



# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2008**

**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 IB Cardiff.*

1. **Analyse the effects of colonial rule on Native American societies in *two* areas of the region.**

**Spanish colonies:** Spaniards destroyed several major Indian civilizations including the Aztecs and Incas. In some places, Indians were enslaved, treated as children or subject to debt slavery (peonage). Intermarriage with Spaniards and blacks was allowed but Native Americans remained at the bottom of the social scale.

**British colonies:** Colonies had different policies and methods for dealing with native peoples; Europeans generally took advantage of them, took their lands, and destroyed their hunting and burial grounds.

**French colonies:** aim was also to civilize and convert the native people. However, in this area, the native populations were not as numerous or as established as in Latin America. Efforts to convert Indians were only randomly successful.

Maximum *[12 marks]* if only one area is analysed.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative accounts and unbalanced answers.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical well-focused and relevant answers. May not address all aspects of the question.

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

**2. To what extent were the ideas of the Enlightenment a cause of independence movements in either the United States or Latin America?**

In both British America and Spanish America the leaders of the protest movements against colonial powers were attracted by and educated in the ideas of the Enlightenment. In British America one of the most influential thinkers was John Locke. His stress on natural rights would provide a rationale for the American Revolution and later for the basic principles of the US Constitution. In Spanish America the ideas of Voltaire, Rousseau, Montesquieu and, later, the ideas of the United States Declaration of Independence had a profound impact on the leaders of the independence movements.

Although there were other causes that can be mentioned, focus should be in the Enlightenment, and an assessment of its impact is necessary.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for general, narrative answers which do not address “to what extent”.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for a clear statement about the extent to which the Enlightenment was a cause but supported with barely sufficient evidence.

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

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers that are well focused although analysis is not fully developed.

**[17+ marks]** for well balanced and structured analysis and perhaps different interpretations.

**3. In what ways did the Declaration of Independence of 1776 justify the United States separation from Britain?**

Drawing from the writings of John Locke, Jefferson argued that governments exist in order to protect the rights of the people and that people have a right and even a duty to overthrow governments that fail their mandate. Jefferson further justified the revolution by detailing king George III’s “abuses and usurpations” against the American colonies and stated that the colonists should establish a new government as the United States of America in order to protect their rights.

Do not expect all of the above, but candidates should focus on the demands of “in what ways”.

A good analysis of two principles of government and two grievances against the king might be the base for a good answer.

**[0 to 7 marks]** maximum for unfocused description or unsubstantiated generalisations.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for descriptive accounts with implicit analysis, or relevant argument supported by limited material.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for description with more explicit analysis, or coherent argument supported by adequate detail.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for well-focused analytical answers, although analysis is not fully developed.

**[17+marks]** for sharply focused, analytical answers, showing depth and detail.

**4. Using examples from at least one country, explain why the caudillos emerged in Latin America in the nineteenth century.**

Important causes of the emergence of regional caudillos in Latin American countries were political instability, debts arising from independence wars, social differences, and centralist/federalist tendencies. After reaching the presidential office, caudillos usually found that sparse treasuries offered little reward for their followers. Their bands then dispersed, and new caudillos emerged with new bands of followers. Caudillos, often charismatic and authoritarian leaders, organized personal militias, took military action against political opposition and governed in a repressive way.

Award high marks for explaining “why” with good focus and accurate detail.

*[0 to 7 marks]* and under for general accounts or vague and inaccurate comments.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive accounts with implicit or undeveloped arguments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narratives that explain why caudillos emerged.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for well-focused analytical answers with supporting knowledge.

*[17+ marks]* for sharply focused explanation showing detailed knowledge and insight.

**5. Analyse the internal and external factors that led to the establishment of the Canadian Confederation.**

Some of the issues that promoted the Confederation were:

**Internal factors:**

Political deadlock resulting from the current political structure, demographic pressure, economic nationalism and the promise of economic development.

