

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series**

### **9769 HISTORY**

**9769/75**

Paper 5n (Special Subject: Russia in Revolution, 1905–1924), 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 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

|               |                              |                 |              |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 2</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>           | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b> | <b>9769</b>     | <b>75</b>    |

### **Special Subjects: Document Question**

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

#### **Introduction**

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

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

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

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

#### **Question (a)**

##### **Band 1: 8–10**

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

##### **Band 2: 4–7**

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

##### **Band 3: 0–3**

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

|               |                              |                 |              |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 3</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>           | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b> | <b>9769</b>     | <b>75</b>    |

## Question (b)

### Band 1: 16–20

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

### Band 2: 11–15

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

### Band 3: 6–10

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

### Band 4: 0–5

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

|               |                              |                 |              |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 4</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>           | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b> | <b>9769</b>     | <b>75</b>    |

### Special Subject Essays

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

#### Introduction

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

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

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

#### Band 1: 25–30

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

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

|               |                              |                 |              |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 5</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>           | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b> | <b>9769</b>     | <b>75</b>    |

## **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.

|               |                              |                 |              |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 6</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>           | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b> | <b>9769</b>     | <b>75</b>    |

### **Band 5: 0–6**

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

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

|               |                              |                 |              |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 7</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>           | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b> | <b>9769</b>     | <b>75</b>    |

**Nominated topic: The ideology of the Civil Rights Movement**

- 1 (a) How far does Document C corroborate the views expressed in Document B about the means to achieve civil rights for Black 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. Both agree that black Americans needed to organise themselves to achieve change. This is emphasised in several of the five points listed in Document B and corroborated in the opening sentences of Document C. Further, Document C seems to corroborate Document B in terms of black Americans gaining greater representation and sharing power or decision making responsibilities. Reference to points 4 and 5 in Document B might be made and set alongside the references to 'sharing of control', 'effective share in the total power of society' and 'full participation in the decision-making processes' in Document C. However, whilst Document B presents specific proposals to achieve change Document C is more general and less definite about the actual lines of action or tactics to be adopted. Candidates might illustrate this by identifying some of the proposals in Document B set against the notion of 'the creation of power bases' in Document C. There are sharp differences between the Documents too. It is clear from Document B that the CFM advocated working with 'other non-whites and some white minorities' as stated in the opening lines and 'other oppressed minorities' in point 5. Document C takes a different stance arguing that 'Black people must lead and run their own organisations'. The most obvious way on which Document C does not corroborate Document B is on the use of violence. Document B regards 'non-violent direct action' as central to the achievement of change in contrast to Document C which rejects 'a non-violent approach' as one that 'black people cannot afford'. Candidates might argue that both documents are a reflection of the constituencies the authors represent. The CFM was an amalgam of various national and local organisations representing various social groups and so was obliged to consider the concerns of more than just the black community as Carmichael seems to advocate. Document B is intent on seeking wide appeal to 'the whole community' whereas Document C stresses 'black self-identity'. Candidates might argue that the CFM is focused in one city – Chicago – where its programme of action might be appropriate to local conditions although the introduction indicates that the thrust of the statement was in tune with the mood of many in the North. Carmichael is concerned to address the problems of black Americans throughout the country, in many parts of which the tactics and methods of the CFM would be inappropriate. The CFM embraced the SCLC, a link that candidates might use to explain its belief in non-violence and confirm the reliability of its views. In contrast Carmichael rejects non-violent protest which was the underlying principle of the organisation he chaired and so the reliability of his views as representative of the SNCC might be questioned. However, his successor as Chairman, H Rap Brown, was equally aggressive. Some might detect Carmichael's rejection of non-violence as an indication of the frustration felt by many black Americans at the limited progress of the time whereas the CFM symbolised the optimism of those in the civil rights movement who were encouraged by the legislation of 1964-65. Further, Document B was written before the explosion of urban violence in 1967, which might explain its continued faith in non-violence. However, such violence was already increasingly commonplace, e.g. Los Angeles in 1965, which suggests the commitment of the CFM to non-violence was sincere and perhaps reinforced by the failure of such violence. Carmichael was writing at a time of the riots of 1967 and was, perhaps, merely tapping into the discontent. Yet, from the early days of his chairmanship of the SNCC he had encouraged more aggressive action. Given that the urban violence of 1967 afflicted Chicago as other cities it could be argued that the views of Document B were, perhaps, less in tune with the national mood amongst black Americans than Document C. On the other hand, Martin Luther King

