



# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2001**

**HISTORY  
THE AMERICAS**

**Higher Level**

**Paper 3**

1. **In what ways, and for what reasons, did the treatment of indigenous peoples in the eighteenth century differ in the Americas? At least *two* specific examples should be discussed.**

United States: Some settlers sought to learn skills from the Indians but many Europeans took advantage of Indians, stole their lands, destroyed their hunting and burial grounds. Colonies varied in their policies and methods for dealing with native peoples.

Canada: Europeans had little contact with Inuit. Nomadic Algonkin Indians traded furs with the French; Iroquois were farmers, used and abused by the English; Plains Indians were nomadic buffalo hunters, Pacific Indians were fishermen. Europeans sought to civilise, convert and sometimes exploit the native peoples.

Latin America: Indians a large but declining percentage of the population. In many places, Indians were enslaved, treated as children or subjected to debt slavery (peonage). Some intermarriage with *mestizos*. Primary aim - to convert native peoples, for example Jesuit missions in Paraguay.

If only 'how' or 'why' is addressed mark out of **[12 marks]**. Otherwise marks will depend on the detail (ways) and depth (reasons) of each answer.

Vague generalisations will not reach **[8 marks]**.

**[8 to 10 marks]** may be awarded for narratives mixing 'how' and 'why'.

**[11 to 13 marks]** will probably be awarded for narrative plus comments.

**[14 to 16 marks]** will be awarded for structured, relevant, informed answers, or higher for very well-developed argument.

**2. Compare and contrast the leadership role of *two* of the following in Wars of Independence in the US and Latin America: Washington, Jefferson, Bolívar, San Martín.**

Similarities and differences in their leadership roles in terms of, *e.g.* ideological and/or military contributions, mass appeal, political goals, *etc.* are required here.

Washington (1732 to 1799). Appointed commander-in-chief of revolutionary forces in 1775. Through his military experience and discipline made significant contributions to the success of the revolutionary movement. Not a great tactician - in some cases guilty of military blunders - but his strength of character, ability to hold the confidence of his army and people and to infuse them with his own courage, were key factors in achieving American victory.

Jefferson (1743 to 1826). Lawyer, from the same background as Washington. Thinker and writer who produced powerful arguments that gave the American colonists a strong, clear and plausible basis for their actions. Helped them win the ideological battle. Responsible for drafting the Declaration of Independence.

Bolívar (1783 to 1830). Aristocratic background, hero ('the Liberator') of struggle for independence from Spain. Aimed at a South American Federation. Brilliant military tactics and campaigns (New Granada, Peru, *etc.*). Renowned for his discipline and revolutionary appeal to the masses and the elite. Involved in personal conflicts with other revolutionary leaders (*e.g.* Miranda and San Martín).

San Martín (1777 to 1850). Impressive military leadership (*e.g.* led army across Andes in surprise attack in 1817 on royalist troops in Chile, won major battle of Chacabuco). Proclaimed independence of Peru (1821). Recognised as 'the protector' by the people, he began making plans to establish a monarchy.

Any two leaders can be chosen; detail offered can vary but needs to be made relevant. A comparative structure usually scores more highly than end-on accounts.

Essays consisting of unsupported generalisations should not reach **[8 marks]**.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be scored for informed narrative with implicit analysis.

**[11 to 13 marks]** will probably be scored for structured comparisons.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** can be awarded if structured comparisons also show good depth of knowledge and analysis.

**[13 marks]** maximum will be awarded for answers that focus only on similarities or differences. Do not expect equal treatment of 'compare' and 'contrast' but maximum.

3. **“I have already intimated to you the dangers of parties ...” (George Washington, Farewell Address 1796). Why, despite George Washington’s warnings, did political parties emerge in the US in the period 1796 to 1828?**

Candidates should be aware of the key factors that led to the emergence of parties, *i.e.* discussions around the issue of ratification of the new constitution and the potential for growing centralisation of power in a federal government; concern over state rights; social, sectional, economic and cultural interests of the north and south; creation of the Bank of the US which also polarised opinion and manifested itself in the formation of the Federalist and Democratic-Republican parties in the 1790s.

*[8 to 10 marks]* could be reached by a mainly descriptive response with comments or implicit explanation.

*[11 to 13 marks]* or *[14 to 16 marks]*, depending on depth and detail provided, will be given for answers which discuss the main factors in an analytical and relevant manner.