**External factors:**

The US doctrine of manifest destiny, the constant threat of intervention from the US, the US Civil War, British actions and American reactions, the Fenian raids, the creation of a new British colonial policy as Britain no longer wanted to maintain troops in its colonies.

Candidates should analyse both internal and external factors. If only one (internal or external) is discussed mark out of *[12 marks]*.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative with implicit examination of external and internal factors.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for focus on and specific knowledge of external and internal factors.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured focus and analytical answers.

*[17+ marks]* for full detailed knowledge and pertinent analysis.

6. **For what reasons, and with what impact, did abolitionism develop in the north of the United States?**

This question might prompt very different answers. Accept positions that are validated by solid arguments and historical evidence.

**For what reasons:** Some candidates might argue that abolitionism developed in the North as a part of a worldwide phenomenon, in which Britain in particular played an important role. British anti-slavery writings had a receptive audience in the US. Others might stress American roots and emphasize the religious revival of the Great Awakening of the 1820s and 1830s which inspired reform movements, one of the most notable of which was abolitionism. “Abolitionism” had several meanings at the time; some of its followers were radicals such as William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips or Frederick Douglass, who demanded the “immediate abolition of slavery”, hence the name. Some like John Brown were extremely controversial; his attempt to start a slave rebellion in 1859 electrified the nation; uniquely among the followers of Garrison he resorted to violence. Others, however, were more conservative and wanted a program of gradual emancipation with a long intermediate stage. The abolitionist movement was more urban than rural; it was stronger in New England, New York and the Ohio Valley.

**Impact:** Abolitionists were not very popular in the North. In fact many Northerners were ambivalent about emancipation or even opposed it outright. Racism continued to be strong in the North. Many Northerners fearing competition for jobs from free blacks hated the abolitionists; in consequence they attacked the abolitionists both in print and physically. Abolitionists had little political success; most public figures and politicians shunned the abolitionists for their radicalism and unwillingness to compromise. Abolitionists’ attacks on slavery goaded Southerners to extol the virtues of their peculiar institution, took specific actions against them and placed new restrictions on slaves. But if abolitionists did little in the short term to help the slaves, they did a great deal to polarise American opinion and heightened sectional animosity. Gradually they stirred the consciences of increasing number of Northerners and succeeded in keeping slavery in the forefront of public attention. By the 1850s many Northerners did believe that slavery was an unnecessary evil.

The question names the United States, however if some other country is addressed and ignores the United States accept it providing that is supported with historical material and relevant evidence.

A two part question mark out of **[12 marks]** if only one part is discussed.

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

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

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

**[14 to 16 marks]** for explicit analysis, solid arguments, evidence supporting specific examples.

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

**7. Why was compromise no longer possible between the North and the South in the United States by 1860?**

Essay answers should focus on the escalation of rhetoric and on crises which polarised opinion between North and South. This led to a growing sense of sectionalism in which the two sections identified more with the North or South than they did with the Union and came to view almost all the actions and pronouncements of the other section as hostile.

Some of the events and crisis were: in 1854, after passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, the Whig Party disappeared and the new Republican Party arose in its place. It was the nation's first major party with only sectional appeal and a commitment to stop the expansion of slavery. One Republican leader, Senator Charles Sumner, was violently attacked and nearly killed at his desk in the Senate by Congressman Preston Brooks of South Carolina. Open warfare in Kansas Territory (the "Bleeding Kansas" crisis), the Dred Scott decision of 1857, John Brown's raid in 1859, and the split in the Democratic Party in 1860 polarised the nation between North and South. The election of Lincoln in 1860 was the final trigger for secession.

Although not all of the above should be expected, candidates should discuss the main events, such as the Kansas-Nebraska Act and the "Bleeding Kansas" crisis, and their effects on the polarisation between North and South. Emphasis on "why by 1860" and analysis are needed for high marks.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for a narrative of the civil war without attention to the demands of the question.

