

Markscheme

May 2015

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.**

18–20:	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.
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.
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.
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.
7–8:	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.
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.
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.
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.
0:	Answers not meeting the requirements of descriptors should be awarded no marks.

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**. If an answer indicates that the demands of the question are understood and addressed but that **not all implications are considered (eg, compare or contrast; reasons or significance; methods or success)**, then examiners should not be afraid of using the full range of marks allowed for by the markscheme: *ie*, responses that offer good coverage of some of the criteria should be rewarded accordingly.

Independence movements

1. “It was the growing resentment of the Creoles toward peninsular Spaniards that encouraged wars of independence in Latin America.” With reference to **one** country in the Americas (excluding Cuba), to what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates can choose to agree or disagree with this view. “To what extent” indicates that other reasons or causes should be considered. However, answers should not simply be a review of all potential causes. Candidates should select one country to illustrate their response. Candidates who refer to Spanish America as a whole only demonstrate some understanding of the question; however it is acceptable to refer to countries in the aggregate or individually (for example Gran Colombia or Colombia, Ecuador, Venezuela or Panama). Brazil is not a valid choice.

Evidence of the growing resentment of the Creoles toward peninsular Spaniards may include: the animosities resulting from the Bourbon reforms that strengthened the control of the crown over the colonial governments and threatened Creole status and influence (such as the creation of new viceroyalties that dislocated the local colonial economies; the intendency system; the impossibility of buying court appointments; the privileged position of peninsular merchants); the upsetting of the status quo that had allowed Creole elites to prosper under the lax administration of the Hapsburgs (assuming roles in key sectors of the economy, holding political posts at a local or regional level, participating in international trade through smuggling); the influence of the ideas of the Enlightenment that bred resentment against the Bourbon interventionist state; the impact of the expulsion of the Jesuits (most of whom were Creoles).

Other factors encouraging independence movements could be: the inspiration from the French and the American Revolutions; the opposition to mercantilist policies and to growing restrictions and exactions on the colonies; the impact of events in Europe that demonstrated the crown’s inability to defend its colonies (such as the Napoleonic invasions, the restoration of Ferdinand VII).

Candidates may argue that the Bourbon reforms actually made the Creoles turn to *cabildos* (town councils) as bases for Creole authority. In turn, these *cabildos* promoted the creation of *juntas* to rule the colonies while the king of Spain was imprisoned. Others may make reference to the fact that the inability of the crown to defend its colonies enabled the formation of colonial militias that would increase Creole confidence in their ability to defend themselves.

*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. Examine the influence of political ideas on the nature of the United States Declaration of Independence.

Political ideas had a most profound impact among the factors that influenced the nature of the Declaration of Independence. While events may be mentioned, they should be considered relevant in proportion to their representation of political ideology and influence on the content of the Declaration.

Political ideas: political theory expressed by Enlightenment philosophers, notably John Locke’s contract theory of government, the natural rights of man and the “right of revolution” concept, influenced the thinking of the Declaration’s main author (Thomas Jefferson) and contributors (John Adams and Benjamin Franklin); hostilities commenced 14 months prior to the issuance of the Declaration, thus raising the question of whether the colonies were seeking reforms or sovereignty; Thomas Paine’s authorship of the pamphlet, *Common Sense*, helped to focus the colonists’ attention on the goal of full independence, rather than reform (based on the colonies alleged superior political morality); the Declaration incorporated the ideas of many previously issued declarations from towns, assemblies, grand juries and political bodies (for example Sons of Liberty) asserting self-rule and local autonomy; as hostilities became more intense, American leaders realized the growing importance of galvanizing colonial public opinion and promoted these political ideals to help overcome the limited extent of colonial unity, substantial apathy toward the war effort and the existence of a significant faction of Loyalists; American leaders realized their war resources were quite limited and that they desperately needed foreign intervention to contest the power of the British military.

Nature of the Declaration: Thomas Jefferson expressed the contract and natural rights theories in referencing the right to “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness”, (similar to Locke’s “life, liberty and property”); the Declaration also alleged the “right of revolution” in stating, “...whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of people to alter or abolish it...”; the list of grievances against King George III alleged that he had violated the natural rights and contract theories and listed numerous specific examples taken predominantly from events of 1763 to 1776; the authors hoped the accusations would provide an ideological justification against George III that would gain support from colonists angry over issues such as the imposition of taxes without consent, suspension of trial by jury or the hiring of mercenaries; the assertion of independence was designed also to solicit foreign intervention and substantial aid in money, arms and personnel (to this point, foreign assistance had been covert and limited) by appealing to liberal interests abroad.

*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. “Independence delivered sovereignty without stability.” With reference to **one** country in Latin America in the first half of the 19th century, to what extent do you agree with this statement?

Most candidates will agree with the statement and are likely to identify several factors that affected the stability in the newly-independent states. The best answers will address social, political, and economic challenges to the establishment of stable political systems after independence. Answers should be supported by specific evidence from one country of the region, (not Latin America as a whole), and should be relevant to the timeframe demanded by the question.

Possible sources of instability could include: the complexity of the social, political and economic panorama after independence that made political organization difficult (for example physical destruction, high cost of the wars of independence, the difficulties in tax collection, the high public debt, the disruption of colonial trade patterns); class and racial conflict; post-independence fragmentation and regionalist disputes; divergent views between liberals and conservatives on issues such as: the form of government to be adopted, the extent of regional autonomy, and the role that religion and traditional values and beliefs would play. The lack of experience in self-government, and the difficulties in the implementation of liberal philosophies and ideals also played a role. Although some reference to the threats from *caudillos* (regional strongmen) is appropriate, the focus of the response should not be on *caudillos*.

