



# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2014**

**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 the IB Assessment Centre.*

*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.***

<b>0:</b>	Answers not meeting the requirements of descriptors should be awarded no marks.
<b>1–2:</b>	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.
<b>3–4:</b>	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.
<b>5–6:</b>	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.
<b>7–8:</b>	The demands of the question are generally understood. Relevant, 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. There is 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.
<b>9–11:</b>	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.
<b>12–14:</b>	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.
<b>15–17:</b>	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.
<b>18–20:</b>	Answers are clearly focused, with a high degree of 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.

## Independence movements

1. With reference to *two* countries of the Americas, discuss how a battle or military campaign impacted on each country's independence movement.

Popular choices might be the battles of Saratoga, Yorktown, Ayacucho, Maipú, Boyacá and Carabobo. Accept any campaigns or battles in the region provided these battles and campaigns address the independence movements of two countries. While some description of the battles might be helpful, do not expect, nor reward, extensive description.

With regard to campaigns that resulted in the independence of the United States, reference may be made to their significance in determining the entry of France (after Saratoga the French shifted from covert to overt aid), Spain and the Netherlands to the American war of independence; their contribution to the eventual victory of the revolutionaries; new threats posed to the British regarding their dominance of the seas; the boost in the morale of the revolutionaries once the colonies consolidated control of the north after Saratoga; the British failure to sever ties between New England and the rest of the colonies; the fall of the North government in Britain and its replacement by a government willing to make peace after Yorktown; the reluctance of Parliament to provide more funds to fight against the American forces.

Candidates choosing Chacabuco (1817) and Maipú (1818) might discuss the significance of both battles in achieving the independence of Chile; the great feat in the crossing of the Andes and the growing determination of the revolutionary forces to end Spanish domination despite human and material losses and lack of coordination. While Chacabuco began the expulsion of the Spanish from Chile, this was only completed after the battle of Maipú; the liberation of Chile allowed for the start of preparations to liberate Perú; it gave the liberators access to the Pacific Ocean and an open land route to liberate Perú. Maipú also secured the sovereignty of Argentina and was the culmination of the war to achieve South American independence; it increased nationalism and demoralized the royalist forces; the battles made San Martín and Bolívar independence heroes.

If Boyacá, Carabobo and Ayacucho were chosen, candidates will probably discuss the significant role played by Bolívar in these battles and their contribution to the independence of Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador and Perú. Bolívar's victory in Boyacá (1819) destroyed the Spanish stronghold of northern South America and secured the independence of Colombia (New Granada). The battle of Carabobo in 1821 secured the independence of Venezuela. Bolívar declared the birth of Gran Colombia (which included the lands of Venezuela, New Granada and Ecuador). After victory at Carabobo, Bolívar would turn south and liberate Perú after the battle of Ayacucho (1824) and establish the Republic of Bolivia (1825). Mention might be made of the losses of the royalists as compared to those of the revolutionary armies; the resurgence of patriotism among the rebel forces.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

2. **Analyse the social and economic impact of independence on *one* country of the Americas.**

**In the case of countries of Latin America, the economic impact could include:** economic devastation; the toll on property; the disruption of the colonial economies based on agriculture and mining; war debts and the difficulties in tax collection; the lack of capital. Independence ended Spanish monopoly of trade with her colonies and opened new European and US markets for Latin American goods; Latin American countries entered the world trading economy as exporters of primary goods but grew increasingly dependent on importing consumer goods from Europe and the US; regional conflict affected economies. **As regards the social impact,** candidates may refer to: substantial decline in the civilian labour force; the army became a channel for careers based on talent; however, conscription became an almost permanent threat to the popular sectors of society; no more legal disabilities for *mestizos*; slavery was abolished in some states. The indigenous population lost their special caste status and suffered discrimination, poverty, loss of communal lands; they became peons in the large estates and workers in the mines. Land was in the hands of a few traditional creole families that held power and replaced the *Peninsulares*; the oligarchic structure remained unchanged; hierarchical, patriarchal society; limited social mobility despite independence.

Although Cuba and the Spanish American War (1898) is in a later unit, accept this as a valid example of an independence movement. American investments (both prior to and following the Spanish–American War) contributed to the establishment of a sugar monoculture economy which profoundly altered its social structure. Interventions, under the Platt Amendment, limited social and economic autonomy. The treatment of the 1959 Castro Revolution will represent little understanding of the question.

**In the case of the United States, the economic impact could include:** the fact that trade was no longer protected by the British Navy; the end of access to markets in the British Empire (hostile ports); British imports had been cut off during and after the war; the end of mercantilism; war debts and inflation. However, candidates may argue that, though the short-term impact might have been negative, this disruption of trade and economic patterns eventually stimulated domestic manufacturing – homespun cloth; growing awareness that they did not need to depend on other countries; the economy diversified; with independence, trade among American states was promoted and new trade areas were opened (Caribbean, Latin America, China). **Reference to social impact might include:** Loyalists’ plight: exile, confiscation of their property and loss of positions; the rise of a patriotic economic elite; an increase in social tension and class conflict; the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Massachusetts; the escape of African American slaves and their open resistance to white control; whites’ fear of slave revolts; the origin of divisions over the issue of slavery; growing demand for lands to the West at the expense of the Native Americans; resentment and deep divisions among Native Americans. After the war, women started to demand protection against abusive men but there was little change; the patriarchal structure was strengthened and women’s place remained in the family but their contribution was reevaluated. Responses may also mention the surge in cultural nationalism and the promotion of art freed from European influence. Education was intended to be public but this was not achieved; private schools were founded for elites; only male students were enrolled but some advance in women’s education (academies) was observed; move to educate Native Americans in white culture (to uplift the “noble savages”).

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

## Nation-building and challenges

### 3. Analyse the reasons for the rise, and assess the impact of, *caudillos* in two countries of the region in the 19th century.

There are plenty of examples, for instance: Mexico (Santa Anna, Juárez, and Díaz); Argentina (Juan Manuel de Rosas, Martín Miguel De Güemes, Facundo Quiroga, José Gervasio Artigas *etc*); Venezuela (General Páez; the Monagas brothers, Guzmán). But any *caudillo* from any country is acceptable providing that they are from the 19th century. Whatever examples are chosen, candidates need to show an understanding of what *caudillo* rule is (*ie* a charismatic leader who advanced his interests through a combination of military and political skills). Be open to slightly different interpretations on the meaning of caudillismo. Their explanation should use a variety of preconditional factors (the causes) to explain the emergence of *caudillo* rule. They should also show detailed knowledge on the impact of their rule.

