

# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2002**

**HISTORY - AMERICAS**

**Higher Level**

**Paper 3**

**1. To what extent did *either* Britain *or* France govern their colonies in the Americas for their own economic gain?**

Responses should consider the kind and degree of involvement by the colonial power chosen. For example, Britain's colonies had much freedom in internal affairs but for foreign affairs and trade the home government retained and strengthened its powers. Mercantilism dominated European attitudes in international trade. Navigation Acts stimulated certain colonial industries where this was helpful to Britain, and forbade large scale manufacturing in the colonies that would compete with British producers. The Iron Act (1750) forbade steel mills in colonies but was amended in 1757 to grant duty free status to all American bar and pig iron; the Sugar Act (1764) raised £300 000 for the British treasury from 1765 to 1774; the Townshend Revenue Act (1767) was intended to raise external taxation of £37 000 a year in the colonies; the Tea Act (1773) was intended to revive sales of tea and so aid the almost bankrupt East India Company, whose administrators and military forces performed valuable services to Britain in India.

Both Britain and France tried to tighten their control over the economic affairs of their colonies but the intended effect was greatly reduced by inefficiency. This should be recognised in responses, but do not expect all the above.

**[8 to 10 marks]** might be scored by narrative accounts of *either* British *or* French colonial policies with implicit analysis or some relevant comment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers that contain more explicit assessment of policies and economic gain.

**[14 to 16 marks]** could be awarded for soundly focused, well-supported argument directly related to economic gain.

**[17+ marks]** could be reached with argument that addresses the question directly and shows detail and insight, perhaps including a perceptive explanation of mercantilism.

**2. Assess the impact on the social classes, in at least *two* countries in the Americas, of the Wars of Independence in those countries.**

Content of answers will vary according to the countries chosen. Candidates may refer to some of the following points in their assessment of impact.

In the United States:

- the elite that dominated the cities before the revolution continued to dominate
- British restrictions on business were gone, political opportunities were opened up, changes were made in the land system, and the western movement increased opportunities for social mobility, at least within the middle ranks of society
- slavery was ended in the northern states, but remained powerful in the South.

In Spanish America:

- independence usually led to abolition of titles of nobility and the end of legal discrimination on the basis of race
- creation and maintenance of large armies in most Latin American republics provided opportunities for people with talent
- Creole rebel leaders had to recruit soldiers and commanders on ability rather than skin colour or social status
- merchant families generally retained their control of trade
- Indians became even more isolated and poverty-stricken as they lost their communal lands.

In Brazil:

- the Portuguese crown and its attendants became the new ruling elite
- life did not change much for the poorest segments of the population, and the institution of slavery was not abolished at independence (or by the 1850s as happened in most of Spanish America).

Answers may legitimately focus on any countries in the Americas. Reward responses according to the depth and detail of the assessment. If the impact on social classes in only one country is assessed then the maximum is **[13 marks]**.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be scored for general accounts of Wars of Independence with implicit assessment of the impact on the social classes.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of the impact on the social classes in the chosen countries.

**[14 to 16 marks]** could be obtained by answers that are focused, consistently analytical and supported by accurate knowledge of immediate and subsequent impact of Wars of Independence on social classes in two or more countries.

**[17+]** could be reached by answers that show perceptive assessment and depth and breadth of knowledge. Depth might include reference to the upward mobility of particular individuals, with assessment of the extent to which they were representative of their social class (for example, José Antonio Páez in Venezuela or José María Morelos in Mexico as upwardly mobile *mestizos*).

**3. To what extent were the grievances expressed in the Declaration of Independence successfully addressed by the Articles of Confederation?**

A popular approach may be to focus on several of the colonial grievances in the Declaration of Independence (some popular choices might be imposing taxes without consent, keeping of standing armies in peace time, and restrictions on overseas trade) and discuss to what extent they were successfully addressed in the Articles of Confederation. The structure of government under the Articles of Confederation (1781) should be considered.

In their responses candidates could use some of the following:

- major issues required the approval of nine states
- Congress had to ask state governments for money and no tax could be levied without their unanimous consent
- this led to a shortage of funds
- the standing army was reduced to as little as 80 soldiers, an insufficient force to defend a major challenge
- state governments operated without “outside” interference but erected customs barriers and taxed each other’s trade where possible
- weaknesses led to the Articles of Confederation being replaced by the United States’ Constitution in 1789.

