



MARKSCHEME

MAY 2010

HISTORY

Route 2

Higher Level

**Paper 3 – Aspects of the history
of the Americas**

*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.*

*Paper 3 markbands: The following bands provide a précis of the full markbands for paper 3 published in the History guide (2008) on pages 77–81. They are intended to assist marking, but must be used in conjunction with the full markbands found in the guide. **For the attention of all examiners: if you are uncertain about the content/accuracy of a candidate’s work please contact your team leader.***

0:	Answers not meeting the requirements of descriptors should be awarded no marks.
1–2:	Answers do not meet the demands of the question and show little or no evidence of appropriate structure. There is little more than unsupported generalization.
3–4:	There is little understanding of the question. Historical knowledge is present but the detail is insufficient. Historical context or processes are barely understood and there are little more than poorly substantiated assertions.
5–6:	Answers indicate some understanding of the question, but historical knowledge is limited in quality and quantity. Understanding of historical processes may be present but underdeveloped. The question is only partially addressed.
7–8:	The demands of the question are generally understood. Relevant, in-depth, historical knowledge is present but is unevenly applied. Knowledge is narrative or descriptive in nature. There may be limited argument that requires further substantiation. Critical commentary may be present. An attempt to place events in historical context and show an understanding of historical processes. An attempt at a structured approach, either chronological or thematic has been made.
9–11:	Answers indicate that the question is understood, but not all implications considered. Knowledge is largely accurate. Critical commentary may be present. Events are generally placed in context, and historical processes, such as comparison and contrast, are understood. There is a clear attempt at a structured approach. Focus on AO1, AO2 and AO4. Responses that simply summarize the views of historians cannot reach the top of this markband.
12–14:	Answers are clearly focused on the demands of the question. Relevant in-depth knowledge is applied as evidence, and analysis or critical commentary is used to indicate some in-depth understanding, but is not consistent throughout. Events are placed in context and there is sound understanding of historical processes and comparison and contrast. Evaluation of different approaches may be used to substantiate arguments presented. Synthesis is present, but not always consistently integrated. Focus on AO3 and AO4.
15–17:	Answers are clearly structured and focused, have full awareness of the demands of the question, and if appropriate may challenge it. Accurate and detailed historical knowledge is used convincingly to support critical commentary. Historical processes such as comparison and contrast, placing events in context and evaluating different interpretations are used appropriately and effectively. Answers are well-structured and balanced and synthesis is well-developed and supported with knowledge and critical commentary.
18–20:	Answers are clearly focused with a high degree of the awareness of the question and may challenge it successfully. Knowledge is extensive, accurately applied and there may be a high level of conceptual ability. Evaluation of different approaches may be present as may be understanding of historical processes as well as comparison and contrast where relevant. Evaluation is integrated into the answer. The answer is well-structured and well-focused. Synthesis is highly developed.

1. **“American independence from Britain was not a revolution but an evolution.” To what extent do you agree with this view?**

This will probably be a popular question. Historians have long argued about this topic, thus candidates might use their knowledge about historiography where relevant. A possible approach to this question could be to define the term “revolution” and then present an argument for a “revolutionary movement” and the “evolutionary movement”, which will then allow them to arrive at their own conclusion. Either point of view might be accepted providing that the argument is supported by historical evidence.

Some of the arguments might include emerging political philosophy, disputes between Great Britain and the colonies, and levels of violence associated with crisis events.

Revolutionary movement

A new nation was formed with a republican government based on federalism and the rights of the individual. Therefore the independence was social as well as political. The war is often referred to as the American Revolutionary War.

Evolutionary movement

The changes that are viewed as evolutionary include representative government, expansion of the right to vote and written constitution, which had all developed earlier, during the colonial period. What was significant about the break with Great Britain was the recognition of an American philosophy based on liberty and democracy that would guide the nation.

2. **To what extent were the wars of independence in Latin America due to the grievances of the Creoles against the peninsular Spaniards? Support your answer with reference to *one* independence movement.**

Answers could vary according to the selected movement. Candidates might agree or disagree with this view but should provide specific examples to support either position. “To what extent” indicates that other reasons or causes have to be taken into consideration.

