limited analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for structured, focused and well-argued answers but whose assessment is rather limited.

**[17+ marks]** answers which show all the above characteristics and in their assessment display knowledge of different historical interpretations about the outbreak of the revolution.

**13. How did the Depression change the role of government in *two* countries of the region?**

Answers will vary according to the selected country. However, the most general trend was the end of the laissez-faire approach and the increase of government participation in the economic (and in some countries also the political) life of the nation.

A traditional and straightforward forward question. The main condition is the use of two countries. If only one is used mark out of **[12]**. Any country should be accepted as an example but it must be explicit about the way in which the government changed its role.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for answers with a limited degree of accurate and relevant knowledge.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers which address the change of the government's role but have limited analysis and examples.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for coherent arguments and sufficient examples about one country but limited reference to the second.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for well-structured and argued answers with supporting evidence for both countries.

**[17+ marks]** for clearly structured and focused answers, well-developed and analytical arguments and demonstration of in-depth understanding of the topic.

**14. Assess the importance of the “conscription crisis” in Canada’s national development.**

Candidates must explain the meaning of the term “conscription crisis” and place it in the context of the at first successful effort at raising a volunteer force as well as the other irritants to French-English relations at the same time and the deepening crisis in Europe. Candidates should indicate the roles of Borden and Laurier and the election of 1917, showing the depth of the ethnic division which still existed. The crisis was significant and national unity may have suffered a setback but stronger forces continued to draw Canadians together.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for general answers that lack accurate and relevant knowledge.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers with relevant arguments but limited assessment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers with relevant and well-supported arguments but only satisfactory assessment.

**[14 to 16 marks]** if the demands of the questions are generally well addressed but not all aspects of the conscription crisis are addressed but the assessment is good.

**[17+ marks]** if answers fulfil all the above requirements plus demonstrate a high level of conceptual ability and understanding of historical explanations.

**15. How and why did nationalism evolve in Latin America in the first half of the twentieth century? Illustrate your answer with examples from *one* country of the region.**

Until the late 1930s Latin American nationalism had been largely cultural and intellectual. Its more frequent manifestation had been attacks on foreign business and intervention. But after the experience of the Depression a new form of nationalism emerged. Nationalists began to argue that it was the agrarian structure of the economy which caused subservience to foreign interests. The build up of manufacturing industry came to be regarded as a way out of these difficulties, for the domestic economies would become less dependent on imports and would therefore be more self-sustaining in times of world recession. The nationalists launched a programme of industrialization planned by the state and designed to develop the capacity to manufacture the industrial products which had to be imported from abroad. This was economic nationalism, and its goal was true national sovereignty through industrial self-sufficiency. The selected countries will reflect the particular evolution of nationalism. Probable choices: Argentina; Brazil (Vargas); or Cuba.

Attention to the time frame is the key to the question. It allows students to discuss familiar topics such as Argentina the Concordancia and Perón's nationalism before he came to power and during his first term in power, as well as Vargas in Brazil. Other choices might be applicable. This, however, does not apply to a discussion about the Cuban revolution, but about the nationalistic elements which launched the Revolution. Both why and how should be addressed.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for answers generalizing about nationalism or narrating the story of a leader or those that are not confined (at all) within the time period.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers which show understanding of the question and have satisfactory arguments but that do not make explicit reference to the why and how included in the question.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers that display good structure, focus, arguments and some limited analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers that fulfil the demands of the question and demonstrate a consistent sound level of knowledge although not all the aspects are addressed.

**[17+ marks]** for answers that display a high level of knowledge, analysis and conceptual ability.

**16. Examine the response of *two* governments of the region to the Holocaust.**

Although any country could be used, the most probable examples might be the United States and Canada because there is more documentation about the topic.

In both the US and Canada there is evidence that the governments knew about the Holocaust as early as 1942. In the US news of the atrocities was reaching the public as well, and public pressures began to build up for an Allied effort to end the killing or at least to rescue some of the surviving Jews. The US government consistently resisted all the pressures. Moreover, both the US and Canada resisted entreaties that it admit large number of Jewish refugees attempting to escape Europe. From 1933 until 1939, the United States admitted 140 000 Jewish refugees and Canada permitted only 4 000 Jewish refugees to enter. While hundreds of thousands more were denied entry. In the US almost 90 % of the quota for Germany remained untouched. In the US, it seems clear, there was a deliberate effort by officials in the State Department, conducted by anti-Semitic elements, to prevent Jewish immigration to the US. A similar situation seems to be the case in Canada, where anti-semitism was prevalent. Both English and French newspapers regularly voiced anti-Semitic commentary, and several Canadian politicians were anti-Semites. A very well-known example is the case of the St Louis liner. In May 1939, the St Louis ocean liner left Germany. On board were 907 Jews, refugees without belongings, home, or safety, fleeing Nazi Germany. When the boat reached Havana, Cuba, the Cuban government refused the Jews safety. Two days later, all Latin America countries had rejected the Jewish refugees. The St Louis left Havana for America, the United States, however, ordered the American Coast Guard to keep the St Louis far from shore. Absolutely desperate the St Louis continued on to Canada, who would not accept the Jewish refugees. The boat was sent back to Germany, the passengers sentenced to gas chambers.

