



Cambridge Pre-U

HISTORY**9769/72**

Paper 5k The Civil Rights Movement in the USA, 1954–1980

October/November 2020

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Special Subject: Source-based Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

- (a) This question is designed 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.
- (b) Examiners will 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.
- (c) 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 will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (d) In marking an answer examiners will 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 3: 8–10 marks**

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 marks

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the focus 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 1: 1–3 marks

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.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Question (b)**Band 4: 16–20 marks**

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.

Band 3: 11–15 marks

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 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.

Band 2: 6–10 marks

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 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.

Band 1: 1–5 marks

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 be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Special Subject: Essay Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

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

Examiners will 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 will be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit will be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind 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 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 4 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 will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will 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 5: 25–30 marks

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.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to 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.

Band 4: 19–24 marks

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.

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 marks

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

Band 2: 7–12 marks

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 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.

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

Band 1: 1–6 marks

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; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. 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 are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Section A

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>How far does the evidence of Document C challenge the views of Document B on relations between African Americans and whites in the USA?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Differences:</p> <p>In general terms, the tone of Document C is suspicious of whites whilst Document B might be considered fawning in its tone. Document C is of the view that ‘whites can only subvert our true search’ whereas Document B is more generous in its tone about whites. More specifically, Document C suggests activists should be confident in their ability to take the initiative and determine their own destiny in contrast to Document B which implies African Americans must proceed cautiously and only at a pace and in ways that carries the whites with them. In Document B, King states that they (African Americans) ‘must pay our profound respects to the white Americans’ and their traditions. However, Document C suggests that African Americans should concentrate on establishing their own identity to the point that ‘black people must define white people’s roles’. King also argues that the ‘aim must never be to defeat or humiliate the white man but to win his friendship and understanding’. By contrast, Document C argues this is not desirable or possible as whites do not understand black people (first sentence) and, crucially, black people ‘must cut ourselves off from white people’.</p> <p>Similarities:</p> <p>Document C corroborates Document B in accepting that whites and African Americans could work together and that the former could help the latter. In Document B, tribute is paid to those whites who ‘come forth boldly to hold hands with us’ which is supported in Document C when it says, ‘this does not mean that whites cannot help’ accepting that they can do so on a ‘voluntary basis’ which is in line with the support King acknowledged. The documents might also be considered similar in their denial of racism. Document C implicitly denies that African Americans are racists in a veiled denial of ‘the charge may be that we are ‘racists’ with the comment that ‘whites who are sensitive to our problems’ implying such people won’t see it that way. Document B is very explicit on the matter. King rejects the idea that there is any difference between whites and African Americans in his emphasis on winning the friendship of the whites and the last two sentences of Document B that confirm his belief in the equality of the races. This point is supported in the opening lines that refer to people of every race and faith coming to ‘the side of its embattled Negroes’.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>Provenance:</p> <p>In evaluating Document B candidates are likely to explain how the comments about whites are consistent with the views expressed by King on many occasions. Candidates may refer to examples such as his speech at the Washington March two years earlier. Similarly, his belief in non-violence, made explicit in this speech was not just a strategy but a logical position given his views on relations with whites. Candidates might also argue that King's comments are a reflection of his relief that the Selma March had ended and he was anticipating the way forward. However, candidates might explain that King's views about relations between whites and African Americans were not shared by all involved in the Selma march. Indeed, there were black divisions with SNCC publicly criticising SCLC for misguiding the movement and leaving the area involved worse off. More, SNCC argued that Selma illustrated the folly of assuming blacks and whites could co-operate as the marchers were exposed to vitriol and abuse along the way and that the outcome on the march was more African Americans in jail rather than any concrete change in their condition.</p> <p>As a member of SNCC, it is not surprising, given their criticism of the Selma march, mentioned above, that the author of Document C, was less sanguine about relations between Blacks and whites. In addition, he was writing a year later when frustrations with the pace of change were rising and trust in white promises was weaker. Indeed, in the intervening period there had been riots in the Watts ghetto in Los Angeles (August 1965) and increasing violence in northern cities such as Chicago. Black attitudes were, arguably, becoming more radical, and in that respect, Carmichael's views reflected those of an increasing number. Shortly after this date, Carmichael was to give support to the Black Panthers. On the other hand, candidates might argue that Document C is a policy statement from the leadership which may not have been a true reflection of the SNCC membership as a whole.