*[17+ marks]* are likely to be awarded for answers that also cover the full time period and touch upon the rise of Jacksonian Democracy with the growing tide of egalitarianism in the later part of the 1820s. The best answers may also point out that, although Washington warned against sectionalised parties, parties did not become fully sectionalised in this period.

4. **How did Brazil achieve independence from Portugal in the nineteenth century, and why was the Brazilian path to independence different from that of Spanish America?**

Accounts of ‘how’ should include reference to Napoleon’s 1807 invasion of Portugal, the role of the exiled Portuguese monarchy in Brazil, opposition of elite Brazilian landowners and urban professions to Portuguese recolonisers, and Dom Pedro’s reforms and decision to stay in Brazil. Why a different path? A key point is that Brazil was by 1800 far more populous and prosperous than the tiny mother country. No single Spanish colonial territory equalled Spain in economic and political power. When the colonials proclaimed independence, Spain fought back doggedly and Spanish America grew to hate the crown. Brazil’s struggle for independence proved far less bloody than Spanish America’s due to Portugal’s military weakness. Also, Napoleon’s 1807 invasion led to the entire Portuguese court fleeing to Brazil and setting up new institutions. Other points that could be argued include Brazilian rebels did not split over the issue of republicanism.

Better candidates will focus on how and why; weaker candidates will offer poorly focused narrative.

*[8 to 10 marks maximum]* will be awarded for a narrative of the main events with implicit analysis.

*[11 to 13 marks]* will be given for informed answers that explain how Brazil achieved independence and offer some comment or limited analysis of ‘why different’.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* will be obtained for good treatment of both parts of the question.

**5. “The causes of the 1837 rebellions in Upper and Lower Canada had little in common.”  
How far do you agree with this claim?**

Ethnic conflict became part of the discontent in Lower Canada where the ruling class was primarily British and the majority of the population were French and Roman Catholics. Another issue which affected one colony more than the other was the impact of American settlement in Upper Canada before and after the War of 1812. On the other hand, there was political and economic discontent with British rule in both Upper and Lower Canada. In both the Canadas the governing councils were controlled by powerful, propertied and commercial interests (Upper Canada - “Family Compact”; Lower Canada - “Chateau Clique”). They dominated the largely agrarian population of the two colonies (*e.g.* their consistent refusal to improve roads and instead build canals which would be more beneficial to them financially). In both colonies there were pro-British elites which reserved tracts of land for the British crown and Anglican churches.

Vague generalisations will not reach **[8 marks]**.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be reached by a narrative which is mainly descriptive but with implicit analysis or some comment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** candidates will discuss causes - political, economic and linguistic/cultural issues - and recognise a distinct difference as a result of the linguistic/cultural issues which were a major problem in Lower Canada.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** can be scored for answers with specific details of similarities and differences in a clear comparative structure, and higher if very focused and detailed.

**6. Analyse the major similarities and differences in the master-slave relationship in the slave culture of *two* countries of the region during the nineteenth century.**

Good countries for comparing and contrasting systems of slavery would be the US, Brazil, Cuba or other Caribbean country. The question is intended to provide candidates with an opportunity to use their knowledge of a country in the region which they have studied in detail. Good answers will indicate similarities and differences in the concept of ownership and the intermingling of races in the two countries chosen. Reference to size of farms, crops, types of work, rebellions, *etc.* will be appropriate here if used effectively.

Don't expect equal detail on the two chosen systems of slavery or on similarities and differences.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be reached by descriptive narratives provided there is some comment or implicit attention to similarities and differences.

**[11 to 13 marks]** can be reached by structured comparisons.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** will be awarded for analytical, well-substantiated, structured comparisons.

**[17 to 18 marks]** or higher could be scored by answers that also include some use of recent historiographical argument.

**7. “Abraham Lincoln has been given greater credit than he deserves for the emancipation of slaves in the US.” How far do you agree with this statement?**

A key point to building a sound answer here is awareness that Lincoln cannot be given sole credit and was even ambivalent about the slavery question for some time. Candidates might refer to his earlier statements on the subject including the Lincoln/Douglas debates and why he finally decided to issue the Proclamation. Assessment should include discussion of the abolition movement, the actions of Northern military commanders in the field, the role of the Radical element of the Republican party, and the need to prevent Britain from recognising the Confederacy. Good answers are also likely to point out what the Emancipation Proclamation did and did not accomplish, and to discuss Lincoln’s role in getting the 13th amendment passed.

