



# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2007**

**HISTORY – AMERICAS**

**Higher Level**

**Paper 3**

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

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

**1. Assess the role of Christianity in *one* of the following colonial areas: British; Spanish; French.**

**British colonies:**

Christians came to the New World, in many cases, for freedom to practise their religion. They instituted schools to train their children in their beliefs; and among the Puritans there was an acceptance of the aboriginal religion and little effort was made to convert them. Answers may include knowledge of different colonies settled by different religious groups: Catholics in Maryland; Quakers in Pennsylvania; colonies where there was diversity and toleration for instance Rhode Island and New York. The establishment of the Church of England in most colonies at the time of the revolution could also be addressed.

**French colonies:**

The Roman Catholic Church played a significant role in the settlement and governance of New France including its economic power by control of large parcels of land; decree by Richelieu that only Catholics (and no Huguenots) could settle there; missionary activities toward native peoples; control of education; role of rural priest in society. There is debate on the role of the Roman Catholic Church in the later period.

**Spanish colonies:**

The Roman Catholic Church played a fundamental role in the settlement, government and cultural, social and economic areas. The Church and Spanish government worked together to convert natives to Catholicism. The Church was a leading landholder in the colonies; controlled education, health care; dominated art and architecture. It tried to protect the natives. Significant points: Bartolomé de Las Casas, New Laws; strong answers could mention Jesuits in Paraguay; power of local clergy.

Candidates should clearly identify the area and develop a well-organized assessment.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive accounts with implicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit assessment of features and role.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for answers showing detailed knowledge and insight into the main features and role of Christianity.

**2. Compare and contrast the leadership roles of George Washington and Simon Bolivar in the Wars of Independence in the United States and Latin America.**

**For comparison:**

Both Washington and Bolivar are recognized as the main leaders of independence in the regions; both military leaders were significant for the revolutionary movement. For Washington, examples of his military campaign may be taken from the period of July 1775 to the British evacuation of Boston in March 1776. For Bolivar, examples either from the New Granada or Peru or any other military campaign could be used.

**For contrast:**

Washington was not a great tactician and in some cases was guilty of military blunders (the chief being his assumption of a position on Long Island in 1776 that exposed his entire army to capture as soon as it was defeated). However, it is unquestionable that his strength of character, his ability to hold the confidence of army and people and to diffuse his own courage among them, as well as his strong common sense, constituted the chief factors in achieving American victory.

On the other hand, Bolivar was a brilliant military tactician. His revolutionary leadership could be observed in his brilliant campaigns. His revolutionary appeal to the masses (the “Decree of War to Death”) and to the elite (the “Letter from Jamaica”) and his discipline could be discussed. On the negative side, his personal conflicts with other leaders of the revolution (Miranda and San Martin) should be assessed.

The question calls for compare and contrast, candidates should include both in their answer and provide concrete evidence about their revolutionary leadership. Do not reward uncritical, unsupported narrative.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations or if only one leader is discussed.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive accounts with implicit comparisons.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit comparisons of the role of leadership.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for answers showing detailed knowledge and linkage of the leaders.

**3. For what reasons, and in what ways, was the United States Constitution of 1787 a “bundle of compromises”?**

The delegates to the Constitutional Convention agreed that the Articles of Confederation were completely inadequate and proceeded to draw up a new constitution. They agreed on some issues: a strong and effective government at home and respected abroad, yet not so strong as to become a tyranny; a government with a visible executive head and an independent judiciary as well as legislature; and a government to have power to levy taxes, control commerce and protect liberties. They disagreed about many other issues. The Constitution that was produced was a compromise between the views of the delegates. The first issue of disagreement was: representation (between populous states that supported proportional representation and smaller states that supported equal representation). This issue was settled by the Great Compromise, in which the legislature consisted of two houses: a House of Representatives, with representation based on population, and a Senate, where each state would have equal representation. Another issue of debate was slavery. A compromise was reached by the Three-Fifth Compromise: five slaves were to be counted as three free persons for both representation and direct taxation. They did not, however, have the right to vote. The third compromise came over the issue of the presidency. The disagreement about term of office and method of election was settled by authorizing a four year term and establishing the procedure for electing the President through an electoral college. The next compromise was about tariffs. The conflict was between southern states (agricultural), who did not want the Congress to pass a tariff on their exports, and the northern states (trade), who wanted the central government to have power for uniform legislation on navigation and protection of shipping. The issue was settled by granting Congress the power to control foreign commerce and to levy tariffs on imports but not exports.

