



# **MARKSCHEME**

**MAY 2010**

**HISTORY**

**Route 2**

**Higher Level**

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

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of IB Cardiff.*

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

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

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

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

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

**Revolutionary movement**

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

**Evolutionary movement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

From the point of view of Great Britain: the British feared that the United States would hinder its war effort against France, and thus could not permit trade between the two to occur. Also, Britain needed sailors for its all-out commercial war and feared United States expansionism.

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

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

The question asks for the effects on the region, thus candidates need to address the impact on both the United States and Mexico. For the United States, the most immediate consequence of the war was enormous gain in territory. As a result of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the US gained the Mexican territories of Alta California and Santa Fé de Nuevo México, recognition of the US annexation of Texas, and set the Rio Grande as the boundary between Mexico and the United States. Also, as part of the treaty, the US paid \$15 million to Mexico. For the US, the victory affirmed the country's belief in "Manifest Destiny", increased nationalism and spurred the settlement of California, especially after the discovery of gold. However, the new territory and the war itself reopened the expansion of slavery question. The Wilmot Proviso, which was approved by the House in 1847, sought to ban slavery in any land gained as a result of the war. Though the Proviso died due to Senate inaction, harsh feelings continued to exist. Candidates might also discuss the anti-war movement within the US and the training that many future military leaders in the American Civil War gained.

For Mexico, the consequences were disastrous, losing over half its land. Coupled with the earlier loss of Texas after the Battle at San Jacinto, Mexico had lost slightly more than two-thirds of its original territory. The enormous loss of territory encouraged Mexico to enact policies to colonize its remaining northern territories as a hedge against further losses. Some Mexicans relocated further south in Mexico, but the vast majority remained in the United States. After losing the war, President Santa Ana resigned and went into exile.

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

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

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

The Kansas–Nebraska problem arose as a result of Stephen Douglas’ proposal for popular sovereignty for these territories. Candidates could argue that the passage of the Kansas–Nebraska Act in 1854 actually strengthened the Southern pro-slavery forces since it rescinded the Missouri–Compromise of 1820. New territory was open to slavery and possible new slave states would increase the South’s political power. The Act angered Northern abolitionists who thought of the Compromise as permanent solution to the slavery expansion question and revered it nearly as much as the Constitution.

Passage of the act turned Kansas into a battleground between pro-slavery and anti-slavery forces, with both sides sending in hundreds of settlers to determine the outcome. Violence ruled the day. Bleeding Kansas, John Brown, the Border War, and the creation of two state governments could be discussed. Candidates might argue that the eventual outcome of Kansas becoming a free state actually weakened the Southern pro-slavery group.

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

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

Candidates need to address the extent to which these factors, as opposed to others, were responsible for the Northern victory. Some of the other factors that could be discussed are Lincoln’s leadership, the effect of the Emancipation Proclamation, Grant and Sherman’s tactics of total war and the success of the Anaconda Plan. Candidates might also discuss reasons why the South lost, but they must focus on the initial premise of the question.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Canada's role was significant in Canada's evolutionary path to full nationhood. In 1914 English Canadians answered Britain's call, thousands volunteered. Canada's small peace time army of 4,000 grew to over 600 000 by war's end (the nation's population totaled 8 million). By 1917 the army had transformed from a militia rabble into an elite assault formation lead by Canadian General Arthur Currie; an outstanding soldier. Canadians fought at Ypres (1915), the Somme (1916) and Passchendaele (1917) and the 100 Days (1918). The "made in Canada" victory at Vimy Ridge (9 April 1917) is hailed by leading Canadian historians as Canada's coming of age. Thereafter, Prime Minister Borden demanded Britain treat Canada as an equal resulting in Resolution IX in May 1917. French Canadians (30 % of the population) did not support "Britain's war" and enlistment in Quebec and non-British immigrants, lagged behind English Canada. Heavy losses and dwindling volunteer enlistments pressured Borden to announce conscription in May 1917. English Canadians applauded, French Quebec did not. Borden called an election. The "Khaki election" of December 1917 tore the country apart. Borden prevailed, conscripted 125 000 men, 25 000 went overseas. The Canadian economy grew and prospered notably wheat sales and manufacture of artillery shell. The war's cost was heavy. Over 60 000 killed, 154 000 wounded; the conscription crisis created a deep and lasting divide between English and French Canada. The Canadian Corps was a source of national pride and was considered the best formation on the Western Front by 1918. Canada earned a seat at the Versailles treaty, an unimaginable development in 1914, membership in the League of Nations and began pursuing an independent foreign policy. These changes were formalized by Britain in the Statute of Westminster (1931) which gave Canada control over its foreign policy.