Descriptive narrative devoid of assessment will not reach **[8 marks]**.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be scored for accurate narrative with some relevant comments or implicit assessment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** or **[14 to 16+ marks]**, depending on the depth and detail of the answer, will be awarded for assessment that is explicit, focused and informed.

**8. To what extent, and for what reasons did French-Canadians outside Quebec province retain their linguistic and minority educational rights between 1867 and 1914?**

Answers should indicate that the British North America Act (1867) provided for French language rights outside Quebec and for the provision of a separate school system. A variety of provinces could be used as examples but it is expected that candidates should know that the Manitoba Act (1870) created Manitoba as a bilingual province with French as an official language and forbade the provincial legislature to adopt any measure which might restrict the rights of denominational schools. Knowledge of the Manitoba Schools Question and the elimination of bilingualism in Manitoba is expected. It is also expected that developments in one or two other provinces will be discussed. Other examples might include the Ontario Schools Question (Regulation 17), reduced separate school rights in Alberta and Saskatchewan, provision of bilingualism in New Brunswick, *etc.* according to local interests.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be reached by narrative accounts provided there is implicit assessment or some comment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** could be reached if answers contain some analysis and assessment.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** will be awarded for argument that is analytical, well substantiated and deals effectively with ‘to what extent’ and ‘for what reasons’.

**9. Examine the positive and negative effects of immigration in *two* Latin American countries during the second half of the nineteenth century.**

Good answers are likely to examine the effects - positive and negative - on the immigrants themselves as well as the social and economic impact on the country to which they migrated. Generally immigration contributed to rapid urbanisation and industrialisation; it changed commercial structures and promoted further ethnic integration. Specific detail is needed for a good response. In Argentina, Italian and Spanish settlers stimulated expansion of the cattle industry and development of wheat and shoe industries. In Brazil, Japanese and Swiss immigrants pioneered the development of cotton and cheese industries respectively, and Italians gained a role in the coffee industry. In Peru and Argentina, British immigrants controlled the railroad and communications. Positive and negative effects on the immigrants? Most immigrants were manual or rural workers. For Latin America's black or Indian population, who generally lacked preparation for skilled work, the outcome of immigration was usually a low socio-economic position. But some immigrants brought a range of skills, generally to the benefit of both themselves and their new country, helping to modernise commerce and industry. (*e.g.* Italians, Chinese and Japanese in banking and restaurant business; the French in jewellery, dressmaking and pharmaceutical businesses.)

If only one country is discussed maximum mark is **[12 marks]**, but do not require equal treatment of positive and negative effects.

Vague generalisation will not reach **[8 marks]**.

**[8 to 10 marks]** answers will require some specifics.

**[11 to 13 marks]** answers will also require some analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]**, or higher for impressive depth and detail, will be awarded for answers showing detailed knowledge and sound analysis.

**10. Analyse the differences in the objectives and methods for advancing African-Americans in the US of Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. Du Bois.**

Objectives. Washington (1856 to 1915) advocated ‘industrial education’ (vocational training); vision of black progress through industrial training and accommodationism. Du Bois (1868 to 1963) focused on political equality, universal suffrage, abolition of all distinctions based on race.

Methods. Washington founded Tuskegee Institute (1881), and built it into a nationally recognised vocational school. At the 1895 Atlanta Exposition he proposed blacks accept white political supremacy and that whites left blacks free to improve themselves economically by vocational education. (Also, secretly, he financed legal challenges to Jim Crow Laws.) Du Bois advocated that blacks exert greater pressure to end racial discrimination and helped found the Niagara Movement (1905) and the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People (1909). He edited the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People’s magazine, *Crisis*, which was then the foremost civil rights publication.

Marks will depend on focus, and extent of knowledge and analysis.

**[8-10 marks]** maximum will be awarded for answers in the form of statements of difference without overt analysis.

**[11 to 13 marks]** could be awarded for answers that are structured and show some analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** will be obtained for well-substantiated analysis.

**[17+ marks]** responses will be characterised by deeper analysis (for example, referring to the influence of their backgrounds and the time of their ideas and initiatives).