*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. “The constitution of 1787 produced a radical change in the US political system.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates will need to establish a definition or criteria by which “radical change” is defined or evaluated. Some narrative as to the content of the two constitutions (Articles of Confederation and US Constitution of 1787) is required but analysis as to “extent” of “radical change” is the necessary analytical emphasis and comparison of the two political systems is necessary. It is likely that most candidates will support the concept that the extent of change was “radical” but remain open to those who might challenge the statement so long as support is specific and detailed.

Supporting points for radical change: the Articles of Confederation was, by definition, a loosely unified group of largely sovereign states while the Constitution created a federal system of government that placed specific limits on state sovereignty as well as asserting a supremacy clause as to the federal government’s power in relationship to the states; while the Articles had provided for equal political power between large and small states, the new constitution provided large states more authority by basing membership of the lower house of Congress on proportional representation; while the Articles provided for only a single branch – the legislative – the new constitution added a national judiciary and an executive branch; the Articles had required a super-majority (9 of 13) for passing major legislation and unanimity for amending the constitution while the Constitution of 1787 provided for most legislative decisions to be approved by a simple majority vote and allowed constitutional changes on the basis of a 2/3 vote of Congress with approval by 3/4 of the states; the new constitution provided substantial federal powers that did not exist under the Articles, including the power to tax and to regulate interstate commerce.

Points that might be applied to challenge “radical change”: both constitutions were based on the concept of representative government, but limited political participation based on race, sex and property ownership; the social structure of the US was not significantly changed by the initial passage of the Constitution of 1787; it might be argued that under the Constitution of 1787, state sovereignty was the main basis for political authority and that federalism gradually evolved and ultimately became predominate due to Supreme Court decisions and the impact of the Civil War.

*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 problems associated with westward expansion were the most significant causes of the US Civil War.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates may choose to agree or disagree with the statement, but their response must thoroughly assess the factor of westward expansion as an element of Civil War causation. If candidates disagree with the quotation they must provide detailed evidence and analysis in support of the alternative theory.

Westward expansion issues: During the 1800s, westward expansion increasingly centred on the need for more productive land to replace that which had experienced “soil exhaustion” due to continual tobacco and cotton planting. The issue of North–South political power in Congress to protect economic interests would eventually come to dominate the issue of expansion. Sectionalism associated with westward expansion emerged with the Louisiana Purchase and led to subsequent questions of “free state” versus “slave state” balance of power in Congress; however, the Missouri Compromise (1820) provided a politically acceptable agreement into the late 1840s.

The annexation of Texas (1845) and its admission as a slave state, along with the territory acquired in the Mexican Cession (1848) severely threatened the stability of the North–South balance of power; the Wilmot Proviso, which would have banned slavery in all territory acquired in the Mexican-American War, showed the strong differences over westward expansion of slavery; the South was driven by soil exhaustion and concerns over growing Northern dominance in the House of Representatives; the North was affected by emerging commercial and manufacturing interests, the “Free Soil” movement and abolitionism; the Compromise of 1850 failed to ameliorate either side and the advancement of popular sovereignty doctrine (Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854) raised additional uncertainties as to slavery expansion in the territories; the potential for violence was illustrated by the events of “bleeding Kansas”; efforts of Southern expansionists, (William Walker in Nicaragua and the Black Warrior incident in Cuba), indicated that expansion for the purpose of adding slave-holding territory was a threat to the status quo; the attempt by President Pierce and southern politicians to annex Cuba (Ostend Manifesto – 1854) added to the potential for conflict; the platform of Lincoln and the Republican Party (1860), adamantly opposed to slavery expansion, was seen by the South as an unacceptable threat to their interests and led to secession and the Civil War.

Other factors that might be advanced include: social, economic and cultural differences between the North and South; emergence and growth of sectionalism; states’ rights and nullification theory; abolitionism; slavery; and the failure of political parties and their leaders.

*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. Compare and contrast the effectiveness of **one** Union and **one** Confederate military leader during the US Civil War.

While the focus is on leadership exercised during the war, allow some attention to their background and personalities as relevant to their performance as wartime leaders. Candidates may focus on Ulysses S Grant and Robert E Lee (as outlined below); **however**, they could instead elect to concentrate on others, such as William T Sherman and Thomas J “Stonewall” Jackson. Any two military leaders are acceptable if the comparison and contrast is factually and analytically supported. Some candidates may choose to evaluate Lincoln or Davis as “military leaders”, due to their roles as “Commander in Chief” of their respective governments, provided that their focus is on military, rather than political, leadership.

Comparison: Neither Lee nor Grant held the full command of their respective countries’ army at the beginning of the war but both would receive consolidated commands as the war progressed. They were revered by the public, though at different times and for somewhat different reasons. Grant gained public reverence by the end of the war for leading the Union to victory and Lee was revered throughout most of the war and post-war period as the best representation of the “lost cause” of the Confederacy. Both faced brief demotions early in the Civil War and later there were calls for their removal from command by critics within their respective governments (Grant for heavy drinking and high casualties; Lee for his failed invasion of the North and heavy losses at Antietam and Gettysburg). Both men were generally well-regarded by their soldiers, Grant for his willingness to act aggressively in attempting to achieve victory and Lee for his tactical capacity, personal qualities and humane leadership style.