**Reasons:** Important political, economic and social causes of the emergence of regional *caudillos* in Latin American countries include: the political instability and debts arising from independence wars; social differences; centralist/federalist tendencies. The discipline, previously maintained by the Spanish administrators, had gone. No significant middle class had yet emerged, to provide stability, and there was no organized public opinion. In the cities the creole elite took control of the government and drew up liberal constitutions and laws which they were unable to enforce, since the idealists' theories conflicted with the real state of the affairs to which they were to be applied. As lawlessness increased, effective political power passed into the hands of personal leaders – *caudillos*, who in many cases had led armies; “*Caudillismo*” was one of the few careers actually open to talent in the post-independence period and it represented a way up for ambitious men of mixed blood.

**Impact:** once in power, *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, built up a network of clients by dispensing favours and patronage, organized personal militias, took military action against political opposition and governed in a repressive way. Usually, the *caudillo* ruled with the aid of lesser *caudillos*, each supreme in his region. Whatever their methods, *caudillos* generally displayed some regard for republican ideology and institutions.

Allow candidates to note that *Caudillismo* was not a new phenomenon as such, however, and represented traditional ways of dealing with political unrest such as in sixteenth century Spain and Portugal. The emergence of *caudillos* in the nineteenth century suggests that a reversion to political conditions had occurred analogous to those in the sixteenth century. Allow also the argument for Bolívar being a *caudillo*, if well supported.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**4. Analyse the causes of the Mexican–American War (1846–1848).**

Causes may address both short and long-term elements and may include the following: Mexican political instability and weakness following the 1821 independence movement; conflicts between the Mexican government and US settlers invited by Mexico to colonize portions of northern Mexico; Mexico’s assumption that US migrants would assimilate into Mexican society; growth of the “Manifest Destiny” movement in the US (as articulated by President Polk); the failure of the US government to prevent US territory from being used as an area to stage support for the Texas independence movement; the failure of Slidell’s mission to negotiate a solution to conflicts between the US and Mexico; US insistence that the annexation of Texas must include support for the largely unwarranted boundary claims by Texas (to include the area between the Nueces and Rio Grande Rivers); opposition to Herrera’s peaceful approach to the problem of annexation, especially symbolized in Arrillaga’s refusal to negotiate. The “trigger to war” might be given as the May 1846 battle of Palo Alto or the April 1846 decision of both the US and Mexico to send troops into the disputed territory (resulting in the Thornton Affair).

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

**United States Civil War: causes, course and effects 1840–1877****5. “The role of foreign powers had a significant effect on the outcome of the United States Civil War.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The question requires an examination of the relationship of foreign powers to both the Union and the Confederacy and the establishment of a position as to the extent to which these relationships determined the outcome of the Civil War. Expect the focus of most candidates to be on the relationship with Britain, though remain open to the role of other countries.

**Background:** Both the Union and the Confederacy recognized the potential of foreign powers to significantly impact their war efforts and sought to influence this relationship to their advantage. English and French textile mills were heavily dependent on Southern supplies of cotton. Thus, the South expected “King Cotton” diplomacy to secure economic and arms assistance as well as naval intervention to protect the flow of trade. The Union recognized the threat of “King Cotton” and sought to pressure European countries to maintain neutrality and hoped to leverage its economic and military potential in order to gain concessions from Britain and France.

**Economic:** prior to the war, Britain stockpiled cotton, which delayed pressure from textile workers whose employment would have been threatened by inadequate supplies; the Union confiscated and sold large quantities of Southern cotton to Britain; Britain encouraged India and Egypt to increase their cotton production (as an alternative to the Southern supply). Poor British harvests led to the purchase of large quantities of grain from the Union, which maintained favourable prices throughout the war; this dependency, and the importance of maintaining low food costs for the British working class, encouraged Britain to avoid actions antagonistic to the Union. **Military:** Lincoln released the two Confederate diplomats seized in the Trent Affair (1861) and avoided possible military confrontation with Britain; British shipyards produced for the Confederacy blockade runners and “commerce-raiders” (armed elsewhere) that captured over 250 Union merchant ships, considerably damaging relations with the Union; British shipyards began to develop the “Laird Ram” ships, which if delivered, would have broken the Union blockade of the South (there were veiled threats of a Union invasion of Canada as a response). **Slavery:** the Emancipation Proclamation (1863) engendered Union support from the British working class, who opposed support for the slave-based Southern economic system; this made it more difficult for Britain to consider assistance to the Confederacy.

**Analysis:** Remain open to considerable differences of interpretation as to “extent”. The Union was relatively successful in using the leverage of trade to counter British interests in providing arms and intervention to the Confederacy. Additionally, British manufacturers sold large quantities of armaments to the Union which was crucial in the early years of the war. The Emancipation Proclamation virtually ended any possibility of a British alliance with the Confederacy. The British construction and surreptitious arming of blockade runners and “raiders” were a crucial advantage for the Confederacy in the early stages of the war. However, the cancellation of the Laird Ram ship contract, the failure to obtain an alliance with Britain, and the announcement of the Emancipation Proclamation were devastating blows to Confederate interests.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***



6. **To what extent did the theory of nullification and the nullification crisis contribute to the origins of the United States Civil War?**

While some marks may be awarded for accurate narrative as to the theory of nullification and the events of the nullification crisis, substantial awards should be limited to those candidates who analyse the events within the context of how they contributed to the coming of the Civil War. States' rights were a vital component of the emerging sectionalism that would lead to war and nullification was an extreme expression of states' rights. Candidates may advance other factors as substantially contributing to the coming of the Civil War, but the focus should be on the "extent of contribution".

**Background:** The theory of nullification in US politics first surfaced in the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions (1798), written by Jefferson and Madison as a response to the Federalist passage of the Alien and Sedition Acts. Nullification theory argued that states formed the Constitution as a compact and had the right to interpret specific federal laws as unconstitutional and declare their enforcement "null and void" within the state. Prior to 1832, there were numerous assertions of nullification theory, such as: during the War of 1812 New England Federalists argued nullification theory in their opposition to the war; during the 1820s Georgia attempted to apply nullification against federal treaties protecting the Cherokees' land rights. The most controversial assertion of nullification occurred in the nullification crisis of 1832 in which John Calhoun authored the South Carolina "Exposition and Protest" advocating nullification of the Tariff of 1828 (Tariff of Abominations). Calhoun's argument was countered by Daniel Webster in the Webster-Hayne debate in which Webster asserted the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution which precluded the states from constitutional interpretation. Nonetheless, in 1832, South Carolina nullified the tariffs of 1828 and 1832. President Jackson threatened the use of force to uphold federal law, but conflict was avoided when no other state supported South Carolina and Henry Clay authored the compromise tariff of 1833.