The question does not require a description of the problems with the Articles of Confederation period and the major areas that needed to be looked at to solve them. The focus of the question must be on what issues the delegates disagreed about and how the problems were solved by compromises. Answers should address the specific compromises.

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

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

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for answers showing detailed knowledge and insight into the main reasons for disagreements and compromises.

**4. Analyse the political problems of upper and lower Canada prior to the rebellions of 1837.**

**Upper Canada:** The main problems were: oligarchic government (Family Compact); economic problems due to tight control of land; clergy reserves; power of Church of England; desire for responsible government; education; transportation, *e.g.* canals and roads.

**Lower Canada:** The main problems were: political conflict between oligarchy (Château Clique) and lower classes generally anglophone and francophone respectively; French desire to preserve traditions such as rural culture, religion, *etc.* Lower Canada assembly wanted to advance French interests in government and commerce although they distrusted English who controlled business, canal building, *etc.* Individuals to mention: Mackenzie, Papineau.

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

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

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for answers that may deal with the question in a problem by problem approach and show detailed knowledge and insight.

**5. Evaluate the economic and social conditions of free African Americans in *one* country of the region during the nineteenth century.**

Answers will probably focus on the United States, Brazil or Haiti. Candidates should provide some specific information about how free African Americans earned their living (different ways), what their legal status was (no rights in the US, some in Brazil, most in Haiti) and social status (at the bottom of the social spectrum in the US, significant assimilation in Brazil, complete integration in Haiti). Answers should show evidence that free African Americans ranged across the entire economic spectrum, from labourer to craftsman to business, education and in some cases political influence. The mention of former slaves in any of the countries would enhance the answers.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative accounts with implicit assessment and limited knowledge.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit assessment and evidence.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured, well supported assessment and argument.

*[17+ marks]* for answers that address the question in a direct and focused manner, with thorough assessment and evidence on the life of the free African Americans.

**6. Why, in spite of the advantages of the North over the South, did the Civil War in the United States last so long?**

Most of the advantages that the North had in terms of resources would only become apparent as the Civil War went on. Actually, initially the Confederate forces seemed to have all the advantages. They were fighting on their own soil and their troops seemed more committed to the cause than those of the north. Their commanders were exceptionally talented, while Union forces were for a time erratically led. Although both sides set out in 1861 anticipating and planning a short campaign, it was the South that was most likely to suffer from the stalemate of 1861–1862. It became a stalemate because of improvements in military technology (rifle-musket) making the battles more deadly, and, the changing nature such as tactics and strategy of warfare (leaders on both sides had formerly served in the United States Armed Forces). Both the Northern and Southern leaders had strategies that contrasted greatly due to the two sides having very different war aims. The Confederacy sought independence and only to defend itself. The North sought to restore the Union and compel the seceded states to relinquish their hopes to found a new nation. In order to do this they would have to invade the Confederacy, destroy its capacity to wage war and crush the will of the southern people to resist. The Confederacy aimed to prolong the war until the Northern people considered the effort too costly in lives and money to persist. Thus, even though actual casualties in the early battles were, on the whole, worse for the North than for the South, the Confederacy often lost a greater proportion of available troops. Thus the apparent early victories of the South were often won at a greater cost in the long-term. This imbalance between the two sides did not mean that the North was guaranteed victory but it dictated Southern strategy, for leaders Lee and Davis were aware from the start that they needed to deliver quick blows that might destroy the morale of the northern voters hence the ill-fated attacks on Antietam (September 1862) and Gettysburg (July 1863). Lincoln, on the other hand, had to worry more about sustaining morale than victory in the field (although of course the two were linked). Both sides were well aware of attrition favouring the side with greater numbers and resources. The Civil War became a war of attrition.

