



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 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. Compare and contrast the economic and political policies of Britain and Spain towards their colonies in the Americas.**

**For comparison:**

Both mother countries were imperial powers that in theory practiced mercantilism. Both saw their colonies as a source of revenue and as having a subordinate status, both economically and politically.

**For contrast:**

The British, however, at least until 1763, practiced salutary neglect, giving their colonies an opportunity to develop economic and political self-sufficiency. Colonial assemblies came to consider themselves little parliaments and had the power of the purse. Colonists elected officials to government positions. Economically, British mercantilist legislation was lightly enforced at best and colonists avoided compliance. The change in this British approach to administration after the French and Indian War would be a major factor in the movement for independence.

The Spanish administered their colonies more strictly, with official government offices such as the Council of the Indies charged with making and enforcing policy for the colonies. Spaniards were assigned to high positions of leadership in the colonies from viceroy on down. Regular inspections of the colonies were directed by the Spanish crown and colonists had no direct participation in the governing of their colonies. Economically, the Spanish also kept a tighter rein on their colonies.

The question asks for a comparative approach. If only one area is addressed **[8 marks]** cannot be reached.

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

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative or descriptive accounts without a balance between economic and/or political policies of Britain and Spain.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for narrative account with explicit comparative approach but limited examples.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, well-focused and balanced answers; some may not address all aspects of the question.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers which address all aspects of the question.

**2. Analyse the areas of continuity and change after the achievement of independence in *one* country in the Americas.**

Specifics given will vary with the countries discussed. It can be argued that wars of independence in the Americas were not revolutions because the basic political, economic, social, and religious systems did not change, but rather Americans replaced Europeans in key positions. In the US, British authorities were removed, but the legal system did not radically change and political rights were not extended to women, blacks, native Americans, *etc.* The economic system changed only in that it lost British advantages and protections. The Church of England was no longer the established church, but the US had long had a variety of denominations. Social classes continued to be based on wealth and to be fairly mobile. If Latin American examples are used, allow for the specifics of the given cases.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague, inaccurate comments.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive accounts with underdeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus on the issues of continuity and change.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical and relevant answers with explicit detail, although some may not address all aspects of the question.

*[17+ marks]* for insightful, perceptive and analytical answers and perhaps different interpretations.

**3. Analyse the aims of caudillos in *two* newly independent countries in the Americas.**

In the years after independence in Latin America, a variety of strong leaders emerged in response to the power vacuum left by the colonial power, often known as caudillos. Caudillos varied in both their aims and personalities. Some were elitists and others were populists. Some of these leaders served to unify their new nations. Some were modernists who sought to build roads, ports, railroads, schools, *etc.* Some simply wanted their position in order to economically benefit themselves and their followers. Elitist caudillos sought support from the aristocracy, the Catholic Church and the military. Folk, or popular, caudillos stood for traditional values and championed the majority. Specific choices to discuss could be Santa Ana of Mexico, Dr Francia of Paraguay, Jean-Pierre Boyer in Haiti, and Juan Manuel de Rosas of Argentina, but allow for candidates' choice of other relevant examples.

In the United States, the experience of the Articles of Confederation government showed the need for a strong executive and George Washington first served in that role. Washington cannot be described as a caudillo but his concern with his responsibilities in a new nation ensured he would be seen as one of the US's best presidents. Andrew Jackson, 7th US president, has sometimes been seen as an American caudillo. His strong exercise of executive power offers several examples candidates could use including his exercise of veto power, his defiance of John Marshall's ruling on the Cherokee Indians, his threat to go to war with South Carolina over the nullification crisis, and his decisions with regard to the 2nd Bank of the United States. Jackson's explanation of those decisions would be that he was acting on behalf of the people. Some historians have argued that Jackson was acting more on the behalf of the western elite against the eastern establishment.

Mark out of **[12 marks]** if candidates only look at one country.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalisation and irrelevant comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for descriptive accounts and underdeveloped arguments.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for explicit focus on the question but limited examples or analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for relevant, well-developed arguments and analysis although not all the aspects are discussed.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical and relevant answers which address all aspects of the question.