Contrast: Whereas Lee has been regarded by military historians as a brilliant tactician, revisionist historians have questioned his strategic vision of the war especially as it relates to the battles of Antietam and Gettysburg. Grant was generally given little credit by his contemporaries as to tactical expertise and was credited mainly for perseverance and application of superior manpower and material. However, revisionists have acknowledged Grant as being an effective strategist. While Lee was given command of the Army of Northern Virginia shortly after the beginning of the war, Grant had difficulty gaining an officer’s appointment. However, his successful capture of Fort Henry and Fort Donaldson in 1862 led to his promotion to Major General. This was followed by a victory at Shiloh, but the severe casualties his troops suffered led to a temporary demotion. His successful siege of Vicksburg split the Confederacy and achieved control of the Mississippi River. Nonetheless, he was criticized for alleged drunkenness and labelled by some as “butcher Grant” for very high casualty rates and for fighting a war of attrition. In accepting the surrender of Lee at Appomattox, he gained considerable respect for his humane terms offered to the defeated foe. In contrast, Lee faced no questions as to his moral character or personal conduct, but was initially criticized for his lack of aggression until his success in the Peninsular Campaign and the Second Battle of Bull Run.

Do not expect all of the above and accept some imbalance. Better answers will provide a running comparison with direct linkage.

*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. Examine the causes of immigration to **two** countries of the Americas between 1865 and 1929.

The question allows candidates to analyse the causal factors, be they social, religious, political, or economic, that can be said to have motivated the decision to leave their homeland (“push” factors) and to feel attracted to the countries of destination (“pull” factors). While essays that emphasize “push factors” will make reference to countries outside the region, reward responses that apply in-depth knowledge relevant to the Americas. Answers will vary according to the selected countries. Any two countries should be accepted but popular choices will be: Argentina, Brazil, the US, and Canada. Focus should remain on the reasons why the immigrants came, not on impact of the immigrants. Reward answers with explicit analysis and clear examples. The period is 1865–1929 so do not accept more recent immigration patterns.

Possible reasons why people left their homeland: demographic pressure; negative effects of modernization and industrialization (low wages, unemployment); racial and/or religious persecution; wars and political turmoil.

Possible reasons why people elected to go to a specific country: opportunities to make progress (job opportunities, better wages); the possibility of social mobility; greater freedoms; the availability of land and resources; the glowing reports from earlier arrivals (chain migration); the assistance provided by those who had migrated before which made adaptation less painful; cheaper and faster transportation; the existence of government schemes to promote and assist immigration; the need for labour in the destination countries (for example, in Brazil “*colonos*” were needed to work on the plantations after slavery had been abolished, in Argentina there was a need to develop the agricultural sector, whilst in the US, labour was required during a period of growth of industrial power).

*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. Evaluate the impact of Social Darwinism on any **two** countries of the Americas during the period 1865 to 1929.

Background: The concept of Social Darwinism, developed by Herbert Spencer, sought to apply the “survival of the fittest” and “natural selection” theories to the relationships of social, business, cultural and even national groups.

The specific impact will vary depending upon the examples selected, but candidates may address economic, political and social/cultural influences.

Economic factors may include: balance of trade, development of infrastructure, job creation, industrial development, resource exploitation and environmental impact.

Political factors may include: status of national sovereignty, governmental philosophy and systems, dominance of a political party, social class or authoritarian figure, extent of local autonomy and territorial gain or loss.

Social/cultural factors may include: religion, language, arts and entertainment, class structure, race and ethnic relationships, cultural borrowing and ethnocentrism.

*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. “The US fought the Spanish–American War of 1898 to obtain Cuba’s freedom from Spain.”
To what extent do you agree with this statement?

The focus of the question is on the causes of the Spanish–American War, namely on the motives that guided US declaration of war on Spain. “To what extent” indicates that other reasons or causes have to be taken into consideration. Candidates might agree or disagree with this view, but should provide specific examples to support either position. Candidates may argue convincingly that guaranteeing Cuba independence was only one of the several motives that drove the US to declare war on Spain. In support of the statement, candidates may assert that the US had a moral duty to assist the Cuban nationalists in their demand of independence from Spanish colonial domination (reference to the Monroe Doctrine can be made). Some might consider this motive only a pretext for *intervention*. Either point of view might be accepted providing that the argument is supported by historical evidence. Stronger answers might distinguish between those motives that were more “idealistic” and those dominated by US “self-interest”, and between short and longer-term causes.

Possible reasons could include: the sympathy felt in the US for the plight of the Cubans (poverty, malnutrition, ill treatment by the Spanish colonial authorities); the outrage felt for Spanish actions (for example, Weyler’s concentration camps); the growing demands for an expansionist policy (extending Manifest Destiny to Cuba); the US aim of removing European (for example Spanish) influence from Latin America; US perception of Cuba as part of her sphere of influence; Cuba’s strategic and economic value for the US (a free Cuba would mean expanded markets for US business); the influence of the yellow press and of the publication of the De Lome letter on US public opinion, which fueled anti-Spanish and pro-Cuban hysteria; the sinking of the USS Maine and McKinley’s war message.

*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. “The impact of the First World War was largely positive.” With reference to **one** country in the Americas (excluding the US), to what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates may choose to agree or disagree with this statement, but must address “to what extent” and support their position with knowledge and analysis. Both short and long-term effects of the war may be considered and some of the effects may properly be evaluated as having been either beneficial and/or harmful. The question is not restricted only to nations of the region that were belligerents in the First World War. Remain open to effects in addition to those mentioned below.