Candidates should account for the long duration of the war, not for why the North won.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive accounts with implicit focus and analysis.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for answers showing detailed knowledge and insight into the reasons why the war lasted so long.

**7. Assess the impact of immigration on *one* country of the region from the mid nineteenth to the early twentieth century.**

Candidates might identify the origins of the immigrants and their occupational skills. Some of the issues that might be considered are: the development of ethnic neighborhoods; a supply of cheap, unskilled labour; urbanization; cultural and religious contributions. The political impact would depend on the selected country. However, although initially immigrants may not have been very active, they soon became a significant resource for local politicians. Racial tension and discrimination could also be addressed.

The period is mid nineteenth to the early twentieth century so do not accept more recent immigration patterns. Answers might vary according to the selected country and any country should be accepted, good choices might be the United States, Canada, Argentina and Peru.

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

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

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for answers showing detailed knowledge and insight into the main features and impact of immigrants in a given country during the suggested period.

**8. “It was the U-boat campaign of 1917 which brought the United States into the First World War.”  
To what extent would you agree with this statement?**

In January 1917 Germany announced the resumption of unrestricted U-boat warfare. Although the January announcement led to the break in diplomatic relations, Congress was not yet ready to declare war. They even refused Wilson’s request to have American merchant ships armed. However, two events convinced them that involvement in the war was inevitable: the Russian Revolution and the Zimmerman telegram both strengthened Wilson’s hand. Firstly, the February Revolution in Russia ended the autocracy and brought in the Provisional Government promising democratic reforms. This meant that the Allied cause could now be seen as thoroughly democratic. Secondly, the British presented the United States with a copy of the “Zimmerman Telegram”, a telegram to Mexico from the German foreign minister A Zimmerman that proposed the Mexicans ally themselves with Germany in return for Germany’s pledge to recover lost territories (Texas, New Mexico and Arizona). The telegram aroused the nationalist anger of the citizens and convinced Wilson that Germany fully expected war with the United States. The further loss of US lives at sea, in February and March of 1917, finally turned public opinion. Thus on April 6 the United States declared war on Germany.

Candidates might agree with this view to some extent and only as a short-term reason as to why the United States joined the First World War. Strong answers would consider the long term causes of: initial submarine warfare and the sinking of *Lusitania* 1915, and other sinkings such as *Arabic* in 1915 and *Sussex* in 1916; economic links with Britain and France; United States ethnic influences; the effects of British war propaganda.

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

**[8 to 10 marks]** for descriptive accounts which only address the “extent” in an implicit way.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit focus, assessment and analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

**[17+ marks]** for answers showing detailed knowledge of the topic, focused on the extent of agreement and insightful analysis.

**9. Analyse the main features and impact of *one* cultural *or* intellectual development in the Americas in the period 1850 to 1919.**

The choice of relevant developments is broad. Candidates will probably refer to painting and literary movements. The publishing industry was prominent in Mexico and Argentina, and political postures adopted by writers included nationalism, Marxism and positivismo. Realism was a tendency in the arts. Some painters illustrated the life of poor people. Mexican Muralistas and developments in the theatre (Grotesque) could be presented as examples. In the US, the response of churches to industrialization was important. In most countries there was a considerable improvement in education and scientific associations.

Be flexible regarding choice of developments and sympathetic to analysis supported by examples.

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

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

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for answers showing detailed knowledge and insight into the main features and impact of a particular cultural or intellectual development of the period.

