

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2013 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/75

Paper 5n (The Civil Rights Movement in the USA, 1954–1980), maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	75

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Question (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	75

Question (b)**Band 1: 16–20**

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	75

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	75

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	75

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	75

- 1 (a) How far are the views on violence and non-violence as ways to achieve civil rights for Black Americans, outlined in Document A, challenged in Document D? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. Where appropriate the answer should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of provenance by use not only of the text, but of headings and attributions.

In general terms the contrast in the views expressed in these documents is stark: Document A favours non-violence and Document D supports violence as the best way to achieve civil rights for Black Americans. Nonetheless, there are elements of agreement as well as difference between the documents. Both documents recognise the power of **non-violence**. In Document A this is 'stressed' and emphasised by reiteration which is corroborated by Document D which concedes that 'Non-violence is a very potent weapon'. However, it is clear that Document A has faith in non-violence as a matter of principle whereas Document D considers it to be only relevant 'when the opponent is civilised'. To highlight these positions Document A claims non-violence was proven to be effective as 'The bus boycott had worked' whereas Document D is scornful of the 'group of non-violent ministers' reflected in his description of them as 'cringing Negro ministers' and clearly disdainful of the way they 'pleaded' with the city fathers, largely it seems, because such overtures were unsuccessful as the city fathers allowed the Klan 'to organise the same way as the NAACP'. The opposition of Document A to **violence** is explained in the way those 'playing a white man' in role-play 'sometimes' 'put so much zealous into his performance he had to be reproved'. In contrast Document D is explicit in advocating violence: indeed, that Negroes 'must be willing to die and to kill'. The difference is explained by the effectiveness each claims for violence. Document A is clear that Negroes should not 'push people around' as this 'would cause trouble'. However, Document D claims that it was as a result of 'a group of Negroes who showed a willingness to fight' that the city fathers 'deprived the Klan of its constitutional rights'. Despite these differences both agree on the propensity of Negroes to use violence. Reference has already been made to the role play conducted by the MIA but, in addition, King admits 'Often a Negro forgot his non-violent role and struck back with vigor'. This is corroborated in Document D in so far as the author admits that he was 'not a pacifist' but also that, in his view, 'most of my people are not'. Candidates might choose the approach outlined above, or consider the points of similarity and difference separately, or treat violence and non-violence according to certain criteria such as attitude, effectiveness, inclination.

In evaluating the documents candidates are likely to place emphasis on the authorship. The non-violence advocated by King was unsurprising given his religious beliefs. Indeed, the author of Document D confirms that the activists he refers to, who negotiated with the city fathers, were ministers committed to non-violence. By contrast Williams was clearly disillusioned with such an approach for which he was suspended from the NAACP, an organisation which eschewed violence. The context is also important. Document A was written at a moment of triumph for the civil rights movement, following the successful desegregation of the buses in Montgomery, and was itself a vindication of non-violent protest. 1956 was also in the early stages of the revival in the civil rights movement when leaders and supporters were cautious, not least because of the strength of the hostility to them.

However, although only three years later, Document D was written at a time of increased confidence in some activists and a degree of frustration with the rate of change. Indeed, arguably, the hostility of the Klan, referred to in the document, had been heightened to a degree that incited a more militant attitude on the part of some civil rights activists. The context in which both documents were written could be used to explain the obvious attempt to control passions revealed in Document A and the sense of wanting to release them expressed in Document D. After all, both documents were written with the intention of persuading a wider audience of the wisdom of their respective positions. 'Stride Toward Freedom' was King's first book and he was seeking to convince his readers of the virtue of

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	75

non-violence. Williams was writing for a magazine that had started in 1956 and which acted as a vehicle to air the diverse ideas of the New Left. Candidates may know that Williams was not representative of mainstream opinion in the 1950s. If anything he was a precursor of the more radical positions adopted by activists in the 1960s.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	75

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that the cause of civil rights for Black Americans was best advanced by the initiative of ordinary people rather than the leaders of organisations?** [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

Two Documents, D and E, seem to support the view that civil rights were best advanced by the initiative of the people, with Documents A, B and C providing a counter argument in favour of leaders of organisations driving the movement. However, Documents C and D contain some evidence that hints at a degree of ambiguity.

