

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 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 2014 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	75

1 (a) How far are the reasons for people supporting the movement for civil rights for Black Americans, outlined in Document B, corroborated by Document D? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both 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 corroboration. Both documents indicate the impact of leading figures in various civil rights organisations: in **B**, Abernathy, Seay and King clearly impressed the author and in **D**, Moses, Bevel and Foreman seem to have inspired the author. The security of acting with others is emphasised in both. In Document **B**, the author had the backing of three to four friends and in **D**, the author was one of 18 prepared to act. The courage to challenge authority appears to have been a factor in supporting the civil rights movement. In both cases the activists were prepared to be arrested and jailed. Arguably, allowing for the retaliation of whites to blacks who tried to register, outlined in **D**, the courage of those referred to was considerable given the personal risk. It might also be argued that with their policy of non-violence – of the MIA, explicitly referred to in **B**, of CORE and the SNCC, implicit in **B**, and the SNCC and the MFDP mentioned in **D** – and with the emphasis on voter registration, it was the pacific tactics of these organisations that appealed. For both, the witness to violence was a factor. In **B**, the attacks on the Freedom Buses and especially the riot in Montgomery which he saw – ‘cars are being burned and churches torn up’ – convinced him of the need to ‘get involved’. In **D**, the shooting of others and the burning of their houses seems to be partly the reason why she ‘worked on voter registration ever since’.

There are differences too. The author of **B**, saw the civil rights movement as ‘an adventure thing’ and clearly empathised with fellow students who ‘never went to a sit-in without their books’ which he found ‘really inspiring’. For the author of **D**, one senses a resignation that she had nothing to lose and joining the movement was more a question of personal necessity. Indeed, those referred to in **D** first got involved as an academic exercise, as a ‘sociology assignment’, whereas for those covered in **B** the motive was more practical with the intention to gain political power.

Candidates might argue that the sympathy of both to the civil rights cause was partly because both authors were poor and conscious of the imperative of struggle to achieve change. However, the racial difference between the two also explains the difference in attitude between them. Being white the author of **B** was not disadvantaged in terms of civil rights as was the author of **D**, which could explain the intensity of the latter compared to the former in terms of their commitment to the cause. The author of **B** is more idealistic about the civil rights movement, the actions of which were in the interest of others, in contrast to the author of **D** for whom the movement was a vehicle for change and, as such, of direct potential benefit to her. However, candidates may know that the author of **B** became a prominent figure in the civil rights movement and the author of **D** remained a leading activist with the MFDP.

Something might be made of the time at which these documents were written. In both cases the resistance of whites to the civil rights movement was intense and violence by whites against activists was widespread. As such, both documents are reliable about this. Candidates could expand on the nature of sit-ins, lunch counter protests and the Freedom Rides of 1960–61, mentioned in **B**, and the famous case of the three activists killed in Mississippi in 1964 who were involved in the campaign to register black voters. Links to the Klan would be appropriate. Dating the documents might also explain the idealism of **B** as it was only in 1960 that the SNCC had been started and the SCLC had been in existence only three years. By 1964, civil rights activists had worked hard and suffered a lot and there was a

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	75

greater sense of urgency to take advantage of the Civil Rights Act, enacted as law on 2 July 1964. In judgement, candidates are likely to conclude that despite the differences between the authors' personal circumstances and attitudes, the documents corroborate each other more than they disagree.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that without the direction of pressure groups, little would have been done to promote the civil rights of Black Americans? [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.

Some documents support this view and others reject it, although some documents are ambiguous so candidates may interpret the documents differently. Document **A** appears to support the view that pressure groups provided the direction needed. The leadership of the Reverend Shuttlesworth was a key factor in encouraging Mrs Walker and others to join the ACMHR. He seems to have convinced her that 'we had the man here to help us' and that the ACMHR actively worked to open the police and civil service to African-Americans. In addition, the organisation backed the campaign to desegregate the buses and was prepared to 'test the judgement'. Further, his personal courage when his house was bombed clearly impressed her and was the event that finally decided her and others to join the organisation.

It is clear from the opening remarks that many African-Americans were afraid to get involved in the movement, and that without the direction and lead of organisations like the ACMHR many people would have remained inactive. Candidates might provide supporting knowledge about the bus boycott and so link the ACMHR with the MIA which initiated the boycott. Similarly, the personal risks to the rank and file for engaging in the movement could be corroborated not least by cross reference to Document **D** or **C**, and the assassination of Dr. King in 1963 might be mentioned to reinforce the real dangers that men like Shuttlesworth faced. It might be argued that this document was part of the anniversary celebrations of the organisation in question, and that it is unsurprising that it praises its efforts and the courage of its leader. It does not, for example, indicate that the campaign for jobs achieved little. However, in 1956 the movement was in its infancy and there is no doubt that the majority of the African-American population was passive and that without organisations like the ACMHR few, if any, people would have acted.