*[8 to 10 marks]* will probably be awarded for answers showing general understanding of the main grievances and provisions of the Articles of Confederation with implicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit assessment of the extent to which grievances expressed in the Declaration of Independence were addressed in the Articles.

*[14 to 16 marks]* could be gained for well-supported argument on how far grievances expressed in the Declaration of Independence were successfully addressed by the Articles.

*[17+ marks]* could be reached by answers showing depth and insight in their assessment.

4. **In 1865, a Canadian politician said, “The British North American colonies face a choice between Confederation or absorption into the United States”. How accurate, in your opinion, was this observation?**

The question seeks to encourage analysis of the impact of fears of American aggression against the British North American colonies during and after the United States’ Civil War.

Responses could consider some of the following:

- British support for the South, the use of Canadian territory to launch the St. Albans Raid and the Trent Affair
- fears of a possible invasion by a mobilized Union army during and at the end of the war
- raids by the Fenian Brotherhood against Canada and New Brunswick
- the problems of political deadlock in the Canadas
- the need for some type of economic union of all the colonies.

There should be some understanding of internal problems but external pressures from both Britain and the United States were particularly important. Do not expect all of the above.

**[8 to 10 marks]** will probably be awarded for answers showing general understanding of the causes of Confederation.

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

**[14 to 16 marks]** could be scored for well-supported, consistently analytical argument.

**[17+ marks]** could be reached for assessment that is direct, focused, well developed and detailed. Answers that make effective use of historiography, for example David Creighton’s argument that external forces hastened the union, could reach **[19 to 20 marks]**.

5. **Analyse the conditions which produced slave insurrections *either* in the United States *or* Brazil. To what extent were these insurrections successful?**

Answers are likely to offer more detail on conditions (*i.e.* that slaves were treated as items of property, had severely limited rights, and many were subjected to heavy punishment). In the United States, slave codes authorized use of force against slaves in ways that would have constituted assault, battery and manslaughter if used against a free person. The best answers may refer to specific insurrections (*e.g.* Prosser’s conspiracy in 1800 with 35 hanged; Vesey’s conspiracy 1822, 37 slaves executed, and Nat Turner’s revolt 1831), analysing their causes and considering how far, if at all, they were successful. Candidates may argue that Turner’s revolt stimulated not only the “positive good defence of slavery” and a reactionary backlash but also abolitionist initiatives (*e.g.* the American Antislavery Society). If the second part of the question is ignored the maximum is **[13 marks]**.

**[8 to 10 marks]** can be scored for narrative accounts of the conditions of slavery with implicit assessment or comment on extent of success.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of conditions and results of insurrections.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for responses that are well-structured, focused and consistently analytical.

**[17+ marks]** can be reached by answers showing thorough analysis of conditions and insight into the immediate and longer-term effects of insurrections.

**6. To what extent did economic and social differences cause the United States' Civil War?**

Social and economic differences were basically: North was industrial (production increased from \$200 million in 1812 to £2 billion in 1859); wealthy; urbanization, transport and population (largely from a variety of European countries) increasing rapidly; also social problems with poor whites and economic downturn in 1857. South was largely rural with extensive estates; agriculture dominated by cotton, which was believed by the slave owners to necessitate the continuance of slavery; not so affected by 1857 economic downturn.

Political problems: formation of the Republican party 1854, partly to oppose slavery; dispute over expansion of slavery into the new territories; fear of South that North would eventually be strong enough to carry a constitutional amendment abolishing slavery. Events leading to war (which could be argued as antecedents or immediate causes): 1859, John Brown and Harpers Ferry Raid; 1860 choice of Lincoln as republican presidential candidate; 1860 South Carolina seceded; 1861 Fort Sumter. Reward relevant, informed argument and do not expect all of the above.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a general answer on causes of the Civil War with implicit assessment of the importance of economic and social differences.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for better detail and awareness of the nature and importance of economic and social differences.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for well-structured, focused, analytical responses that begin to see slavery as more than a social and economic problem.

*[17+ marks]* for answers that see the fusion of economic, social and political causes.