**11. Examine the causes for, and the impact of, the growth of unions in *two* countries of the region in the period 1890 to 1920.**

In search of improved pay and conditions for workers, Federation of Organised Trade and Labor Unions of the US and Canada founded May 1881. Its 13 craft unions were reorganised in 1886 as the American Federation of Labor, with Gompers as the first president. Strike at Carnegie's vast Housesteads plant in 1892 led to much publicity and violence. Economic depression of 1893 stimulated union growth; by 1904 the AFL had over 1.5 million members, and over three million by 1920. Radical members of the AFL founded the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) in 1905; by 1919 this union had 58,000 members. The aggressive tactics of the IWW often brought brutal retaliation. In Canada, a national Trades and Labour Congress in 1886; union growth spurted in Canada after 1918. Other countries to be used could include Mexico or Cuba or the students' own case study country.

Note the time period; answers should not go much beyond 1920.

*[8 to 10 marks]* can be reached by descriptive narrative.

*[11 to 13 marks]* with some discussion.

*[14 to 16 marks]*, or higher depending on depth and detail, will be awarded where the discussion develops into well-substantiated analysis of the causes and impact.

**12. In what ways, and for what reasons, did the US intervene in Latin America in the period 1898 to 1932?**

Main forms of intervention: threats, non-recognition, economic sanctions, and above all military intervention. In this period the US intervened militarily in nine Caribbean countries. Its occupation forces ran the governments of the Dominican Republic, Cuba, Nicaragua, Haiti and Panama for long periods; there were shorter invasions of Honduras, Mexico, Guatemala and Costa Rica. Reasons for intervention: preserve and increase economic investments; foster political stability favourable to those investments; and in some instances for strategic reasons (Panama Canal).

Note the dates and reward candidates who cover the whole period, for instance by referring to Hoover's efforts and the Clark Memorandum (1930). Some candidates may choose to describe and explain a series of interventions.

*[8 to 10 marks]* maximum will be awarded for descriptive accounts with comments and for argument based on barely sufficient material.

*[11 to 13 marks]* or *[14 to 16 marks]*, according to depth and detail, will be scored for structured answers showing analysis and knowledge will merit.

*[17+ marks]* answers will show depth of knowledge, understanding and analysis in dealing with US justifications (Monroe Doctrine and Roosevelt Corollary 1904) and their treatment of 'doctrines', including 'Big Stick', 'Dollar Diplomacy', and Wilson's 'watchful waiting'. They may also show awareness of changes over time (e.g. that the basic goal of the US foreign policy in Latin America did not change after the First World War but the tactics changed and military intervention was abandoned to a more conciliatory approach, e.g. Mexico).

**13. How important were economic grievances in causing the Mexican Revolution that began in 1910, and to what extent were these grievances solved by the Constitution of 1917?**

The wealthy prospered under Díaz but the majority of Mexicans faced grinding poverty. Labour surplus so wage rates remained very low. Repeated protests from workers, urban and rural, at highly unequal economic ‘progress’. Protests at higher wage rates given to US labourers; significant strikes among railroad and textile mill workers. Peasants in the Morelos area bitterly resented losing their land to commercial cultivation of sugar and other market crops; in the North a similar reaction to loss of land for railway construction. Perceptive candidates will be aware of economic grievances but also argue that rebellion began with Madero’s call for political democracy and armed resistance, and that his key concern was dislike of Díaz’s political machine. (On the other hand, Zapata led landless peasants, and Villa’s supporters mainly wanted jobs.) Candidates should note in the second part that the Constitution did not originally call for sweeping land distribution but should focus on Article 27, that empowered the government to redistribute land, and Article 123 that announced new rights for labour. Good answers will also refer to the limitations of agrarian reform in the revolutionary period.

**[13 marks]** maximum will be awarded for answers that deal with only one part of the question. Answers which deal with any other Mexican Revolution than the one beginning in 1910 are not acceptable.

**[11 to 13 marks]** or **[14 to 16 marks]**, depending on depth and detail, can be obtained for explicit assessment supported by relevant knowledge.

**[17+ marks]** answers may point out that the *extent* was dependent on the leader and refer to the progress made by Obregón and Calles and note that the most significant measures did not take place until the regime of Cárdenas (1934 to 1940). Credit candidates whose answers cover a long time-span. Some candidates may refer to the economic reforms of Alemán, but do not require this, or all the detail above for high marks.