Both Document **B** and Document **D** support the view that pressure groups were important if not essential in organising action. Several organisations are mentioned – the MIA, the SNCC and CORE – and most are credited with playing a key role in promoting the movement for civil rights. Specifically (in **B**), Dr. King and Reverend Abernathy were clearly engaged with local students in Montgomery and reference to the work of the MIA could be made, particularly in running the bus boycott. Also, CORE and SNCC are recognised as the organisations that promoted the Freedom Buses: knowledge of the events referred to in the document might be used. Similarly (in **D**), the SNCC were clearly important in raising the awareness of African-Americans – they 'opened our eyes' – and encouraging people to participate in voter registration. The MFDP was an organisation specifically created to promote this, in part by engaging with the Democratic Party. In both cases, the authors make

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	75

it clear that their views were shared by others. Indeed, the fact that the MFDP was created from the initiative of the SNCC indicates how the latter was important in providing the direction for action. However, it might be argued that both accounts are reflections by the authors on previous events in which they were involved (or, in the case of **B**, were to become involved in) and that their testimony might be tinged by a desire to highlight their own contribution to the cause. However, close reading of the tone and substance of these documents suggests otherwise. In **B** the author simply expresses his respect for the actions of others and in **D** the author is very matter of fact about her role.

A counter argument can be constructed. Indeed, both **B** and **D** might be deployed in this way. In **B** it is clear that ‘on their own initiative students organised sit-ins’. Candidates should know that it was as a result of this that the SNCC was formed, not the other way round. Similarly, actions by students to challenge segregation at lunch counters were not organised, in the first instance at least, by any pressure group. Further, the likes of Rosa Parks (bus boycott) and James Meredith (enlisting at a university) were examples of individuals taking action without the support or direction of any pressure group. Similarly, in **D** it was as much the hostility of the plantation owner and white violence that galvanised the author into action rather than the SNCC. However, the fact that she helped found the MFDP illustrates the ‘chicken and egg’ nature of this issue.

Indeed, Document **C** is an example of this. Many candidates will refer to the Summer Project as support for the view that pressure groups provided the direction for action. The SNCC clearly organised the recruitment and training of volunteers to carry out the Project. Without the volunteers, action would not have been possible. However, it is apparent that action was less to do with the pressure groups than the volunteers themselves. Firstly, SNCC actually instructed the volunteers ‘not to engage in testing the law or desegregating public facilities’. Secondly, these same ‘teenagers’ ‘took the initiative to encourage black voters to register’ ‘without COFO help or supervision’. The lack of direction of COFO is emphasised in the final clause: ‘events were no longer in their control’. In evaluating the document, it might be argued that the critical tone of the evidence is explained by the reluctance of SNCC to embrace the white volunteers of whom they were ‘suspicious’ or the ‘frustration’ of youth at wanting to get on with things. Nonetheless, knowledge of events in Mississippi in the summer of 1964 could be deployed to confirm the testimony in **C**, as those familiar with ‘Mississippi Burning’ will be aware.

The negative effect of pressure groups is made more explicit by the evidence in Document **E**. The whole piece suggests that those campaigning in Cleveland, at least, did not want the ‘Big Six’, even Dr. King, to be involved on the grounds that his presence ‘would only release the persons looking for an issue to excite racist reaction’. The author and his supporters thought ‘they could only bring problems for us’ and as a result specifically ‘asked them not to come’. Further, the document makes it clear that local folk ‘already had the black community organised’, that they were confident – ‘we already had a winner’ – and that the tactics of the pressure groups were not appropriate: ‘I knew I could do things that no civil rights march ever did’. Some candidates may dismiss this evidence as arrogance on the part of the author. Martin Luther King did go to Cleveland and campaign, and so it is possible that his contribution helps explain Stokes’ victory. However, knowledge suggests the testimony is largely reliable. Stokes had run a campaign two years earlier and the experience gained then helped improve his preparations in 1967. Furthermore, King’s role was subdued – specifically because he respected the concerns of Stokes and his campaign team. Indeed, there was debate then, as now, about the role of leading civil rights activists. Some argue they inflamed passions and had a negative influence in some instances, even if their role was essential in others. In judgement, some candidates may conclude that the pressure groups were essential to provide the leadership for action and others will disagree. Many will, no doubt, appreciate the links between the two positions.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	75

2 How much did the ideology of the civil rights movement change during the 1960s? [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. Some measure of the gains made would be appropriate.