Do not expect all the details discussed above, but reward specific examples. Emotional responses without historical basis should not accepted.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for narrative “commentaries” without historical evidence.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers that show understanding of the question and offer satisfactory arguments and evidence but emphasise only the response of one government, though the second may be mentioned.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for well-argued and focused answers but where there is uneven treatment of the responses of the two governments.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for well-argued, focused, balanced and analytical responses but lacking historical insights about why the governments responded in those ways.

**[17+ marks]** for answers that reflect wider reading and historical interpretations.

**17. How far did the Cold War bring changes to *either* Latin America *or* Canada in their relations with the United States?**

**Latin America**

Strong candidates will discuss the basic “neglect” of US foreign policy towards Latin America after 1945 and its concern with the events in Europe, although the trend for hemispheric cooperation, as illustrated by the formation of the OAS, should be included. Latin America became the focus of concern for the US only after the Cuban Revolution in 1959.

The Cold War brought a closer relationship with the US, with two major developments: economic aid to prevent spread of Communism (such as the Alliance for Progress) and US support for dictatorial regimes when the US considered that it was the only alternative to disorder and possible revolution. Virtually all of South America fell under such regimes. Some examples that can be used are: Argentina and Peru 1962; Brazil 1964; Chile 1973. In Central America, in countries such as Nicaragua and El Salvador, the US employed tactics that included economic sanctions, a campaign of public misinformation, support of rightist counter voluntary armies (the contras), and covert terrorist operations aided by CIA.

**Canada**

Relations with the US became one of collaboration and cooperation. Their initial perceptions toward the Cold War seemed very close to those of the US, although uneasiness about US power and actions emerged later. Concerns for the country’s security led Canada to join Britain and the US in the formation of NATO, in which it became an important member. Canadian Cold War policies were a mixture of caution and self-interest (no participation in the Berlin airlift; a share of offshore procurements under the Marshall Plan) but cooperation was the rule. However, conflict and disagreements were sometimes present such as in the NORAD agreements and US demands; Cuba in 1962; the nuclear warheads controversy; and the Vietnam War.

A rather traditional and straightforward question. The main issue to address in the question is the “change” in the relations with the US. Expect more answers based on Latin American examples.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for answers that are general and unsupported by historical evidence, and where candidates do not address the changes.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers showing understanding of the question but limited analysis and evidence.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers which are focused and well-structured in their arguments but do not consider all the implications of the change in the relationship.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for well-structured, focused, and analytical answers that show an understanding of the changing relationship (perhaps implicitly rather than explicitly).

**[17+ marks]** for answers which address all the aspects in the previous markband and display an excellent understanding of the historical context by analyzing the relations before and after the Cold War, and/or challenges, the assertion of “change” in an effective way.

**18. Analyse the political impact of the Watergate Affair in the United States.**

Watergate had both a positive and negative impact.

**Negative:** Development of public cynicism toward politicians individually and the political system (only 38 % of the voting age population went to the polls in 1974, the lowest voter turn out in almost 30 years); endangering the ability of the Republican party to govern effectively; and a blot on the American political record.

**Positive:** Until the Watergate affair, there had been a steady increase in presidential power. Beginning with F D Roosevelt's strong presidency in the 1930s, the power exercised by the White House was enormous, especially in times of war (the Second World War, the Korean War and Vietnam War). It seemed that presidents could ignore the Congress and the American people. Watergate and Nixon's resignation brought an end to what had been called the "imperial presidency". Congress, the Supreme Court, and an independent press had fully asserted themselves in checking Nixon's power. Americans saw that the constitutional system of checks and balances worked.

The question asks candidates to "analyse the political impact". Candidates are not required to discuss the affair itself, but if they do it briefly and it leads to a solid argument it will enhance the answer.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for answers that provide a general account of the Watergate affair without focus on the political impact.

*[8 to 10 marks]* could be reached if the answer is narrative but shows some analysis of the political impact.

