



Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

HISTORY

9769/72

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

May/June 2016

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2016 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.

This syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document consists of **14** printed pages.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	72

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.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	72

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.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	72

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.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	72

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.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	72

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.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	72

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.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	72

Section A

- 1 (a) How far does the evidence of Document D corroborate the recollections in Document C on the sit-in movement of 1960? [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.

Similarities

The motive of the students involved was largely borne of frustration. In Document D, this is described as 'a desire to do something' which is similar to the view in Document C that 'somehow many of us wanted to make a contribution'. Both agree that the actions taken were 'spontaneous' (the word is used in both documents). Specifically, Document C gives the impression that the initial sit-in was, to some extent, an initiative taken on the spur of the moment (certainly, in terms of when to do so) and Document D confirms that sit-ins themselves were spontaneous. In addition, they agree that the escalation of the protest was unforeseen and not planned. Document D is emphatic that action 'was in no way coordinated' and in Document C it is implied that the rapid spread of support for the sit-in was a surprise.

Both documents agree that the publicity given to the sit-ins was a key factor in promoting interest in the action. Document C comments on how 'others found out what we had done because the press reported it' and Document D corroborates the importance of news in galvanising support in the North when it says 'we began hearing about the Southern sit-in demonstrations' which clearly motivated students there to get involved. Document D corroborates Document C on the fearlessness or naivety of the students involved. Document D claims 'Few of us thought we would go to jail' and the nonchalance of those involved in the first sit-in in Greensboro is evident in the description of how they merely 'walked in that day and sat at a lunch counter where Blacks had never sat before'.

Differences

Document D explains that in the North students picketed Woolworth stores outside, whereas in the South they actually challenged the segregation system of seating within the stores. Similarly, their objectives were different. In the North, as Document D makes clear, their actions were intended as 'support' for those in the South and to 'arouse Northern interest', whereas in the South, the aim was to force change by sitting 'until they decided to serve us'.

Provenance

That the sit-in in Greensboro was spontaneous is not contentious in that only four friends were initially involved. The nonchalant tone of Document C might be questioned. The interviewee is recalling events that occurred 30 years previously, and the circumstances in which they undertook their actions would have required considerable courage given the racism of the South and the hostility which attended their action. It might also be argued that the sit-ins in the South and the sympathetic picketing in the North were consistent with the confidence and idealism of youth and the inclination of students to support one another irrespective of colour.

Nonetheless, examples of segregation in education might be cited to challenge this. Cross reference to Document B would be helpful and the refusal to allow Black students into universities might be mentioned. Further, the claim in Document D that support must 'have been duplicated throughout the North' might be challenged as an exaggeration. Indeed, white students at the conference at Shaw University experienced opposition to their

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	72

participation in the planning committee referred to in Document D, and which led to the creation of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC).

Candidates may explain the differences between the documents as simply due to circumstances. Segregation at eating places was not an issue in Chicago and other cities in the North, and certainly not for white students, such as the author of Document D, so a sit-in as such was simply not possible. Picketing was the best option in those circumstances to apply pressure on Woolworth's.

Candidates may conclude that Document D does corroborate Document C in many respects and that the differences between them are unsurprising given the contrast between the North and South and the authorship of the documents. Some may stress the time difference between the two documents as significant in the accuracy of the testimony provided by the authors.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that direct action was dependent on the leadership of civil rights organisations? 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.

Evidence for the view that direct action was dependent on the leadership of civil rights organisations is provided in all documents except Document C. However, there is a counter argument for which all five documents provide evidence. Perhaps Documents B and E are the documents that best illustrate the importance of the leadership of civil rights organisations.

The NAACP was clearly instrumental in the preparations for the admission of nine Black pupils to Central High School in Little Rock. In Document B, the leader of the NAACP in Arkansas and her colleagues 'talked to the police' and coordinated with parents who 'were called to tell them to meet' at an agreed location. Given the tension and danger surrounding this event, it could be argued that the leadership provided by the NAACP was crucial. Arguably, this was highlighted by the exposure of Elizabeth Eckford to the 'jeering mob' as a result of her parents not being contacted about arrangements the NAACP had made. Candidates may elaborate on the actions of the mob and the National Guard. They may also consider the testimony of Daisy Bates as reliable, given her admission of error or incompetence in handling the matter, especially given the dangers Elizabeth Eckford experienced.

Document E refers to a Freedom Ride which had been organised by CORE so it would be reasonable to argue that the event was dependent on their initiative. The document confirms that CORE 'was looking for volunteers'. Similarly, the implication is that the SCLC were actively involved as they 'had been sent to meet us and drove us away with them' from Montgomery bus station. It appears they returned the riders to the station so the bus was able to continue later. The author provides these details as matters of fact and implies that without the leadership of civil rights organisations, there would not have been a Freedom Ride and as such confirms that direct action was dependent on this.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	72

Documents A and D also support the view that direct action was dependent on the leadership of civil rights organisations if only in sustaining and advancing the action concerned. In Document A, it is claimed that the bus protest initiated by Rosa Parks needed 'a clearer order and direction' and despite early success there was uncertainty about 'where do we go from here'. As such, 'a new organisation was required' (the MIA) which provided direction by electing a leader (King) and agreeing a strategy 'that the protest should continue until certain demands were met'. It might be argued that it is unsurprising that such claims should be made by King if only to justify his intervention and that of others. However, knowledge of how they galvanised the initial protest of Rosa Parks and coordinated the long months of bus boycott might be used to confirm the dependence of the action on the leadership they provided. Similarly, in Document D a reference is made to the establishment of 'a planning committee' to consolidate and advance the sit-in campaign. Candidates may argue that the reference is brief and provides little substantial evidence of the importance of the leadership of civil rights organisations. However, they may be aware that the SNCC emerged as a result which helped sustain the sit-in movement and which organised other direct actions at later dates.