|               |                              |                 |              |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 8</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>           | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b> | <b>9769</b>     | <b>75</b>    |

led marches in Chicago and was widely popular there. There is plenty of scope for candidates to argue from different perspectives on the provenance of these documents.

|               |                              |                 |              |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 9</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>           | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b> | <b>9769</b>     | <b>75</b>    |

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that integration of Black Americans into existing American society was the most powerful argument presented by civil rights activists in the 1960s?**

**In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E). [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. The documents provide evidence that indicates that integration was the objective of some but by no means all civil rights activists. Others aimed to separate black people from white people. If such a basic division of objectives is accepted some candidates may recognise shades of difference within both schools of thought. Documents B and E stress integration as the objective of the activists concerned, whilst Documents A and C regard the separation of the races as their objective. Document D might be regarded as slightly ambiguous, though most candidates are likely to see it as evidence in support of integration. Document E is explicit in arguing for integration. The word 'integration' is emphasised and is presented as essential: the 'black man's paramount need is to learn about management, business organisation and capital' and separation is clearly rejected ('there is no such thing as Black capitalism'). There are parallels with Document B. The CFM reiterates the importance of Negroes working with other minorities to create 'a just and open city in which all men can live with dignity' and refers to 'the whole community' and 'people in every sector' pulling together. Point 4 recommends Black Americans (and others) take their share of responsibility in 'government, industry, labour and church' which is in line with what Document E argues about involvement in 'management' and 'capital'. Document E develops this idea with specific calls for 'educational forums and exchange meetings' of different social groups and recognition that problems that affect all are best resolved with others. Similarly, Document B clearly advocates 'community organisation' including 'education' and 'job development' in line with the emphasis on emancipation primarily through economic measures in Document E. Arguably, Document B places more emphasis on political action to improve the lot of Black Americans and others but in all instances integration is the objective. Many may challenge the views expressed by both documents as idealistic and rooted in religious conviction: this is most obvious for the author of Document E (last line) but could be said of the CFM given the composition of the Movement. On the other hand, the OICs were real practical vehicles by which the objective of integration could be achieved. Writing after the OICs had been operating for a decade the record of the OICs could be used to support the claims made by the author. The emphasis on self help should be regarded as consistent with the tenor of Document B and the belief in constructive action. Some candidates may argue that Document D lends weight to the interpretation that integration was the objective of activists. After all, it states that 'all men' should respect each other and seems to imply that reconciliation was possible if 'reparation by the nation for the despicable deed of slavery' were achieved. Such a position could be considered to be consistent with the Christianity of the churchmen behind the statement. Even if candidates argue along this line they may recognise a certain ambiguity in the document. Do the references to slavery and its legacy imply that separation might be the better course forward given the history of segregation in the past? Does the reference to 'blackness ... that emancipates black people' suggest the separation of the races? Some candidates might feel that the evidence of Document D lends more support to separation rather than integration as the objective of Negro activists. Documents A and C seem to be more forthright in rejecting integration. The former is more

|                |                              |                 |              |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 10</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>           | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|                | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b> | <b>9769</b>     | <b>75</b>    |

