

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/75

Paper 5n (Special Subject: 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 May/June 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	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 met.

Question 1 (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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	75

Question 1 (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 a 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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	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 met.

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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	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, while 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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	75

- 1 (a) How far does Document C corroborate Document B on the role of the federal authorities to help improve conditions for African–Americans? [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.

There are several points of agreement. In general terms, both authors call for Affirmative Action to help African–Americans. C considers this to be so important that he advocates ‘a domestic ‘Marshall Plan’ ... to help the Negro help himself’. This is in line with the thrust of B which stresses the need for positive intervention by Congress. Specifically, B asks Congress ‘to make a commitment’ which is corroborated in C which calls for ‘a special effort’ to be made. In demanding that African–Americans ‘can compete on a realistic basis of equality’, C corroborates B which claims ‘that race has no place in American life’, implicitly stating that there should be equality. There is agreement too on the dangers of inaction. Both documents fear disorder if there is no change. B fears that ‘unless Congress acts, their (African–Americans) only remedy is in the street’ which is corroborated in C in the opening sentence which predicts ‘violence could erupt at any moment unless realistic action is taken’. Nonetheless, there are shades of difference. C struck a pessimistic note in complaining that ‘Federal action ... is still too little and may be too late’ whereas the tone of B is optimistic that congressional action should make a difference. Arguably, C places hope in cooperative action by federal and private bodies, whereas B assumes the initiative for change lies with federal authorities (Federal judiciary (Supreme Court), Congress and the Federal Government) which others (‘hotels, restaurants’, etc.) would be obliged to follow.

The extent of the common ground between the documents may be explained by the fact that the concept of Affirmative Action was a relatively new idea, promoted by the Kennedy administration, and the authors are exploring the practical options for its implementation as they saw them. As the initiator of the concept, Kennedy’s confidence in the role of federal authorities is, perhaps, unsurprising whereas Young’s experience of the reality of ‘18.7 million American Negroes already handicapped’ helps explain the reservations evident in his perspective about federal authority. Further, the circumstances of the comments made in the documents are instructive. Kennedy was speaking to the nation, intent on convincing the audience of the imperative of action not least by reminding his audience of the progress made so far by federal authorities, namely in education. Young’s remarks follow a summer of important events – the Birmingham protest and the March on Washington – which might be explained as confirmation of the rising sense of frustration within the African–American population. The context helps explain the sense of urgency which impelled Young to place huge store by the policy of Affirmative Action, reflected in the high expectation he had of it. His call for Federal action might also be a function of his close relationship with JFK. Further, his call for ‘a domestic Marshall Plan’ might be regarded as simply an aspect of his flamboyant personality. Indeed, as someone who represented the urban African–Americans as director of the NUL, it is not surprising that Young pressed hard to go further than Kennedy was prepared to go especially if the political constraints faced by the latter are recognised. Both were also aware of the considerable opposition to Affirmative Action and the imperative of not alienating white Americans. This might explain why Young is insistent that his plea ‘is *not* a plea for special privilege’ and why Kennedy appealed to ‘the ideals upon which the nation was based’.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	75

- (b) How far do these documents suggest that government at all levels failed to provide effective leadership to advance the rights of African–Americans?

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E). [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.

Candidates may define government differently. It is intended to embrace all branches of the central government as well as State government. A and C provide the most compelling evidence in support of the view that government failed to provide effective leadership. B is also helpful in this respect. However, D and E contradict this view though A and B could also be used in the counter argument.

A makes clear that both Martin Luther King and John Kennedy think that Eisenhower failed to provide effective leadership. King argues that ‘there was a need for a strong executive leadership’ which had not been the case ‘during this Eisenhower administration’ which might be interpreted as from 1957 when Eisenhower began his second term or 1953 when he first became president. Certainly Eisenhower was disappointed with the Brown decision of 1954 and only reluctantly intervened at Little Rock in 1957. However, candidates may challenge King’s assessment of Eisenhower in so far as he did resolve the Little Rock crisis and introduced civil rights acts in 1957 and 1960 which gave the Supreme Court more power to enforce the registration of black voters. Kennedy is said to have ‘agreed with all these things’ including the criticism of Eisenhower. In response to King’s concern that there should be ‘an executive order’ to deal with housing and voting issues, Kennedy is said to have promised ‘to give this kind of leadership’. Some candidates may consider this pledge to be nothing more than you would expect from a politician seeking the nomination of the Democratic Party. Indeed, King accused Kennedy of opposing the civil rights bill of 1957. Others may regard such assurances as valid with knowledge of Kennedy’s subsequent actions by cross reference to B.