The emphasis should be on the ideas of the civil rights movement rather than events and developments specifically. However, the context of events is relevant to illustrate the application of ideas and to explain the background against which such ideas were formulated. The ideas considered will be at the discretion of the candidates who will place emphasis on different ones. A degree of organisation of the ideas would help provide structure. To fully assess how far the ideology changed in the 1960s, some comparison with the 1950s can be expected.

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

Methods – Throughout the 1960s peaceful protest was the mainstay of many activists. This was shown in the various marches of the period, for example, the March on Washington, 1963, and Selma to Montgomery, 1965. This was similar to the methods used in the 1950s. Indeed, non-violent protest was written into the constitution of the SCLC (founded in 1957), although there was less emphasis on marches than boycotts (for example, the bus boycott in Montgomery, 1956) and sit-ins and lunch counter protests (1960). However, in the 1960s violence was used by many activists, endorsed by some pressure groups such as the Organisation for Afro-American Unity, and riots and disorder were more frequent and widespread, for example, in Watts, 1965, and Northern cities in succeeding summers. There had been violence in the 1950s (organisations like the Nation of Islam had been militant since it started in 1931) but the riots of the 1960s differed from those of the 1950s. The latter started with attacks by whites on blacks, whereas those of the 1960s were mainly between blacks and local police. Further, the purpose of the violence in the 1960s, for some at least, was to start a revolution. This was the intent of the Black Panthers, founded in 1966. However, they were finished as a force by 1970, in part because of police activity but largely because they were unpopular: membership was never more than 5000. The majority of African-Americans continued to favour reform which had been the ideology of the movement in the 1950s and earlier.

Objectives – Desegregation was a constant idea of the civil rights movement throughout the period. In the 1950s the struggle was to achieve acceptance of this principle in law. This was achieved in education with the Supreme Court decision of 1956 and in bussing with the decision of 1956. However, in the 1960s the emphasis was on testing these legal rulings to ensure their application: reference to the various cases of individuals trying to enrol at High School and University could be sited (though this started with the Little Rock Nine of 1957) and the Freedom Rides. A key plank in the ideology of the movement was the right to vote, officially granted in the late 1860s. That this was achieved in the 1960s should not obscure the fact this was a central idea of activists in the 1950s. Nonetheless, in the 1960s the notion of Black Power changed the debate. For some, the objective was the assertion of black identity and African-Americans gaining power to advance their own interests. Others took this further and advocated separation, i.e. the establishment of a separate state for African Americans. This was proposed by Malcolm X, for example. This was in stark contrast to the ideas of the 1950s which assumed the integration of blacks and whites, perhaps best encapsulated in King's speech '*I have a dream*'. Delivered in 1963 to a mass audience, it is evidence of the dominance of this view into the 1960s. Ideas of

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	75

social equality in terms of housing and jobs assumed importance in the 1960s. For example, King launched his '*Poor Peoples Campaign*' of 1967 to achieve change in these areas but these were not new ideas. The timing of his campaign was more a practical response to the disturbances of the mid-1960s and a recognition that unrest was largely caused by social deprivation. Similarly, ideas about African-Americans being exempt from military service were only heard in the 1960s simply because the Vietnam War was a controversial subject then, when it had not been in the previous decade.

In judgement, candidates can be expected to identify specific aspects of ideology that changed in the 1960s but they should also acknowledge the continuity of ideas. They might also assess many of the 'new' ideas of the 1960s to have been held by a minority of those in the civil rights movement.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, 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 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	75

3 How important was the personal role of Martin Luther King in securing the civil rights achieved for Black Americans from 1963 to 1965? [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. Some measure of the gains made would be appropriate. Changes were made by the Federal government that improved the civil rights of African-Americans by addressing problems of discrimination and voting rights. Gains were made in Alabama and the profile of the movement was raised nationally. All were the product of the campaigns organised there. King was important in leading the Birmingham protest of 1963, the March on Washington also of 1963, the Selma registration campaign and subsequent march to Montgomery in 1965. All these actions were carefully planned by the SCLC with King at the helm.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses, but are not required. Candidates should focus on the role of King and attempt to present a case for and against his importance. Discussion of other factors is pertinent, not least because it could be argued, as shown above, that they were linked to the actions of King. He led by example in marching at the head of the protests, putting himself in harm's way, notably in Birmingham but also Selma. He provided inspiration with his 'Letter from Birmingham Jail' and his 'I have a dream' speech. The strategy and tactics deployed secured media coverage throughout the nation. Interracial marches elsewhere such as Chicago, Detroit, New York were sparked by the example of King in the South. The response of both Federal and State authorities of introducing change was in part due to the pressure of these actions. Donations to the SCLC increased hugely. However, King's importance can be exaggerated. To a large extent the support from black communities was fortuitous as initially only high school students in Birmingham backed the protest there and others joined in without prior organisation. King did not achieve the full support of the NAACP or SNCC. He was indecisive after Birmingham in terms of what to do next. He is criticised for simply marching through towns and cities without securing concessions before moving on. Did King's celebrated speeches merely generate emotion but nothing practical?