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

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers that have limited analysis but address why by 1860.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers with emphasis on why by 1860 and good detailed selected examples, though analysis is not fully developed.

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

**8. In what ways did the building of railroads stimulate economic activity in *one* country of the Americas in the second half of the nineteenth century?**

Railroads stimulated bridge building, telegraph development, land sales and, by moving goods and people cheaply over great distances, the exploitation of natural resources, growth of specific industries such as cattle and coffee, large-scale manufacturing and independent markets. In North America railroads transformed agriculture and spurred regional concentration of industry and the growth of investment banking. In Latin America, they stimulated development of resources and the formation of modern export-economies.

Answers may vary in scope according to the selected country. Reward well good structure and relevant knowledge.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for narrative on the role of railroads.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative with implicit attention to “in what ways”.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit attention to the structure of the question.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focused, well-substantiated answers; not all aspects may be addressed.

*[17+marks]* for detailed knowledge, sharp focus and thorough analysis and assessment.

**9. Analyse the domestic and foreign policies of *one* leader in *one* country of the region between 1850 and 1919.**

This question provides opportunities for using knowledge of candidates’ own country.

Candidates’ answers will vary according to the selected country and leader but answers might cover political, social, economic, international policies and issues (although not all of these aspects would be necessary for a good answer). Some possible examples could be: Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson in the United States, John MacDonal in Canada, Porfirio Diaz in Mexico or any other Latin American leader within the prescribed period.

If only one of the two demands (domestic or foreign) is addressed mark out of *[12 marks]* but allow for some unbalance between the two.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative with implicit examination of domestic and foreign policies.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for focus on and specific knowledge of domestic and foreign issues.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured focus and analytical answers.

*[17+ marks]* for full detailed knowledge and pertinent analysis.



**10. Assess the significance of Booker T Washington in the advancement of African-American rights.**

Booker T. Washington was one of the dominant figures in African-American history in the United States from 1890 to 1915. He argued that self-support and self-reliance were the key to improved conditions for African Americans in the United States and that they could not expect too much, having only just been granted emancipation.

His aim was to improve African-Americans education, which would lead to social advancement. He avoided openly campaigning for equal civil and political rights. Washington received national prominence for his Atlanta Address of 1895, attracting the attention of politicians and the public as a popular spokesperson for African-American citizens. In his speech, Washington argued that African-Americans’ need for education and economic progress were of foremost importance and that they should concentrate on learning industrial skills for better wages. Only after establishing a secure economic base could African Americans hope to realise their other goals of political and social equality.

Active in politics, Booker T. Washington was routinely consulted by Republican Congressmen and Presidents about the appointment of African Americans to political positions. He worked and socialised with many white politicians and notables. Although labelled by some activists as an “accommodator”, his work cooperating with white people and enlisting the support of wealthy philanthropists helped raise funds to establish and operate hundreds of small community schools and institutions of higher education for the betterment of black persons throughout the South. In addition to the substantial contributions in the field of education, Washington did much to improve the working relationship between the races in the United States.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative accounts and unbalanced answers.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical well-focused and relevant answers. May not address all aspects of the question.

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

**11. Evaluate the influence of intellectuals on society in *one* country of the region during the period 1890 to 1919.**

Answers will vary according to the selected country.

Some of the issues that could be considered: influence and participation of intellectuals in government, education and literary currents.

Governments' policies aimed at democratization of education and influenced by intellectuals, diminished illiteracy considerably. The press became a useful instrument for intellectuals' expression of ideas that nurtured public opinion. Literary magazines were associated with political tendencies. Scientific knowledge was incorporated into production. University reform in Latin America spread its influence beyond Argentina's frontier; universities tended to abandon their traditional political indifference. Education became not only a way of personal development but also economic progress.

Reward argument supported by specific historical evidence.

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

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit assessment of intellectuals' influence on society.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for assessment that is well informed and consistently analytical, although not fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for assessment showing detailed knowledge and insight into the influence of intellectuals on various aspects of society.