**14. Analyse the impact of the First World War upon the political and economic development of Canada between 1914 and 1930.**

Candidates should refer to at least some of the following in their analysis: Canada's entry to world affairs for the first time, its military contribution to the Allied victory (including the taking of Vimy Ridge in April 1917 - the first essentially Canadian attack), conscription crisis and its effects with French Canadians not regarding a foreign war as their concern; increased agricultural exports, demand for minerals, railroads, ships, *etc.*; increased self-awareness as a nation.

Do not require equal treatment of political and economic aspects, but reserve *[14 and above marks]* for answers that analyse both.

*[8 to 10 marks]* may be reached by answers in which the analysis is generally implicit or limited to comments.

*[11 to 13 marks]* answers require some informed analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]*, or higher depending on depth and detail, will be awarded for answers with well developed, substantiated analysis will merit.

**15. With reference to any two countries in the region, evaluate the effectiveness of governmental programmes in solving the problems confronting agriculture and industry during the Great Depression.**

Candidates can be expected to choose two from the US, Canada, Brazil, Mexico or Argentina but could include other countries. Though, generally speaking, it was the burst of economic activity which came with World War Two rather than the New Deal and the programmes of other countries which did most to solve the problems of the Great Depression, it can be argued that some progress was made in tackling the problems of agriculture and industry. Candidates are usually familiar with the major aspects of these programmes so some specificity can be expected.

Answers must focus on the two named areas, agriculture and industry; attention to other areas should not receive credit unless the material is made relevant. Mark out of *[12 marks]* if an answer addresses just one aspect *or* the programme of one country.

*11 to 13 marks]* or *[14 to 16 marks]*, according to the depth and detail of the argument, will be awarded for answers that show accurate knowledge of the relevant aspects of governmental programmes and evaluate their effectiveness.

*[17+ marks]* will be scored by particularly detailed, perceptive evaluation.

**16. Assess the domestic (internal) programme and policies of *one* populist leader of Latin America in the period 1900 to 1955.**

Perón of Argentina, Vargas of Brazil and Cárdenas of Mexico are likely choices. The question also provides an opportunity for candidates to use a case-study of a country of their choice. Any country and populist leader that falls into this period is acceptable. Answers will vary according to the country and leader chosen. Candidates should assess a range of aspects of the leader's policies and programme, *e.g.* social, economic and political.

Castro, who came to power in 1959, is **not** a suitable example.

**[8 to 10 marks]** can be reached by descriptive accounts with some comment or implicit assessment of the chosen leader's policies and programme.

**[11 to 13 marks]** will be awarded for explicit assessment supported by accurate knowledge

**[14 to 16 marks]** will be awarded if the analysis is consistent and breadth of knowledge is also shown.

**[16+ marks]** will be characterised by the candidate's ability to define and use effectively concepts like 'Perónism'; 'populism'; and 'corporatism' when or if the selected example calls for it.

**17. Examine the military and diplomatic role of *two* countries in the region during the Second World War.**

Candidates may choose any countries they wish. Possibilities include the US, Canada, Brazil, Mexico and Argentina, with candidates having the opportunity to demonstrate knowledge of their own country. However, if they choose a country outside the region (*e.g.* Germany) this part of the answer cannot receive credit. The question invites analysis; good essays will be characterised by carefully structured, analytical, well-substantiated argument.

Given the wealth of available material, a broad-brush approach to the military role of the US is acceptable, but argument must be well-substantiated if answers are to reach the higher marks bands.

Vague generalisations or narrative of the course of their chosen countries' involvement in the war will not reach **[8 marks]**.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** should be reserved for answers that examine both military and diplomatic roles. There is a great deal that could be written here regarding the US in particular so do not expect equal treatment of the two countries.

- 18. With reference to *one* state in *either* the Caribbean *or* mainland Latin America, assess the advantages and disadvantages of foreign investment in that state during the first half of the twentieth century.**

Note that the question asks candidates to deal with foreign investment in their chosen country in the first half of the twentieth century. Do not expect equally detailed coverage across the period but look for knowledge and coverage that shows analysis and understanding. Reward argument with detail rather than general statements.

Unsubstantiated generalisations will not reach **[8 marks]**.

**[14 to 16 marks]**, and higher according to depth and detail, can be reached by structured answers with informed assessment of advantages and disadvantages. Cuba can be the chosen country here! The question provides an opportunity for candidates to show knowledge of their own country.