The wars of independence evolved from a number of internal and external causes, some related, some independent from each other. Besides the ideas of the Enlightenment, a number of economic, ethnic and nationalist circumstances added to the level of discontent among the Latin American population. But the antagonism and bitter feelings between Latin American Creoles and the Spaniards, who came to the areas either as government administrators or in private enterprise, helped ignite the revolutions.

Other rebellions and revolutions in the Americas inspired the Creoles into action. The American Revolution of 1776 and the French Revolution of 1789 encouraged Creoles to emulate their example. On the other hand, the train of events in Spain itself helped precipitate the independence movements. Napoleon’s invasion of 1807, the installation of his brother Joseph as king of Spain, the Spanish resistance, the rise of revolutionary *juntas* to resist Napoleon, and convocation of the liberal Cortes in Cadiz all inspired Creoles to take matters into their own hands.

Do not expect all of the above, but reward analytical essays.

3. Why did the United States go to war against British North America in 1812?

From the point of view of the United States, the major causes of the war were: Britain's seizure of American ships and impressments of American sailors; American resentment of Britain (dating back to Revolutionary days); the American belief that the British in Canada were arming the Indians and inciting them to raid American settlements; and the United States' ambitions to annex Canada and Florida.

From the point of view of Great Britain: the British were engaged in a life and death war with Napoleon and could not allow the Americans to help the enemy (regardless of their lawful neutral rights to do so), Great Britain feared that the United States would hinder its war effort against France, the need of sailors for its all-out commercial war and the fears of United States expansionism.

The question does not ask for the British motivations for the war, but if it is also included, accept it and reward the answer accordingly.

4. Analyse the effects of the Mexican–American War (1846–1848) on the region.

The most important consequence of the war for the United States was the Mexican Cession, in which the Mexican territories of Alta California and Santa Fé de Nuevo México were ceded to the United States under the terms of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. In Mexico, the enormous loss of territory following the war encouraged its government to enact policies to colonize its remaining northern territories as a hedge against further losses. In addition, the Rio Grande River became the boundary between Texas and Mexico, and Mexico never again claimed ownership of Texas. Mexico lost 55 % of its national territory. This figure rises to over two thirds of its territory if Texas is included. Some Mexicans relocated further south in Mexico, but the vast majority remained in the United States.

The US' victory and the acquisition of new land brought a surge of patriotism. Victory seemed to fulfil citizens' belief in their country's "Manifest Destiny". Many of the military leaders on both sides of the American Civil War had fought as junior officers in Mexico, including Ulysses S Grant and Robert E Lee, as well as the future Confederate President Jefferson Davis.

During the war, political quarrels in the US arose regarding the disposition of conquered Mexico. A strong "All-Mexico" movement urged annexation of the entire territory. Abolitionists opposed that position and fought for the exclusion of slavery from any territory absorbed by the United States. In 1847, the House of Representatives passed the Wilmot Proviso, stipulating that none of the territory acquired should be open to slavery. The Senate avoided the issue, and a late attempt to add it to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was defeated.

The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was approved by the US Senate on 10 March, 1848, and ratified by the Mexican Congress on 25 May. The Mexican Cession of Alta California and Santa Fé de Nuevo México and its recognition of US sovereignty over all of Texas north of the Rio Grande formalized the addition of 1.2 million square miles (3.1 million km²) of territory to the United States. In return the United States agreed to pay \$15 million and assumed the claims of its citizens against Mexico. A final territorial adjustment between Mexico and the United States was made by the Gadsden Purchase in 1853.

Do not expect all of the above, but reward analytical essays.

**5. “The Kansas–Nebraska problem destroyed the power of the Southern pro-slavery group.”
To what extent do you agree with this view?**

Candidates might agree or disagree with this statement. However, they should focus on the Kansas–Nebraska conflict and assess its impact on the pro-slavery group and not use this question for a rendition of the Civil War. Other factors that might be deemed necessary to support the answer and the decline of the Southern pro-slavery coalition could be debated.