Document E provides the clearest argument for the initiative of the people. The author considers this to be the way to 'keep the movement democratic' and not just within the Black American community but to embrace 'Negro and white students, North and South'. This might be linked to her obvious desire to engage the students as the best hope for advancing the civil rights cause. She is explicit in the direction the movement should take stating an 'inclination toward group-centred leadership, rather than toward a leader-centred group pattern of organisation'. This appears to be born of a suspicion of the latter which has encouraged 'struggles for personal leadership' and produced expectations of leaders which have been disappointed, as 'when the prophetic leader turns out to have feet of clay'. It is implied that this partly explains the 'apprehension' students have about 'adults' who they seem to feel 'might try to capture the student movement'. Her conviction in the importance of the role of the individual is highlighted in the final clause of the document. The sincerity of the author can be verified as someone who resigned from the SCLC and, as many will know, helped found the SNCC in 1960. Her confidence in student activity was long standing, dating back to her work in Harlem in the 1930s. In addition, actions of 'the Little Rock Nine' in 1957 and the Greensboro sit-in of February 1960 might be cited as examples of the effectiveness of the initiative of the people which may have helped influence the views of the author.

The initiative of the people prepared to use violence is lauded in Document D which argues that 'a willingness to fight caused the city officials to deprive the Klan of its constitutional rights' as a result of clashes between the Klan and Negroes. However, it might be argued that the thrust of Document D is defensive and the actions of Negroes were a reaction to provocation. This is made explicit in the assertion that 'Negroes must be willing to defend themselves' and 'willing to die and to kill in repelling their assailants'. The final sentence reinforces this point in stating that violence used by Negroes was a means to 'fight back'. Candidates could argue, therefore, that the evidence of Document D to show that civil rights for Black Americans was advanced by the initiative of the people is limited and outweighed by the evidence that suggests such actions were merely 'holding the line'. Nonetheless, Document D clearly has little confidence in the ability of leaders of organisations to make a difference in the way he dismisses the efforts of 'non-violent ministers'. The attitude of Document D might be assessed as understandable in the light of Klan violence, which candidates could develop with knowledge, possibly making a link to the reference they posed to 'their families and their homes'. However, some may consider the views expressed in Document D as those of a minority on the fringe of the civil rights movement at that time. Further, the reference in Document C to 'an open society' might be considered to hint at some support for the interpretation with the implication of creating a democratic society. Also, the importance of individual relationships is stressed as a key way 'to love it (hatred) out'.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	75

Documents A and C present a counter argument in favour of the leadership of the movement by organisations. Both emphasise the importance of training. In Document A ‘teaching sessions’ are referred to and the nature of these sessions is then amplified in the role play that is described. In Document C the author feels that activists ‘were being trained for a war’. This Document concedes ‘The Church played a major role in educating, preparing’ those who would lead the struggle. It could be claimed that Document A backs this view as candidates will know that the author was a clergyman. In addition, both sources show that the inculcation of ideas, notably those of non-violence, by leaders of civil rights organisations was regarded as important. In Document A we are told that ‘Leaders went into the schools and urged students to stick to non-violence’ and Jim Lawson’s efforts in this direction are highlighted in Document C. Indeed, leaders seem intent on ‘indoctrination’, especially in the latter which refers to ‘planting in us a sense of both rightness and righteousness’. The sense that leaders wanted to control things is stressed in Document A which mentions the instructions issued to people on how to behave on integrated buses.

The theme of control, or co-ordination at least, is developed in Document B. This provides evidence of how leaders of local organisations exchanged views and experience of protest in an attempt to learn from each other. As a measure of their belief in organisation from the top they agreed to establish the Southern Negro Leaders Conference which, it is claimed, was the beginning of a ‘campaign against segregation’ which suggests that unity of action was necessary. By implication, at least, is the view that if various organisations need to combine their efforts then action by the initiative of the people would be pointless. The difficulties facing local organisations is highlighted by the reference to the ‘strong men’ of the Mississippi Delta’ having to operate covertly. Each Document A-C favoured non-violence which might be considered a reason for their preference for leadership from above in so far as strength in numbers and in unison was essential for such a strategy to succeed. It might also be argued that all three Documents represent the views of religious figures or organisations and it is not surprising that supporters of a hierarchical and highly organised structure would favour the same approach to civil rights protest. This point is reinforced in Document D which refers to the ministers within the NAACP who clearly believed in the leadership provided by their organisation, which the suspension from this organisation of the author, who preferred the people to take the initiative, testifies.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	75

2 'The Little Rock crisis of 1957 did more to hinder than advance the struggle for the desegregation of education'. Do you agree? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded.

Details about the Little Rock Crisis would be helpful: 9 Black American students tried to enrol at Central High School, Arkansas but were prevented from doing so by a mob of Whites. The Governor called in the state's National Guard to stop the students. Eisenhower stepped in by ordering 1,000 members of 101 Airborne Division to Little Rock to ensure the students were allowed to enrol.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required.