- 19. Analyse the political impact of the Vietnam War upon the US between 1964 and 1974.**

Answers should include reference to some of the following: the 1964 presidential election; the gulf of Tonkin Resolution; domestic reaction against the war; Johnson's decision not to run for re-election; the derailment of the Great Society programme; the 1968 Democratic national convention; Nixon's election; rise of Kissinger; decision to recognise People's Republic of China; Pentagon Papers.

The question asks candidates to 'analyse the political impact'.

**[8 marks]** could be reached, with difficulty, by a general account of the war with little or no focus on political impact.

**[11 to 13 marks]** could be reached, depending on the extent of the comments and knowledge shown, by narrative accounts including some relevant comments on political impact.

**[14 to 16 marks]**, and higher depending on depth and detail of the answer, will be awarded for detailed, focused analysis.

**20. With reference to their aims and actions, examine the foreign policy of *one* of the following presidents of the US: Truman; Eisenhower; Carter; Reagan.**

Truman (1945 to 1953). Aims included bringing World War Two to an effective end and containment of the USSR (especially when confronted with the spread of communism in Eastern Europe, China and Korea). Actions examined could include the dropping of atomic bombs on Japan (August 1945); support for Kuomintang in China; the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan; Berlin Airlift (1948 to 1949); creation of North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (1949); and authorisation of US involvement in Korea.

Eisenhower (1953 to 1961). Aims included continued US efforts to contain communism, including action in Korea and economic and military aid to any country in the Middle East that requested it; brinkmanship and massive retaliation. Actions examined could include negotiating a truce in the Korean War; Eisenhower Doctrine (1957) which was intended to reassure the Western allies after the Suez Crisis and promised US military assistance to any Middle East nation that was invaded and incapable of repelling aggression with its own forces; Lebanon Intervention (1958) which implemented the Eisenhower Doctrine when Syria and Egypt threatened Lebanon.

Carter (1977 to 1981). As with all presidents, concerned to uphold US interests; pursuit of peace in the Middle East; emphasised US interests in the Persian Gulf. Ceded control of the Panama Canal (1978); arranged peace treaty between Egypt and Israel (Camp David Accords, 1979); handling of Iran Hostage Crisis (1979 to 1980) and Soviet invasion of Afghanistan; Carter Doctrine (1980) declared that the Persian Gulf's oil reserves were of vital interest to the US.

Reagan (1981 to 1989). Strong anti-Communist stance; upholding US interests, and military dominance through massive increase in defence spending. Strategic Defence Initiative; directed US intervention in Grenada, Lebanon and Libya; in second term less confrontational toward the USSR and reached agreement on nuclear arms reductions.

**[11 to 13 marks]** could be reached by answers which show knowledge of foreign policy but limited analysis.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** could be reached for better answers with structured and substantiated analysis of both aims and actions if they show very good knowledge and perceptive analysis.

**21. In what ways, and for what reasons, were there differences in the philosophy and methods of the campaigns for civil rights of Martin Luther King Jr. and Malcolm X?**

Philosophy. King (1929 to 1968) non-violent, passive resistance, direct action philosophy in his pursuit of voting rights and integration of public facilities and the issue of voting rights. Malcolm X (1925 to 1965) sought to instil pride in African heritage, to set high moral standards for blacks, rejected integration and recognised that the struggle for equality was moving into the economic sphere. He initially favoured advancement through black separatism but later revised his beliefs to accept co-operation with whites who supported civil rights.

Methods. King helped found the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) as a base for co-ordinating efforts in the struggle for racial equality, mobilised the black community to challenge segregation laws in the South through non-violent marches (*e.g.* Selma march), demonstrations, boycotts (*e.g.* Montgomery Bus Boycott), registration drives (*e.g.* Alabama) and freedom rides, and broadened support for the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Malcolm X greatly expanded the influence and support for the Black Muslims. His approach and speeches scared many whites, but later he founded the Organisation for the Afro-American Unity, dedicated to the alliance of American Blacks and other non-white peoples.

In explaining the differences, candidates should put King's ideas and methods in the context of his Christianity and the Southern situation of the 1950s and 60s, as seeming to him appropriate to the situation as he saw it. Similarly they should explain the reasons for Malcolm X's philosophy and methods, including the different audience he was seeking to address and changes evident after his pilgrimage to Mecca.

Good answers will offer structured, substantiated argument.

**[11 to 13 marks]** could be reached by narratives plus relevant comments on differences.

**[14 to 16+ marks]** could probably be reached by detailed, structured and focused argument.

Answers that deal effectively with 'in what ways' and 'for what reasons' there were differences in their philosophy and methods can reach the top two mark bands.