The Kansas–Nebraska Act was passed by the US Congress on 30 May 1854. It allowed people in the territories of Kansas and Nebraska to decide for themselves whether or not to allow slavery within their borders. The Act served to repeal the Missouri Compromise of 1820 which prohibited slavery north of latitude 36°30’.

The Kansas–Nebraska Act infuriated many in the North who considered the Missouri Compromise to be a long-standing binding agreement. In the pro-slavery South it was strongly supported.

After the Kansas–Nebraska Act was passed, pro-slavery and anti-slavery supporters rushed in to settle Kansas to affect the outcome of the first election held there after the law went into effect. Pro-slavery settlers carried the election but were charged with fraud by anti-slavery settlers, and the results were not accepted by them. The anti-slavery settlers held another election; however pro-slavery settlers refused to vote. This resulted in the establishment of two opposing legislatures within the Kansas territory. Violence soon erupted, with the anti-slavery forces led by John Brown. The territory earned the nickname “bleeding Kansas” as the death toll rose. President Franklin Pierce, in support of the pro-slavery settlers, sent in Federal troops to stop the violence and disperse the anti-slavery legislature. Another election was called. Once again pro-slavery supporters won and once again they were charged with election fraud.

As a result, Congress did not recognize the constitution adopted by the pro-slavery settlers and Kansas was not allowed to become a state.

Eventually, however, anti-slavery settlers outnumbered pro-slavery settlers and a new constitution was drawn up. On 29 January 1861, just before the start of the Civil War, Kansas was admitted to the Union as a free state.

6. To what extent was the victory of the North in the United States Civil War due to its superior industrial resources and manpower?

Candidates should recognize that the North’s overwhelming superiority in industrial resources, manpower and logistical capacity was a necessary condition for Northern victory. But that is not a sufficient explanation. Victory does not always go to the side that is stronger in numbers and resources, as we well know from the Vietnam War, and, indeed, as Americans knew in 1861 when they looked at the history of their conflict with Britain.

While the North could not have won the war without that kind of superiority, that was not the total explanation. A very significant factor was the gradual development in the North of a coherent strategy for victory and the gradual rise of military commanders under Lincoln’s leadership. Leaders like Grant, Sherman, Sheridan and George Thomas, who were willing to put in place a kind of hard-war strategy. This was a strategy of all-out military conflict to destroy Confederate armies, but also an all-out effort to destroy the economic and social infrastructure that supported the Confederate war effort, including the institution of slavery. It was not until the Northern leadership was willing to grasp the necessity of fighting this kind of a war against a determined and skillful foe that they were able to achieve ultimate victory.

The reason why industrial and population superiority was a necessary condition to win the war is that the North had to occupy the South and destroy its capacity to wage war. That is a far harder task than what was necessary for the Confederacy to win the war, which was merely to defend what they already had in 1861; that is, military and political control of an existing government and a population willing to support that government. But it was the emergence of the right strategy and the leadership to carry it out that was in the end the sufficient condition for Northern victory.

Both aspects should be addressed but allow for some imbalance. If only one aspect is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].

7. Compare and contrast the successes and failures of one United States leader and one Canadian leader between 1865 and 1929.

There are several choices here – accept any providing that the selected leaders are within the dates stipulated in the question. Candidates should deal with both domestic and foreign policy issues. Popular choices may be J MacDonalld or Wilfrid Laurier.

If only one leader is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks].

8. Discuss the impact of the development of the modern state (1865–1929) on the Native American population in *one* country of the region.

Answers to this question should focus on the given dates, therefore do not accept renditions of the European-indigenous relations during the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries. There are many possible choices for this topic, but the most popular will probably be the United States, Canada, Argentina, Chile and Mexico. Regardless of the selected country the answers have to be supported by specific evidence and examples.

The impact of modernization on the indigenous people during this period was negative. Several forces were behind this situation: doctrines of Social Darwinism and Progressivism; the opening of new territories; the development of railroads and settlements and, in some areas, the need for labour. These developments brought displacement, starvation and, in some cases, annihilation of the Native American population. Governments used different means to achieve these goals, ranging from relocations and “unequal treaties” to warfare and extermination campaigns.