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that activists for civil rights for African Americans accepted the need for violence in the 1960s? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Evidence for the view that civil rights activists accepted the need for violence is provided in Documents A and E but some candidates might regard some elements of Documents C and D as supportive of this view. In presenting a counter argument, candidates are likely to focus on Document B reinforced by Documents C and D.</p> <p>Document A openly espouses violence. Malcolm X does not explicitly say African Americans should seize power, but he makes it clear that the existing system should be overthrown, and the thrust of the whole piece implies that Blacks should challenge white power. Indeed, he argues that the white man ‘is the wolf’ and ‘a pastor who teaches you not to fight the white man (is) a traitor’. He advocates violence to the point of killing whites: if ‘someone puts his hand on you, send him to the cemetery’ and if threatened with death to make sure you reciprocate (last lines). The author advocates revolution on the grounds that this is the way change was taking place in Latin America. He also claims that violence does not contradict the laws of Islam. In evaluating the Document candidates might explain that as a member of the Nation of Islam, the author had to reconcile his call to arms with the teaching of the Koran not least to reassure his Moslem followers. Further, candidates might explain that Malcolm X is implicitly criticising Martin Luther King as one of the pastors he scorns in an attempt, perhaps, to counter the huge publicity given to MLK’s speech in Washington on 28 August 1963 and his message of non-violence and co-existence with whites. Given the prominence of MLK at the time and the many examples of non-violent protest to date, it might be argued that Malcolm X represented a minority opinion within the civil rights movement.</p> <p>In Document E, Fred Hampton also calls for revolution, going one step further than Malcolm X, when he implies that Blacks should enlist support from abroad in saying, ‘fight reactionary pigs with international workers revolution’. He is clear that a violent struggle is needed (‘We need some guns’) in order to ‘deal with things right’, the objective being the replacement of the existing system by violent means. His claim that ‘the people have to have the power’ clearly implies he anticipates seizing power. In doing so a new system would replace racism with solidarity and capitalism with socialism. In commenting on the Document, candidates might point out that Hampton was speaking for the Black Panthers in Chicago and did not,</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>necessarily, represent all Black Panthers. Indeed, Hampton, himself, conceded that the Chicago branch ‘may be in the minority’. Further, candidates might cross reference Document D which explains that other Black Panthers thought differently elsewhere.</p> <p>In analysing Document D, candidates might argue that it supports the view that activists were intent on seizing power with violence as it explains that the Black Panthers were armed. Similarly, some might suggest that Document C lends support to this view in its rhetoric about ‘we must cut ourselves off from white people’ and ‘we must determine our own destiny’. However, most candidates are likely to interpret Documents C and D as statements on the aspirations of activists and the initiatives they proposed to achieve them, which may have been radical, but which did not necessarily involve the use of violence.</p> <p>After all, Document C emphasizes the need for Black people to assert themselves and take the lead in the struggle not least because ‘liberal whites have not begun to address themselves to the real problem of black people’. Rather than rely on whites as allies, black people needed to form their ‘own institutions, credit unions’ etc. Whilst accepting white assistance, it was for Black people to determine policymaking. At no point does Document C suggest the use of violence or the overthrow of the existing system. Further, the author was the chairman of the SNCC, an organisation, as its name indicates, opposed to violence, though some candidates may argue this was notional as several leaders of SNCC advocated violence including James Forman and H. Rap Brown. Indeed, the author of Document C did support the Black Panthers, later, but as Document D makes clear, when the party was formed in October 1966 it kept ‘their activities within legal bounds’. The Black Panthers were more concerned to monitor the work of the police rather than challenge them and they made sure they did not give the authorities cause to arrest them. Indeed, the possession of the arms they carried was consistent with the law so they could always claim they were ordinary citizens merely exercising their right to bear arms. The objective, stated in Document D, was to show that ‘we were no longer their subjects but their equals’. Candidates might discuss some of the actions associated with the Black Panthers, for example, their storming of the Capitol in Sacramento in 1966, which might be interpreted as revolutionary or merely the expression of the right to bear arms. Written by the founder of the Black Panthers, candidates might argue that Document D has some veracity for that reason and also because it is in line with the official Manifesto of the party when it was formed in 1966. In discussing Documents C and D some candidates might refer to the violence and disorder in Los Angeles in 1965 and the riots of 1967. As the Kerner report into the latter made clear, these disturbances were motivated more by economic deprivation rather than any conspiracy of violence.</p> <p>Candidates will regard Document B as providing the evidence that most clearly refutes the view in the question. It reaffirms a belief in ‘the faith of non-violence’ and, crucially, that ‘our aim must never be to defeat or humiliate the white man’. Throughout, it shows respect for white individuals who supported the Selma March and ‘democratic traditions’ and a vision of society ‘at peace with itself’ in which colour will not distinguish one citizen from another. Candidates might query the extent to which it might be considered representative of the movement. As a reverend in the Church his views may</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>be explained by his religious beliefs but candidates might point out the strength of religion amongst Black people in the South who would have shared these views. Indeed, MLK still enjoyed the respect of a large proportion of those involved in the civil rights movement at that time. Some may argue that his views accorded with the thinking of the mainstream of the civil rights movement at that time as the radicalism of Malcolm X, expressed in Document A, was shared by a minority only.</p> <p>In judgement, candidates may conclude that the evidence suggests that some activists accepted the need for violence and, given the dates of Documents A and E, this was the case throughout the 1960s. However, some may conclude that they were a minority despite their striking rhetoric. Organisations such as SCLC led by King (Document B) and the SNCC (Document C) had huge membership compared to the organisations led by Malcolm X and Fred Hampton. Indeed, the latter represented a minority within the Black Panthers and, after the assassination of Malcolm X, the Nation of Islam remained a party on the fringe of the movement.</p>	