**10. Compare and contrast the policies towards Latin America of *two* United States presidents between 1900 and 1945.**

**For comparison:**

All the US presidents had significant impact in Central and Latin America and the Caribbean during this period. Their policies were justified and modified depending on the mood of the nation and the potential for alienating friends in the rest of the world. The comparison should include reference to the high number of military interventions during these years with specific mention of at least a few. Use of the generally known tags such as “Dollar Diplomacy”, “Big Stick”, “Roosevelt Corollary” and “Good Neighbor”, will be useful if the student identifies them correctly. The Monroe Doctrine could be mentioned relevantly.

**For contrast:**

The answer should address the different principles and conditions which guided the policies. It could be noted that in some cases, such as during the Democratic administrations of W Wilson and F D Roosevelt, altruistic principles were invoked. For example, in the 1930s, when it was reluctant to intervene militarily, Washington looked to other means than “gunboat diplomacy” to maintain dominance, particularly after Roosevelt declared his “Good Neighbor” policy in 1933. The result was a drive to develop mutual decision-making under the rubric of Pan-Americanism. Yet it might be argued that the goals of the “Good Neighbor” policy and Pan-Americanism were ultimately not very different from those of the overt US interventions that had taken place in the Caribbean in the 1930s.

Any two from T R Roosevelt, W Wilson, Taft or F D Roosevelt would be suitable choices. A lengthy narrative of the many interventions is not necessary; political and economic motives are more important. Tracing US policy in one country, for example, Cuba, could be a good approach.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations and if only one president is examined.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive accounts with implicit comparisons or comparisons with few specifics.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for answers showing detailed knowledge and linkage of policies.

## 11. Analyse the political causes of the Mexican Revolution of 1910.

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century Mexico had enjoyed political stability and economic progress. However, the dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz had failed to establish a constitutional democracy and had paid no more than lip service to the constitution of 1857. Diaz's regime was a highly centralized, personalistic dictatorship, which had allowed rapid economic growth without upsetting the local interests. A large web of patronage linked all the institutions and groups that really mattered (the local oligarchies, the army, the Church, the merchants and the urban professional classes) and that might otherwise challenge his rule. But the flaw of this system was that it had to rely for its continuity on the survival of Diaz, who by 1900 had turned seventy, thus Mexico had to solve its basic political problem: how to transfer power from one ruler to the next without risking a catastrophe.

In the first decade of the twentieth century the dictator's political touch appeared to be deserting him and the question of his succession became more pressing. Tension increased between the most powerful factions within the regime: the *cientificos*, progressive technocrats connected, mainly, with the business interests of Mexico City. This group wanted the creation of a ruling party. On the other hand, there was a more traditional faction of *caudillos* with strong roots in the regions, who feared institutionalization because it threatened the personal bases of their power. These men preferred the old style of power brokers between regional barons and their clans. Diaz contributed to the ferment by announcing in 1908 that Mexico was ready for democracy and that he would welcome the emergence of an opposition party. He expected it to be like the seven others he had rigged before: a mere formality. Instead Madero, a wealthy hacendado from Coahuila, decided to challenge Diaz for the presidency. He announced his candidacy and offered a reformist platform and began to campaign. He called for the end of the dictatorship, democratic election and modernization of the economy through education and better administration. A member of the elite, he was not a revolutionary and feared the continuation of the existing political order would cause a social revolution. By "democracy" he meant control by the elite. Hardly in touch with the Amerindian masses, he nonetheless addressed some issues that mattered to millions of Mexicans. Concerned with his popularity, Diaz had him jailed and, rigging the vote, won the elections. Madero went to Texas where he wrote his Plan of San Luis Potosi with his slogan of "free suffrage and no re-election". Not a major blueprint for radical socioeconomic reform, still it made some references to restoring land to the Amerindians, advocated education and criticized Diaz abuses. More significant, it was a change of tactics and a call for armed struggle to overthrow the dictatorship, and he was joined by a number of revolutionary movements: in the north Orozco and Villa; in the south Zapata. Thus the revolution was launched.

Do not expect all of the above. However, answers should focus on the political causes of the revolution. Narratives of the revolution will not score highly.