While the nullification crisis of 1832 was over the issue of tariff enforcement in one state, Calhoun would subsequently acknowledge the underlying issue was the ability of the South to protect slavery. Later attempts to apply nullification include the passage of "personal liberty laws" by several Northern states, a form of unstated nullification in opposition to the Fugitive Slave Law (1850). Several Supreme Court rulings later confirmed the Supremacy Clause as prohibitive to state nullification. With the failure of nullification theory as a defence of states' rights, the South would ultimately turn to secession as their final political method to secure their interests.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the "**best fit**" to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

## The development of modern nations 1865–1929

7. Compare and contrast the aims and tactics of *two* of the following leaders in their efforts to improve the situation of African Americans between 1865 and 1929: Booker T Washington; WEB Dubois; Marcus Garvey.

### Booker T Washington

Aims: to encourage the advance of practical education and self-improvement for African Americans in order to assist the growth of self-respect and to advance economic security; he avoided pursuit of social equality and largely accepted the continuation of segregation. Tactics: established Tuskegee Institute (1881) to train African Americans in scientific agriculture and commercial and industrial trades; Atlanta Compromise speech (1895) described agitation for social equality as “extremist folly”; labelled as an “accommodationist” and “Uncle Tom” for failure to challenge white supremacy.

### WEB Dubois

Aims: complete social, economic and political equality for African Americans; access to university education for the “talented tenth”; Tactics: initiated the Niagara Movement (1905) which rejected the philosophy of Washington and sought full equality to that of white citizens; helped to found the NAACP (1909) which pursued anti-lynching legislation and placed emphasis on legal advocacy as in the *Guinn v US* case (1915) that opposed the Oklahoma application of the grandfather clause; *Souls of Black Folk* (1903) attacked the philosophy of Washington’s Atlanta Compromise concept.

### Marcus Garvey

Aims: Garvey rejected assimilation and sought to promote and develop pride in African culture; supported Black Nationalism and the re-settlement of American Blacks to Africa. Tactics: founded the Universal Negro Improvement Association (1914) which sponsored a variety of businesses, including the Black Star Steamship Line, to promote Black businesses for Black consumers. Garvey’s indictment on business fraud charges (1922) led to deportation to his native Jamaica.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**8. Assess the role of railroad construction in the modernization of any *two* countries of the region between 1865 and 1929.**

The question requires a clear definition of what is meant by “modernization”, the extent of the role of railroad construction in that modernization, and argument should be supported by some good detailed knowledge of at least one specific railway project in each of two different nations of the region. A favourite US railroad project might be the Transcontinental Railroad, but there are plenty of Latin American examples, such as Henry Meiggs’s railroad projects in Costa Rica, Perú and Chile.

The building of railroads, involving as they did such a wide variety of political, economic and social factors, brought about a number of different immediate, short-term and longer term economic, social and political changes. These contributed to the particular path of modernisation each country of the region took, some (in particular the US) being more intensely modernised as a consequence of railroad construction than others.

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. The building of the Canadian Pacific (transcontinental) Railway was necessary for the unification of the nation to prevent United States expansion north of the 49th parallel and therefore a significant factor in Canadian modernization. In Latin America, they stimulated development of resources and the formation of modern export-economies. Issues that might be addressed are: social and political integration of the country (sense of national identity); formation of national markets, internal migrations, access to raw materials, changing social structures, and effects on native populations and economic dependency; impact on international markets and economy. In Canada and Latin America too, railroads transformed the exploitation of natural resources. Being financed by foreign investment meant they were more structured around linking productive areas to ports than communication between the entire country, which had consequences on the sense of national identity and the export nature of their economies and economic dependency on foreign capital.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

## Emergence of the Americas in global affairs 1880–1929

### 9. Analyse the reasons for the expansionist foreign policy of the United States during the period 1880–1929.

The focus of the question is on the **motives** for US expansionist foreign policy. Narratives as to the events of expansionism should receive marks only to the extent they are used to illustrate and analyse the reasons for expansion.

**Political:** Theodore Roosevelt and Congressman Henry Cabot Lodge saw the US as representing a superior culture and deserving to engage in the “race for empire” in competition with European nations; James G Blaine (US Secretary of State during much of the 1880s) asserted the “Big Sister” policy of US leadership in the Americas along with promotion of Pan-Americanism; the US responded to perceived threats to the Monroe Doctrine (*ie* British Guiana – Venezuela boundary dispute) with assertions such as the Olney Corollary and the Roosevelt Corollary.

**Economic:** the 1893 depression caused some businessmen to see foreign markets as a “solution” to their economic future as a means to sell surplus agricultural and industrial goods; the McKinley Tariff (1890) raised trade barriers to foreign products (*ie* motive for US business interests to intervene in Hawaii); expansion as a means to access scarce natural resources and cheap labour in the acquisition of those resources.

**Social:** growth of patriotism and nationalism that emerged once Civil War animosities receded and which also accompanied US economic and industrial growth; the “closing” of the American frontier (1890) thus suggesting that expansionist opportunities must be found outside the North American continent; the post-Civil War emergence of a “new” manifest destiny with presumptions as to cultural, racial and national superiority; promotion of an aggressive foreign policy as an outlet for and distraction from labour violence and social unrest that threatened social and political stability.

**Ideological:** Reverend Josiah Strong wrote *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Present Crisis* (1885) promoting missionary efforts and the assertion of US religious and cultural superiority; Captain Alfred Mahan wrote *The Influence of Sea Power Upon History, 1660–1783* (1890) which stated that sea power was the key to world domination and which led to a naval arms race and support for the building of a trans-isthmian canal; he also suggested the necessity of establishing naval bases abroad to protect US trade interests; the interpretation of Darwin’s theory of natural selection to justify expansionism as a natural and scientific reflection of “Social Darwinism”.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**10. In what ways, and for what reasons, did *either* Canada or one country of Latin America participate in the First World War?**

Answers should focus on the reasons for the participation of the country chosen in the war as well as detailed evidence of the nature of that participation.