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Assess the view that the Freedom Rides of 1961 were the major turning point in the Civil Rights movement in the period 1954 to 1980.</p> <p>AO/2 – The question concerns the significance of the Freedom Rides and whether they marked a change in the civil rights movement in the period. Some answers might argue they were the major turning point, but others might disagree. In support of the Freedom Rides being the major turning point, answers might argue that they represented a change in strategy in so far as they were intended to create a crisis and force the government to intervene. Some may argue the Rides succeeded in this respect. Answers might argue that they showed a greater degree of planning and organisation which became a feature of subsequent actions, rather than ad hoc initiatives. Responses might claim that the violent response of the whites was so extreme that it exposed the barbarity of opponents to an extent not seen before. Some might argue that the Freedom Rides sparked a more aggressive approach from civil rights activists and helps explain the emergence of radical groups and more violent direct action thereafter. In challenging the view that the Rides were the major turning point, answers might explain that Kennedy's response to the Rides was limited in terms of action to address the issues. Further, it might be argued that the Freedom Rides were simply one more example of non-violent protest as was the case before 1961, albeit against the most severe provocation, which continued to be the norm thereafter. It might be argued that, despite the planning, the Freedom Rides were the work of one organisation, CORE, and that the various organisations in the movement still lacked co-ordination. Some might compare the Freedom Rides with other important moments in the history of the civil rights movement in the period.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>'The desegregation of education was entirely due to the judgements of the Supreme Court.' Discuss this view for the years from 1954 to 1980.</p> <p>AO1/2 The question concerns the reasons for the desegregation of education in the period. The role of the Supreme Court in this respect should be analysed and other factors considered. A judgement is needed that weighs the importance of various reasons. Responses are likely to focus on the 'Brown versus Topeka Board of Education' judgement of 1954 which declared that 'separate but equal' was not the reality. This judgement overthrew the 'Plessy versus Ferguson' case of 1896 and after so many years of segregation candidates might stress the historical significance of it. By the Brown II judgement the following year, the Supreme Court demanded the integration of public schools 'with all deliberate speed'. Answers might refer to the 'Alexander versus Holmes County' decision of 1969 when the court decided all public schools should be desegregated immediately. In 1971 in 'Swann versus Charlotte Mecklenburg' the court ordered bussing of pupils from one area to another to overcome the segregation caused as a result of segregated housing. In presenting an alternative argument, candidates might argue that the decisions of the Supreme Court were often ignored, as after the 1954 decision. Also, the Court moderated its position on bussing in 1974 because of white opposition. Answers may explain that the Supreme Court only judged cases brought before it so without organisations such as NAACP there would not have been the Brown judgement. Similarly, some might argue that the actions of individuals such as the Little Rock Nine and James Meredith challenged the authorities and the federal government was forced to intervene. Responses might also argue that the pressure of African American parents, street protests and involvement in local politics by integrationists made a difference.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>What best explains white resistance to the Civil Rights movement in the period from 1954 to 1980?</p> <p>AO1/2 – The question concerns the reasons for the opposition of whites to the civil rights movement. Candidates should aim to evaluate each factor and compare their importance to arrive at a final judgement as to which factor explains the opposition best. Some may argue that racism and prejudice, was a key factor, not least because of its long history and the fact that it was ingrained in white communities and whole regions. Answers might argue that demands for political rights for African Americans especially the right to vote was resisted as a threat to white supremacy. Responses might suggest that whites resented Federal interference in the internal affairs of individual States, notably those where the civil rights movement was most active. Responses might argue that whites opposed the desegregation of schools, housing and public facilities as an infringement of their rights to choose the schools for their children and the neighbours they lived with. Some may argue that whites saw the civil rights movement as a threat to their jobs and economic prospects. Despite the violence inflicted by whites on African Americans, many whites opposed the civil rights movement as it was associated with violence (Malcolm X, urban riots, Black power radicals).</p>	30