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

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

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of political issues as triggers of the revolution.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

**[17+ marks]** for answers showing detailed knowledge and insight into the political issues as causes of the revolution.

**12. To what extent was the Wall Street Crash a cause of the Great Depression of 1929? Support your argument with specific examples from *one* country of the region.**

Candidates with a solid knowledge of the topic might argue that the Wall Street Crash was to some extent a cause of the Depression in the United States. While the collapse of the stock market in 1929 may have triggered economic turmoil, it alone was not responsible for the Great Depression. The Depression throughout the United States and the world was the result of a combination of factors that matured in the 1920s.

The Crash took money out of the system and led via a vicious circle to the Depression. However, the United States actually did weather the Crash. Business activity did not begin to decline significantly until mid-1930. Fewer than 5% of people in the United States owned stock so most were not affected. By April 1930 share prices had actually regained a fifth of the losses of the previous autumn. The really disastrous fall came in 1931–1932. Arguably the Crash was more a symptom than a cause of the Depression.

The economic crisis of 1929, however, had a profound impact on all of the countries of the region. In Canada, because of its close links with the United States, it caused economic upheaval. In Latin America, as measures were taken in the United States to balance the economy, it exposed the vulnerability of its economy: the area's foreign markets collapsed and the prices of its raw materials and foodstuffs fell much more sharply than those of the manufactured goods it had to import.

Answers could use as an example any country but probably the popular choice would be the United States. Once the candidates have taken a position about the role of the Wall Street market in the Depression it is expected that other causes of the Depression would be discussed in order to support the argument.

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

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit analysis of role of the Wall Street Crash.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for answers showing detailed knowledge and insight into the role of the Crash in the Depression and possibly some different interpretations.

**13. How and why did the relationship between Canada and Britain change between 1900 and 1931?**

“**How**” could address some possible areas of change in the political, social and economic spheres. Specifics could include: First World War; Commonwealth; sense of nationhood; representation at Versailles; changed economic relationship due to World War I; the impact of US media; Depression; Halibut Treaty (1923); Balfour Report (1926); Statute of Westminster (1931).

“**Why**” could include: First World War; world economic situation; increasing political awareness and maturity of Canada.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive accounts with implicit differentiation between how and why.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit differentiation and detail.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are soundly focused on the demands of the question and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for answers showing detailed knowledge and insight into the main features of the how and the why.

**14. Assess the nature and effectiveness of opposition to *either* Juan Domingo Perón (1946–55) or Getulio Vargas (1930–45).**

The question requires that candidates assess the role of opposition during the regime of **either** Perón **or** Vargas, considering both the composition of the opposition movements and the methods used against the leaders.

Opposition to Perón came from different sectors. The higher ranks of the Army did not agree with either the democratisation of the armed forces or the candidature of Eva Perón to the vice presidency. The landed elite believed that his centralised economic policies affected their interests. Many intellectuals opposed his authoritarian methods, in particular his use of censorship. The Catholic Church opposed restrictions imposed on religious associations, the legalisation of prostitution and divorce and the elimination of religious teaching. The United States also opposed Perón's nationalist and statist economic policy. Economic problems after 1952 brought about opposition from formerly supportive sectors of society.

As for the effectiveness of opposition, candidates could assess the roles of the aforementioned institutions in the overthrow of Perón as well as Perón's own contribution to his downfall by the use of repression and violence and by his decision to give up power.

Vargas also faced opposition from different sectors. The landed elite and coffee-growers opposed his centralisation efforts. Army officers and leaders of several states opposed what they considered to be leftist policies, while the left accused Vargas of reneging on the promises of land reform. Brazilian liberals and the USA opposed Vargas's economic measures aiming to reduce the influence of foreign companies in the Brazilian economy.

Like Perón, Vargas was eventually removed from office by the army. The first occasion was in 1945, when a bloodless coup brought the Estado Novo to an end and Vargas was exiled to Rio Grande do Sul. However, opponents were unable to prevent his election in 1950.