**7. Define economic dependency and account for its emergence in, and importance for, *one* country of Latin America in the late nineteenth century.**

“Economic dependency” in this context refers to a country or countries being dependent on economic decisions and prosperity in other parts of the world for its continuing economic well-being. Latin American countries exporting food and raw materials to relatively industrialized European countries were dependent upon exports and further investment in order to purchase necessary imports and sustain exports. Reasons for its emergence in *one* Latin American country could include some of the following: by the late nineteenth century industrialization in Europe was producing a strong demand for food and raw materials; economic ties deepened between Europe and Latin America countries that could supply beef and grain (Argentina), coffee and natural rubber exports (Brazil), sugar and tobacco (Cuba), copper (Chile), henequen, copper and zinc (Mexico), guano and silver (Peru); export-import growth stimulated development in raw materials, sustained by foreign investment; within this system Latin American countries occupied an essentially subordinate or “dependent” position.

Regarding its importance for *one* Latin American country, focus may be mainly on economic impact but stronger answers might also explain social and political consequences.

Economic importance:

- rapid expansion of exports (for example, in beef, wheat and wool in Argentina)
- prosperity
- Latin American economies tied to overseas markets.

Social importance:

- development of entrepreneurial spirit (cattle ranchers in Argentina, coffee growers in Brazil, sugar barons in Cuba)
- growth of middle-class (including lawyers, merchants and owners of small businesses)
- heavy immigration to help sustain expansion of export economies.

Political importance:

- political stability viewed as essential to attract foreign investment
- in Argentina and Chile landowners and other economic elite groups took control of government
- dictatorial strongmen took control in Peru, Venezuela and Mexico (*e.g.* Porfirio Díaz).

Do not expect all of the above, and allow some flexibility as to the period implied by the “late” nineteenth century.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be scored for an account of economic developments in one country with implicit attention to the emergence and importance of economic dependency.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of the emergence and importance of economic dependency.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for structured, well-supported responses to the three parts of the question.

**[17+ marks]** could be reached with detailed analysis and insight. The strongest answers may also show a high level of conceptual ability in defining “economic dependency”.

**8. Analyse the treatment of the indigenous people of Western Canada between Confederation and the First World War.**

Well developed answers could include recognition of the refusal and/or inability of the Canadian government to respond to aboriginal concerns including the loss of traditional hunting lifestyle (bison) with resulting problems of famine, problems associated with government land surveying techniques, increased European immigration and settlement, and the determination of some groups to resist changes (Northwest Rebellion of 1885).

*[8 to 10 marks]* could be awarded for descriptive accounts of treatment with implicit analysis.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit analysis of the treatment and its effects.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focused, structured, well-supported analysis of treatment and effects.

*[17+ marks]* could be achieved by answers that address the question in a direct and focused manner, showing insight and detailed understanding of both the indigenous people and government policy.

**9. Compare and contrast the experience of *two* different groups of immigrants in the United States in the period 1890 to 1914.**

Choices for discussion might include Oriental and other Asian immigrants to California; Italian, Irish, Eastern or Jewish immigrants in major urban centres. Credit also the responses of candidates who interpret groups in terms of occupation, religion, social status *etc.* The question requires candidates to examine the similarities and differences in the experiences of two different groups of immigrants. Experiences examined could include discriminatory government policies, problems with climate and isolation, living and working conditions, *etc.* Some credit could also be given for comparing and contrasting the groups' reasons for immigrating. If the experiences of only one group are addressed then *[8 marks]* cannot be reached.

*[8 to 10 marks]* could be awarded for narrative accounts with implicit analysis of similarities and differences in the experiences of two groups of immigrants.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit analysis of similarities and differences.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers that are focused, well-structured, consistently analytical and supported by accurate knowledge.

*[17+ marks]* could be reached by answers that address similarities and differences in a direct and focused manner, with detailed analysis of specific situations. The strongest answers may offer running comparisons showing depth and insight.