4. **“Opponents of slavery in the Americas were united in their reasons for opposing slavery and in their proposals for ending the practice.” Using *one* country in the region, explain to what extent you agree with this statement.**

Answers here will depend on the country chosen, but candidates should discuss specific groups and individuals and their views. Opponents of slavery did not agree on their reasons or their proposals. Some opponents of slavery based their reasoning on humanitarianism (the Quakers for example); others on economics (the Free Soilers and new Republican Party); others on political theory and idealism (Garrison’s views on the Constitution), and others on racism. Proposals varied from colonization of former slaves in other countries or segregation within the country to incorporation within the existing society. Others who opposed slavery had no concrete plan for what to do once the practice was abolished. Candidates might also discuss differing methods of these groups and individuals from moral persuasion to violent action.

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

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative answers with a more explicit focus on the question.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical and well-focused analysis although not all the aspects of the question are addressed.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical answers with a well-developed argument and perceptive examples.

5. **“By 1861 efforts to solve the conflict peacefully had been exhausted”. To what extent does this explain the outbreak of the Civil War in the United States?**

There are a number of possible points to choose in answering this question. Belief in Manifest Destiny, expansion to the west, opening up of new markets and annexation of lands played an important role in the North-South relationship. Neither the Declaration of Independence nor the constitution took a stand against the practice of slavery, although the issue arose in discussion at both conventions. The 1850 Fugitive Slave Act and its effects, intensification of Abolitionists’ propaganda, social intolerance in the 1850s and the publication of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* all aroused public opinion. The Missouri Compromise, 1854 Kansas-Nebraska Act, role of Lincoln in his debates with Douglas, and secession crisis are particularly relevant to explaining why war broke out in 1861. Other issues may also be pertinent.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive or narrative answers with only implicit focus on the question.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit analysis and a developed argument with examples.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focused arguments supported by relevant examples and analysis although not all the aspects of the question are addressed.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail and insight and perhaps different interpretations.

6. **Analyse the reasons for industrial development in *one* country of the region between 1865 and 1900.**

Some of the reasons for the industrial development during this period were: raw materials; labour supply; technology; growing markets, of the state and/or government; and in some cases, foreign investment. Answers will depend on the selected countries. Probably the US and Canada will be the most frequently selected, but accept any country providing that the kind of industrialization and particular to the country are explained.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general and inadequate answers.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive accounts and undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question but limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical, well-focused and relevant answers although not all the aspects of the question are addressed.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detailed insights and perceptive comments.

**7. Why did *either* Canada *or* the United States enter the First World War?**

Canada was obligated to enter the First World War because she was a British colony. Historians have commented, however, that Canada's willingness and effort went beyond obligation and Canada lost more men in the First World War than the United States.

For the United States there are various opinions. These include: economic reasons; hope for world position and leadership; pressure from ethnic groups; idealism, both from Wilson and the American sense of exceptionalism; and national honour. Unrestricted submarine warfare, neutral rights, the Russian Revolution, and the Zimmermann Telegram can be discussed as specifics.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general and inadequate answers.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive accounts and undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question but limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical, well-focused and relevant examples.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detailed insights and perceptive comments.



**8. Analyse the causes for the rise of the Progressive movement in the United States in the early years of the twentieth century.**

The causes for the rise of the Progressives can be found in the transformations that the United States had experienced since the Civil War: industrialization, urbanization, immigration. Many Americans looked at the “Gilded Age” with distaste and were keen to end or reform the political corruption, monopolistic practices of the large firms and the urban deprivation that had characterized the period. The movement was initially encouraged by writers and journalists, the “muckrakers”, who used their writings to draw the attention of the public to various abuses in politics and business which stirred public opinion into demanding some regulation and change. They were joined by sectors of the middle classes that were alarmed by the increasing gap between the rich and the poor, the violent conflict between labour and capital, and the dominance of corrupt political machines in the cities. Most disturbing to minorities were the racist Jim Crow laws in the South. Crusaders for women’s suffrage added their voice to the call for political reform and greater democracy. The groups participating in the Progressive movement were diverse. There were Protestant church leaders who championed one set of reforms, African Americans proposing other reforms, union leaders seeking public support for their goals, and feminists lobbying their state legislature for votes for women. Loosely linking their reform efforts under a single label, Progressive, was a belief that changes in society were badly needed and that government was the agency for correcting social and economic ills.