**In the case of Latin America**, Brazil was the only major country to declare war on Germany and waited until October of 1917. Possible reasons could include: Brazil’s reaction to the German use of unrestricted submarine warfare which affected Brazilian trade and people (the sinking of the *Río Branco* and *Paraná* as examples); the friendship that bound the nation to the US; the need to have her merchant ships protected by the Allies; the pressure put on the government to enter the war.

As regards the nature of Brazil’s participation, candidates may mention: the passing of the War Law by Congress; the seizing of German assets and ships; sending a medical mission to Europe; Brazil’s contribution of pilots to the Royal Air Force and forces to the French army; the use of the DNOG (Naval Division for War Operations) to patrol the seas; mine sweeping activities; the participation of part of the Brazilian fleet in the anti-submarine campaign.

**In the case of Canada**, her involvement on the side of the Allies was immediate since she was a British Dominion.

Possible ways could include: the valuable participation of the Canadian Corps (CEF) made up entirely of volunteers under a Canadian commander in battles such as: Vimy Ridge, the second battle of Passchendaele, the Somme; the contribution of more soldiers after the passing of the Military Service Act in 1917; the role played by Canadian women (as nurses, soldiers and chaplains). Candidates will probably refer to Canada’s Hundred Days between August 8th 1918 and November 11th 1918 and the decisive battles (such as Amiens, Arras, Cambrai and Mons) Canadians fought breaking through the Hindenburg Line that determined the Allied victory. Responses could also make reference to Canada’s role in supplying the Allies with food during the whole war.

Some consideration may be given to discussion of countries which did not engage in military action but whose trade activities aided the war effort.

Note: the application of the Zimmermann note as a basis for Mexican “participation” should not be accepted as it was a German proposal that was not engaged by Mexico, thus no “participation” took place.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

## The Mexican Revolution 1910–1940

### 11. Examine the successes and failures of Álvaro Obregón’s rule (1920–1924).

Candidates will need to show concrete evidence of relevant knowledge and analysis of the presidency of Obregón, one of the members of the “revolutionary family”. The approach must not be merely a description of his policies but an appraisal of their success and/or failure. Assessment might consider the problems that Obregón faced when he became President, namely those of institutionalizing the revolution, building nationwide authority, and rebuilding Mexico after ten years of revolutionary upheaval. Remain open to assessment of both the short-term and long-term success or failure of his policies.

Answers may address some of the following aspects: the political, economic and social policies he adopted to enforce the Constitution of 1917; Obregón’s labour policies: his relations with the CROM and with employers; his economic policies: the implementation of a cautious land reform (only 10% of the peasants received land since Obregón feared loss of production), and setting up of Agrarian Leagues; the oil issue and the conflict with the US; the establishment of the Bank of Mexico and credit institutions to develop infrastructure; the attempt to keep a balanced budget by cutting back on public spending and privatizing the railways. Candidates may argue that his rhetoric was nationalistic, but economically, Obregón aimed at capitalist development financed by exports of raw materials and foreign capital investment. Reference will be made to his educational reforms and the role that Vasconcelos played in promoting nationalism and spreading a revolutionary vision of Mexico. In this aspect candidates will probably address the measures adopted to incorporate the indigenous and *mestizo* heritage in the idea of nation; the promotion of literacy among the rural masses; and the official support given to the arts (muralist movement). The problem of succession may be addressed and candidates may argue the extent to which the principle of no-reelection was observed.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

**12. Compare and contrast the political and economic policies of Plutarco Elías Calles and Lázaro Cárdenas.**

**Possible comparisons could include:** their aim at consolidating the revolution, continuing to build a strong nationwide authority. Calles founded the National Revolutionary Party (PNR) and Cárdenas reorganized the ruling party and renamed it as the PRM (Party of the Mexican Revolution). Candidates may also refer to the common aim to achieve economic independence; implementing the articles of the 1917 Constitution (such as article 27 related to the national ownership of the subsoil and its resources); the attempts to carry out the agrarian reform; their anti-clerical stance; reinforcing workers' rights. Candidates may argue that while similarities could be observed in both rulers' aims, the main differences can be found in the policies actually adopted to achieve those aims and in their effectiveness.

**Possible contrasts could include:** the fact that Cárdenas aimed at “renewing” and restoring the revolutionary ideals that had become discredited by his predecessors; Cárdenas' organization of corporatist structures for trade unions, peasant organizations, and middle class professionals and office workers within the reorganized ruling party; the limited agrarian reform Calles carried out as opposed to Cárdenas who redistributed 44 millions of acres of *hacienda* land to around 800 000 peasants, through setting up *ejidos*; the stronger anti-clericalism of Calles that led to the War of the *Cristeros* and how, Cárdenas, though not repealing Calles's measures, attempted to heal the relations between Church and state; the different handling of the oil conflict with the US: Calles's concessions as opposed to Cárdenas's more assertive nationalization of oil in 1938 and the setting up of *Petróleos Mexicanos* (PEMEX); Calles's attempt to perpetuate his rule through the *Maximato* as opposed to Cárdenas's strict observance of the no-reelection principle; Cárdenas's promotion of industrialization.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

## The Great Depression and the Americas 1929–1939

### 13. With reference to specific groups and individuals, analyse their reasons for opposition to the New Deal (1933–1939).

The following examples reflect that criticism of the New Deal came almost equally from liberals and conservatives, as well as from special interest groups. While some description of the groups and individuals may be necessary, the focus of the question requires analysis as to the “reasons for opposition”.