Further, other factors explaining the gains in civil rights might be assessed. The bigotry and violence of the whites in Birmingham ('Bull' Connor) and elsewhere was provocative to the point of revolting in the eyes of others and served to undermine the conservative position. It could be argued that it was King who engineered this reaction but the behaviour of the whites was instrumental in creating pressure for change. The importance of Kennedy and Johnson could be considered. Did they introduce the legislation of the period as a response to the campaigns in the South or were they a convenient pretext for change already anticipated? A judgement on King's importance should be offered. Some may challenge the idea that gains were actually made. Certainly, promised changes failed to materialise in places like Birmingham, and the federal laws on voting rights were largely stymied by the intransigence of local populations to accept change.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, 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 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	75

4 How significant were the decisions of the Supreme Court in advancing the cause of civil rights for Black Americans 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. The leadership of the Supreme Court was important and there was a difference between the two Chief Justices of the period. Earl Warren as Chief Justice, 1953–69, supported civil rights but his replacement, Warren E. Burger, was a conservative. In 1967, Thurgood Marshall was appointed as the first African-American member of the Supreme Court. The Court’s decisions on education, bussing and affirmative action are the issues candidates are likely to focus on.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses, but are not required. In the field of education there is scope to argue that the Court’s record was mixed. The ‘Brown versus The Board of Education’ judgement was a landmark in the history of civil rights and began the process of desegregation of schools (co-incidentally a case won by Marshall). This obliged the Federal authorities to uphold the rights of the Little Rock Nine. In the ‘Cooper versus Aaron’ case of 1958, the Supreme Court stated that any law that sought to keep public schools segregated was unconstitutional. Later, the Court supported the right of James Meredith to enrol at the University of Mississippi. His success encouraged other African-Americans to do the same. Even under Burger, integration was speeded up by the ‘Alexander versus Holmes County’ judgement. On bussing, the Court under Warren insisted on inter-state bussing which, under Burger, the Court was prepared to uphold in the ‘Swann versus Charlotte Mecklenburg’ case (1971). However, in 1974 the courts severely limited the authority of lower courts to order bussing in Detroit. In addition, it could be argued that such decisions caused problems, as in Boston in 1974, when the implementation of a bussing plan led to disorders. Opponents of the Court on these matters argued that their decisions set back the cause of civil rights: Eisenhower famously remarked that school integration might also mean social disintegration. Yet the percentage of African-Americans educated in segregated schools in the Old South fell from 68 to 8, between 1969 and 1974.

Following the Montgomery Bus Boycott, the Supreme Court backed the federal district court that had ordered the desegregation of the local buses. The Supreme Court advanced the cause of civil rights by declaring Birmingham’s segregation laws unconstitutional. However, on this as with other issues like the Little Rock Nine, the decision of the Supreme Court was, arguably, the result of pressure from the NAACP. Further, their decisions did not mean that litigation against segregation was successful elsewhere; cases failed in Birmingham and a bus boycott failed in Rock Hill, South Carolina. Supreme Court rulings against segregation on interstate bus facilities (1960) were disregarded, even when challenged, as in Albany in 1961.

The Supreme Court made many judgements on affirmative action. It backed Nixon’s drive to extend the policy with its decision in the ‘Giggs versus Duke Power Company’ (1971). Since the late 1970s, the Court has been involved in the resolution of many cases on affirmative action. In 1980, in the ‘Fullilove versus Klutznik’ case, the Court insisted that 10% of jobs should go to ethnic minorities. It could be argued that the controversy surrounding affirmative action suggests that the Court’s support for the policy has increased the difficulties of the civil rights movement. Its decision in 1978 (the Bakke case), which upheld a white student’s right to enter the University of California, was a retreat on the issue.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	75

It might be argued that the impact of decisions taken by the Supreme Court was dependent on the context and the response of other agencies to them. It was, ultimately, the implementation of them that made the difference. Candidates could reasonably assess the actions of state and federal governments and the attitude and influence of Presidents to the Court's decisions.

Candidates may conclude that the evidence largely upholds the statement in the question. Even in the post 1969 phase the decisions of the Court were largely supportive of civil rights. However, candidates should be aware of the limitations of Supreme Court decisions and the fact that some of them were detrimental to the cause.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, 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. Candidates may conclude that the evidence largely upholds the statement in the question. Even in the post 1969 phase the decisions of the Court were largely supportive of civil rights. However, candidates should be aware of the limitations of Supreme Court decisions and the fact that some of them were detrimental to the cause.