12. **Define what the Monroe Doctrine was and analyse how it was applied in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. Support your answer with specific examples.**

**Definition:** statement by President J. Monroe in 1823, which claimed the United States as guardian of the Americas while pledging no US interference in Europe. Proclaimed at a time in which the European powers were too preoccupied with other matters to pay much attention to it and the US was too weak to enforce it, the Monroe Doctrine gradually became the centre of US policy towards Latin America. As American power grew US presidents increasingly asserted the doctrine to justify commercial and territorial expansion.

**How it was applied:** during the 1890s it was used to restrain European intervention in Latin America. In 1904 Theodore Roosevelt broadened the doctrine with a corollary that proclaimed the right of the US to police the Western hemisphere in cases of “chronic wrongdoing” or “impotence”. Under the Roosevelt Corollary the doctrine served as a justification for US intervention in the Caribbean area during the 1920s and became hotly contested within Latin America.

Some examples might be: Venezuela, Cuba, Panama, Nicaragua, Mexico or Haiti. Two well-selected examples with specific detail would be appropriate. A two-part question mark out of **[12 marks]** if only one part is discussed.

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

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative with some reference to what the Monroe Doctrine was and how it was applied.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more substantial answers which implicitly analyse how it was applied and some of the instances in which it was used.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focused answers which address the two parts of the question but in which analysis is not fully developed.

**[17+ marks]** for perceptive understanding of the historical conditions in which the doctrine was established and thorough analysis of how it was applied.

**13. Compare and contrast the aims of Pancho Villa and Emiliano Zapata in the Mexican Revolution (1910–1923).**

**Comparison:** candidates could refer to Zapata’s Plan de Ayala (1911) and Villa’s pronounced agrarian reform of 1913 for evidence of aims. Both wanted agrarian reform, both were truly revolutionary and wanted to change the social and economic structure of the country.

**Contrast:** Zapata led a rebellion of landless peasants and sought the return of the land of the *haciendas* to the landless peasants. Villa called for confiscation of large *haciendas*, but not for their subdivision into plots. The state would administer the *haciendas*, their crops would help to fund the revolutionary struggle, and once victory had been achieved they were to be used to restore village lands, pay taxes left unpaid by the *hacendados*, establish schools, *etc.*

The dates in the question indicate that answers should address the comparison during their lifetimes (Zapata was killed in 1919, Villa in 1923).

If only one leader is addressed mark out of **[7 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for vague or general answers, or if only one leader is selected.

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

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit comparison of aims of both leaders.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for comparative structure and specific evidence.

**[17+ marks]** for balanced comparison based on detailed specific evidence.

14. **“The Great Depression changed governments’ views of their role and responsibility.” With reference to *two* countries of the region, to what extent do you agree with this statement?**

This statement should be perceived as valid to some extent, regardless of the countries selected as examples. Democratic or undemocratic measures taken by governments during or immediately after the Great Depression changed the non-intervention attitude of governments to one of an expanded and assertive role of the governments in economic, social, and political issues. Particular countries can illustrate this trend.

The question does not demand the causes of the Depression. If only one country is used mark out of **[12 marks]**.

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

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative accounts and unbalanced answers.

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

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical well focused and relevant answers. May not address all aspects of the question.

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

15. **Analyse the short-term and long-term effects of the First World War on the economic and political development of Canada.**

**Economic development:** immediate industrial growth and agricultural boom; Canadian wheat fed Allied armies; manufacturing sector expanded rapidly. War was very costly; victory bonds and income tax; Canada emerged from war without debt; post-war unemployment.

**Political development:** the war weakened ties with Britain, changed Canada from colonial status to self-confident nation, brought international recognition at Versailles and in League of Nations, but divided Canada. Conscription crisis and a “khaki election” in 1917 created long-lasting acrimony between English and French Canadians.

Reward coverage of immediate and longer-term effects, detail and balance. If only one aspect is addressed mark out of **[12 marks]**.