**10. Analyse the aims of the Progressives in the United States. To what extent had they achieved their aims by 1920?**

The question requires *analysis* of the aims of the Progressives and *assessment* of the extent to which their aims had been achieved by 1920. Answers are likely to be more detailed on political aims (women’s suffrage, direct election of senators, laws regarding the source and use of campaign contributions in order to curb powers of political bosses, democratizing governing institutions, *etc.*) than on economic and social reforms to ameliorate problems caused by industrialization and urbanization.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be scored by descriptive accounts of the Progressives with implicit analysis of aims and achievements.

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

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers that are well informed, focused and consistently analytical.

Stronger answers **[17+ marks]** might also consider the influence of outstanding leaders among the reformers, or show depth and breadth in their analysis of aims and insight in their assessment of the extent to which they were achieved.

**11. How successful was the United States’ foreign policy towards Latin America in the first decade of the twentieth century?**

The question requires candidates to make an assessment. Answers that clearly identify the goals of the United States’ foreign policy towards Latin America in the period specified, refer to specific examples and draw conclusions about successes and failures, should score well. Theodore Roosevelt (1901–09) wanted the United States to be a respected international power, and consequently to exert United States influence in Latin America. President Taft (1909–13) was Secretary of War under Roosevelt and continued his aggressive foreign policy. Popular specific examples for assessment are likely to be the Roosevelt Corollary, “Big Stick” diplomacy, and United States intervention in the Dominican Republic (which from 1905 to 1924 placed its customs duties in United States receivership) and particularly Panama. After Colombia rejected the Hay-Herrán Convention, the United States sent warships to prevent Colombia from quelling the Panama Revolt (2 November 1903) and recognised Panama’s independence (6 November). To ensure United States’ protection against Colombia, Panama signed the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty (18 November) giving the United States the right to build and operate the Panama Canal in return for \$10 million compensation, an annual fee of \$25 000 and a promise to protect Panama from Colombian reconquest.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be awarded for general description of United States’ foreign policy under Theodore Roosevelt with implicit assessment.

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

**[14 to 16 marks]** could be scored by well-focused, analytical argument that draws conclusions about United States’ foreign policy during the period specified.

**[17+ marks]** could be reached by answers addressing the question in a direct and focused manner, with detailed analysis and assessment, and perhaps different interpretations.

**12. To what extent were the aims of Emiliano Zapata and Pancho Villa realised during the Mexican Revolution (1910 to 1940)?**

Candidates could refer to Zapata's Plan de Ayala (1911) and Villa's pronounced agrarian reform of 1913 for evidence of aims. Stronger candidates will make effective use of the differences in their aims. Zapata led a rebellion of landless peasants and sought the return of the land of the haciendas to the landless peasants. Villa called for confiscation of large haciendas, but not for their subdivision into plots. The state would administer the haciendas, their crops would help to fund the revolutionary struggle, and once victory had been achieved they were to be used to restore village lands, pay taxes left unpaid by the hacendados, establish schools, *etc.* The dates in the question indicate that answers should assess the extent to which aims were achieved not only in their lifetimes (Zapata was killed in 1919, Villa in 1923) but also up to 1940 (*i.e.* the end of the presidency of Cárdenas).

**[8 to 10 marks]** might be scored for narrative accounts of Zapata and Villa with some implicit assessment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of aims and achievements of both leaders.

**[14 to 16 marks]** could be obtained by structured, well-supported argument on the extent to which their aims were achieved.

**[17+ marks]** could be reached by answers showing breadth and insight in their coverage of the period 1910 to 1940.

**13. Assess the impact of the Great Depression on the society of any *one* country of the region. Provide specific examples to support your answer.**

Specific examples will vary depending on the country chosen.

Impacts assessed could include some of the following:

- the effects of unemployment such as poverty, hunger and population migration
- impact on the family
- decline in educational opportunities; changing attitudes such as a loss of trust in government or confidence in banks
- political consequences including repression of political movements and organized labour.

The United States will no doubt be a popular choice.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be awarded for narrative accounts with implicit assessment of the impact of the Great Depression on the society of the chosen country.

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

**[14 to 16 marks]** could be obtained by structured, well-supported assessment of impact.

**[17+ marks]** could be reached by answers that address the question in a direct and focused manner, with thorough assessment of impact on the society of the chosen country.

**14. In what ways, and for what reasons, did the relationship between Canada and Britain change between 1900 and 1931?**

Stronger responses will deal with both how and why the relationship changed, and are likely to refer to economic (and possibly social) changes as well as political ones.