Candidates should consider the impact of the decision. In some respects the crisis hindered the desegregation of schooling. Incidents of violence against Black American students who tried to enrol in schools from which they had previously been barred increased and the KKK were increasingly active in terrorising communities who tried to follow the lead of the Little Rock Nine. The case of James Meredith in 1962 might be cited: two people were killed in disturbances at the University of Mississippi when he tried to enrol and he had to be protected by soldiers and US marshals sent by JF Kennedy. Four years later Meredith was shot by a White sniper (he survived) which indicates the lengths some were prepared to go to stop integration of education. Authorities in the South devised various means to avoid desegregation. Some took direct action. For example, Wallace, as Governor of Alabama, stood in the entrance to the University of Alabama in 1963 to prevent two Black Americans from enrolling there. Southern Democrats and conservative Republicans in Congress combined to prevent any significant legislation to speed up desegregation. In both the North and South Whites withdrew their children from public schools and placed them in private ones. Segregation was maintained by housing patterns with neighbourhoods predominantly of one colour confining the intake into local schools to those living in that neighbourhood. Five years after the Little Rock Crisis only one half of one percent of the Black American children of the South was attending integrated schools.

Yet, it could be argued that the Little Rock Crisis promoted and advanced the segregation of education. Immediately after the Supreme Court decision of *Brown v Board of Education of Topeka* in 1954 there had been no change. Southern States invoked States Rights and ignored the decision. When Autherine Lucy, a 26 year old, tried to enrol at the University of Alabama in 1956 the school officials refused her entry and, attacked by a mob, she was forced to withdraw. Little Rock, a year later, changed that situation entirely. Southern authorities and White mobs might resist desegregation, as above, but they had to back down in all cases, albeit in some instances because of the intervention of Federal forces. However, after 1957 the clock could not be turned back. Further, if Congress was reluctant to enforce legislation the Supreme Court continued to insist on desegregation. In the *Alexander v Holmes County* case of 1969 it declared that all public schools should be desegregated immediately. In the *Swan v Charlotte Mecklenburg Board of Education* case, 1971, the segregation of schools based on housing patterns was declared illegal. As a result the bussing of students from one area to another was initiated. This stimulated further resistance from Whites and serious disturbances, and not just in the South: the riots in Boston in 1974 sparked a nationwide campaign called ROAR (Restore our Alienated Rights). In the same year in a case concerning a bussing plan for Detroit the Supreme Court changed course and reduced the lower courts' authority to order bussing. The order remains in place still. So, the record of the Supreme Court on bussing has lacked consistency but the principle of bussing has been upheld. Again, figures might be used to indicate the success of the

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	75

desegregation of education. In 1974 only 8% of Black American school children were educated in segregated schools.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	75

3 How important are urban riots from 1965 to 1968 in explaining the decline of the Civil Rights Movement in the late 1960s and 1970s? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. The case for urban riots as a reason for the eventual decline of the movement is persuasive. The scale of the violence was huge, not least in the Watts, Los Angeles, 1965; they were also widespread, plaguing major cities like Chicago. Their impact was, therefore, undeniable in terms of damage to property concerned. But this also alienated the property holders, black and white. Well-meaning white liberals who had backed the Civil Rights Movement with their expertise and money were alienated. Residents of northern cities, previously on the margins of urban disturbances were shocked by the Civil Rights Movement. There had been urban unrest before 1965 but that was largely between whites and blacks whereas from 1965 to 1968 it was mainly between blacks and police. The riots fostered a desire for law and order which Nixon exploited to gain support in the South in 1968. Yet, the riots also appealed to many young blacks, in part because extensive poverty created deep despair in many quarters. Conversely, the non-violent wing of the Civil Rights Movement did not buckle, if anything they were emboldened. The Turner Commission which reported in 1968 condemned white racism as the cause of the violence and threw down a challenge to the politicians to address the problems of Black Americans.

Other factors also played a part in the eventual decline of the movement. Federal policy in the 1970s was less than supportive of the movement. The integration of schools was discouraged by Nixon and Ford. In the process the progress made since the desegregation of schools was declared in 1954 was checked. However, Federal policy was a response to the uproar and violence that accompanied bussing, notably in Boston in 1974, and the increasing number of whites who placed their children in private schools so leaving state school overwhelmingly Black American. It could be argued that the Federal government could have taken a firmer line against this white backlash. Affirmative Action by the Federal government was controversial and served to undermine the civil rights movement as this was regarded by many as reverse discrimination and patronising to Black Americans. Yet, it could be argued that by extending rights to work and equal opportunities to Black Americans the movement was given an incentive to keep going. If there was a failure of Federal policy was this due to the death of the Kennedys, the distraction of Vietnam, Watergate, and the weakness of Carter? Another major factor explaining the decline of the movement was its leadership. The death of Martin Luther King could be considered a loss in terms of his inspiration and organisational skills. The rise of 'Black Power' leaders might be assessed: did it divide the movement on strategy and did it alienate potential supporters? The division within the movement between supporters of non-violence and violence is worth analysis. The strength of the opposition to the movement from the whites is relevant: all the points above helped shape white attitudes and responses. It might be argued that by 1980 the Civil Rights Movement had made significant advances – the Civil Rights legislation of the 1960s – and, as a result, the early energy had been exhausted. Coupled with a harsher economic climate by the late 1970s priorities were redirected to the problems of jobs and poverty.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required.