In C, Young’s plea for action is, essentially, a criticism of government implying they have not provided the support needed to date. He complains that ‘Federal action, however commendable, is still too little and may well be too late’. Indeed, he ‘urges the responsible leadership of our country to undertake a domestic ‘Marshall Plan’ the nature of which he does not elaborate upon, but candidates may be able to develop the reference to the Marshall Plan of 1947. This serves to emphasise how damaging the lack of leadership has been. B lends some support to this view. It suggests that Congress ‘has not fully made (a commitment) in this century to the proposition that race has no place in American life or law’. The history of the century provides candidates with many examples of Congressional resistance, from their reluctance to pass laws against lynching in the early decades to the blocking of civil rights proposals from Truman. Further, the fact that the Brown decision of 1954 had still not been fully implemented, as B confirms in the final sentence, indicates a failure of government and judiciary at State and local level. Candidates may elaborate on how the decision was resisted.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	75

However, a strong counter-argument can be constructed that government did show effective leadership. In B, Kennedy shows leadership by saying he will ‘ask Congress’ to commit itself against racism, ‘to enact legislation’ and ‘to authorise the Federal Government to participate more fully in resolving lawsuits’. Candidates may confirm that he was as good as his word. Nonetheless, Kennedy’s influence over Congress was limited throughout his term of office and, given his assassination a few months later, he had little time in which to progress on the issues he raised in his address. He also shows leadership in asserting the moral and practical reasons for actions in so far as ‘in too many communities ... wrongs are inflicted on Negro citizens’ and ‘unless Congress acts their remedy is in the streets’. To some extent Kennedy was reacting to the pressure of the civil rights movement and their activities such as the Sit-ins, the Freedom Rides and the Birmingham March. More immediately, Wallace (Governor of Alabama) had earlier the same day issued a statement challenging the right of the Federal authorities to interfere in State affairs. Another political consideration may also be recognised by some candidates as relevant, namely JFK’s ambitions to serve another term. Further, the Supreme Court is hailed as having taken positive steps to improve the lot of African–Americans ‘in the employment of Federal personnel, the use of Federal facilities and the sale of federally financed housing’. Candidates may show this to have been so by reference to particular decisions of the Supreme Court.

In a similar vein, D confirms the leadership of Johnson in looking to give ‘all our citizens the ability to walk through those gates’ (of opportunity). Further, the scale of his ambition is great, aiming ‘to give 20 million Negroes the same chance as every other American’. Johnson’s confidence is also a feature of his leadership, in so far as he regards the Voting Rights Bill then on Capitol Hill as secure (‘the Voting Rights Bill will be the latest, and amongst the most important, in a long series of victories’). Johnson had already achieved the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Some may acknowledge the contribution of Kennedy in that the Act was effectively launched by him. A link might be made with A which concedes that JFK did achieve a ‘grasp and comprehension of the depths of the problem’, if not in 1960 ‘as he did later’. Candidates may stress the fact that Johnson enjoyed the support of Congress in part because of his ability to persuade and charm. Further, Johnson’s commitment to tackle the social problems of the time might be shown by reference to his Great Society programme.

Finally, E offers evidence that city government provided effective leadership by engagement with all sections of the urban population and Affirmative Action. It claims success in advancing the rights of African–Americans in terms of ‘employment, business contracts and so forth’. In addition, ‘basic systems that will guarantee fair competition to all people’ were set up. Government engaged ‘the grass roots’ and women experienced significant progress. However, candidates may regard the claims made by the Mayor as an exaggeration for political gain. The title of the piece might be used to test the claims made in E. It indicates that Affirmative Action failed elsewhere but, whilst examples of this could be cited, candidates may be able to provide some evidence that successes were more widespread than E suggests.

In judgement, candidates may conclude that the evidence upholds the view in the question or not. Some may think the evidence for the view is stronger for the earlier years of the period than the years from the mid 1960s. Others may regard the record of central government to be less effective than State or local government.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	75

2 Was mass participation the key development in strengthening the civil rights movement in the years 1954 to 1964? [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.

Several developments could be considered. One was the fact that increasing numbers of people became involved in the civil rights movement. More were prepared to commit themselves to various aspects of the cause. Linked to this was the creation of organisations at the grassroots. In addition, the leadership of the movement improved. Further, there was strengthened by developments external to itself notably the political context.

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.