Possible areas of discussion:

Economic impact

For Canada, the war produced high inflation that led to strikes, lockouts and labour unrest as illustrated by the six-week general strike in Winnipeg (1919); Canada contributed great quantities of food, raw materials and munitions to the war effort; the war effort aided Canada’s industrialization and mass-production techniques, led to nationalization of bankrupt railroads, introduction of an income tax and control of commodity prices.

For Latin America, candidates may discuss the fluctuations in international trade which included the initial loss of traditional markets followed by the increase in the demands for foodstuff and minerals that contributed to the war effort and postwar recovery. Candidates may refer to US economic pressure and to the Pan American Financial Conference in 1915 which marked the transition of Latin America’s financial and economic dependence from Europe to the United States.

Social impact

Canada suffered over 65 000 deaths; the gradual decline of volunteers led to the 1917 Canadian Military Service Act, imposing a draft which opened underlying tensions between English and French Canadians, and reawakened French nationalist feelings, especially in Quebec; due to patriotism (and the impact of a recession), Prime Minister Borden’s call for volunteers initially produced an overwhelming response (by war’s end over half a million had volunteered); Canada’s heroic efforts in battles such as Ypres, the Somme, Passchendaele and Vimy Ridge contributed to a growing spirit of nationalism; the labour demands of the war led to more women entering the work force and contributed to their gaining suffrage in national elections (1918); labour demands led to the doubling of union membership and post-war labour reform.

For Latin America, candidates could include the treatment of German immigrants and citizens of German descent in the chosen country; social unrest leading to the attack of German properties and investments; the role of pacifist demonstrations against declarations of war and the response on the part of the State (for example the declaration of a state of emergency in Brazil); British and German immigrants returning to Europe to fight for their homeland; the immigration waves from Europe that followed the war.

Political impact

For Canada, the war established a precedent for more government regulation of the economy; post-war economic frustrations led to a farmer-labour alliance taking control of Ontario and a United Farmers movement; the agrarian-based Progressive party became the second-largest party, and demanded farm price supports and the regulation of grain and transportation industries; isolationist sentiment grew; as a result of their participation in the war, Canada demanded and received the right to establish separate treaties with the defeated Central Powers which assisted the move toward a foreign policy separate from Great Britain; these military contributions may have been significant in assisting Canada's movement toward full national sovereignty.

For Latin America, relevant material could include the pressure put on Latin American countries to declare war on the Central Powers; German attacks on Latin American ships as a result of the use of unrestricted submarine warfare; the political debates surrounding the decision to take part of the war; the invitations extended to some Latin American countries to attend the Versailles Conference in 1919 (with limited effective participation in the decision-making process) and to join the League of Nations. In the case of Brazil, its navy expanded as it was allowed to keep ships which had been seized from the Central Powers during the war.

*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. Compare and contrast the aims **and** methods of Villa and Zapata in the Mexican Revolution.

Aims

Comparisons could include: the overthrow of Diaz and then, of Huerta; agrarian reform (Zapata’s slogan: *Tierra y Libertad*); to change the social and economic structures of Mexico; improve the lives of the lower classes in Mexico.

Contrasts could include: while Zapata sought the return of the land of the *haciendas* to the peasants, Villa wanted the confiscation of the *haciendas* but not their subdivision into plots (the state would administer the land and the crops would help sustain the revolutionary struggle); he did not want the destruction of the *hacienda* as an institution; Villa had wider goals: the redistribution of income; educational reform; protection of workers’ rights.

Methods

Comparisons could include: both supported direct action, and organized guerrilla campaigns against the *hacendados*; both supported Madero in ending the dictatorship of Diaz; both allied to remove Huerta from power; both supported the Convention in Aguascalientes to urge social reform; both opposed Carranza.

Contrasts could include: Zapata’s army was made up of peasants, while Villa’s army had a more heterogeneous composition; Zapata’s peasant army was not professional, whereas Villa built a professional army (*División del Norte*) and his soldiers were paid wages; the scope of Villa’s campaigns was larger (outside Chihuahua) and involved cavalry charges across vast expanses of land, movement of troops, trains and artillery, while Zapata’s action largely concentrated in Morelos; while Zapata’s *Plan de Ayala* denounced Madero, Villa remained on good terms with Madero; Zapata’s army did not receive US aid, whereas Villa’s army was funded by the US for some time; in the fight against Huerta, Villa led the *División del Norte*, as part of Carranza’s Constitutionalist Army, while Zapata’s army was not part of the Constitutionalist Army; while Villa engaged in actions along the Northern border (raid on Columbus) that provoked the US, Zapata did not confront the US.

*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. Examine the impact of the educational reforms of Vasconcelos.

The focus of this question is on the effects Vasconcelos's reforms had on Mexican society. Candidates can discuss both the immediate impact as well as the short and longer term impact of the reforms. The best answers will show detailed evidence of these reforms and make an appraisal of their impact. However, the approach must not be merely a description of his reforms. Candidates may identify the aims of the educational reforms in order to evaluate their impact.