**Father Charles Coughlin:** At the height of his popularity, the Catholic Priest from Michigan attracted a radio audience of 40 million listeners; he advocated monetary reforms including the remonetization of silver, issuance of Greenbacks and the nationalization of the banking system as a part of his “Social Justice” movement which was formalized in the creation of the National Union for Social Justice (1934); he was silenced by the Catholic Church after becoming increasingly pro-Fascist and anti-Semitic. **Dr Francis Townsend:** retired California physician who lost his savings in the Wall Street crash; he advocated that each senior citizen over the age of 60 who retired, thus opening jobs to younger citizens, receive \$200 per month so long as the money was spent in that month; the \$200 stipend would serve as an economic stimulus; the popularity of his concept and the five million seniors who joined “Townsend Clubs” placed pressure on the government to adopt the Social Security Act in 1935. **Huey Long:** established a populist and progressive record as Governor of Louisiana and was elected to the US Senate in 1930; created the “Share Our Wealth” program of income redistribution which would be funded by confiscatory taxes on the wealthy and would provide a “homestead” of \$5000 per person and an annual “wage” of \$2500; flamboyant and popular, he was thought to challenge Roosevelt within the Democratic party or to possibly launch a third-party movement, but was assassinated in 1935. **Republican Party;** Alfred Landon: ran as Roosevelt’s Republican opponent in the 1936 election with a platform that opposed the Social Security Act and criticized the New Deal for waste, experimentalism and deficit spending. **American Liberty League:** formed in 1934 by members of the DuPont industrial family and which represented Northern manufacturing interests and wealthy conservatives; critical of the New Deal for promoting socialist programmes and its alleged attack on the free enterprise system. **Supreme Court:** by 1936, the Supreme Court had ruled against the New Deal in seven of nine cases; the court consisted of ultra-conservatives mostly appointed by pro-business Republican presidents of the 1920s; six of nine judges were over 70 years of age; rulings against the New Deal cited varying justifications including usurpation of legislative authority by the executive branch and unconstitutional expansion of executive authority. **American Socialist Party and American Communist Party:** both claimed the New Deal had protected capitalism at the expense of working men and women; while they possessed different political goals both asserted that the reforms established were inadequate to prevent concentrations of capital that would create future economic crises and prevent workers from achieving social justice; neither attracted large-scale public support.

Remain open to additional arguments beyond the examples cited (*ie* criticism from Native Americans, African Americans, women, farm labourers and sharecroppers *etc*).

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***



**14. Examine the impact of the Great Depression on women and minorities in *either* the United States *or* Canada.**

Be receptive to both the impact that occurred during the Great Depression as well as the effects that were more long-term.

**Women in the US and Canada:** many married women experienced the loss of work and work opportunity as some employers applied a “male-first” employment policy regarding males as the appropriate “bread-winners” in a household; married women, who had not worked outside the home, often sought menial labour positions to expand the family income or replace the income from husbands who lost jobs (the entrance of so many women into the labour force further depressed wages); perhaps 1.5 million women in the US faced increased economic and child care responsibilities as men abandoned their families; women experienced stress and anguish over their limited capacity to provide adequate food, clothing and shelter for their children; while government civil works and relief programs were created, most were restricted to or favoured males (*ie* Franklin D Roosevelt’s Civilian Conservation Corp and Bennett’s Relief Camps); in the US, an exception was the Social Security Act’s creation of the “Aid to Dependent Children” program which aided the children of single mothers (however, women who worked as “domestics” were ineligible); women delayed marriages, birth rates and divorce rates declined.

**Minorities in the US and Canada:** minorities lost work as the “last hired, first fired”; minorities migrated to urban centres in search of jobs, causing growth of *barrios* and ghettos; minority unemployment rates were estimated at two to three times those of white workers; African Americans in the southern US were largely ineligible for New Deal agricultural programs, since most were sharecroppers; in the northern US, African American women were less likely to be unemployed than were their male counterparts, thus increasing their economic status within the family; Mexican Americans faced increased discrimination as employers gave preference to white workers and sought to reduce relief rolls; in the southwestern US, immigrants of Mexican descent were pressured by state and national deportation programs (generally carried out without due process); perhaps 500 000 to 1 million left the US; Mexican Americans of US birth were often treated similarly to undocumented immigrants; Native Americans in the US and Canada experienced rising rates of poverty, suicide and crime but, in the US, were benefitted by Roosevelt’s implementation of the Indian Reorganization Act; Canadian immigrants lost jobs and nearly 30 000 were deported; Canada followed with very restrictive immigration laws that gave preference to British and American immigrants at the expense of ethnic and racial minorities; economic decline in Canada caused the growth of Anglo–Saxon nativism and a corresponding increase in anti-Semitism; French Canadians were among the groups highest in unemployment, leading to their advocacy of a variety of social and economic reforms.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

## The Second World War and the Americas 1933–1945

### 15. Analyse the diplomatic impact of the Second World War on *either* Canada *or* one country of Latin America.

The question requires candidates to examine the impact of the Second World War on diplomatic relations both during the Second World War and in the years that immediately followed the conclusion of the War. The focus of their answers may include unilateral elements (such as the diplomatic relations between Canada and the United States or between Argentina and Chile) and/or multilateral relations (for example: the relationship of a country to the Pan-American Conferences of the period 1939–1945); its role as an original member of the United Nations; or the part it played in the establishment of the Organization of American States (OAS/OEA) in 1948 or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1949 *etc.* While the US is not acceptable as the focal point of the response, the diplomatic impact of the war on the relationship of Canada or one country of Latin America **to** the US should be regarded as having potential for full relevance. The impact on diplomacy during the war as well as those aspects having an immediate post-war effect should also be treated as equally relevant. Be open to responses that analyse multiple aspects of diplomatic relations with less depth as well as those which concentrate more thoroughly on fewer elements.

Given the many approaches available to the candidate, the following topics may be suitable depending on the choices made: the impact of wartime economic and military imperatives on the diplomatic relations of countries; shifting alliances caused by the pressures of war; the material needs of war and their effect on diplomatic policy regarding trade and marketing policies; diplomatic relations as affected by post-war loss of trade and markets; changes in diplomatic relations fostered by post-war uncertainties and the origins of the Cold War; post-war interest in establishing multilateral security organizations; migrations caused either by war or post-war conditions that had an impact on diplomacy.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**16. “The origin of all hemispheric cooperation in the Americas between 1933 and 1945 lay in the Good Neighbour policy.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

This is a question that allows candidates to argue for or against the statement. Whichever argument is offered, candidates need to provide clear evidence and analysis for the extent to which they either agree or disagree with the statement and demonstrate good connection between European events (“the Old World”) and American cooperation (“Republics of the New World”).

Much depends upon what is meant by “Good Neighbour policy”. Candidates will need to understand the origin and explicit content of Roosevelt’s Good Neighbour policy (1933) – *ie* “opposed to armed intervention” – the reasons for its implementation and its immediate, short-term and long-term consequences in order to be able to distinguish which expressions of hemispheric cooperation can be accredited to it, and those which can be accredited to some other cause or motivation.