Candidates should analyse the conditions that triggered the Progressive impulse, not their achievements or failures.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate general answers.

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical, well-focused and relevant answers although not all the aspects of the question are addressed.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and developed arguments supported by well-chosen and perceptive examples.

9. **“Intellectuals made a significant impact on society.” With reference to *one* country of the region in the period 1880–1919, to what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Answers will vary according to the selected country. Some of the issues that might be considered are: influence of intellectuals on government policies such as expansion of education; decline of illiteracy; their use of the press and literary magazines to promote ideas and sensitize public opinion. Another possible area could be the establishment and transformation of universities.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general and inadequate answers.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive accounts and undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question but limited examples and analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical, well-focused and relevant answers although not all the aspects of the question are addressed.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detailed insights and perceptive comments.

10. **Analyse the effects of the Spanish-American War on *both* the United States *and* Cuba.**

**Effects on USA** include: proving to be the unquestionable leader of the region; ensuring control of Cuba through economic and political instruments (*e.g.* Reciprocity Act, Platt Amendment); the acquisition of Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippines from Spain; a burst of patriotism at home as a result of victory in the war. It also helped to consolidate relations between the North and the South as they joined against the common enemy for the first time since the American Civil War. Some candidates may also identify the influence the War on the development of diplomatic instruments such as the Roosevelt Corollary and the Dollar Diplomacy.

**Effects on Cuba** include: becoming a US protectorate; enduring US military occupation; the imposition of diplomatic instruments, which constrained its independence (Platt Amendment, Reciprocity Act); the consolidation of sugar monoculture; the remodelling of Cuban society along North American lines. Better candidates may show awareness of the divide in the Cuban society between those – such as the bulk of the independence Army – who felt shunted aside during peace talks and the reordering of institutions, and those who supported total annexation by USA – mainly the elite in power after independence; a divide leading to difficulties in developing a national identity.

Mark out of *[12 marks]* if candidates only look at one country.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general comments.

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit analysis of effects backed up with relevant evidence.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured, analytical answers focused on effects.

*[17+ marks]* for detailed, balanced and comprehensive analysis.

**11. “The Mexican Revolution was a revolt of the impoverished many against the wealthy few.”  
To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates could determine whether the situation in Mexico by 1910 corresponded to this account and then assess the extent to which it was this imbalance that caused the Mexican Revolution.

Arguments to support the statement may include the fact that, at the outbreak of Revolution, Mexico was marked by extreme class distinction: a large part of Mexican land was in the hands of few “hacendados”, many small farmers and indigenous people had been displaced; conditions comparable to slavery existed on some plantations; urban workers were paid extremely low salaries, were not protected by work legislation and felt discriminated against (US workers who received higher pay). The economic recession of 1907–1908 caused rising unemployment and declining standards of living, all of which led to unrest and strikes. The Revolution aimed at redressing social imbalances by nationalizing property in favour of the creation of new ejidos, issuing labour legislation, and ending monopolies. The Mexican Revolution unleashed violence and destruction largely aimed at the powerful and the rich.

However, the Mexican Revolution could be also viewed as a movement to gain political participation. A new generation of young leaders wanting to participate in the political life of their country played a significant role in the outbreak and their aims and expectations should be considered. Mexico’s middle class was unhappy about the degree of favouritism that their government was showing to foreign businessmen; there was discontent about government neglect of public services. Porfirio Diaz’s declarations that Mexico was ready for democracy and the government’s repressive violence contributed to the revolutionary atmosphere.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague comments on the causes of the Mexican Revolution.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptions of the status of the different social classes at the time of the outbreak of the Revolution, with implicit assessment of the part played by these.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit analysis on the role social differences played in the outbreak of revolution.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured analysis with effective use of relevant knowledge and perhaps, different interpretations.