**22. Analyse the main political and economic developments in *either* Canada or in *one* country in mainland Latin America during the period 1960 to 1990.**

Content of answers will of course vary according to choice of country. Canada is the likely choice for this session. Note the period specified. It begins in the year of the Canadian Bill of Rights and the signing of the OECD convention by Canada, US and 18 OEEC countries creating an Atlantic economic community. Developments included the creation of Parti Québécois (1968), 1980 Quebec Referendum, 1982 repatriation of the Canadian Constitution, US-Canadian free trade agreement of 1988 and refusal of Manitoba and Newfoundland in 1990 to ratify the Meech Lake Accord recognising Quebec as a ‘distinct society’.

The scope of the question means a broad-brush approach is acceptable. Reward breadth of coverage, detailed knowledge and depth of analysis.

*[8 to 10 marks]* can be reached by descriptive accounts with implicit analysis.

*[11 to 13 marks]* can be reached with some explicit analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* will be awarded for focused, well-structured analysis. Do not require equal treatment of political and economic developments. Given the wording of the question, Cuba is **not** a valid choice here.

**23. “The changes in the role of women since 1940 owe more to the impact of wars than to the feminist movement.” With specific reference to changes in *two* countries of the region, assess the accuracy of this statement.**

Most answers are likely to focus on changes in the US, Canada, Argentina or Chile. The question provides candidates with an opportunity to write about their own country as well as one other. Answers should include some specifics, but general material on changes is acceptable here.

If the changes refer to only one country, mark out of *[12 marks]*. Please note that candidates can, if they wish, base their answer on two Latin American or two North American countries. Equal treatment of the two countries chosen should not be expected. The question requires assessment as well as description of changes.

Vague generalisation will not reach *[8 marks]*.

*[8 to 10 marks]* would probably be scored by a narrative of changes in two countries with some implicit assessment or relevant comment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* could be scored with focused comments or some assessment.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* will be awarded for well-substantiated, focused assessment of reasons for the changes.

*[17+ marks]* answers may differentiate between major and minor reasons in their assessment, and may discuss how changes varied from country to country and within the country itself.

**24. “Cuba, unlike other Latin American countries, has created a true social revolution.”  
How valid is this assessment of the impact of Castro’s regime upon Cuba?**

Expect a variety of answers and reward those that are supported with analysis and historical evidence. The social reforms should be included in order to assess the validity of this point of view. Arguments that could be made in favour: economic equality, education, health, *etc.* Arguments that could be made against: capitalistic dictatorship, replaced by communist dictatorship. The issue of the Cuban exiles might be addressed as evidence, that it was not a true social revolution since some classes were not included.

*[7 marks]* maximum will be given for emotional, narrative answers.

*[8 to 10 marks]* will be awarded for answers with implicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* will be scored by answers with some explicit analysis.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* will be obtained for answers that demonstrate perceptive analysis, evidence and balanced arguments.

**25. To what extent was the Organization of American States (OAS) able to achieve its aims in the period 1970 to 1990, and what factors hindered greater success?**

Organisation of American States established (1948) to co-ordinate the work of a variety of inter-American departments. The member states committed themselves to promote peace and democracy, economic co-operation, social justice and human rights, continental solidarity (which the US wanted) and total non-intervention (which the Latin American states wanted). Candidates are asked to focus on 1970 to 1990. Material for assessment could include observation and monitoring of elections; sanctions against Cuba (till 1975) for promoting Communist subversion; peace keeping missions (intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965, El Salvador and Honduras in 1969 (the soccer war); the Inter-American Council of Human Rights (established in 1979) and the Inter-American Commission for Women; US intervention in Nicaragua and Panama in the 1980s. Conflicts inherent in the aims, historic tensions, and particularly fear of US dominance could be used in addressing the second part of the question.

Note the dates, and the two parts of the question (retain at least *[6 marks]* for the second part). There is a great deal of material that candidates could use here. Do not expect all the above and reward answers that show some knowledge and grasp of the question’s implications.

*[8 to 10 marks]* could be scored by narrative with implicit assessment or comment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* or *[14 to 16 marks]*, according to depth and detail, could be reached by answers showing structure, analysis and knowledge.

*[17 to 18+ marks]* will be awarded for argument that is particularly well developed.

---