Mass participation strengthened the civil rights movement in several ways, some of which candidates may consider. Most obviously, perhaps, was the effectiveness of protest, for example, big marches like the March on Washington with 250 000. Such events made an impact and were difficult for opponents, whether police or public, to stop them. It might be argued they served to antagonise opponents. Either way, they attracted media coverage which provided publicity and helped extend awareness. The involvement of students was particularly important in making sit-ins and other actions at small locations but on a wide scale possible. The inclusion of increasing numbers of whites gave the movement greater credibility. Mass participation extended the scope for fund raising and enlisting the expertise of those involved. Widening the scale of participation made the demands of the movement more difficult to ignore politically. In this respect, some candidates may comment on the political context as another development that strengthened the movement. The willingness of Eisenhower and Kennedy to deploy troops or federal marshals in support of African-American rights to education was important. Similarly, the apparent sympathy of JFK for the rights of African-Americans and the actual reforms of Johnson (the Civil Rights Act, 1964, for example) strengthened the movement. The importance of grassroots organisations such as the MIA, SNCC and the MFDP and the extension of the movement into the cities of the North could be assessed. The emergence of significant leaders – King (Nobel Prize 1964 bestowed respect) was only one of several influential figures at a national level – and the initiatives and inspiration of individuals at a local level – Parkes, Meredith – was another key development. There is scope for cross linkage of several of these developments.

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 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	75

- 3 'The Southern Christian Leadership Council (SCLC) was the dominant organisation within the civil rights movement.' Discuss, with reference to the period from 1954 to 1980. [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 SCLC was established in 1957 and was led initially by Martin Luther King. It was very influential but the extent of its influence should be assessed against the importance of other civil rights groups, such as the NAACP, CORE, the Black Panthers, amongst others.

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.

SCLC was an umbrella organisation serving to unite different groups to maximise their effectiveness. In this respect it provided a certain coherence of strategy and a sense of direction. Yet, the creation of the SNCC in 1961 out of the SCLC, only undermined the latter. With Martin Luther King the SCLC provided leadership and inspiration which, considering his reputation and influence, arguably, gave the SCLC a dominant position in the civil rights organisation. King enjoyed close relations with the Kennedys and Johnson, but with King's opposition to the war in Vietnam in 1967 that advantage was lost. With the death of King in 1968, the SCLC had lost its dominance. By then, figures (Stokely Carmichael and Malcolm X) had positions of leadership and enjoyed mass support. The actions of the SCLC, especially in the early 1960s, including the Selma to Montgomery March of 1965, arguably, gave it a dominant profile. To some extent it was the dominant organisation in terms of the agenda of the civil rights movement, in pressing for desegregation and voting rights. Yet, CORE and NAACP were forceful in pressing for desegregation with, for example, the Freedom Rides of 1961. Further, the attempts of the SCLC in 1958-60 to double the number of African-Americans as registered voters met with limited success: rather, it was the SNCC and the MFDP that took the lead in this regard. Also, the SCLC philosophy of integration was increasingly challenged with groups like the Black Panthers advocating separation and 'Black Power'. The policy of non-violence of the SCLC, and the stoicism of its supporters in the face of provocation, ensured the continued commitment of pacifist supporters. However, the violence of the urban riots of 1965 was an indication that it did not have a dominant influence. Arguably, it was the Urban League that was dominant in the cities and towns. CORE, the Urban League and NAACP were established well before the SCLC and the latter declined from the mid-1960s, so if the SCLC was dominant it was for a limited period and, arguably, in the South only.

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 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	75

- 4 'Discrimination was the main form of opposition to the civil rights movement.' How persuasive is this view of white resistance in the period from 1954 to 1980? [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.

Discrimination was widely applied. African–Americans faced discrimination in terms of jobs, housing, education, the use of public facilities and so on. However, they were also denied their voting rights. They were also denied equality of treatment in the law and were subject to arbitrary justice, usually of a violent nature.

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.

Levels of unemployment were higher and rates of pay lower for African–Americans who were often employed only because there were no whites for the job or they refused the pay. However, affirmative action was adopted by Federal and State governments and helped break tackle the problem. By 1972, affirmative action was extended to include about 300 000 firms. Nonetheless, opposition remained with employers taking their case to court and trade unions discriminating against African–Americans. Candidates may refer to individuals like Andrew Young (US Ambassador to the UN) as examples, if not entirely typical, of the progress made in the area of employment. African–Americans continued to be discriminated against in housing despite legislation such as the Omnibus Housing Act of 1965. In education, strides were made to desegregate schooling following the Brown decision of 1954 and the bussing of African–Americans to schools. Progress was also made in giving African–Americans access to university education. However, at both levels resistance was considerable with the Supreme Court forced to intervene in several cases and troops were deployed in others. Denying voting rights to African–Americans may be considered more important than discrimination in so far as it deprived African–Americans of the means of influencing the composition of Congress and hence the chance to affect the law. Despite the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1965, resistance from whites, especially in the South, to African–Americans voting was widespread. The campaigns of civil rights activists on this cause and the hostility they encountered is pertinent. Some candidates may regard the denial of legal rights despite the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as most important. Candidates may refer to the activities of the KKK. In judgement some more agree with the view in the question if only because of the widespread and entrenched nature of discrimination. A case could be made for other ways as being more important. Some may emphasise the links between the different ways in which whites denied African–Americans their civil rights.

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.