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

**[8 to 10 marks]** for descriptive accounts with implicit analysis, or undeveloped argument.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more effective focus on immediate and longer-term effects.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for well-structured analysis of immediate and longer-term effects on economic and political development, although analysis may not be fully developed.

**[17+ marks]** for balanced and sharply focused answers, with detailed supporting evidence.

16. **For what reasons and with what results did Populist movements emerge in Latin America in the first half of the twentieth century? Support your answer with specific examples from *one* country of the region.**

**Reasons:** answers should include the idea of a political response to the socio-economic changes experienced in the area during the 1930s (urbanisation, economic instability, nationalism, political awareness of classes not included in political process).

**Results:** multi-class “popular alliances”, generally pro-industrial, merging the interests of entrepreneurs and workers and, in some cases, directly challenging the longstanding predominance of agricultural and landed interests. Each of these alliances was created by a national leader who used the power of the state for his purpose. Most populist regimes were at least semi-authoritarian and created a coalition against a particular set of interests that was prevented from participation; this involved some degree of exclusion and repression. They represented class interests that were bound to conflict with each other.

Typical examples: Juan Perón in Argentina during 1940’s; Estado Novo and Getulio Vargas in Brazil during the late 1930’s; and Lázaro Cárdenas in Mexico during the same period. Other countries can be used as examples but an account of specific conditions in the given country is a must.

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

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

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

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

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

**17. To what extent were attempts at “hemispheric cooperation” successful before and during the Second World War?**

Answers should define hemispheric cooperation and its motivations and mention US interventionism before 1933. Issues to be discussed: Good Neighbor Policy, FDR moving toward intervention in Europe (Neutrality Acts). Some or all of the following could be mentioned: Montevideo Conference Pact 1933, Buenos Aires Conference 1936, Lima Conference 1938, Panama 1939, and Havana 1940. Development of means to safeguard the hemisphere against aggression; Destroyer for Bases Agreement, Lend-lease, Rio Conference 1942. Different position of Argentina can be noted.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general answers not focusing on the demands of the question.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative accounts but with focus on assessment.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers with clear focus on assessment but not a well balanced response between before/during.

*[17+ marks]* for answers with clear focus on assessment, a well-balanced response between before/during and specific examples.

**18. To what extent did *either Canada or one Latin American country* develop a foreign policy independent of the United States after 1945?**

Strong answers will take a position in response to this question and defend it with reference to several examples from across the period since 1945. Content in answers will vary with the country selected.

**For Canada** coverage could include some of the following:

- Canadian participation in the Korean War, involvement in NORAD and NATO,
- Canada's commitment to the United Nations,
- the Suez Crisis (and Lester Pearson's suggestion of the UNEF),
- nuclear armaments policy,
- Canada's recognition of, and trade relations with, Fidel Castro's Cuba,
- Vietnam.

A reasonable position would be that there have been clear disagreements (*e.g.* Kennedy's and Diefenbaker's disagreement over nuclear arms and Cuban Missile Crisis) but within an overall context of shared values and cooperation.

**For Latin America** answers will vary according to the selected country.

Do not expect all the above; accurate and detailed discussion of three well-selected specifics could be sufficient.

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

**[8 to 10 marks]** for a general overview of Canadian or Latin American foreign relations with implicit assessment or some comment.

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

**[14 to 16 marks]** for focused, structured, well-supported argument.

**[17+ marks]** for answers that address the question in a direct and focused manner, with thorough analysis of some specifics and showing insight. The best answers may also analyse the influence of individual leaders.



**19. Compare and contrast the domestic policies of Jimmy Carter (1977–1981) and Ronald Reagan (1981–1989).**

**For comparison:** both came to power at a time in which the American people were experiencing significant turmoil and expected a new leadership and a new direction. Carter after the commotion and unhappiness of Watergate; Reagan after the traumatic events of the Iranian revolution and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Both came to power at times of economic decline due to high fuel prices and unemployment.