*[17+ marks]* for well-substantiated, detailed and comprehensive analysis.

**12. How did *one* country of the Americas deal with unemployment between 1929 and the beginning of the Second World War?**

Canada, the United States, Argentina and Brazil are likely to be the most popular choices here, but any country of the region is acceptable. Key information for Canada and the US would be:

**Canada** – Candidates should note differences between the King and Bennett governments and should give specific programs as examples. When the crisis began, King urged Canadians to “wait it out”. Bennett in 1930 had two emergency bills passed providing for unemployment relief and an increased tariff, but basically maintained the “wait and see” attitude. As conditions worsened, US New Deal ideas spread to Canada and in 1935 Bennett announced a reform program with measures very similar to the US New Deal. Actual legislation did not live up to expectations.

**US** – Candidates should contrast the Hoover and Roosevelt approaches, although more attention will no doubt be given to the Roosevelt administrations. Some of Hoover’s limited efforts can be mentioned. For Roosevelt, students could explain how his approach to the problem differed philosophically from Hoover’s, then go on to discuss specific programs. There are many to choose from and 3 or 4 solid examples are sufficient. Candidates can also briefly discuss the effectiveness of these programs. Possibilities include, but are not limited to: the CCC, FERA, the CWA, the WPA, the NYA, and Social Security.

Governments in Latin America took active roles in the economies and implemented different policies so as to cope with unemployment issues.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general comments.

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for a more explicit account on the means by which the government dealt with unemployment.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical, well-focused and developed answers.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail and specific examples.

**13. For what reasons did French Canadian nationalism evolve in the first half of the twentieth century?**

Quebec separatism was deeply rooted in Canadian history: some Québécois maintained a perennial desire to have their own state, which in a sense they had possessed from 1791 to 1841, and many French Canadians had long felt a sense of minority grievance, stimulated by the execution of Louis Riel in the west, given substance by the Manitoba Schools Question, and given voice in the nationalism of journalists such as Jules-Paul Tardivel and Henri Bourassa.

French Canadian nationalism was also the outcome of profound economic and social changes that had taken place in Quebec since about 1890. Until that time French Canadians had lived by agriculture and seasonal work in the timber trade. The middle-class French of Quebec and Montreal acted as intermediaries between their countrymen and the English masters of commerce and industry. The coming of hydroelectric power and the wood-pulp industry created a demand for labour force that brought French Canadians as workers into the cities. The rate of growth of the French Canadian population and the lack of good workable land outside the narrow St. Lawrence and Richelieu valleys contributed to the rush to low-paying jobs in urban industries and to the growth of slums, particularly in Montreal. The conscription crisis enhanced nationalistic feelings among French Canadians. By 1921 Quebec was the most urbanized and industrialized of all Canadian provinces, including Ontario, which remained, however, the most populous and the wealthiest. The Quebec government, devoted to the nineteenth-century policy of laissez-faire, encouraged industry. However, with few exceptions the new enterprises were owned and directed, in the English language, by English Canadians or by US businesses. At the same time industrialization diminished some ideas by which French Canada had survived: that of the Roman Catholic mission to the New World and the cult of agriculture as the basis of virtuous life. Ever more Québécois had to make their way as best they could in quite a different world, in which the old values were declining. This clash of old and new came to a head in the last years of the regime of Premier Maurice Duplessis, a Quebec nationalist who led Quebec from 1936 to 1939 and from 1944 to 1959.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general answers.

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for a more explicit analysis of the reasons of the evolution of French Canadian nationalism.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical, well-focused and developed analysis.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail and perceptive comments.

**14. Examine the methods used and the conditions which helped the rise to power of *one* single party state leader in *one* country of Latin America in the first half of the twentieth century.**

This question could be answered with reference to any single party state leader in Latin America. It is possible that two favorites will be Peron and Vargas.

Castro should not be accepted because his rise to power is not during the time frame.

**Methods** could include: armed revolt; free elections; use of ideology; support from both inside the country and foreign powers; the appeal of the leader; propaganda.