The most popular symbols of hemispheric cooperation will probably be the Montevideo Convention in 1933; Buenos Aires Conference in 1936; Lima Conference in 1938; Panama in 1939; Havana in 1940; Rio Conference in 1942.

Secretary of State Hull’s comments at the Montevideo Conference of December 1933 were explicitly underpinned by the Good Neighbour policy; other actions which might be attributed to the same cause are the removal of US marines from Nicaragua and Haiti in 1934; the annulment of the Platt Amendment; Pan-Americanism; various economic actions, such as reciprocal trade agreements. Similarly, it could be pointed out that the Declaration of Lima in 1938 made explicit reference to the Good Neighbour principles of “inter-American solidarity” and “the protocol of non-intervention” approved at Buenos Aires in 1936.

Others might interpret these later expressions of “hemispheric cooperation” as driven by more immediate contextual causes: for example, the Buenos Aires Conference of 1936 as motivated by strategic concerns over the American continent’s reaction to Japan’s attack on China and Italy’s attack on Ethiopia, the Spanish Civil War and the danger of global war than the maintenance of the Good Neighbour policy itself. Similarly, it could be argued that the Panama Conference of 1939 was motivated out of a strategic concern about neutrality, or that discussions of economic cooperation would have taken place whether or not the Good Neighbour policy existed. It could be argued that the decision to alter the understanding of the Monroe Doctrine (which came out of the Havana Conference of 1940) was more a consequence of collective security needs than anything to do with the Good Neighbour policy. Others might argue that declarations of war by almost all Latin American countries or their joining of the United Nations responded to developments in Europe rather than US foreign policy. Some might argue that the changes in US foreign policy at the end of the Second World War were less a consequence of the Cold War and more a sign of how superficial the Good Neighbour policy was from the beginning.

Candidates may also show an understanding of the limits of hemispheric cooperation during this time (for example, Chile and Argentina’s refusal to break economic ties with Axis powers as originally requested at the Rio Conference of 1942).

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

## Political developments in the Americas after the Second World War 1945–1979

### 17. For what reasons, and with what results, did President Johnson attempt to establish a “Great Society” in the United States?

Candidates should define the aims of the Great Society, identify areas of specific legislation and reform as well as analyse the impact of the programmes. While analysis as to “impact” may briefly raise current economic and political issues, the focus should be clearly on the historical impact of the Great Society.

Johnson sought to achieve the Great Society by ambitious legislative and funding programs reminiscent of Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal; Racial Justice legislation: Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Public Accommodations Law) to prohibit segregation of most private businesses that served the public; creation of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission to eliminate racial discrimination in hiring; support for the 24th Amendment to eliminate the poll (voting) tax; passage of the Voting Rights Act (1965) outlawing literacy tests and ending discriminatory voter registration policies. “War on Poverty” efforts: creation of the Office of Economic Opportunity which sponsored “Head Start” for preschool children; “Job Core” for vocational training; aid to Appalachia; increased funds for public housing *etc.* Education: Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) to provide additional funding for poorer school districts; National Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities; increased funding for higher education. Health Care: passage of Medicare (1965) to provide national health care for citizens over 65 years of age; passage of Medicaid (1965) to provide government health insurance for the indigent and disabled.

**Reasons:** influenced by Michael Harrington’s, *The Other America* (1962), which documented the high rate of poverty in the US, especially for African Americans, the Great Society sought to eliminate poverty and racial injustice; also included were initiatives for education, health care, consumer protection, environmental protection and other reforms. By promoting these Great Society programmes Johnson hoped to extend the reforms of FDR’s New Deal.

**Results:** a significant decline in the “poverty rate”, particularly among the elderly; improvement of the educational performance of underprivileged children and youth; lowered infant mortality rates; increase of black participation in the US political system and election of black officials; increased taxes and growth of the federal bureaucracy; creation of new entitlement programs that would improve the health of millions of citizens, but which would also strain the federal government’s financial health; increase in federal budget deficits (due in part to the Great Society, but also due to the Vietnam War); erosion of the Democratic party’s base of support in the South, since many voters opposed the civil rights legislation sponsored by Johnson; this would gradually lead to the majority of Southern whites transferring their political allegiance to the Republican party by the 1980s.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

**18. In what ways, and to what extent, was *one* populist leader in Latin America successful in achieving economic independence during the period 1945–1979?**

Candidates should identify economic aims, the ways in which they were implemented and then make an assessment of the extent to which they were achieved. Popular choices might be: Perón, Castro (a valid example since he represents some elements of a populist leader), and Vargas. Although Allende does not meet all of the criteria of a populist leader, his efforts for economic independence may also be considered.

**Perón’s** aim was to achieve economic independence. Candidates may address ways such as: the drive to move away from dependence from Britain; the policy of nationalizations and the repatriation of foreign debt; the *Planes Quinquenales* (especially the first Five Year Plan); the promotion of Import Substitution Industrialization (ISI); the nationalization of the subsoil and its resources. Candidates may argue convincingly that self-sufficiency was never fully achieved. Evidence of this can be: the fact that only light industry actually developed; the shortage of fuel to further industrialization; the continued dependence on foreign capital and intermediate goods; the rectification measures implied by the second Five Year Plan consequence of the dollar crisis starting in 1949 (the negative impact of the Marshall Plan on the Argentine economy); the Export-Import Bank (EXIM) loan of US \$125 million; the deal with Standard Oil of California to compensate for the fuel shortages; the deals with Fiat and Kaiser to produce trucks, tractors.

With regard to **Vargas**, possible ways may include: ISI; the raise in tariffs; the reduction in imports;; attempts to diversify the economy; progressive nationalization of mines and other sources of energy; his Five Year Plan to develop heavy industry. Candidates may argue that Vargas was, above all, a pragmatist and only his rhetoric was nationalistic. An assessment of his achievement of economic independence could include: the fact that industrial expansion was funded by foreign investors; that tariffs were not raised for machinery and raw materials necessary for industrial development; that Brazil asked for loans during the Second World War to build state-owned iron and steel plants.