9. Assess the role of Canada in the First World War.

When the First World War broke out in 1914, all Dominions of the British Empire, including Canada, were called upon by Great Britain to fight on her behalf. Canada’s sacrifices and contributions to the war changed its history and enabled it to become more independent, while opening a deep rift between the French and English speaking populations. For the first time in its history, Canadian forces fought as a distinct unit under a Canadian-born commander. Battles such as Vimy Ridge, the Second Battle of Passchendaele and the Battle of the Somme are still remembered today by anglophones as part of Canada’s founding myth, for both its identity and culture. Canada’s total casualties stood at 67 000 young men and women killed and 173 000 wounded. These figures are disproportionately high considering Canada’s total population was 7 million on the eve of the First World War.

10. Define the United States’ policy of Moral Diplomacy and discuss its impact on the region.

Answers to this question should be focused on Latin America. Do not accept responses that discuss US entrance and participation in the First World War in Europe. Candidates would probably select the case of Mexico to illustrate the application and impact of the policy, however, the choice of other cases should also be accepted.

“Moral Diplomacy” or “Missionary Diplomacy” is a descriptive label often applied to the policies and practices of the United States in Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean during the presidency of Woodrow Wilson (1913–1921). Soon after taking office, President Wilson rejected the Dollar Diplomacy that had guided US relations with Latin America during the administration of William Taft. In ways consistent with his domestic Progressive reform goals and his faith in the superiority of American democracy, Wilson resolved that the United States would only recognize Latin American governments founded upon law and order, “not upon arbitrary or irregular force”. Furthermore, Wilson was willing to use military force to demonstrate to Latin Americans “how to elect good men” as leaders. Nevertheless, he wanted US financial, commercial, and manufacturing interests to find opportunities in the area. He also hoped American capitalism could aid the promotion of democracy, which he held to be a moral duty of the United States.

Wilson did not lack opportunities to carry out his Moral Diplomacy in Latin America. Under Wilson, the United States intervention in Latin America escalated. Between 1914 and 1918, the United States intervened in Latin America, particularly in Mexico, Haiti, Cuba and Panama. The US maintained troops in Nicaragua throughout his administration and used them to select the president of Nicaragua and then to force Nicaragua to pass the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty. American troops in Haiti forced the Haitian legislature to choose the candidate Wilson selected as Haitian president. American troops occupied Haiti between 1915 and 1934.

On the whole, Wilson’s actions in Latin America protected US commercial and strategic interests, but the goal of spreading democracy went mostly unfulfilled. Moral Diplomacy created seemingly permanent hostility between the United States and Latin America. This was especially true in the countries which experienced Wilsonian interventionism.

Both aspects should be addressed but allow for some imbalance. If only one aspect is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].

11. “Lázaro Cárdenas’ rule (1934–1940) renewed the ideals of the Mexican Revolution.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

This could be a popular question. The answers to “to what extent” will be, probably, “to a large extent”. But accept different views provided they are analytical and supported by relevant arguments.

Cárdenas’ goals were to regain the revolutionary credibility that had stagnated. He is credited with giving definite shape to the political system that lasted in Mexico until the end of the 1980s. Central to this project was the organization of corporatist structures for trade unions, peasant organizations, and middle class professionals and office workers within the reorganized ruling party, now renamed the PRM (Party of the Mexican Revolution). The centrepiece of his domestic policy was the renewal of the agrarian reform. During Cárdenas’ presidency, the government expropriated and redistributed millions of acres of *hacienda* land to peasants, and urban and industrial workers gained unprecedented unionization rights and wage increases. The railway *Ferrocarriles Nacionales de México* was nationalized in 1938 and put under a “workers’ administration”.