In assessing the importance of the leadership of civil rights organisations in direct action, candidates may focus on the evidence in Documents C and D. They emphasise the role of small groups of people who initiated direct action without the guidance or support of any organisation. Document C makes clear the impact that four like-minded students had in starting the sit-in movement. It highlights the spontaneity of the protest and the uncertainty of their approach, explaining that 'we played over in our minds possible scenarios and how we would conduct ourselves'. Similar points might be made of Document D which stresses the strength of desire amongst the student body to make a difference if only by showing solidarity with students involved in the sit-ins in the South, simply 'to be part of the movement'.

Candidates may identify the way both acknowledge the influence of the example of others which stimulated direct action. From Greensboro and Chicago, direct action spread to other cities as students elsewhere were inspired by the actions of fellow students. Document C begins with a tribute to the inspiration of 'the people of Little Rock'. Reference to both Documents B and A highlights the importance of specific individuals. It could be argued that Elizabeth Eckford's walk to school owed nothing to the leadership of others (as she later claimed herself) but to her own initiative: 'before I could reach her she had walked'. Similarly, in Document A it is clear that Rosa Parks decided to challenge the segregation on the buses as a personal gesture of defiance without any input from civil rights organisations (even though she was a member of the NAACP). The document admits that up to the time of her trial, 'things had moved forward more or less spontaneously'.

In addition, the power of the press is evident in three of the documents. In Document C, it seems to acknowledge that the coverage given to the sit-in in Greensboro helped encourage interest and support. As it says, 'others found out what we had done because the press reported it'. The same point is made in Document D, if obliquely, for 'in February we began hearing about the Southern sit-in demonstrations'. This could have been by word of mouth but equally, and more likely, by press, TV and radio coverage.

Document E makes a similar point. The author admits to seeing 'a newspaper showing a student leaving a bus on the outskirts of Anniston ... being struck on the head'. It was this that stimulated him to take part in the Freedom Ride, for he says, 'I was infuriated. The next day I boarded a Greyhound bus with tickets for Montgomery'. Candidates may be familiar with the images of that bus alight and the brutality with which Freedom Riders were attacked at various stations on the route.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	72

Lastly, it might be argued that direct action depended on other, official, agencies. Using Document B, some may argue that the school authorities and the Superintendent of Schools played a crucial role in supporting direct action. It might be said that the attitude of the police determined whether direct action was possible. As Document E makes clear, the Freedom Ride progressed only as far as the police were prepared to let it go and at Jackson they 'were arrested for refusing to obey a policeman's order to move on'.

In judgement, candidates are likely to acknowledge that the role of the leadership of civil rights organisations in direct action was important whilst recognising that in many instances direct action was initiated without the involvement of such leadership at all. It might be argued that direct action was dependent on the leadership of civil rights organisations if only in sustaining the initiative already taken by individuals or small groups of people, in some cases bolstered by the actions of the media and other bodies.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	72

Section B

2 Assess the significance of Malcolm X as a leader within the Black Power movement. [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. A definition of Black Power might be expected with comments on the aims and methods of those associated with the movement. Answers are likely to focus on Malcolm X but the significance of other leaders might be attempted: Elijah Muhammad, Bobby Seale and Huey Newton, Stokely Carmichael and H Rap Brown, for example.

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 of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses.

Malcolm X's career as an activist stretched from 1952, when released from prison for criminal activity, to 21 February 1965, when he was assassinated. In that time, he was an important speaker who influenced thousands with his ideas which included the use of violence. As a member of the Nation of Islam, it might be argued that his views may have had limited appeal, and he was less important than its leader. However, in 1964 he founded the Organisation of Afro-American Unity which advocated the unity of different groups. His ideas might be seen as significant in encouraging the disturbances of the mid-1960s as he advocated 'fighting your enemies' to achieve a social revolution. He had little influence outside the cities of the north. Similarly, his influence in hardening white attitudes might be assessed. Arguably, his book, 'The Autobiography of Malcolm X' (published after his death), was particularly important in the influence it had on young African-Americans. Candidates might claim he was more significant in death than in life.

Elijah Mohammad founded the Nation of Islam (1931) and might be regarded as the forerunner of the Black Power movement of the 1960s, rejecting Christianity as a white man's religion and advocating the separation of the races. A case can be made for Stokely Carmichael as the most significant leader within the Black Power movement, not least because he coined the phrase but also because he was the chairman of SNCC, arguably the most important civil rights organisation of the 1960s. Candidates may expand on its activities. It might be argued that the extremism of H Rap Brown, as Carmichael's successor of SNCC, reduced the significance of the organisation in alienating moderate opinion, both black and white.