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

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative/descriptive accounts with some implicit assessment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for identification and explicit assessment of both the nature and effectiveness of dissent.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for structured, focused and clear assessment of the nature and effectiveness of dissent supported by appropriate use of relevant knowledge.

**[17+ marks]** for well-substantiated assessment of both the nature and effectiveness of dissent that reveals in-depth understanding of the topic.

**15. For what reasons, and with what results, were Japanese citizens of Canada and the United States interned during the Second World War?**

Candidates could discuss national security, safety of the Japanese, economic reasons and racism, as well as official explanations and underlying reasons, and they should trace the problem from the pre-war years. Results could include: break up of families; the denial of citizenship; social, economic and political impact on the countries concerned.

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

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

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for answers showing detailed knowledge and insight into the reasons and results of Japanese internment.

**N.B.** If only one country is addressed mark out of *[12 marks]*.

**16. How did the Cold War change relations between the United States and *either* Latin America or Canada between 1953–1979?**

A rather traditional and straightforward question. The main issue to address in the question is the “change” in the relations with the US.

**Latin America**

Strong candidates will discuss the basic “neglect” of the US foreign policy toward 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, could be included. Latin America became the focus of concern for the US mainly after the Cuban Revolution in 1959. The Cold War brought a closer relationship with the US, with two major developments: economic aid to prevent the 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 the rightist counter-revolutionary armies (the Contras) and covert terrorist operations aided by the 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. 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 disagreement were sometimes present such as with the NORAD agreements and US demands; Cuba in 1962; the nuclear warheads controversy and the Vietnam War.

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

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

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers that 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, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

**[17+ marks]** for answers showing detailed knowledge and well developed analysis.

**17. Analyse the effects of the Vietnam War on the United States.**

The social and psychological costs were enormous, as were the costs in people and material. The US had spent at least \$150 billion on the war, taking resources away from social policies at home. Three million Americans served in Vietnam. About 46 000 were killed and around 300 000 were wounded. The social problems of veterans returning home having lost a war they expected to win were immense and in many cases ignored. Many veterans suffered from post-traumatic syndrome and the rates of suicides, divorces, drug addiction and alcoholism were very high. The government and the political system were also affected. After the war there was a lack of faith in the government. Given the strong presidential power provided by the Tonkin Resolution and the illegality of the Nixon administration’s bombing of Cambodia, the Congress passed the War Powers Act in 1973 requiring that it be consulted before the President could send US troops into a war or within 48 hours of an emergency. There was widespread disillusionment with the US world role among both the public and politicians, at home and abroad. These feelings translated into unwillingness to involve themselves into faraway lands or send American troops to wars: the so-called “Vietnam Syndrome”.

The term “effects” implies consideration of events after the war. However, candidates might like to include reference to events such as student protests that were occurring while the war was taking place. Recognize those arguments providing that answers make reference to issues discussed in the above paragraph.

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

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

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are soundly focused on effects and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for answers showing detailed knowledge and insight into the effects of the Vietnam War.

**18. Why, and with what consequences, did the United States get involved in Korea?**

**Why:**

The war was in origin a civil war over the unification and future direction of Korea but it became an issue of ideological conflict within the context of the superpower rivalry of the Cold War. For the Truman administration it was a call to contain the spread of communism in Asia. In the United States the anti-communism of McCarthy was sweeping the country. Republicans were especially alarmed by the “loss of China” to the communists and blamed the Democrats and the Truman administration as wholly responsible for the disaster. In 1950, China and the Soviet Union signed the Sino-Soviet pact, which seemed to provide further “proof” of a worldwide Communist conspiracy. There was little, if any, evidence of it but it was what most Americans were to believe. Firm action was now needed to prevent the spread of communism.