**Conditions:** could include: economic problems, foreign intervention, social conflicts, dictatorship, *etc.*

*[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 methods and conditions.

*[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 methods and conditions that brought the selected party leader to power.

**15. How did *either* the United States *or* Canada react to the Holocaust?**

In both the United States and Canada there is evidence the governments knew about the Holocaust as early as 1942. In the United States 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 United States government consistently resisted all the pressures. Moreover, both the United States and Canada resisted pressure to admit Jewish refugees attempting to escape Europe. From 1933 until 1939, the United States admitted 140 000 Jewish refugees and Canada permitted only 4000 Jewish refugees to enter. In the United States, almost 90% of the quota for Germany remained untouched. It seems clear there was a deliberate effort by officials in the State Department, conducted by anti-Semitic elements, to prevent Jews entering the United States. A similar situation seemed to be the case in Canada. Canada was also permeated by anti-Semitic sentiment. Both English and French newspapers frequently voiced anti-Semitic sentiments, and several Canadian politicians were anti-Semites.

Candidates should be able to provide specific examples to support their line of argument.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative accounts with undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit focus on the question but limited analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical, well-balanced answers although not all the aspects of the question are addressed.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail and insight.

**16. Compare and contrast the United States’ foreign policy, towards *two* countries of the region, between 1959 and 1985.**

Candidates should identify reasons for and means used by the United States to influence events in the selected countries. Among the reasons, ideology, security and trade are likely to be the most popular areas for comparison and contrast. Concerns about the role of left wing political parties, for Latin American-Soviet relations, and for economic integration; as well as fear of a “Domino Effect” after the Cuban Revolution, could also be addressed.

Means to influence the region will vary according to the selection of examples and may include: direct/indirect intervention; support of military and right wing regimes; economic sanctions; aid; regional organizations; alliances and mutual defence pacts.

The question asks for a comparative approach. If only one area is addressed More than **[8 marks]** cannot be reached.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative with implicit comparison and contrast.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for comparative structure with explicit linkage.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for comparative structure and balanced, relevant knowledge.

*[17+ marks]* for detail and depth of analysis.

**17. Evaluate the successes and failures of the domestic policies of *one* US president between 1945 and 1976.**

Students may choose from any one of the following presidents: Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon or Ford. Answers should present several key, specific areas of domestic policy and then judge to what extent these were achieved.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general answers.

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit assessment and limited analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for explicit assessment and analysis.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical answers with balanced assessment and examples.



**18. Why was there a resurgence of conservative politics in the United States between 1968 and 1984?**

The policies of presidents Nixon and Ford and the writings of the political commentator W. Buckley and the economist Milton Friedman gave evidence in the 1970s of a steady shift to the right, away from the liberalism of the 60s. By 1980, a loose coalition of economic and political conservatives, religious fundamentalists, and political action committees (PACs) had become a potent force for change. These groups were opposed to big government, New Deal liberalism, gun control, feminism, welfare, affirmative action, sexual permissiveness, abortion, and drug use, which in their view were responsible for undermining family and religious values, the work ethic, and national security. The emerging conservative agenda produced such diverse causes as: a taxpayers' revolt that wanted lower taxes; moral revival; "reverse discrimination". For the 1980 election, the Republicans nominated Ronald Reagan. Reagan had established a reputation for patriotic nationalism and for his support of the reduction of the role of government. The Democrats nominated President Carter. The voters' rejection of Carter's presidency and the growing conservative mood gave Reagan the Presidency. Reagan's election broke a key element of the New Deal coalition by taking over 50% of the blue-collar vote. For the first time since 1954, the Republicans gained control of the Senate by defeating 11 liberal Democrats targeted by the "Moral Majority". The Republicans also gained 33 seats in the House, which combined with the votes of conservative Southern Democrats would give them a working majority on many key issues. The 1980 election seemed to mark the end of half a century of Democratic dominance of Congress and Reagan's Presidency launched and enhanced the conservative resurgence.

*[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.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are soundly focused and consistently analytical although not all the issues are addressed.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical answers showing detailed knowledge and insight into the reasons for the resurgence of conservatism.