**Castro’s** economic aims were to achieve economic sovereignty, self-sufficiency and the end of foreign, namely US, domination of the Cuban economy. Possible ways could include: the Agrarian Reform Acts to end both Cuban and foreign ownership of large estates; the widespread nationalization programme; the “Year of the Ten Million” (1970) that aimed to obtain from the record harvest enough money to pay off Cuban debts to the USSR and, by selling surplus sugar, make investments to achieve economic diversification; Guevara’s industrialization plans. Candidates may argue convincingly that economic independence was not fully achieved; while Cuba became economically independent from the US (resulting from US embargo), it grew increasingly dependent on the USSR. Evidence of the failure to achieve economic independence can be found in the failure to industrialize the country; the failure of moral incentives to increase productivity and thus, enlarge the capital available for diversification and industrialization. Responses may provide concrete evidence of dependence on the USSR. Credit may be given for those answers that make reference to relevant post-1979 events and issues.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

## The Cold War and the Americas 1945–1981

### 19. Discuss the aims of President Kennedy’s Alliance for Progress and analyse its impact on Latin America during the 1960s.

Candidates should look into the aims of Kennedy’s Alliance for Progress and then make an assessment of its short and long-term impact or effects on Latin America. Treatment of impact may be positive, negative or some aspects of each.

Through the Alliance for Progress the United States was to spend \$10 billion in the region, over ten years, to develop infrastructure, provide technology and industrial material. Public and private capital would be channeled to elected reformist governments in Latin America whose reform proposals met with the approval of the US. Latin American governments were to institute programmes of social (including land), and political reform.

With regard to aims, candidates may distinguish between those that were “idealistic” and those dominated by US “self-interest”. **Aims that might represent US idealism include:** to attempt to solve the issues of political instability, poverty and inequality in the region (all considered sources of social discontent and revolution); to promote democracy; to eradicate illiteracy; to foster cooperation between North and South; to create a free trade area to facilitate goods and capital flows within the Americas; to increase the per capita income; to achieve price stability and curb inflation. **Aims that might represent US self-interest include:** to prevent other Cuban-style revolutions; to counter the spread of communism in the region; to carry out a “peaceful” revolution and thus, preserve hemispheric stability under the leadership of the US. US business interests aimed to avoid nationalization and to preserve their investments and profit-potential.

**Evidence of positive impact may include:** the growth in regional output in Latin America in the 1960s; illiteracy was not eliminated although it was reduced; in some countries, the number of people attending universities doubled or even tripled; increased access to secondary education; health clinics were built across Latin America.

**Evidence of negative impact may include:** it proved difficult to reconcile the goal of promoting democracy with that of no more Cubas; reformist governments had little authority and introduced limited reforms: in Colombia the success was partial since there was no significant land distribution and shanty towns grew around large cities; Betancourt introduced minor social reform; only one million out of 15 million peasant families benefited from land reform; land reform continued to be resisted by traditional elites; success in improving health care was hindered by population growth; although minimum wage laws were passed, the minimum wages offered were set very low; US loans eventually had to be repaid and aid money had to be spent on purchasing US products; beneficiaries in the end had to borrow more money to pay off their debts (leading to an increase in foreign debt with serious consequences in the 1980s); corruption and inefficiency in the implementation of the programme; the programme was regarded with suspicion among Latin American nationalists (seen as another tool for US domination). Social unrest was not appeased; the 1960s was a decade of social turmoil and guerrilla warfare. Candidates will probably refer to the failure to promote democracy; in Latin America during the 1960s thirteen constitutional governments were replaced by military dictatorships lasting well into the 1980s. For example: 1964 coup in Brazil; 1966 in Argentina (Onganía); in Perú, in Uruguay.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

**20. Analyse the impact of the Cold War on the foreign policy of *either* Canada *or* one country of Latin America from 1945 to 1965.**

For those who choose Canada, it is likely that Canadian–US relations will dominate the focus of many candidates. However, Canadian foreign policy in relationship to any country may be relevant, so long as the focus is on the effects of the Cold War. Some of the possible topics may include: Canada’s decision to become a founding member in the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (1949); Canada’s commitment to the United Nations as the best mechanism for world peace and subsequent participation in international peace-keeping activities; Canada’s involvement as a member of UN forces in the Korean conflict, in helping to defuse the Suez Crisis and as a part of the peace-keeping force in Cyprus. In respect to Canadian relations with the US, possible topics might be: how Canada’s initial reaction to the Cold War was very close to that of the US and reflected these concerns by collaborating in the NORAD defence system and support for the US during the Cuban Missile Crisis. However, the independence of Canadian policy may be argued by noting Canadian refusal to participate in the Berlin airlift, opposition to the US embargo of Cuba, and Canada’s anti-Vietnam War stance.

For those who choose Latin America, the options are many. Themes that may have relevance, depending upon the country chosen, are: the growth of the US as Latin America’s largest export market; US concerns for controlling access to Latin America’s critical natural resources and preventing the growth of other foreign power’s influence in the region; US covert and overt interventions in the region based on the expressed interests of stopping Communist expansion; access to the World Bank, Inter-American bank loans and the International Monetary Fund hinged on compliance with US policy; the impact of Castro’s 1959 revolution on attitudes toward the OAS, the Soviet bloc, US hegemony and future relations with Cuba; internal policies toward progressive reforms, leftist ideological groups, and the Communist Party; the response to Cuba’s efforts to export revolution throughout Latin America; extent of collaboration with or independence from US interests and control; debate on the “external connection” (foreign involvement in Central and South America since 1942) and the extent to which the US and the Cold War dominated Latin American development.

In all cases, candidates need to analyse the impact of the Cold War and demonstrate the relevance of the examples cited within the context of the chosen country’s foreign policy.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

## Civil rights and social movements in the Americas

21. **“The rise of radical African American activism (1965–1968) damaged the efforts of Dr Martin Luther King to achieve racial equality in the United States.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The question requires candidates to support a position as to whether the emergence of radical leadership and organizations, (*ie* Black Muslims – Malcolm X; Black Panthers – Huey Newton; Black Power – Stokely Carmichael *etc*) limited the fulfillment of Dr King’s efforts to achieve racial equality by the time of his death in 1968. Inherent in the argument will be an evaluation of what had been achieved by 1965 and what was still unaddressed. There are valid arguments both in support of and opposition to the statement. Reward the application of specific knowledge and analysis and remain open to both balanced positions, as well as those which either support or challenge the quotation. While some narrative as to the individual radical leaders and movements will be required, the focus should remain on analysis of the question posed.