“In what ways” could include reference to some of the following:

- the First World War
- growing sense of nationhood
- Paris Peace Conference
- changed economic relationship due to the First World War
- depression; Balfour Report (1926); Statute of Westminster.

“For what reasons” could include:

- consideration of the impact of the First World War on Canada and Britain
- world economic situation
- Canada’s growing national consciousness.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be awarded for a general overview of the relationship between Canada and Britain with implicit coverage of reasons for changes.

**[11 to 13 marks]** will be scored with adequate accurate detail and more explicit reasons for changes in the relationship.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for well-informed, structured, focused discussion of how and why the relationship changed.

**[17+ marks]** for answers that show depth, breadth and insight in their analysis of how and why the relationship changed between 1900 and 1931.

**15. In what ways, and with what results, did *either* Perón or Vargas pursue populist policies?**

Perón, President of Argentina 1946–55 and 1973–74, built a multiclass, urban-based populist coalition of workers, industrialists and some segments of the middle class during the 1940s. He derived immense popularity by cultivating that support and expanding government expenditure in the wake of an export boom. Vargas governed Brazil as head of a provisional government (1930–34), as a constitutional President (1934–37), as dictator (1937–45) and finally as a constitutional President elected by universal suffrage (1950–54). He sought a *conciliação* based upon support from the army and major industrial groups to achieve a centralized state. The question invites candidates to explain the ways in which *either* Perón or Vargas pursued populist policies and the consequences of that pursuit for themselves and for their countries. Reward good focus and detailed knowledge and understanding.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be awarded for narrative accounts of either Perón or Vargas with implicit analysis of ways and results.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of ways and results.

**[14 to 16 marks]** could be scored where the demands of the question are addressed with focused, well-informed argument.

Strong answers **[17+ marks]** might show a high level of conceptual ability through defining terms such as “populism”, “corporatism”, “Perónism”, *etc.*

**16. Compare and contrast the attitudes to, and roles in, the Second World War of Canada and Argentina.**

Canada hurried to the support of Britain and France after they declared war on Germany in September 1939. In contrast there was strong Argentine antipathy to the Allies, especially the United States and Britain. During the war Canada's assistance to the Allies included military personnel, training facilities, and essential supplies. Argentina chose to preserve its neutrality. In practice that meant it would continue to sell essential foodstuffs to Britain while refusing to join the US-led military effort. The question requires candidates to indicate similarities and differences; the best answers will be those that achieve a running comparison with good supporting evidence. If candidates address the attitude to and role in the war of only one country then **[8 marks]** cannot be reached.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be awarded for end-on accounts with implicit comparison of attitudes and roles.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit comparison of their attitudes to and roles in the Second World War.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for a comparative structure, analysis of similarities and difference in attitudes and roles, and good supporting evidence.

**[17+ marks]** could be reached by answers that address the question in a direct and focused manner, showing insight and detailed comparative analysis.

**17. Why, and with what results, did Castro replace Batista as ruler of Cuba?**

Candidates may focus on some of the following reasons why Castro replaced Batista:

- Batista's ruthless and corrupt dictatorial rule
- Castro's leadership and success of his guerrilla tactics
- evaporation of support for Batista, including the loss of United States' support
- desperate desire for change among Cubans
- Batista's flight to the Dominican Republic.

Results mentioned could include some of the following:

- introduction of Marxist-Leninist programme
- overthrow of United States' economic dominance
- land and social reforms, with improvements in health and education
- vast increase in Cuban immigration (approximately 750,000 had fled to the USA by 1990); dependence on Soviet aid.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be awarded for factual accounts with implicit analysis.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more explicit analysis of "why" and "with what results".

**[14 to 16 marks]** could be scored for focused, well-supported discussion of the causes and consequences of Castro replacing Batista.

**[17+ marks]** could be reached by answers that show depth of analysis and insight, possibly analyzing thoroughly why Batista's support collapsed in 1958 and/or whether a capitalist dictatorship was simply replaced by communist dictatorship.