Also central to Cárdenas’ project were nationalistic economic policies involving Mexico’s vast oil production, which had soared following strikes in 1910 in the area known as the “Golden Lane”, near Tampico, and which made Mexico the world’s second-largest oil producer by 1921, supplying approximately 20 % of domestic demand in the United States. His attempts to negotiate with foreign companies failed and he nationalized Mexico’s petroleum reserves and expropriated the equipment of the foreign oil companies in Mexico. Despite pressures from the oil lobby, Franklin D Roosevelt decided to adhere to his Good Neighbour policy and refused to intervene in Mexican affairs. The oil companies retaliated by boycotting Mexican oil and other goods despite an international ruling in favor of Mexico’s government. The company that Cárdenas founded, *Petróleos Mexicanos* (or Pemex), would later be a model for other nations seeking greater control over their own oil and natural gas resources and, 70 years later, it remains one of the most important sources of income for the country, despite weakening finances. Relations with the Catholic Church were also healed during Cárdenas’ rule.

12. Analyse the influence of the Mexican Revolution on the arts.

Candidates who select this question might analyse only one or two of the famous muralists. That is a valid approach, providing that they address the revolutionary aspect. More recently, a painter, also related to the group, has been recognized: Frida Kahlo. She could also be a very good choice.

Between 1920 and 1924, extensive campaigns in education and literacy were made in Mexico. This campaign was accompanied by extensive official patronage of indigenous arts and crafts, as a means of fostering pride in the achievements of the people. The muralist movement was also born in this period under the auspices of the state. The leading muralists, Diego Rivera, José Orozco and David Siqueiros, were commissioned to paint *frescos* on the walls of ministries and public buildings depicting revolutionary and indigenous themes. The movement stands out historically because of its political undertones, the majority of which are of a Marxist nature, or related to a social and political situation of post-revolutionary Mexico. The outpouring of images and pictorial themes which came from the muralist movement disseminated the notion of the legitimizing Revolution among the masses, and served to consolidate a state ideology of common citizenship and progressive nationalism.

In addition to the above other arts such as literature, music and dance are acceptable.

13. “The prosperity of the 1920s in the Americas was more apparent than real.” Using examples from *two* countries of the region, evaluate the validity of this statement.

This question asks candidates to explore the real problems that were beneath the optimism of the 1920s and that eventually resulted in the Great Depression of 1929. Candidates might take different approaches to answer it, but better answers will address the positive aspects of the period while indicating the limitations and latent dangers underneath them. A basic answer about the causes of the Depression should not be awarded more than **[13 marks]**.

If only one country is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].

14. Why was there opposition to the New Deal policies of Franklin D Roosevelt?

The New Deal attracted much opposition: from the political right and the political left. Candidates that choose to answer this question could focus on the groups (or individuals) and arguments of the opposition, or on the individual programs of the New Deal and opposition to them.

Liberty Leaguers (Right)

Many of the wealthy, who had supported Roosevelt in the darkest days of the Depression as the saviour of capitalism, turned against him when it seemed that capitalism was saved. This was in part because of the increase in taxes, which they opposed, and also what they perceived as too much continued government involvement in the Depression. The Liberty League was formed in 1934 to promote private property and private enterprise. Its members saw Roosevelt as a traitor to his class and some labelled him a communist.

Other groups/persons

End Poverty in California (Upton Sinclair), Share our Wealth (Huey Long), Old Age Revolving Pensions Inc. (Francis Townsend), National Union for Social Justice (Father Charles Coughlin), Thunder on the Left (a coalition of leftist groups). Each one of these individuals or groups had their own particular argument or agenda. However, a common theme was their desire to see more government intervention and greater distribution of wealth.

Do not expect all of the above, but reward balanced and well-informed answers.

15. Analyse the social and economic effects of the Second World War on *one* country of the region.

Effects could be taken from both during and after the war.

Social effects

Changing status and attitudes toward social groups: women, African Americans, Native Americans, “enemy aliens”, demographic changes and new legislation that affected these groups.

Economic effects

Economic growth, end of Depression, Post-war economic problems, changes in the economy, patterns of trade, demobilizations and changes in employment and unemployment, labour migration.

If only one type of effect is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks]. However, allow some imbalance in the answers.

16. “The atomic bombs were necessary to end the Second World War.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

This is a highly debated topic which requires balanced judgements and historical evidence. It is not a question about the moral justification of dropping the bombs, but about the options that existed before the decision was made. Candidates might also argue Truman’s political motivations for doing it. Those can be accepted if answers are factual and analytical.