Answers may address some of the following aspects: Vasconcelos's role as the head of the newly created Ministry of Education during Obregon's rule; the changes he introduced to the educational programmes through the creation of the SEP (Secretariat of Public Education); the increase of the educational budget to build rural schools (*casas del pueblo*) and libraries; the impact of Vasconcelos's efforts to promote nationalism, economic progress; the measures adopted to incorporate the Indian and *mestizo* heritage in the idea of nation (*indigenismo*); the promotion of literacy among the rural masses; and the official support given to the arts (muralist movement; the expansion of the network of vocational schools; the "cultural missions"). Analysis may be demonstrated by discussing the results of his reforms; achievements and failures; the extent of support, and the degree of change achieved.

*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. To what extent did **either** Vargas in Brazil **or** the Concordancia in Argentina successfully resolve the problems caused by the Great Depression?

The question demands that candidates identify the problems caused by the Great Depression, describe the measures the governments of Argentina or Brazil adopted in response to the crisis, and make an assessment about their effectiveness or limitations. Answers will vary according to the selected country, though in all cases social, political as well as economic solutions could be discussed.

Problems common to both countries may include: their export-oriented economies; dependence on foreign imports; the lack of sufficient industrialization; the impact of the collapse of foreign markets (the decline in exports); revenue problems; the plunge in prices of raw materials and foodstuffs; the fall of foreign investment; demands for increasing state action and state control; the inability of the existing governments to manage the crisis.

In relation to **the ways in which the governments addressed the problems caused by the Depression** candidates may discuss: protectionist policies and other forms of government intervention in the economy (such as *juntas reguladoras* – regulatory boards); centralization of authority; increase in government spending; the introduction of Import Substitution Industrialization, ISI (to reduce dependency); the development of non-traditional sectors; fiscal reform and exchange controls; public works' programmes; relations with the working classes. Candidates should show accurate knowledge of programmes in several areas such as agriculture, job creation, social reform and fiscal reform.

*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. To what extent was Franklin D Roosevelt's response to the Great Depression conservative rather than radical?

The question requires candidates to establish a definition and/or criteria by which the terms "conservative" and "radical" will be applied and evaluated. For the purposes of the markscheme, "conservative" is defined as those actions which maintained the status quo and "radical" is defined as those actions which introduced fundamental change. Some candidates may use the term "liberal", rather than "radical" in assessing Franklin D Roosevelt's (FDR's) policies. In these cases, examiners should consider the merit of the evidence and argument supporting "fundamental change", rather than the terminology applied by the candidate. It is important that these terms are placed in context to the issues and perspectives of the 1930s.

Conservative response: in response to the banking crisis, Roosevelt opposed nationalization of the banking industry, instead applying regulation and banking insurance that preserved the US private banking system; FDR did not support direct handouts but instead created work relief programmes (such as the Civilian Conservation Corp and Works Progress Administration); rather than distribute surplus food, his agricultural programme (Agricultural Adjustment Administration) raised farmers' prices by reducing production (in spite of significant hunger and malnutrition); in response to criticism as to first term deficits, he cut spending going into 1936 (resulting in the "Roosevelt Recession" of 1937 that delayed the recovery); while social security was implemented in 1935, it provided very limited benefits and excluded the majority of workers; some historians argue that FDR's New Deal preserved capitalism to the extent possible and avoided revolution and more radical extremes.

Radical response: Roosevelt often used executive authority (idea of the "imperial presidency"), rather than wait for Congressional approval as illustrated by his declaration of a "banking holiday" and removal of the US from the gold standard; the creation of the National Recovery Administration was intended to reduce competition through a system of price fixing in order to both support the growth of unions and achieve a "living wage" for workers (declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court); the Tennessee Valley Authority was perhaps the most revolutionary act of the New Deal and included many aspects of a planned economy as it brought the government into competition with private enterprise in the production of electrical power; FDR, in response to adverse rulings from the Supreme Court, sought to alter the separation of powers doctrine by "packing" the Supreme Court with judges more amenable to his programmes; some historians contend that Roosevelt paved the way for later expansion of social welfare and entitlement programmes as well as massive expansion of the federal bureaucracy and power through his New Deal programmes.

*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. Examine the significance of the diplomatic **or** military role of **two** countries in the Americas during the Second World War.

Discussion of either the diplomatic or military role requires that candidates consider the nature of both countries' diplomatic **or** military participation, and make an assessment of the significance of their contribution. Much depends upon the particular countries chosen. Popular choices might be the US, Canada and Brazil; however accept any choice of countries selected by the candidates provided the focus remains on their role.

Diplomatic issues may include: agreements by which the US provided economic and industrial assistance in exchange for naval bases and a secure flow of war materials; decisions related to concerns over Axis-nation residents in Latin America and their possible confinement or deportation to the US; agreements reached at the meetings of foreign ministers (for example Panama, 1939; Havana, 1940; and Rio, 1942).

Military issues may include: the provision and the use of naval and air bases; the contribution regarding strategies or tactics; intelligence gathering; contribution with troops and their participation in the different theatres of war; the production of war supplies; the patrolling of the seas and other actions against German U-boats; the protection of the Panama Canal zone.

*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. To what extent was the use of the atomic bomb in the Second World War a political rather than a military decision?

The decision to use the atomic bomb against Japan has been extensively researched and yet remains controversial. Reward responses that thoroughly evaluate the political and military considerations which led to the decision and **assess the extent** to which the decision was political.