*[11 to 13 marks]* could be reached, depending on the extent of the comments and knowledge shown, by narrative accounts including good analysis of the political impact.

*[14 to 16 marks]* can be awarded for answers which display depth, detail and focused analysis.

*[17+ marks]* for answers that comply with the description of the previous markband and include considerations of its positive impact.

**19. How effective was Jimmy Carter in applying the principle of human rights to United States foreign policy?**

The effectiveness or ineffectiveness of Carter’s human right policies are one of the most controversial aspects of his foreign policy. It should be analyzed according to particular cases and regions.

In Latin America: he centred his attention on Chile, Argentina, and Brazil, the harshest practitioners of repression in the region. The US instituted sanctions against all of these nations, ending or reducing economic and military aid and impeding their ability to obtain credit from international lending agencies. In the last two years of his term, as a result of increased pressure from American business and concern about growing communist influence in central America, Carter backed off from his human rights activism. His earlier efforts, however, had shown some success. Carter’s criticism of Chile helped bring about some lessening of oppression there; the resulting junta released many prisoners and disbanded the hated secret police, DINA. The intensity of repression eased in Brazil as the military dictatorship pursued a process of political openness, proclaiming an amnesty in 1979.

Carter spoke out sharply and often about violations in many countries (including, most prominently, the Soviet Union, South Africa and Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) and Cuba). Beyond that general commitment, his administration focused on several more traditional concerns.

Question asks for the degree of effectiveness. Candidates should address the particular demands of the question and cases from any part of the world are accepted.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalisations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* can be reached by descriptive accounts with some implicit evaluation of the effectiveness of the policy.

*[11 to 13 marks]* will be awarded for explicit evaluation supported by accurate knowledge.

*[14 to 16 marks]* will be awarded if the analysis is consistent and if breadth of knowledge is also shown.

*[17+ marks]* will be awarded if the candidate’s analysis shows conceptual ability to define “effectiveness” within the context of foreign policies.

**20. In what ways, and for what reasons, did the African American struggle for civil rights in the United States change between the early and late 1960s?**

**What ways:** the civil rights movement changed from the early sixties emphasis on integration and non violent tactics to a more radical movement in the late sixties and early seventies with emphasis on cultural identity, black nationalism, separatism and self improvement. Examples of the first phase of Civil Rights: Martin Luther King’s leadership and philosophy, sit-ins, freedom rides; the March on Washington (1963); March to Alabama (1965). Examples for the second phase: Black Muslims and Malcolm X’s advocacy of self-defence – using black violence to counter white violence. Black Power and the Black Panthers; race riots which erupted in black neighbourhoods of major cities from 1964 through 1968.

**For what reasons:** some African Americans argued that racist attitudes and institutions were too deeply entrenched in American society for integration to work. Despite the Civil rights Acts of 1964 and 1965, young African Americans, particularly in the North, were losing patience with the slow progress towards equality and the continued violence against their people by white extremists. The Kerner Commission, a federal investigation of the riots of the mid sixties, agreed with them. It concluded that racism and segregation were chiefly responsible and that the United States was becoming “two societies, one black, one white – separate but unequal”. The issue of civil rights had spread far beyond de jure segregation practised under the law in the South and now included de facto segregation and discrimination in the North and West.

Candidates should address the two parts of the question. If only one aspect is developed mark out of *[12]*.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalisations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* maximum will be awarded for descriptive accounts with comments and argument based on barely sufficient material.

*[11 to 13 marks]* or *[14 to 16 marks]* according to depth and detail, will be scored for structured answers showing analysis and knowledge will merit.

*[17+ marks]* answers will show depth of knowledge, understanding and analysis in dealings with the ways in which the movement changed and their treatment of the reasons why.

**21. Analyse the reasons for the transition to democracy in *one* country of Latin America in the 1980s and 1990s.**

Answers will vary according to the particular conditions of the country. However, some issues that influenced the transition were: the deep economic crisis that Latin America confronted at the time; the coalitions supporting the military juntas turned out to be relatively fragile. Local industries felt threatened by multinational corporations, and the military's policies of annihilation of any military opposition aroused protest from intellectuals, artists, and middle sector representatives. Other pressures came also from below. One conspicuous feature of Latin American politics throughout the 1980s was the rise of civil participation, as ordinary citizens began to insist on their rights and demanded accountability from governments. In part this resulted from the uniting of opposition forces produced by the brutality of military repression. In part, it was an increased commitment to the electoral process, as people demanded free and fair elections. A last factor to be considered is the lack of credibility, demoralization, and division of the left.

Note the time period: 1980s and 1990s.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague generalizations without supporting evidence.