There was considerable disagreement among United States’ officials about Japan’s capacity to continue the war. Many believed that a costly invasion of the home islands would be required before Japan surrendered. A repetition of the resistance shown during the islands fighting and of the *kamikaze* tactic was expected. Battles on Iwo Jima and Okinawa appeared to foreshadow the kind of defence the Japanese would make on their home islands; an invasion surely would take a large toll of both American and Japanese lives. Assuming that the alternatives were invasion or dropping the atomic bombs, American and Japanese casualties in the invasion would have far exceeded the losses at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

17. Assess the results of the Silent Revolution (Quiet Revolution) in Canada during the 1960s.

The Silent (Quiet) Revolution of the 1960s was a period of intense change in Québec, Canada, characterized by the rapid and effective secularization of society, the creation of a welfare state and a re-alignment of politics into federalist and separatist factions.

The provincial government took over the fields of health care and education, which had been in the hands of the Roman Catholic Church. It created ministries of education and health, expanded the public service, and made massive investments in the public education system and provincial infrastructure. The government allowed unionization of the civil service. It took measures to increase Québécois control over the province’s economy and nationalized electricity production and distribution. It also gave rise to a powerful separatist movement and even to terrorist manifestations, both of which linked strongly the ideology of nationalism and the desire for social change.

18. Compare and contrast the rise to power of *two* populist leaders in Latin America between 1945 and 1979.

Candidates will find many examples to answer this question. Almost all Latin American nations have experienced populism at one point, but the time frame excludes the first periods of Vargas (1930–1945), and Lázaro Cárdenas (1934–1940). Possible examples could be Perón in Argentina, Castro in Cuba, Kubitschek, Goulart and Quadros in Brazil, and Betancourt in Venezuela, Paz Estenssoro in Bolivia, Ibáñez in Chile and Velasco Ibarra in Ecuador, but accept any other relevant figure provided that the individual is a “populist leader” and fits into the period. Furthermore, valid examples are limited to those populist leaders who actually became rulers.

A good strategy for this question is to begin with the definition of populism: populism has been associated with expansive electoral campaigning by a “charismatic” leader with special attributes (often a political outsider); the participation of the masses (that is, the “people”, or the “popular” of populism); with strong appeals to nationalism or to cultural pride. Successful populist movements usually bypass traditional political institutions like the Church, the oligarchy, political parties, newspapers and elites. Given this, they are typically urban-centred and particularly court the working class, but bring together a heterogeneous, if sometimes fleeting, coalition. Populism can be associated with a left-wing or right-wing ideology. More generally, however, populism conspicuously lacks an identifiable doctrine.

Some of the issues to be considered are: methods by which the leader came to power; groups that supported him and opposed him. Did ideology play a role in the rise to power? If yes, which was it; if not what appeal did he offer? What was the political, social or economic environment of the country which promoted his rise?

If only one leader is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks].

19. Analyse the successes and failures of President Kennedy's foreign policies towards Latin America between 1961 and 1963.

Kennedy's policies toward Latin America have to be understood within the context of the Cold War, the core of the United States' policy until its end in 1991. Cuba was the first major crisis to confront the new administration of John F Kennedy in 1961. The ultimate goal of the policy was to thoroughly undermine, or even assassinate if necessary (Operation Mongoose), Cuban revolutionary leader Fidel Castro.

Besides this policy towards Cuba, the administration proposed a comprehensive plan for Latin America; the Alliance for Progress. It aimed at establishing economic cooperation between North and South America. The aid was intended to counter the perceived emerging communist threat from Cuba to US interests and dominance in the region. The programme was signed at an inter-American conference at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in August 1961. The United States pledged to spend \$10 billion in the region, over ten years, to build transportation facilities and to provide technology and industrial material. In return, Latin American governments were to institute programmes of social and political reform, including land reform. To guard against more radical movements like Castrist guerrilla movements in Cuba, the US government also undertook to strengthen the military forces of the region with arms and training. At the same time, the US suspended economic and/or broke off diplomatic relations with several dictatorships between 1961 and Kennedy's assassination in 1963, including Argentina, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras and Peru. But these suspensions were imposed only temporarily. Unlike Operation Mongoose, the Alliance had its successes and failures.