Military considerations: advisors to President Truman disagreed as to how close Japan was to ending the war, with Secretary of State Byrnes, Secretary of War Stimson and the Joint Chiefs of Staff advocating the necessity of the bomb to achieve Japan's surrender; several Cabinet members, scientific groups and senior military advisors (including General Eisenhower) maintained that Japan was nearly at the point of surrender without the use of the atomic bomb; US intelligence sources estimated that Japan had two million soldiers ready to defend the islands and that tactics similar to those used at Okinawa would be employed; various estimates of US casualties (dead and wounded) have been made, ranging from sixty-six thousand to one million; estimates are speculative and depend upon various assumptions having to do with Japanese military capacity, time span necessary to defeat Japan, actions Japan may have taken against Allied prisoners of war, and numerous other factors; questions have emerged as to the changing nature of the estimates, which were often increased after the war, and whether this reflected an attempt to justify the use of the atomic bomb; projections less frequently address the estimates as to Japanese civilian or military casualties; also less considered is the question of how the war's continuation might have impacted Allied casualties in other areas of the Pacific theatre of war.

Political considerations: difficult to quantify, but subject to speculation, is the American desire for revenge against Japan over the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941; the US public might raise criticism of the expenditure of over two billion dollars, (Manhattan Project), to develop the bomb if there was no use of the device; high casualties from a conventional invasion of Japan could not be justified to the American public if they knew that a weapon was available to end the war (the political effect could cause Truman and the Democratic party to lose power); use of the bomb might end the war before the USSR could broaden its expansion into East Asia, particularly Manchuria; the Soviet Union might be intimidated by the new weapon and its implications as to US military superiority, thus limiting Soviet expansion in Europe; the moral issue of civilian casualties in Hiroshima and Nagasaki was made politically acceptable by the wartime promotion of the Japanese as immoral for their commission of atrocities.

*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. To what extent were domestic political factors in Cuba the main cause of the Cuban Revolution?

The question demands that candidates assess the extent of the contribution of domestic political factors to the Cuban Revolution. Analysing the “extent” indicates that other reasons or causes could be considered. Most candidates will address Batista’s rule as a dictator since 1952 in their responses. Candidates may reasonably claim that internal Cuban politics was dominated by Cuba’s relationship with the US.

Domestic political factors may include: particular features of Batista’s dictatorship such as: his subservience to US interests; the inefficiency and corruption of his regime (that alienated a part of the population that had initially supported him); Batista’s disregard of the needs and aspirations of the majority of Cubans; the brutality of his regime (such as the repression of political opponents), and its effects on the relations with the US. Candidates may also provide evidence on weaknesses in Batista’s leadership such as releasing revolutionaries in 1955 and the increasing unreliability of his low-paid army. An analysis of the weaknesses of Batista’s non-revolutionary opponents can also be relevant. Candidates will probably discuss the significance of the role Castro and the 26th of July movement played in the Cuban Revolution: Castro’s leadership skills and determination; his revolutionary programme and tactics.

Other factors contributing to the cause of the Cuban Revolution may include: the growth of Cuban nationalism and the resentment against the US; dependency on sugar exports and the control of wealth in the hands of a few.

*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. Examine the extent to which Trudeau’s domestic policies as Canadian prime minister (1968–1979) were successful.

Candidates will need to establish the criteria by which to evaluate Pierre Trudeau’s success and may choose to consider his political legacy as well as policy achievements and limitations in domestic affairs. As head of the Liberal Party, Trudeau held the post of prime minister from 1968 to 1979. While Trudeau served again as prime minister from 1980 to 1984, events of this era are not relevant to the question.

Domestic policies

Trudeau achieved passage of the Official Languages Act (1969) that made Canada officially bilingual and also promoted multiculturalism; however, the act resulted in an anti-bilingual backlash that was most notable in the alienation of the Western Provinces.

The Trudeau government put forth a “White Paper on Indians” (1969) which proposed gradual assimilation of First Nations and elimination of the “Indian Act” and dismantlement of the reserves. This resulted in mobilization of First Nation and aboriginal activists strongly opposed to the change and led Trudeau to withdraw the proposal in March of 1971.

In the October Crisis of 1970 involving the kidnapping of two government officials by the Front de Liberation du Quebec (FLQ), Trudeau imposed the War Measures Act. The act provided the government extraordinary powers of arrest and detention without trial as well as censorship. Controversy remains as to both the effectiveness of the act in response to the crisis and the impact of the act on Canada’s commitment to civil rights and constitutionalism.

Trudeau undertook measures to promote centralization and nationalization that increased the powers of the Office of Prime Minister, the Privy Council Office and the Treasury Board, among others. While Trudeau argued the measures were necessary to advance federalism and efficiency, critics maintained that these measures attacked Provincial authority, led to inefficiency and undermined the power of Parliament and the Cabinet.

In response to growing concerns over inflation, in 1975 Trudeau instituted mandatory wage and price controls through the Anti-Inflation Act. The action was supported by most business leaders but strongly criticized by labour. Criticism of the measure was also based on the fact that inflation continued to harm the Canadian economy.

*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. Examine the reasons for, and methods of, US intervention in Chile in the early 1970s.

The question demands that candidates assess the relative significance of the reasons for Nixon's intervention in Chile during the given time frame, and determine which means were more significant in causing Allende's fall from power. It focuses on the efforts of the US during the Nixon presidency both to prevent Allende's election as President of Chile, to destabilize Allende's regime between 1970 and 1973 and to eventually secure his removal. Answers to this question should focus on the given dates. Discussion of events after the military coup of 1973 is outside of the remit of the question.