**Consequences:**

The war had a considerable impact on US foreign policy. It had shown Truman the necessity of strengthening US military position in the Far East and led the United States to establish a number of alliances: two defence treaties were signed in 1951, with Japan and the Philippines. The same year the ANZUS Pact was signed between Australia, New Zealand and the United States. In Indochina, the United States increased aid to the French. Ho Chi Minh was only confirmed as an agent of the Kremlin by Korea. Furthermore, the Korean War promoted other developments: implementation of the NSC 68; strengthening of NATO; proposal to rearm Germany; the restoration of sovereignty in Japan; the recognition of Taiwan as the only official Chinese state. It also led to the rearming of the United States with a significant increase in military expenditure. War in Korea also led to increasing militarization of US policy. Before Korea the avoidance of committing US troops to war in Asia had been an axiom of US policy. After Korea the US was ready to send troops anywhere in order to defend the “free world”.

Candidates might use examples from both domestic and foreign areas. Question asks for “why” and “consequences”: but recognize some imbalance in treatment of two aspects of the question.

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

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit analysis of why and consequences.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for answers showing detailed knowledge and insight into the reasons and consequences of US involvement in the war.

**19. “The presidency of Ronald Reagan marked a turning point in domestic affairs.” To what extent do you agree with this view?**

Answers should analyse his domestic policies: supply-side economics; federal tax reduction; spending cuts; deregulation; his actions against labour unions. The economy rebounded and, beginning in 1983, entered a long period of recovery. The recovery, however, widened the income gap between rich and poor. In social issues his appointment of conservative judges to the Supreme Court scaled back affirmative action in hiring and promoting and limited *Roe v Wade* by allowing states to impose certain restrictions on abortion. Reagan’s two terms reduced restrictions on the free-market economy and left more money in the hands of investors and higher income Americans. His policies also succeeded in containing the growth of the New Deal Great Society welfare state. On the other hand, he left huge federal deficits and thus changed the context of future political debates. With yearly deficits between \$200–\$300 billions, it no longer seemed reasonable for either Democrats or Republicans to propose new social programmes, such as universal health coverage. Instead of asking what new government programmes might be needed, “Reaganomics” changed the debate to issues of what government programs to cut and how much. Reagan also revitalized the presidency after the Watergate problems and the tensions of the Ford and Carter years and he restored Americans’ self-confidence.

The statement might promote controversies because views about whether Reagan’s presidency marked a turning point in domestic affairs are divided. Some see him as an ageing, grade-B actor who somehow stumbled into the White House. Others think that he rates with FDR as the greatest president in the twentieth century. Reward solid and specific arguments focused on the question.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives of the president’s policies with implicit analysis of achievements and some focus on the quotation.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit analysis, and focus on the quotation.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for detailed and well-focused arguments, focused on the question.

*[17 to 20 marks]* for perceptive analysis, possibly with use of different interpretations.

**20. To what extent had African Americans in the United States gained their civil and political rights by 1968?**

By 1968, African Americans' civil and political rights had progressed a long way in just a quarter of a century: segregation in public places had disappeared from all but the most resistant parts of the Deep South. This was a remarkable achievement in such a short time. Most transport facilities were now thoroughly integrated. Far more African Americans were now registered to vote. Racial integration of schools was now proceeding in many states. Where housing patterns discouraged this, the possibility of busing students from one area to another to achieve a racial mix had been introduced. Armed forces integration was well established and African Americans were starting to rise to high rank both within the forces and in many different walks of life. By the time of Martin Luther King's assassination, legal segregation was rapidly coming to an end in the "Old South". However, the fact was segregation still existed across the United States. Although African Americans could vote freely, many still faced severe economic hardship and poor educational systems and housing compared with whites. African Americans still faced far greater social and economic problems than the majority of the white population. Instead of being a year of triumph for African Americans, 1968 became a year of riots in almost every major city of the United States. The Civil Rights movement was weakened and divided over tactics. Its two greater spokesmen had been assassinated.

Candidates should focus on "to what extent" by discussing the gains obtained but also making assessment of the conditions of the civil rights movement by 1968. Accept discussion of the specifics of the movement but if no assessment is made of conditions by 1968, mark out of *[12 marks]*.