**18. Compare and contrast the Cold War policies of Truman and Eisenhower.**

The question requires candidates to discuss the similarities and differences in the policies of Truman (1945–53) and Eisenhower (1953–61). Responses could include some of the following points:

- both sought to contain communism
- both made promises of assistance to governments facing external aggression or internal subversion by communist forces (the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, and the Eisenhower Doctrine promising economic and military assistance to Middle East nations)
- both built alliances to contain communism (Truman and NATO, Eisenhower and SEATO).

Contrasts could include that Eisenhower was committed to ending the Korean War, that Truman drew back from the use of nuclear weapons in the Korean War whereas Eisenhower's implied threat to use them hastened the signing of an armistice, and that brinkmanship characterized Eisenhower's Cold War policy. If the policies of only one of the two presidents named are addressed then **[8 marks]** cannot be reached.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be awarded for end-on accounts of both presidencies with implicit comparison or comment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** may be scored with more explicit comparison of their policies.

**[14 to 16 marks]** could be gained for answers with a comparative structure and well-supported argument.

**[17+ marks]** could be reached by running comparisons showing depth and insight.

**19. Analyse the successes and failures of the United States’ Civil Rights movement between 1954 and 1964.**

Candidates could refer to some of the following in their analysis of successes:

- the filing of more lawsuits to challenge segregation and demand equal rights (encouraged by *Brown v Board of Education*, 1954)
- mobilizing the black community to challenge segregation laws in the South (e.g. Montgomery Bus Boycott of 1955)
- Freedom marches (e.g. 1963 March on Washington led by Martin Luther King)
- enactment of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, and the stronger measures in the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Analysis of failures could include discussion of, for example, slow progress in desegregation in education, the limited impact of the civil rights legislation passed in the period 1954–64, and signs of fragmentation in the Civil Rights movement with some activists demanding a change of aims and methods.

*[8 to 10 marks]* could be awarded for a general overview of developments 1954 to 1964 with implicit assessment of successes and weaknesses.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit analysis of successes and failures.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for well-structured analysis with good supporting evidence of successes and failures of the Civil Rights movement.

*[17+ marks]* could be reached by answers that address the question in a direct and focused manner, with detailed and perceptive analysis of, for example, the actual impact of the Civil Rights Acts or extent to which particular campaigns were successful.

**20. “Vietnam and Watergate destroyed the reputations of various United States’ Presidents in the 1960s and 1970s.” To what extent do you agree with this judgment?**

The question invites discussion. Watergate most affected Richard Nixon (1969–74), whose resignation was the first by a President in United States history. To what extent did “Vietnam” also adversely affect his reputation? Candidates might discuss the extent to which Vietnam adversely affected the reputation of Lyndon B. Johnson (1963–69). Some candidates may consider the reputations of other Presidents of the period in order to refute that the judgement in the question applied to “various United States’ Presidents”. In all answers, reward relevant, well-supported argument.

*[8 to 10 marks]* could be awarded for relevant comment in a generally narrative account.

*[11 to 13 marks]* could be obtained for more explicit assessment of the quotation.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for a clearly structured response arguing a well-supported case for or against the quote.

*[17+ marks]* could be reached by answers that address the question in a direct and focused manner, showing detail and insight. The strongest answers may successfully probe the question, for example questioning what is being referred to by “Vietnam”.

**21. To what extent has *either Canada or one Latin American country* developed a foreign policy independent of the United States since 1945?**

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

For Canada coverage could include some of the following:

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

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

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

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

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

**[14 to 16 marks]** can be achieved by focused, structured, well-supported argument.

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

- 22. Account for the emergence of the “women’s liberation” movement of the 1960s. How successful has it been in addressing its original concerns? Provide specific examples from one or more counties in the Americas to support your answer.**

Candidates might consider some of the following reasons for its emergence:

- the Second World War: work experience
- subsequent lack of workplace opportunities
- significantly poorer wage scales for women
- artificial contraception
- access to higher education
- sexism in advertising
- influence of civil rights movements.

For evaluation of success, candidates could focus on some of the following:

- extent of increased participation in political process
- number of women in political office
- extent of increase in professional opportunities
- number of women working outside the home
- extent to which the wage gap has closed
- availability of day care
- redefinition of gender roles.