**For contrast:**

Carter: used “demand side” policies to stimulate the economy. The National Energy Act (1978) was intended to reduce the threat of a second oil crisis; it encouraged production of natural gas, offered incentives for the development of alternative energy sources to fossil fuels, and encouraged energy conservation by grants and an energy tax on petroleum. It was forward looking, but its impact in reducing dependence upon foreign oil was marginal; Carter’s legislative successes were few because he found little support for his policies, failed to establish a working relationship with Congress, and his administration was plagued by economic stagnation and soaring inflation. He greatly increased the number of ethnic minority members in government; and created a new government department, the Department of Energy.

Reagan: used a “supply side” economic policy and sought to raise prosperity through income tax cuts, increasing employment, reducing spending on social services, and substantially increased growth in GDP. The economy did boom, assisted by a decline in world commodity prices, deregulation, and extensive military spending as well as his tax cuts (of 25 %). Achievements also included substantial growth in GDP (33 %), creation of eighteen million new jobs, and a reduction in federal spending. By the late 1980s, however, there was a huge domestic budget deficit, serious economic recession, and it was clear that tax cuts had mainly benefited the rich.

Do not expect answers to include all the points above, but maximum of *[7 marks]* if only one president is discussed.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated general answers or if only one president is addressed.

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more focused answers, with some explicit linkage and comparison.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that compare and contrast but in which the analysis is not fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for comparative structure and thorough analysis.

**20. Analyse the successes and failures of the foreign policies of *either* Richard Nixon (1969–1974) or George H W Bush (1989–1993).**

**Nixon:** assessment could include reference to some of the following: detente, taking advantage of rivalry between China and USSR, recognising People’s Republic of China, visits to China (1971, 1972), SALT I (1969–1972), Nixon Doctrine (1969), Vietnamization, US invasion of Cambodia and Laos, bombing of North Vietnam, Paris Peace Accords (1973) and US withdrawal from Vietnam.

**Bush:** assessment might include reference to US intervention in Panama (1989), the Gulf War (1990–1991) and Somalia (1992–1994); START I (1991) START II (1993); reactions to the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War.

*[0 to 7 marks]* maximum for vague, general narratives of one presidency.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives of the chosen president’s policies with implicit analysis of achievements and limitations.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for detailed and well-focused argument on achievements and limitations, though not all aspects of the question may be addressed.

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

**21. With reference to *two* United States presidencies between 1945 and 1969, assess the role of the US Federal Government in the achievement of African-American civil rights.**

Candidates should be aware that the “Federal Government” comprises the President, Congress and the Supreme Court. The period under consideration covers the presidencies of Truman 1945–1953, Eisenhower 1953–1961, Kennedy 1961–1963, and Johnson 1963–1969.

**Truman:** the first modern president to use presidential powers to challenge racial discrimination; two executive orders that ended racial discrimination in federal government and desegregated the armed forces. Many of his attempts were blocked by southern Democrats in the Senate.

**Eisenhower:** appointment of Earl Warren as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court helped to bring about a revolution in the institution. The landmark decision of the Brown Case (1954) declared the “separate but equal” interpretation of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment unconstitutional thereby ending legal segregation in public schools. He sent federal troops to protect black students enrolling at Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas in 1957, the first president since reconstruction to use federal troops to protect the rights of African Americans. Segregation of public transportation was also challenged with the Montgomery Bus Boycott in Alabama and in 1956 the Supreme Court ruled that segregation laws were unconstitutional. In the first civil rights acts since reconstruction, the 1957 and 1960 Acts attempted to give federal judges more power in enforcing black voter registration. Again, southern Democrat resistance in Congress made both acts ineffectual.