**19. How successful was Kennedy’s foreign policy towards the USSR between 1961 and 1963?**

Kennedy set the tone for his administration’s policy towards the Soviet Union in his inaugural address. Aware that the Soviets saw him as young and inexperienced, he wanted to be seen as a strong Cold Warrior. However, the Bay of Pigs invasion made him seem weak to the Soviets, as did JFK’s performance at the Vienna Summit Conference. Kennedy’s not forcing the issue on the Berlin Wall was also interpreted by the Soviets as a sign of weakness, helping Khrushchev to decide to secretly put missiles in Cuba. It can be argued that Kennedy then handled the Cuban Missile Crisis skilfully, avoiding nuclear war. On the other hand, it can also be pointed out he made a secret deal to remove missiles in Turkey in exchange for the removal of missiles in Cuba. After the Missile Crisis, Kennedy was interested in lessening tensions between the two superpowers and called for a nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate general answers.

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit focus on the question and developed assessment.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical, well-focused analysis although not all the aspects of the question are addressed.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and well focused arguments, assessment and perhaps different interpretations.

**20. Analyse the reasons for the rise of the Civil Rights movement in the United States after the Second World War.**

A number of factors are involved in the emergence of the Civil Rights movement. African-American participation in World War II had both positive and negative effects. On one hand, they were credited with bravery in battle and groups such as the Tuskegee Airmen were admired. Still, military units were segregated as were blood banks and African-American soldiers were often treated worse than the POWs they were guarding in the Southern United States. These kinds of things were motivators for young men who fought in the war, and felt that a country fighting against racism abroad should also be addressing the question at home. After the war, the GI Bill of Rights gave young African-Americans opportunities for professional training and helped them join the middle class. By the 1950s, NAACP cases that had been in the court system for years were coming to the Supreme Court, culminating in the landmark *Brown vs. Board of Education* 1954. Another factor was the Cold War. US racial policy was prime propaganda material for the USSR in appealing to Third World countries. When Eisenhower sent troops to Little Rock, world opinion was a key reason. Kennedy was also concerned about world opinion when he saw the TV coverage of the 1963 events in Birmingham, Alabama. The increasing news coverage by television also served the cause. Another fortunate factor was the emergence of talented and inspiring leadership in the African-American community. In the early days of the movement, many African-American Southern ministers and other professionals were willing to lead in often dangerous circumstances. Candidates will no doubt mention Martin Luther King Jr, but other examples should also be credited.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative answers with limited specific examples.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit focus on the reasons but limited analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for well-focused, analytical answers although not all the issues are addressed.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical answers and well-supported arguments.

**21. How and why did Fidel Castro rise to power in 1959?**

Candidates should be able to identify the reasons that led to the downfall of Batista and the rise of Castro as well as the methods used by the latter to rise to power in 1959. Reasons may include: social inequalities due to highly concentrated ownership of land and an inadequate distribution of income; economic problems caused by a highly US dependent economy of monoculture – aggravated by the deep decline of sugar prices and their effects on purchasing power; growing opposition to US influence in Cuba. Also, the role played by Batista: his illegitimate rule, the use of repression and the excesses committed against opponents which led to the loss of support from the middle class and the cutting off of US arms supplies; the fact that he had underestimated Castro, setting him free. Finally, Castro’s own personality should also be examined: he represented a new generation demanding change and led a movement of enormous popularity.

Methods could include: Castro’s use of oratory and charisma; the promises of a new Cuba and his appeal to the notion of “Cubanness” which generated workers’ and peasants’ support; the Granma expedition and the use of guerrilla warfare – for which Batista’s government was unprepared; the contributions of leaders such as Ernesto “Che” Guevara, Camilo Cienfuegos, Raul Castro, *etc.*

*[0 to 7 marks]* for generalisations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative accounts of Castro’s rise with implicit reference to reasons and methods.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit reason and methods supported by relevant evidence.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for a structured framework and focus on reasons and methods supported by effective use of relevant knowledge.

*[17+ marks]* for detail and depth of analysis.