**Background:** By 1965, the Civil Rights Movement was at its peak of momentum with the recent passages of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Voting Rights Act of 1965 as well as many supportive court rulings. Dr King’s receipt of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964 symbolized his growing stature and acceptance within the US and the world; Dr King enjoyed the support of President Lyndon Johnson and his willingness to make civil rights reforms a priority of his domestic policy.

**Arguments in recognition of forces other than the rise of radicalism:** Dr King’s base of support among African Americans had always been located in the South and was unlikely to grow in the urban West and North; Dr King’s emerging opposition to the Vietnam War was beginning to damage his relationship with President Johnson and may have led to his rejection among many mainstream whites who had supported, or at least not opposed, his civil rights initiatives; the reforms emphasized by Dr King, (*ie* voting rights, integration of public accommodations *etc*), achieved through court decisions and legislation, had been largely achieved by 1965 and thus the momentum for his efforts was likely to fade.

**Arguments in recognition of radical forces as limiting factors:** In the urban North and West, poverty, urban decay, and claims of police brutality *etc* were of more immediate importance to African Americans than the issues which Dr King had emphasized. Thus, solutions supported by radical organizations and leaders were more appealing than the methods and proposals of Dr King; the urban riots (*ie* Watts (1965), Detroit (1967) *etc*) represented the growth of new civil rights issues that Dr King had not addressed: black employment twice that of whites, the growth of poverty and unemployment in the black community, charges of police brutality, de-facto segregation, poor urban housing conditions *etc*; the advocacy of confrontation to the point of violence, along with black power and black nationalism, was causing a “backlash” among many whites who viewed the radical forces as a threat to their political and economic control as well as national unity.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***



**22. Analyse the reasons for, *and* the impact of, the youth protests of the 1960s and 1970s in one country of the Americas.**

The question demands focus on possible reasons for youth protests and analysis of their impact. Candidates may address reasons related to the context as well as more general and specific reasons. Candidates may contextualize the youth protests by referring to the civil rights movements; the Vietnam War; 1968 as the year of worldwide protest. Regardless of the selected country, the answer must be supported by specific evidence and examples.

**In the US, possible reasons for youth protests may include:** a renewed interest in the politics of the left; baby boomers becoming young adults (increase in the number of college students) and questioning the materialistic, consumerist and conformist US culture; the need to promote values of sharing and community, liberty, racial, economic and social justice; the urge to reassert their rights and to have a say in how universities were run; the influence of the media inspiring and spreading the protests; the inspiration found in the civil rights movements; the perceived immorality of the Vietnam War. Answers may address: the emergence of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) (Port Huron Statement) and the New Left; protest about university and other broader issues – combined with anti-war movements. Examples of protests could be: 1964 in Berkeley – University of California, the Free Speech Movement, Columbia, Harvard, 1969 Berkeley (over the People’s Park); anti-war protest in 1970 at Kent State University in Ohio. **The impact of the youth protests involved:** the growing polarization and fragmentation of society; youth involvement in civil rights’ protests such as the Freedom Rides and the Greensboro sit-ins; the radicalization and militancy of American college and university students that led to the split and loss of support for the SDS; mounting tension due to brutal police repression; the enactment of very few reforms. Fear among Middle America the “silent majority” – would determine a return to conservative politics in the early 1970s. Protests helped to push the issue of war into the center of American politics (Nixon’s Vietnamization); “rights revolution”: inspired protests of other groups (women, gays and lesbians, Native Americans).

**In Brazil,** university students protested against the repressive military dictatorship of Artur da Costa e Silva; demanded the return to democracy; opposed the government’s educational policies and US interference in Brazilian education. Candidates may refer to: a series of anti-government demonstrations in reaction to the murder of the student Edson Luis Lima Souto by the police in early 1968; the Hundred Thousand March in Rio on 26 June 1968. The impact of the protests involved: massive arrests and brutal police repression; the army occupation of the Law School in Sao Paulo and of the University of Brasilia, among others; the tightening of military control through the AI-5 (Institutional Act Number 5); stricter censorship of the media. **In Mexico,** in 1968, students demanded greater political freedom and the end to the one-party oligarchic rule of the PRI (Institutional Revolutionary Party). Over 50,000 students led by the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) protested against the brutal repression of students and teachers. This resulted in the army occupation of the UNAM and in violent confrontations between soldiers and students; a peaceful demonstration organized by the CNH (National Strike Council) in the *Plaza de las Tres Culturas* resulted in the Tlatelolco Massacre (October 1968).

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required.***

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so.***

### Into the 21st century — from the 1980s to 2000

**23. “President Reagan’s policies brought great benefits to the United States in the period 1981 to 1989.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Benefits could be said to include a massive (25 per cent) cut in income taxes which brought prosperity, a substantial growth in GDP (33 per cent) that helped to create 18 million new jobs, and a reduction in federal spending. On the other hand, candidates could also argue that Reagan’s policies produced cuts in social services and Reaganomics left behind a huge federal deficit; reduction in federal government spending increased the economic burden on state and local governments; tax cuts mainly benefited the wealthy and deregulation had serious long-term consequences. On foreign policy, candidates could argue that his strong anti-communist stance and determination to uphold United States’ interests brought benefits (including an agreement with the USSR on nuclear arms reduction), but the Iran–Contra Affair tarnished the reputation not only of his administration but also the United States. His military build-up (especially the Strategic Defence Initiative, or “Star Wars”) led to a massive increase in defence spending, but ensured military dominance and contributed to the USSR’s later political collapse.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

**24. Examine the impact of globalization on any *one* country of the region in the last 20 years of the 20th century.**

Candidates will need to structure their answer around a clear definition of the term “globalization”. While the US is likely to be the most popular choice, any country of the region could be chosen. As this is based on a case study, some detailed knowledge should be shown in the evidence used to support the argument. Remain equally open to political, economic and social impacts.

**Economic impacts to be addressed might include:** deregulation of international stock markets; international mergers and acquisitions, growth of multi-national enterprises; the effects of delocalisation of industry. **Political impacts could include:** the rolling back of the state and the rising political power of multi-national corporations; the rise of the extremist right in domestic politics; changes in foreign policy; rise of green parties; awareness of the issues by the major parties; formation of lobbying groups; political impact of multi-national corporations. **Social impacts might include:** the demise of welfare programmes; the weakening of welfare states and trade union movements; the rise of the green movement; effects on the environment; transmission of disease; growth of world organisations (World Bank; International Court of Justice); effects on health; human migration and consequent social tensions.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

---