Successes

- Growth in regional output in Latin America in the 1960s was 2.4 %, nearly matching the Alliance for Progress goal of 2.5 %.
- In contrast to the 2.1 % growth in the 1950s, the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth rate in Latin America reached 2.7 % in the later part of the 1960s and climbed 3.8 % between 1970 and 1974.
- Overall seven countries reached the target goal of 2.5 % GDP growth, twelve nations did not reach the goal, and Haiti and Uruguay had lower GDPs.
- Adult illiteracy was not wiped out, although it was reduced. In some countries, the number of people attending universities doubled or even tripled. Access to secondary education also showed increases.
- Health clinics were built across Latin America. However, success in improving health care was hindered by population growth.

Failures

- Of the 15 million peasant families living in Latin America, only one million benefited from any kind of land reform. The traditional elites resisted any land reform.
- Minimum wage laws were created but the minimum wages offered to Nicaraguan workers, for example, were set so low as to have no appreciable effect on the wages received. In other nations, minimum wage laws encouraged employers to use labour-saving machinery.
- Much of the aid to the region was in the form of loans that eventually had to be repaid. Moreover, aid money had to be used to buy US products transported on US ships; by eliminating competition, such restrictions added generally to the cost. The recipient nations often had to obtain new loans just to pay off their debts. A significant percentage of aids funds were dissipated through corruption and inefficiency.
- In Latin America during the 1960s thirteen constitutional governments were replaced by military dictatorships. Instead of promoting and consolidating reformist civilian rule, the 1960s witnessed a rash of military coups throughout the region. By the end of 1968 dictators were holding sway in several countries.

The question addresses Latin America. Narratives answers that address events without linking them to policies do not fully address the demands of the question.

*Do not expect all of the above, but reward balanced and well supported examples. If only successes or failures are addressed, mark out of a maximum of **[12 marks]**.*

**20. “During the Cold War, Canada and the United States had disagreements about policies.”
To what extent do you agree with this view?**

Answers to this question will probably go to the middle ground and state “to some extent”.

Canada played a middle power role in the Cold War. Throughout the US/Soviet rivalry, Canada was usually on the side of the United States and the West. However, opposition to the Vietnam War and Canada’s relationship with China and Cuba, along with the prime ministership of Pierre Trudeau often had Canada at odds with its Western neighbours.

To defend North America against a possible enemy attack, Canada and the United States began to work very closely together in the 1950s. The North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) created a joint air-defense system. In northern Canada, the Distant Early Warning line (DEW line) was established to give warning of Soviet bombers heading over the North Pole. Great debate broke out while John Diefenbaker was prime minister as to whether Canada should accept U.S. nuclear weapons on its territory. Diefenbaker had already agreed to buy the BOMARC missile system from the Americans, which would be useless without nuclear warheads, but balked at permitting the weapons into Canada. In the 1963 Canadian election, Diefenbaker was replaced by the diplomat Lester B Pearson, who accepted the warheads. Further tensions developed when Pearson criticized the American role in the Vietnam War in a speech he gave at Temple University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and when the U.S. didn’t comply with U.S.–Canadian agreements.

Canada maintained diplomatic and economic ties with Cuba following the Cuban Revolution. It also refused to join the Organization of American States (OAS), disliking the support and tolerance of the Cold War OAS for dictators. Under Pearson’s successor Pierre Trudeau, US–Canadian policies grew further apart. Trudeau removed nuclear weapons from Canadian soil, formally recognized the People’s Republic of China, established a personal friendship with Castro, and decreased the number of Canadian troops stationed at NATO bases in Europe.

21. With reference to *two* countries of the region, to what extent did the civil rights of Native Americans change from the 1960s to the 1980s?

Answers will vary according to the selected countries.

Some of the aspects that might be discussed are: greater equality; rights to vote; education and self-government; use of the legal system for protection; restitution of lands and compensations. “To what extent” also indicates consideration of some of the aspects that still remain unsolved.

If only one country is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].