**22. In what ways did the role of the government evolve in Canada between the Second World War and 1982?**

Candidates might discuss the following issues:

The changes in Federal and Provincial Powers reflected in the Federal Constitutional Act of 1940; the British North American Act 1951 and the British North American Act, 1964.

The increase of Ottawa's political and financial power such as the efforts of Prime Minister Mackenzie King and the Federal government's use of its financial resources to promote programs in the provinces. The most significant example is in the provision of universal health insurance in Canada.

The strength of the Supreme Court: the Supreme Court of Canada was established in 1875. Until 1949, however, it was still possible to appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in Britain. This came to an end in 1949, when the Supreme Court of Canada finally became the last court of appeal.

The renewing of the Constitution and its different proposals and outcomes reaching to the passing of the Constitution Act, 1982.

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

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for a more explicit analysis but limited supporting arguments.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical framework although not all the aspects of the question are addressed.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical answers with well-developed and specific arguments.

**23. For what reasons, and with what results, did women’s movements emerge in the Americas in the second half of the twentieth century?**

Some of the reasons that could be mentioned are: the experience of the Second World War, access to contraception and higher education; the influence of the Civil Rights movements as well as the activism of minorities.

Results will vary depending on the specific cases used.

Answers should mention specific cases and individuals. If only one part of the question is addressed mark out of **[12 marks]**.

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

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative accounts with limited supporting evidence.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for focus on the reasons and results but limited arguments.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focused and analytical answers that use knowledge in a relevant way although not all the aspects are considered.

**[17+ marks]** for fully analytical answers that address the reasons and results and use concrete and relevant answers.

**24. To what extent did the Organization of American States (OAS) fulfill its aims between 1962 and 1995?**

The Organisation of American States was founded in 1948 under the principles of non-intervention, democracy and human rights, economic cooperation, and peaceful settlement of disputes.

Candidates are expected to identify the aims of the OAS and assess the extent to which they were achieved, supporting their arguments with concrete examples from the period.

It has been claimed that the Cold War context limited the role that the OAS played in the promotion of democracy. In fact, OAS never took steps to suspend the membership of the various dictatorships that emerged in the 1970s (*e.g.* Argentina, Brazil, Chile). However, in the early 80s, the organisation emphasised efforts to strengthen national and local government and electoral agencies. Multinational observation missions were sent to oversee elections in many member states (*e.g.* Nicaragua, Haiti, Paraguay, Guatemala, Peru). Resolution 1080 on Representative Democracy – which provides for an emergency meeting of foreign ministers to decide on specific collective action when democracy is interrupted – was used to manage crises in Haiti (1991), Peru (1992) and Guatemala (1993).

Non-intervention was not always consistent in this period. For example, while the OAS opposed the unilateral intervention of USA in Panama (1989), it approved of USA intervention in the Dominican Republic's civil war (1965).

As for peaceful settlements of disputes, examples show results have been mixed. In 1978, the OAS responded to Costa Rican allegations of border violations by Nicaragua by creating a committee of civilian observers to monitor the border and sought to arrange the peaceful departure of dictator Anastasio Somoza from Nicaragua and his replacement by a democratic government, but the effort failed in the face of Somoza's determination to stay in power. OAS played a role in ending a six-year conflict in Surinam (1992) helping to disarm former guerrillas. Conflicts between Peru and Ecuador, and Belize and Nicaragua had not been fully resolved by 1995.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for generalisations.

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for attempts to focus on the aims and policies of OAS.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for specific focus and explicit assessment on whether the aims were achieved in the given period.

*[17+ marks]* for in-depth, well-substantiated assessment and, perhaps, different interpretations.

**25. To what extent did the return to democracy in *one* Latin American country after 1980 contribute to its stability?**

Answers will vary according to the selected country. Some of the issues that might be considered are: the changing economic policies and the impact both positive and negative; the emerging political currents and participation, and the changes in the societies brought about by democratization.

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

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for focused answers that address the extent but with limited arguments.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical answers with explicit assessment but may not address all the aspects of the question.

*[17+ marks]* for fully analytical and relevant answers which address all the aspects of the question.

---