*Do not expect all of the above and reward answers focused on Canadian impact.*

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

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

“Moral Diplomacy” or “Missionary Diplomacy” is a descriptive label often applied to the policies and practices of the United States in Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean during the presidency of Woodrow Wilson (1913–1921). He believed that governments in the area should be selected in a democratic manner. Countries that were democratic or appeared democratic would be supported; those that were not would face pressure from the United States. President Wilson changed to this because of his dissatisfaction with former President Taft’s Dollar Diplomacy. He first implemented Moral Diplomacy when he chose not to recognize President Huerta as the legitimate ruler of Mexico, making a distinction between “de jure” and “de facto” governments. Wilson believed it was the moral duty of the United States to show Latin American nations how to be democratic, even if it meant using military force or financial pressure.

For Latin American nations, this meant American interference of one kind or another was not far away. Presidential elections and economic development in Nicaragua and in Haiti were strongly influenced by the presence of American troops. Cuba and Panama also experienced American intervention. Moral Diplomacy created seemingly permanent hostility between the United States and Latin America. This was especially true in the countries that experienced Wilsonian interventionism.

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

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

This could be a popular question. The answers to “to what extent” will be, probably, “to a large extent”. But accept different views provided they are analytical and supported by relevant arguments. To some, Cardenas is seen as the embodiment of the ideals of the Revolution, but accept different views provided they are analytical and supported by relevant arguments.

Cárdenas’ goals were to regain the revolutionary credibility that had stagnated. He is credited with giving definite shape to the political system that lasted in Mexico until the end of the 1980s. Candidates could argue that under his leadership, the ideals of the Constitution of 1917 came to fruition. The centerpiece of his domestic policy was the renewal of the agrarian reform, in which over 43 million acres of land were redistributed to peasant communities. Other parts of his Six Year Plan included increased unionization rights for industrial workers and higher wages, the building of modern schools, and nationalization of railroads and foreign oil companies. Relations with the Catholic Church were also healed during Cárdenas’ rule. On the other hand, candidates could argue that despite these reforms, Mexico was still controlled by an elite class.

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

Candidates might analyse one or two of the famous muralists. That is a valid approach, providing that they address the revolutionary aspect. More recently, a painter, also related to the group, has been recognized: Frida Kahlo. She could also be a very good choice. Other arts such as literature, music and dance are also acceptable.

Between 1920 and 1924, extensive campaigns in education and literacy were made in Mexico. As part of these campaigns, the government sponsored the development of the arts in order to increase Mexican pride in their cultural accomplishments. The muralist movement was also born in this period under the auspices of the state. The leading muralists, Diego Rivera, José Orozco and David Siqueiros, were hired to memorialize the Revolution with *frescos* on municipal buildings. The outpouring of images and pictorial themes which came from the muralist movement disseminated the notion of the legitimizing Revolution among the masses, and brought about an increased sense of nationalism.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Liberty Leaguers (Right)**

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

**Other groups/persons**

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

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

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

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

**Social effects**

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

**Economic effects**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Greatly influenced by post-war decolonization in Algeria and the US civil rights movement, the Quiet Revolution began in Quebec. Led by Jean Lesage’s Liberal government elected in 1960 behind the slogan “maitre chez nous” (masters in our house), the movement sought to end English Canada’s dominance and modernize Quebec’s institutions. Traditional Quebec had been rural and Catholic; during the revolution it became urban and secularized. The hydroelectric industry became a public utility and control of education was wrested from the Roman Catholic Church. Health care and social services were next. Of particular concern was protecting French language and culture surrounded by English North America and controlled economically by English Canadians. Culturally, the revolution produced a renaissance in Quebecois art and music. This fear was heightened by growing anxiety spawned by a decreasing birth rate. Lesage demanded and won concessions from the Federal government that Quebec deserved special recognition. Quebec would operate federally funded programs such as old age pensions. The result was that by 1970 Quebec had put in place mechanisms and programs to protect Quebec’s language and culture, control the economy through government intervention and had successfully negotiated de facto special status with the Federal government. An unintended outcome was the growth of a two-headed separatist movement. The Partis Quebecois, led by the charismatic Rene Levesque, popular with young Quebecois separatists, won the 1976 provincial election. The other, was the terrorist Front de Liberation du Quebec (FLQ) that bombed, kidnapped and murdered. The 1970 October crisis was the FLQ’s high point and final act. In sum, in less than a decade, The Quiet Revolution had succeeded in permanently changing Quebec and redefining federal-provincial relations in Canada.

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

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

A good strategy for this question is to begin with the definition of populism. Populism can be associated with a left-wing or right-wing ideology. More generally, however, populism defies any singular recognizable category.