Candidates should consider the rioting with an eye to its negative impact but also be prepared to challenge such a position. Candidates should identify some alternative reasons and weigh their relative importance in the decline of the movement. If not as much was done by government as might have been achieved the responsibility of politicians could be assessed taking into account mitigating circumstances and other factors. The link between the riots and the emergence of

Page 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	75

'Black Power' leaders might be considered. A sense of the broader context will inform the stronger answers.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 15	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	75

4 'Defence of their political power best explains White opposition to civil rights for Black Americans in the period 1954 to 1980.' Discuss. [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded.

White resistance was evident throughout the period but the motivation for such opposition has varied. Whites' opposition to civil rights for Black Americans can be explained, in part at least, because of concerns for their political interests. Other reasons include the following: resentment at Federal interference in the internal affairs of individual States, hostility to the desegregation of schools, racism and economic fears about the impact of civil rights for White people.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required.

Whites also regarded the exercise of the vote by Negroes as a threat to their political supremacy. The Voting Act of 1965 which banned literacy tests for voter registration and provided for the appointment of Federal examiners to ensure voter registration were denounced by White supremacists. The previous year they had objected to the 24th Amendment which outlawed the use of poll taxes in Federal elections – something that had been in place since the 1880s. The work of the NAACP and the fate of civil rights activists in many States especially Mississippi, would be helpful to illustrate the opposition of whites to political reform. Some may refer to the case of the three civil rights activists killed in Philadelphia, Mississippi, in 1964, which was the basis of the film 'Mississippi Burning'. Whites wanted to prevent Black Americans from exercising the vote and returning some of their number as representatives in towns and state governments and so affecting change in their interests. The KKK intimidating Black Americans and doing what they could to deny them the free exercise of their rights was an issue throughout this period.

States rights were a sensitive issue. Candidates could place this in its historical context and explain how this had been the case since the foundation of the USA. 19th Century precedents (the Nullification Crisis of 1832 and secession in 1861) help explain late 20th century attitudes on this which were very strong. Indeed, the principle was an integral part of the fabric of Southern society. The role of the Supreme Court, the lower judiciary and Congress in imposing decisions on the States and infringing their rights in the process were hated. Moreover, Southern Whites genuinely believed that they knew best in terms of race relations and that relations between the white and Negro races had developed amicably since the end of the civil war. Interference in the affairs of the South was regarded as a conspiracy by the North that had no moral right to do so.

Interference in the schooling and education in the South was a major reason for Whites' opposition. Specific reference to the Brown v Board of Education of Topeka in 1954 can be expected. This rejected the doctrine of 'separate but equal' which was held in the South, with regard to schooling, and overturned previous judgements such as the Plessy Case of 1896 and the Taft judgement of 1927. Whites' resistance to desegregation was strong. Reference to 'the Little Rock Nine' and the attempts by others to enrol in schools and universities can be expected. Although the Supreme Court declared, in 1969, that segregation must end 'at once', and the judgement of 1971 effectively ordered bussing across America, opposition was so strong that in 1974 it changed course and limited the authority of state courts to order bussing which had been introduced to bring black children to school. Nixon and Ford denounced bussing and the resistance of local populations to the practice was widespread.

Racism and prejudice explain White opposition. Many supremacists simply refused to accept the equality of African Americans. The latter were regarded as inferior in every respect. White violence especially the activities of the KKK can be explained on this count alone not least because the violence was often indiscriminate.

Page 16	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	75

The concerns of poor whites about the consequences of civil rights for Negroes on their job prospects and standards of living were widespread. Reference to the riots of 1967 could be made to illustrate the extent of white resistance and that it was not confined to the South. The riots in Detroit in July were the worst of the decade in which 43 died. Such violence was an indication of the depth of white hostility to civil rights for Negroes made worse by the tendency of some of the black communities to use violence themselves. Whites opposed the policy of affirmative action introduced by Johnson and developed by Nixon with federal-funded projects to provide job opportunities for Blacks. However, the scale of the programme remained small and Carter's administration made little impact, partly because of the constraints of the economic climate. In conclusion candidates are likely to stress the linkage of factors even if they accept or reject the view expressed in the question.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.