22. Why was the African American Civil Rights Movement in the United States more effective in the years 1954 to 1964 than in the late 1960s?

The question suggests an analysis of the main factors that contributed to the effectiveness of the movement between 1954 and 1964 and a consideration of those that made the later movement less so. A detailed account of the Civil Rights Movement is not to be expected.

Some of the factors that contributed to the achievements in the first stage were: the aims and methods of the protesters in some areas of the United States; Martin Luther King's leadership in the campaigns; the Federal system and its institutions; the role of the Supreme Court; the Civil Rights Acts (1957, 1960 and 1964); the sympathy and coverage of the media; the work of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People (NAACP) and other civil rights associations; and to some extent the idealism of youth movement at the time. Some of the factors that made the late 1960s less effective were: racism; black rivalries and aggressive tactics; white backlash; loss of leadership and the impact of the Vietnam War.

Do not expect all of the above, but reward well-selected and analysed factors.

23. To what extent do you agree with the view that during the last decades of the twentieth century, access to new technology increased the gap between rich and poor nations?

It is possible that answers to this question will agree with this view. However the topic is much debated, and opinions are highly divided about this issue. Nevertheless, reward well-argued and balanced answers supported by relevant examples.

There is little doubt that, in many parts of the world, in the past 20 years, when computers have enjoyed their greatest rise, the distribution of income has become increasingly unequal. This is certainly true among blue-collar workers earning less today than a generation ago, while earnings of professionals have surged. The ones that have more knowledge, and more access to technology, receive better paid jobs. The situation is even more severe in the developing world. There are many reasons for the gross disparity, including the facts that technology-led economic growth is faster in the developed countries than the developing countries, but population growth is faster in the developing countries. The regional gap opening between those who share the digital revolution – and the increased productivity and wealth it creates – and those who live on the other side of the digital divide. The Internet may be changing everything for those who use it, but it is doing nothing for the 19 out of 20 people who still lack access.

Examples could be taken from either one or more countries within the region.

24. Analyse the foreign policy of President George H W Bush (1989–1993) towards *two* countries of the region.

Candidates will probably select Panama, Canada and Mexico; the last two can be combined in North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).

Panama

In the 1980s, Panamanian leader Manuel Noriega, a once US-supportive leader who was later accused of spying for Fidel Castro and using Panama to traffic drugs into the US, was one of the most recognizable names in the United States, being constantly covered by the press. In May 1989, Panama held democratic elections, in which Guillermo Endara was elected president; the results were then annulled by Noriega's government. In response, Bush sent 2000 more troops to the country, where they began conducting regular military exercises in Panamanian territory (in violation of prior treaties). Bush then removed the embassy and ambassador from the country, and dispatched additional troops to Panama to prepare for an upcoming invasion. Noriega suppressed an October military coup attempt and massive protests in Panama against him, but after a US serviceman was shot by Panamanian forces in December 1989, Bush ordered 24 000 troops into the country with an objective of removing Noriega from power; "Operation Just Cause" was a large-scale American military operation, and the first in more than 40 years that was not Cold War related. The mission was highly controversial, but American forces achieved control of the country and Endara assumed the presidency. Noriega surrendered to the US and was convicted and imprisoned on racketeering and drug trafficking charges in April 1992.

NAFTA

The Bush administration, along with the Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, spearheaded the negotiations of NAFTA, which would eliminate the majority of tariffs on products traded among the United States, Canada, and Mexico, to encourage trade amongst the countries. The treaty also restricts patents, copyrights and trademarks, and outlines the removal of investment restrictions among the three countries. The agreement came under heavy scrutiny amongst mainly Democrats, who charged that NAFTA resulted in a loss of US jobs. NAFTA also contained no provisions for labour rights; according to the Bush administration, the trade agreement would generate economic resources necessary to enable Mexico's government to overcome problems of funding and enforcement of its labour laws. While initial signing was possible during his term, negotiations made slow, but steady, progress. President Clinton would go on to make the passage of NAFTA a priority for his administration, despite its conservative and Republican roots – with the addition of two side agreements – to achieve its passage in 1993. Up until today, the treaty has had supporters and adversaries.

If only one country is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].