**Kennedy:** In 1962, James Meredith tried to enroll at the University of Mississippi, but he was prevented from doing so by white students. Kennedy responded by sending some 400 federal marshals and 3,000 troops to ensure that Meredith could enroll in his first class. Kennedy also assigned federal marshals to protect Freedom Riders. It was, however, the Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, who with his actions desegregated lunch counters and the Supreme Court ruling on inter-state bussing was enforced. The Justice Department under RFK also helped to desegregate the universities of Mississippi and Alabama. In 1963 the intensity of African-American protest induced Kennedy to introduce the Civil Rights Bill to end legal segregation.

**Johnson:** legal segregation came to an end. He was able to pass through Congress the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Together with the 24<sup>th</sup> Amendment of 1964 these enforced the civil and political rights that had been promised to the African-Americans in the Civil War amendments of 1865–1870. In addition Johnson’s “war on poverty” brought much needed federal aid to inner city areas.

If only one president is discussed mark out of **[12 marks]**.

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

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative accounts and unbalanced answers.

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

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical well-focused and relevant answers. May not address all aspects of the question

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

**22. “Fidel Castro came to power in Cuba because of the weaknesses of Batista’s regime.”  
To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Answers might vary according to the extent in which there is agreement or disagreement with the quotation. In any case, the Batista regime should be discussed: repressive measures; links and profits from foreign gambling establishments; subservience to the United States; savage reprisals against the guerrillas, torturing and murdering suspects, many of them middle class students, and therefore alienating a sector of society which previously had supported him.

Other reasons that could be addressed: long-standing resentment among many Cubans about US influence in the country; dependency on sugar exports and the control of wealth in the hands of a few; lack of effective political system; Castro’s nationalism and charisma.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general, narrative answers which do not address “to what extent”.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a clear statement about the extent to which the Batista’s was a cause but supported with barely sufficient evidence.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are well focused although analysis is not fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for well balanced and structured analysis and perhaps different interpretations.

**23. Compare and contrast the successes and failures of the domestic policies of *two* Canadian prime ministers from 1948 to 1979.**

Answers would vary according to the selected prime minister but candidates should make reference to economic and social policies as well as problems that they confronted and how they attempted to solve them. Some possible choices are: Louis St. Laurent 1948–1957; John Diefenbaker 1957–1963; Lester Pearson 1963–1968; Pierre Trudeau 1968–1979 (first term).

Maximum *[7 marks]* if only one prime minister is discussed.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for accurate narratives with implicit assessment or some comment.

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

*[14 to 16 marks]* for well-focused, detailed analysis of the successes and failures of the domestic policies of the selected prime ministers although not all aspects may be addressed.

*[17+ marks]* for perceptive analysis, possibly including use of different interpretations.

**24. Why did the Native American movement emerge in *one* country of the region in the 1960s?**

Answers will vary according to the country of choice. However, as a general issue, it is clear that the growth of the African-American protest in the United States, and the significant white response to it, encouraged other minorities to assert themselves and demand redress of their grievances.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate/general material.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives about the topic that are informed, but lack overt analysis.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for suitable selection of material and explicit analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured answers that address specific reasons in a well balanced, focused argument.

*[17+ marks]* for well balanced, argued and analytical answers showing insight and depth.

**25. Analyse the aims and impact of the NAFTA agreements.**

**NAFTA:** in operation since January 1994 (Canada, Mexico and the USA), it emerged from the free trade area between Canada and the USA effective from January 1989.

**Aims:** to create a free trade area between member states through the phasing out of tariffs and other barriers on the exchange of goods, services and investments.

**Impact:** aroused fears in USA that it would lead to export of US jobs to Mexico; not all tariffs eliminated. Created great competition for Mexican products and produced unrest in that country.

If only one aspect of the question is answered mark out of *[12 marks]*.

*[0 to 7 marks]* maximum for unsubstantiated generalisations and vague general accounts.

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

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative with explicit focus on aims and impact, or analytical approach showing adequate supporting knowledge.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for well-focused analytical answers supported by appropriate knowledge, although the analysis may not be fully developed.

*[17+ marks]* for sharply focused, fully analytical answers with detail, insight and perhaps reference to different interpretations.

---