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

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

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

Kennedy's policies toward Latin America have to be understood within the context of the Cold War, the core of the United States' policy until its end in 1991. While many candidates might focus on Cuba, the Bay of Pigs and the Cuban Missile Crisis, the question is broader than that. Besides these actions against Cuba, the US suspended economic and/or broke off diplomatic relations with several dictatorships between 1961 and 1963, including Argentina, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras and Peru. Unlike Cuba, these suspensions were imposed only temporarily. A major part of Kennedy's Latin America foreign policy was the Alliance for Progress. The program was signed at an inter-American conference at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in August 1961. It promised to spend \$10 billion in the region, improve economic cooperation between nations and promote social and political reform within Latin American nations. To some the Alliance was a success, increasing economic growth in several countries and promoting democracy. Others might consider it a failure and cite increased debt of Latin American nations to the US, corruption and inefficiency, and the increasing number of military dictatorships.

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

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

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

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

During the Cold War Canada and the U.S. remained close Allies, but at times relations became strained particularly during the 1960s and 1970s. The 1950s was a time of close cooperation militarily and diplomatically. Examples: 1949 NATO (Canada garrisoned 10 000 soldiers to Europe), the Korean War, NORAD (1957) and the DEW line. The first sign strain came with Cuba (1959) and Canada’s refusal to break off diplomatic relations or embargo Castro. Canada refused to join the OAS over US support of Latin American dictators. Canada also recognized the People’s Republic of China. Relations between PM Diefenbaker and President Kennedy were strained over the issue of missiles. Diefenbaker refused to arm the Bomarc anti-aircraft missiles with nuclear warheads, rendering them useless. During the Cuban missile crisis, Diefenbaker was upset when Kennedy had not immediately advised of the crisis and dragged his heels mobilizing Canada’s military which angered JFK. Pearson replaced Diefenbaker (1963) and installed the warheads. However, in 1965 Pearson, while visiting the US, criticized US bombing of North Vietnam. President Johnson was furious, confronted Pearson and relations remained strained thereafter. Canadian criticism of the war grew. Canadian chemical companies supplying the US with defoliants were scourged. Canada accepted thousands of draft dodgers. (Note: Over 30 000 Canadians volunteered with US forces and fought in Vietnam, over 100 were killed in action). Trudeau replaced Pearson and initiated a “third way” foreign policy that cut Canada’s NATO contribution by half, reduced the military and appeared to some U.S. observers as steering Canada towards neutrality. Trudeau believed US policies had created/ responsible for much of the Cold War tension. Nixon did not trust Trudeau. Trudeau spent time with Castro and visited a number of communist countries. Relations became cordial in the 1980s with the close friendship of P.M. Mulroney and President Regan. Despite periodic criticism of US Cold War policies, economic ties increased and mutual defense of North America remained a cornerstone.

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

Answers will vary according to the selected countries.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is little doubt that in the past 20 years, in many parts of the region, in areas where computers have enjoyed their greatest use, the distribution of income has become increasingly unequal. This is certainly true among blue-collar workers earning less today than a generation ago, while earnings of professionals have surged. The ones that have more knowledge, and more access to technology, receive better paying jobs. The situation is even more severe in the developing world. There are many reasons for the gross disparity, including the facts that technology-led economic growth is faster in developed countries than in developing countries, while population growth is faster in the developing countries. The gap is not just in economic growth, but might also be seen in living conditions, education and health care.

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

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

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

**Panama**

Candidates are likely to discuss President Bush's actions in removing Manuel Noriega from power. In 1989, Bush responded to Noriega's nullifying the results of a presidential election, by sending additional troops to Panama. Bush may have hoped that this would convince Noriega to reverse his action, and allow the newly elected president Guillermo Endara to take office. It did not, and Bush increased the tensions diplomatically by removing the American ambassador and militarily by sending in more troops. Noriega tightened his control of the country. In December 1989, Bush decided to intervene after Panamanian forces killed an American serviceman. Additional US forces were sent in as part of Operation Just Cause, which resulted in Noriega's capture and the installation of Endara as president. Candidates might see this action as another example of US interference to control Latin American nations, or as protecting a democratically elected leader from a military coup.

**Canada and Mexico/NAFTA**

Candidates are likely to choose one or both of these nations. In either case, the candidate will probably discuss the creation of NAFTA, which eliminated the majority of trade barriers among the three countries. In Canada, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney teamed with Bush to negotiate an agreement acceptable to both sides. In Mexico, President Salinas worked with Bush to produce similar results. The agreement was signed by all three in 1992, and approved by Congress during the Clinton presidency in 1993. The treaty has had supporters and adversaries in all three countries.

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

---