Possible reasons could include: US fear of Allende's victory and the possibility of having "a second Cuba" in Latin America; US fear of the impact that a democratically elected Marxist regime could have on the region; the US perceived threat to her national security and economic interests in Chile (such as copper mining corporations such as Kennecott and Anaconda, IT&T distrusted Allende's intentions). Some candidates may address Nixon's personal reasons for intervention such as his concern about losing Chile to communism.

Possible methods could include: US funding (Central Intelligence Agency, CIA) of Allende's opponents to prevent his rise to power and to unseat Allende; US diplomatic pressure on countries to cut all ties with Allende; US funding of media criticism; fomenting demonstrations and strikes; waging economic warfare to destabilize Chilean economy (for example blocking credit and loans in reaction to Allende's nationalization programmes); instigating the military to stage a coup against Allende.

*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. Evaluate the factors that influenced US military intervention in Korea.

This question allows for contextualization, however, the focus should be on the evaluation of the motives for intervention.

Possible reasons may include:

Truman and Containment: in 1947, George Kennan helped to formulate the containment doctrine, which would soon be adopted by President Truman as a means of opposing communist expansion and as part of his “get tough with Russia” policy; with the assumption that North Korea was acting as a proxy of the USSR, Truman believed support for the containment policy necessitated a military response to the invasion; with his administration facing heavy criticism for the “loss of China” in 1949, Truman and his Democratic party could not politically afford to be seen as weak.

US National Security Council: in April 1950, the US NSC-68 document had been secretly issued (prior to the invasion of South Korea) advocating that a massive US military build-up was necessary to protect the US from Soviet aggression; the document asserted that the US must not rely on other nations to stop Soviet expansion and that the US must take the initiative to stop communist expansion regardless of the strategic or economic value of the lands in question; some historians have maintained that the US military response was regarded as an action that would justify the necessity of maintaining a large peace-time military establishment and would effectively negate those who sought to reduce the size of the military budget.

United Nations: at the time of the invasion, the USSR was boycotting the UN Security Council meetings (perhaps to protest the exclusion of the People’s Republic of China from that body); the absence of the USSR’s veto power allowed the Security Council to authorize UN members to take any action “necessary to restore the peace”; thus, the US military presence in Korea was officially a “police action” under the authority of the UN and represented the desire of the US to support the UN as a credible deterrent to aggression; in support of the US as a member of the UN, President Truman was able to order military action without Congressional authorization.

Remain open to factors other than those mentioned above as motives for US military action in Korea. Candidates should be rewarded for analysis supported by specific examples as to the “**factors**” for intervention.

*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. Evaluate the contribution of **either** Dr Martin Luther King **or** Malcolm X to the Civil Rights Movement.

The question allows candidates to examine the contribution of either leader in terms of: beliefs, tactics, influences, achievements and limitations. However, responses should not consist of a narrative of the leader's actions in the Civil Rights Movement but an evaluation of the role of the leader chosen within the Civil Rights Movement.

Candidates choosing Martin Luther King could consider: inspirational leadership; the creation and leadership of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC); the goal of integration; civil disobedience; national appeal; peaceful tactics (such as speeches, marches, "jail not bail"; attracting media attention to the plight of African Americans). Candidates will probably credit King with ending *de jure* segregation, but claim he failed to end *de facto* segregation. Some may refer to his lack of success in the north and his declining influence after 1965. Other candidates may discuss the extent of King's contribution in relation to others' contributions (such as governmental institutions, grassroots action, other civil rights activists and organizations).

Candidates choosing Malcolm X could consider: drawing attention to the conditions of northern ghettos (addressing the issue of social and economic inequality); his appeal to the black youths; promoting racial pride and ideas of self-help; inspiring a new generation of black leaders (for example Stokely Carmichael and Floyd McKissick). Responses could make reference to: the leader's limited effectiveness due to his tactics and the tone of his messages; the extent of his responsibility for the split within the Civil Rights Movement; his failure to rally government or whites' support.

*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. Examine the extent to which the native peoples of **one** country of the Americas advanced their civil rights after 1945.

Candidates may define civil rights somewhat broadly, but should not generalize to focus mainly on economic and social conditions. Focus may be on collective aspects of civil rights for Native American tribal groups, rather than solely on individual rights.

United States: efforts to redress grievances and advance rights were inspired by African American success; most post-1945 government policy focused on assimilation, whether desired or not; “Termination” policy introduced in 1953 wherein federal government withdrew recognition of tribes as legally separate from state governments, thus placing them under local jurisdiction; in 1958, Eisenhower administration banned “Termination” policy without consulting tribes; representatives of 67 tribes met in Chicago and issued “Declaration of Indian Purpose” as a manifesto (1961); books such as Dee Brown’s *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* increased societal awareness and Native American nationalism including organization of National Indian Youth Council and American Indian Movement (AIM); Congress passed the Indian Civil Rights Act (1968) to guarantee Native Americans the same rights as in the Bill of Rights and recognized tribal law within reservations; AIM asserted direct action with confrontations over fishing rights on Columbia River, occupation of Alcatraz Island and seizure of Wounded Knee to protest government failure to honour treaty obligations, but efforts produced limited success; *US v. Wheeler* (1978) ruled that tribes had independent legal standing that Congress could not terminate; additional cases extended tribal autonomy over reservation policy and restored land rights based on treaties of the past; division continued among Native Americans as to benefits of assimilation versus advancement of tribal civil rights and autonomy.