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

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit analysis and assessment of gains and limitations.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for answers showing detailed knowledge and insight into the conditions of African Americans by 1968.

**21. For what reasons, and with what results, did the military intervene in *one* country in Latin America between 1960 and 1980?**

Military intervention in Latin America during this period was due to the social, political and economic crises in the area and there are certain issues that should be discussed: first, the conditions of the country in which the military intervened; second, the particular reasons why they intervened in the particular countries. The military saw themselves as the only institution preventing chaos: they were determined modernizers and were committed to nationalism, industrialization and technology, reacting against “communist” trends and gaining support from both inside the country and from foreign powers. All established brutal dictatorships. The best examples are Chile, Argentina and Brazil. The social, economic and political results of military rule should then be examined: among them, abuses of human rights.

Any external intervention will be acceptable with reference to reasons and results.

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

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

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for answers showing detailed knowledge and insight into the conditions and results of the selected examples.

**22. What contributions have foreign investment and transnationals made to the economic development of Canada since 1950?**

The question provides candidates with an opportunity to show their ability to weigh the positive and negative contribution made by foreign investment and transnationals. Good answers may advance an argument substantiating their contribution to employment, prosperity and development of resources but weighing this against increased dependency on US investment in Canadian natural resources and US control of much Canadian manufacturing.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for answers showing limited knowledge and awareness of the question's implications.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for accounts of Canada's economic development since 1950 with some implicit assessment of the transnationals' contributions.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for well-focused, structured assessment of the contribution of foreign investment and transnationals to Canada's economic development post 1950, although assessment may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for a deeper, perceptive assessment of their contribution across the period 1950–1995.

**23. Assess the achievements and failures of indigenous peoples' movements in *two* countries of the region since 1945.**

Examples can be selected from: the Native American movements in the United States; Inuit peoples in Canada (Canadian land claims and self-government issues); Native American movements in some Central American countries (Rigoberta Menchu's movement in Guatemala, Chiapas in Mexico, may be mentioned but should not be the focus of the essay).

The achievements and failures will depend on the selected countries. However, among the achievements legal challenges and political representation should be noted. Among the failures relatively low increase in the standards of living unemployment and low pay, and continued discrimination might be discussed.

If only one country is addressed, mark out of **[12 marks]**, but two Latin American countries are admissible.

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

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

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of achievements and failures.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

**[17+ marks]** for answers showing detailed knowledge and insight into the main successes and failures of the Native American movements.

**24. Examine the contribution of women to political developments in *one* country of the region in the twentieth century.**

Candidates will have the opportunity to display knowledge of the topic. Women’s contributions in the political developments are many: movements for women rights; political participation and leadership; membership of the highest legal boards in different countries; representation in the United Nations, OAS and other international organizations. Answers will depend on the selected country. Candidates should name specific women and be clear about their particular contribution in the political arena.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative accounts with only implicit analysis and limited evidence.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for explicit analysis, solid arguments and clear evidence.

*[17+ marks]* for answers that address the question in a focused, structured manner and show depth, insight and evidence.

**25. How successful was the Organization of American States (OAS) in mediating conflicts in the period 1950 to 1970?**

In their assessment of the mediating role of the organization candidates could refer to some of the following: compromise reached following the outbreak of war in Korea in 1950; agreement to suspend Cuba's membership in 1962 and to impose sanctions in 1964; intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965; attempts to settle border disputes between El Salvador and Honduras (Soccer War, 1969); initiatives to promote social justice and human rights.

Reward assessment that shows sound knowledge and understanding of the mediating activities of the OAS in the period 1950 to 1970.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for better informed accounts of the OAS's role, though assessment may be implicit or limited to some comments.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers showing structure and consistent analysis, though the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for detailed and very thorough assessment of the extent to which the OAS was successful in achieving its mediating role in the period 1950 to 1970, possibly referring to differing interpretations.

---