Bobby Seale and Huey Newton may be considered. The Black Panthers which they started in 1966 attracted a lot of media activity, but did they achieve anything more than publicity? The Black Power salute associated with them was significant as a leitmotif for the defence of African-Americans, but it might be regarded as a temporary phenomenon, remembered more for the use of the salute at the 1968 Olympics than anything else. Membership and support were limited. Their militaristic clothing and talk of armed revolt were significant but arguably more in a negative way than a positive one.

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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	72

3 Who was the more significant in the advancement of civil rights for African-Americans in the 1960s: Kennedy or Johnson? [30]

Candidates should:

A01 – 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. Key legislation was introduced: the Civil Rights Act (1964), the 24th Amendment (1964) and the Civil Rights Act (1965). Further, both Presidents intervened to diffuse dangerous situations: the Selma March was protected (1965). Both were prepared to back Martin Luther King and to challenge politicians opposed to change.

A02 – 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 of differing historical interpretations may enhance responses.

Arguably, Johnson achieved more than Kennedy in terms of legislation introduced. The Acts of 1964 and 1965 were of major significance and greater than anything Kennedy had managed. However, these measures could be said to have owed something to Kennedy. Johnson had chaired the PCEE and the sympathy that flowed from Kennedy's assassination helped ease the passage of the legislation. The composition of the Act of 1964 was essentially the same as JFK's bill of the previous year. Arguably, Johnson deserves more credit than Kennedy in that he exerted greater influence over Congress than Kennedy, without which change would not have been possible.

Johnson was accomplished in his management of Congressmen. That being said, he was fortunate to have more liberal Democrats in the Congress than had been the case under JFK. Johnson also tackled the poverty faced by poor and disadvantaged blacks. However, his tenure of office faded into disappointment as by the mid-1960s racial tensions began to intensify and erupt into urban violence. As a result, his period in office ended with pessimism about the future unlike JFK's which ended with optimism. In addition, LBJ was distracted by Vietnam in a way that was not so for Kennedy.

Both Presidents were prepared to work with the moderate civil rights leaders of the time notably Martin Luther King, but also CORE and SNCC. Both recognised the imperative of action to address the circumstances of the day not least because of the media interest and exposure of civil rights abuse. To some extent, both Presidents were forced to be pro-active on civil rights because of the circumstances of the time, and the work they did owed much to the fact that they were partners in government until 1963. Some may argue that despite this, one deserves more credit than the other. How the evidence is used is the crucial thing.

A03 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

A04 – 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 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	72

- 4 'The police were the section of white society in the South most resistant to the civil rights movement in the period 1954–1980.' 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. Candidates should assess the actions of the police in southern states against the civil rights movement – its leaders, supporters and activities. Also, candidates should consider other groups who resisted the movement. These might include the KKK, politicians, White Citizens Councils, education establishments, landlords and employers.

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. The police were prepared to interpret the law flexibly to restrict civil rights activists and to protect whites who broke the law in opposing the movement. For example, activists were subject to arbitrary arrest but the murders of civil rights activists by whites were not investigated, famously in the case of the murders in Philadelphia, Mississippi in 1964. They used force, often excessively, against demonstrators, notably under the leadership of Bull Connor in Birmingham. They co-operated with the KKK allowing them to disrupt civil rights demonstrations violently, for example, the Freedom Rides. They refused to safeguard the rights of African-Americans granted in this period: instead, they upheld segregation and discrimination whenever they could.

Candidates may argue that the police were merely following the orders of state politicians, that some of their actions were in response to the violence and disorder of civil rights protestors and that celebrated examples of police brutality distort the picture overall. The KKK was dedicated to upholding the status quo and might be considered the most resistant to the civil rights movement. In states like Alabama and Mississippi, the Klan forged alliances with Governors, police and the judiciary. The extent of Klan violence was considerable. For example, Birmingham was the target of so much bombing that it became known as 'Bombingham'. Prominent figures in the civil rights movement were assassinated by Klan members, including several within the NAACP, even if the evidence was not confirmed until much later.

There is little doubt that the KKK was instrumental, directly or indirectly, in denying African-Americans their rights in law. In the 1970s, they were successful in blocking or delaying the implementation of the law on bussing – in 1971 they destroyed ten school buses in Pontiac, Michigan – Affirmative Action and immigration. Yet, by 1980 there were only 5,000 members, a fall from 30 000 50 years before. The White Citizens' Councils preached white supremacy and organised resistance within local government to progress on civil rights. Many State officials (politicians and administrators) opposed changes to the civil rights of African-Americans, notably Wallace of Alabama, but the declaration of 1956 confirmed that 90% of Southern Congressmen opposed change. Throughout the period, schools and universities often had to be forced by the intervention of the federal government and the National Guard to implement the desegregation of education. Landlords and employers continued to exploit African-Americans, confirmed by the introduction of Affirmative Action later in the period.

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.