Answers may legitimately focus on either a single country or more widely. Reward depth and breadth according to the candidate’s approach.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be scored for narrative accounts of some aspects of the “women’s liberation” movement with implicit analysis.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more specific details and some analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** could be obtained for focused, structured, well-supported argument on emergence and success.

**[17+ marks]** could be reached by answers that also include perceptive assessment of the influence of specific individuals (authors, politicians, women of distinction/power).



**23. Analyse the reasons for the United States’ intervention in Guatemala in 1954.**

Analysis of reasons could focus on some of the following:

- United States’ conviction that the battle with communism was world-wide (heightened by “fall” of China in 1949 and war in Korea)
- United States fears of a Soviet takeover of the Panama Canal and a “domino theory” effect in Central America
- President Arévalo’s decision in 1950 to hand over the presidency of Guatemala to Colonel Arbenz, who was anti-American and began accepting communist support
- Arbenz’s agrarian reforms which included expropriation of over one million acres of corporate land, most of which was owned by the United States Fruit Company
- United States’ alarm when a Soviet bloc ship brought military supplies to Puerto Barrios (15 May 1954)
- United States’ failure to get OAS sponsorship for intervention in Guatemala, which led to the CIA being used to help organize rightist exiles under Carlos Castillo Armas to invade via Honduras.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be awarded for factual accounts of the United States’ intervention with implicit analysis.

**[11 to 13 marks]** answers will contain more explicit analysis of United States’ intervention.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers that are detailed and accurate in their discussion of the reasons for United States’ intervention.

**[17+ marks]** could be scored for perceptive analysis of reasons, possibly focusing not only on reasons associated with United States’ policy regarding Guatemala and Latin America but also the wider context of Cold War policies and events.

**24. “President Reagan’s policies brought great benefits to the United States in the period 1981 to 1990.” How far do you agree with this judgment?**

Benefits could be said to include a massive (25%) cut in income taxes, a substantial growth in GDP (33%) that helped to create 18 million new jobs, and a reduction in federal spending. Candidates could also argue that Reagan’s policies produced cuts in social services, “Reaganomics” left behind a huge federal deficit, and tax cuts mainly benefited the wealthy. On foreign policy, candidates could argue that his strong anti-communist stance and determination to uphold United States’ interests brought benefits (including an agreement with the USSR on nuclear arms reduction), but the Iran-Contra Affair tarnished the reputation not only of his administration but also the United States. His military build-up (especially the Strategic Defence Initiative, or “Star Wars”) led to a massive increase in defence spending, but ensured military dominance and contributed to the USSR’s later political collapse. Reward well-supported argument and do not demand all the above.

*[8 to 10 marks]* could be awarded for narratives of Reagan’s presidency with implicit assessment of benefits to the United States.

*[11 to 13 marks]* answers will contain more explicit assessment of Reagan’s policies.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for well-focused, detailed argument on the extent to which Reagan’s policies benefited the United States.

*[17+ marks]* could be reached with balanced judgements based on thorough analysis of Reagan’s policies and showing insight.

**25. Why was the Organization of American States (OAS) founded and how successful has it been in achieving its aims?**

Responses could include some of the following reasons:

- to promote peace, democracy, economic co-operation, and social advancement
- to co-ordinate the work of a variety of inter-American departments
- for continental solidarity (which the United States wanted)
- for non-intervention (which Latin American states wanted).

There is a vast amount of material that could be used to assess “how successful”.

Candidates may refer to some of the following:

- attempted settlement of border disputes (*e.g.* El Salvador and Honduras in the 1960s)
- condemnation of communist activity and imposition of sanctions against Cuba (1964 to 1975)
- the work of the Inter-American Council of Human Rights and the Inter-American Commission for Women
- support for the United States in the Cuban Missile Crisis but not for United States’ policy in Nicaragua in the 1980s or the United States’ invasion of Panama in 1989.

Do not expect consideration of all of the above and reward relevant detail in whatever is offered.

**[8 to 10 marks]** could be awarded for narratives of the foundation and work of the OAS with implicit reasons and assessment.

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

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers where “why founded?” and “how successful?” are addressed with well-focused, detailed argument.

**[17+ marks]** can be reached by answers showing insight and analytical treatment of both parts of the question, with coverage of a range of aims and OAS activities.

---