Canada: “The Indian Act” (1951) was passed as the principal federal statute dealing with status of indigenous people, local government and management of reserve land and funds – amended in 1981 and 1985 to further define each issue; from 1970s to 1980s, controversy over status of “First Nation” members who married outside their tribe or “band” and thus lost status (women only); resolved by 1982 Constitutional Act that reinstated “band” status if previously lost through marriage – effect was to double the number of First Nation people but to also place strains on resources of First Nation reserves.

Latin America: there are multiple examples but candidates will most likely address the efforts made by the Mapuches in Chile, the Aymara in Bolivia, the Mayas in Guatemala, the CONAIE (Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador) to advance their civil rights since the 1980s. Reference can be made to the limited possibility of organizing national-level movements during the dictatorial regimes in the 1960s and 1970s (with the exception of Bolivia) and the opportunities that arose with the restoration of democracy since the 1980s. The plight faced by the indigenous groups and their demands (for example, the recognition of land rights, right to special status, respect for their cultural and ethnic identity, participation in the economic, social and political life and resistance to processes of assimilation and integration) are good starting points for discussion.

In assessing the extent of success candidates will probably discuss: the effectiveness and limitations of their tactics and organization (peaceful mobilizations, marches, roadblocks, joining progressive urban groups, setting up cultural organizations, allying international NGOs addressing human rights, cultural and environmental issues to get funding and publicize their cause); the role played by women leaders in such movements (for example Rigoberta Menchu in Guatemala); the contribution of the International Labour Organization (ILO), the Catholic Church, the United Nations and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR); the response national governments gave to their demands and the extent to which their situation has improved.

*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. Evaluate the successes and failures of Reagan’s foreign policy in the Americas.

Candidates will need to establish criteria for what constitutes success and failure and should consider the impact on both the US and the affected countries. While the focus emphasizes Reagan’s policies toward Argentina, Grenada, Haiti, Nicaragua and El Salvador, be open to policies impacting other countries of the Americas. Candidates may assess Reagan’s Latin American policy in terms of the “Reagan Doctrine”, which applied both overt and covert aid in an attempt to “rollback” the influence of Soviet-backed communist or socialist governments in Latin America. This is a question likely to induce strong arguments one way or another. Reward responses with thorough factual and analytical support.

Argentina: while the US sought better relations with Argentina, (to assist against the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front – FMLN in El Salvador), the Reagan administration shifted support to aid Great Britain in the Falklands/Malvinas War; the defeat of Argentina thus undermined Latin American trust in the US as a potential ally.

Grenada: the October 1983 invasion to remove an allegedly Marxist, Cuban-style government was a military success and based on the pretext of rescuing US medical students; underlying the decision was opposition to the economic and social reforms in Grenada that were seen as a communist or socialist threat; the impact was to intimidate those who sought such reforms in other Latin American nations as well as indicating that the US was more concerned with the spread of communism than with poverty or attempts to establish social justice.

Haiti: the US was concerned with the flood of Haitian immigrants to Florida and the possibility of a communist takeover in Haiti; the US initially cut off aid and helped engineer a bloodless coup to achieve the exile of Jean Claude Duvalier; several military “strongmen” received US support but failed to improve the quality of government; by the end of Reagan’s second term, conditions in Haiti were still in turmoil, with corruption, poverty and repression rampant.

Nicaragua: Reagan was determined to use every means possible to remove the Sandinista government due to the Sandinistas social and economic agenda, which was seen as Marxist and anti-American; the US employed economic sanctions, misinformation campaigns, and covert operations (including the mining of Nicaraguan harbours); in 1979, the CIA formed the *contras* (from ex-Somocista National Guard elements) – by 1985, the US had spent over 200 million in funding this group; at various points, the US Congress both funded and prohibited funding (Boland Amendment) of the *contras*; during a period of prohibited funding, the Reagan administration illegally sold arms to Iran and used some of the proceeds to fund the *contras* – the resulting scandal occupied much of Reagan’s last two years in office; Nicaragua was largely able to defeat the *contras* within their borders and the US then created a *contra* base operating out of Honduras; while the *contras* had limited military success, the effect of the insurgency had a critical economic impact on Nicaragua.

El Salvador: during Reagan’s terms in office, the US spent nearly US\$4 billion in an attempt to defeat the FMLN guerrilla movement, which sought to overthrow the government of the US-backed centrist leader, Jose Napoleon Duarte; military equipment, the training of Salvadorian troops in the US and extension of military advisors to El Salvador were provided, but with little effectiveness against the insurgents; by the end of Reagan’s second term, peace talks were scheduled between the FMLN and Duarte’s successor.

*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.** To what extent did **one** country in Latin America successfully meet the challenges it faced when restoring democracy during the period 1980 to 2000?

The question requires an analysis of the economic, social and political problems that one newly-restored democracy faced during the given period, the programmes the government of the selected country adopted to meet those challenges, and an assessment about its effectiveness or limitations. Answers will vary according to the selected country, though in all cases social, political as well as economic challenges could be examined. Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay are likely to prove popular choices, although other valid cases should be accepted provided that they are well supported.

Answers may address some of the following challenges: the country’s large foreign debt; inflation (adopting anti-inflationary or austerity measures); external economic and political pressures; the impact of neo liberalism and globalization on democracies; the challenge of developing mechanisms to make democracy viable (allowing for the active participation of political parties and citizens through *consultas*) and neutralize the threat of another coup or revolution; the resolution of crises through representative institutions; the need to revitalize industry; addressing labour and poverty issues; efforts to reconcile society and punish those responsible for human rights abuses.

*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**.*