*[8 to 10 marks]* can be reached for a descriptive narrative.

*[11 to 13 marks]* with arguments but limited analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* or *[17+ marks]* depending on depth of detail, will be awarded where the argument develops into well-substantiated analysis of the reasons why democracy was achieved in the country.

**22. In what ways have Canadian-American trade relations evolved since 1960?**

There is a great deal of material to cover in this question. Candidates should strive to cover the period in a balanced way. Canada became increasingly tied to the US market in natural resource sales; US corporations built plants and bought out Canadian firms and invested heavily in Canada. Canada became an increasingly important market for the US goods. Mention should be made of economic integration, for instance, the US Pacific Northwest and British Columbia and NAFTA. More recently, opposition of Canadians to these trends should be noted and the ways in which they have tried to counteract it. Although media, culture, *etc.* have economic facets this should not be the focus of the answer.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* can be reached by descriptive accounts with implicit analysis.

*[11 to 13 marks]* can be reached with some explicit analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* will be awarded to focused, well-structured analysis.

*[17+ marks]* can be reached by answers which demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the topic.

**23. What were the goals of the reformers in *one* of the following movements:**

- (a) women rights**
- (b) rights of Native Americans?**

**Illustrate your answer with examples from *one* country of the region from the 1960s to the 1990s.**

Answers will vary according to the country but in general terms it could be argued that women and Native Americans were searching for civil rights, equality and participation. Some possible examples in the United States (Gloria Steinem and Betty Friedan; the NOW movement and the Equal Rights Amendment). In both the US and LA, in general, Native Americans have been plagued by poverty and discrimination. But by the 1960s they were no longer willing to accept their status. They have become more assertive in pressing their demands for justice and equality. In the United States they speak of “Red Power” and inform the world that “We discovered America”. In Latin America a significant figure is Rigoberta Menchú, the Guatemalan Indian Nobel Peace Prize winner in 1992, who provided the Indian masses of Guatemala with an international recognized leader in their struggle for political and social rights.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for general accounts without relevant knowledge.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for satisfactory arguments and evidence but only addressing a limited number of goals.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for a good level of knowledge and analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** or **[17+ marks]** depending on the depth and breath of the knowledge, analysis and evidence presented.

24. **“Cultural developments (literature, art, music) between the 1940s and the 1980s were instruments of social protest and change.” Using specific examples, assess the validity of this statement in either the United States, or Latin America, or Canada.**

Expect affirmative answers about the validity of the statement. Examples of any of the regions and genres are abundant.

The time period and the wide range of choices will allow the candidates ample opportunities to display their knowledge about cultural development. The question does not specify the number of examples but it should be at least two (regardless of the genre) or two from the same type (*i.e.* literature or art *etc.*). Moreover, examples should be specific.

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

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be awarded to a mainly narrative account with implicit assessment of social protest and change.

**[11 to 13 marks]** answers will contain explicit assessment.

**[14 to 16 marks]** answers will contain well-structured arguments and assessment supported by specific examples.

**[17+ marks]** for answers that demonstrate analytical insights and evidence of sound knowledge about the topic/genre.

**25. Account for the formation and development of MERCOSUR.**

With the collapse of the Berlin Wall, and the end of the Cold War, a “New World Order” emerged. The new world order implied globalization of the region’s economy. In Latin America, freer trade and more efficient production promised ways to increase standards of living and to reinforce of the political freedoms recently acquired. Certainly the emerging consensus regarding free trade, privatization, and reduced regulation stimulated more production and trade in the region. A number of trade integration schemes (some in existence by 1988) helped this growth. One of them was MERCOSUR (the “Common Market of the South”), a four-partner association that included Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, and Paraguay. Established in 1991, the scheme envisioned the creation of a free trade zone that would eventually evolve into a full-fledged “common market” along the lines of the European Union. Despite occasional tension among the members, the volume of trade and investment within MERCOSUR grew rapidly throughout the 1990s.

The development of MERCOSUR is as interesting as it is complex, given its size, its strategic orientation and its political goals, the contradictory tendencies which emerged among its members, and the unexpected attempts by the US for the renewal of the “fast track” consideration of international trade agreements. Thus, do not expect a very detailed or economically specific answer and accept descriptive/narrative approaches

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* can be reached by descriptive accounts with implicit analysis and more emphasis on one part of the question than the other.

*[11 to 13 marks]* can be reached with some explicit analysis of both parts of the question.

*[14 to 16 marks]* or *[17+ marks]* will be awarded for focused, well-structured arguments demonstrating sound knowledge of the topic.

---