explicit in this respect claiming ‘The black masses don’t want ... integration’ and the latter regards integration as ‘a subterfuge for the maintenance of white supremacy’. Document A is more radical, demanding ‘complete separation’ with the ultimate objective of becoming ‘an independent people and an independent nation in our own land’. The opening remarks are an explicit rejection of integration ‘into a society of bloodthirsty white wolves’. Document C implies that separation might be temporary rather than permanent in so far as it states that ‘Before black people can enter the open society, they must first close ranks’. This appears to be necessary to assert ‘Black Power’ and to preserve the ‘racial and cultural personality of the black community’. Document A is even more adamant in defining the difference between the races with talk of being in ‘this white doghouse too long’ and the separation of the innocent from the guilty. Such views accord with the extremism of Malcolm X and the Nation of Islam though candidates will know that Malcolm X split from the latter in November 1963 and was assassinated by them two years later. Similarly, although Carmichael’s views are at variance with the non-violence of the founding principles of the SNCC they are consistent with the views he developed at this time, notably the notion of Black Power which he coined. Given the balance of the evidence and its quality candidates might be swayed to conclude that integration was the most powerful argument of the majority. Documents B, E and D, even elements of C, too, could be used to this end. Knowledge of the period could be used to reinforce this position. The likes of Martin Luther King continued to hold sway until his assassination in 1968 and his ‘dream’ continued to inspire thereafter. Indeed, the violence of the 1960s, which Documents A and C seem to endorse, should not be confused with support for separation: rather, they were a reflection of frustration at the pace of change. The actions of radical groups like the Black Panthers might also be considered but, again, their profile (athletes at the Olympic Games saluting their support for the organisation) exaggerates the extent of their following.

|         |                       |          |       |
|---------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 11 | Mark Scheme           | Syllabus | Paper |
|         | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769     | 75    |

- 2 'The Montgomery Bus Boycott, 1955, was the key factor in the development of the civil rights movement in the period from 1954 to 1960.' How far do you agree with this assessment? [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 bus boycott was sparked by Mrs Rosa Parks, an NAACP activist, who was arrested in March 1955 for refusing to concede her seat to a white man. Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA) was formed to head a campaign in Montgomery against bus segregation. Martin Luther King was invited to lead the MIA and Dexter Baptist Church in Montgomery became the centre of the protest. The boycott held firm and segregation was ended in December 1956.

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 do more than assess the intrinsic importance of several factors. The impact of the Montgomery Bus Boycott should be weighed against other factors to determine whether it was the key factor. The Bus Boycott had a profound impact on the civil rights movement of which the emergence of Martin Luther King may be considered by most candidates to have been the most significant. His direction of the boycott propelled him to the fore as a leader of the civil rights movement and both his style and methods were dominant influences until his death and especially in the period in question. The boycott also proved the ability of activists to effectively organise grass root support. The MIA was important as a model of how to mobilise and deploy support. Indeed, the emergence of the SCLC in 1957, within whose embrace the MIA merged, could be said to have been created as a result of the boycott. The very success of the boycott provided a stimulus and encouragement to the civil rights movement. There had been boycotts before Montgomery (in which Rosa Parks herself was involved) but they had failed. Further, the success was more dramatic given the location (the capital of the old Confederacy). In addition, the boycott received the sympathy of the white press (at least in the North) and this helped arouse awareness and interest amongst whites that it had not previously enjoyed. The fact that the Supreme Court declared segregation unconstitutional was also significant and proved that the institutions of state could be instrumental in effecting change. However, other factors were also significant. The following may be considered by candidates. The Brown versus Topeka Decision of 1954 which declared that 'separate but equal education' was unconstitutional was highly significant in overturning the law on this point which had been established with the 'Plessy versus Ferguson' case of 1896 and subsequent ratifications of the same. However, the decision of 1954 was resisted and its implementation proved difficult. Candidates may see the Little Rock Nine of 1957 as an indication of this and proof of the limited importance of the 1954 decision. On the other hand, without it the nine students may not have pursued their demands for integration. The formation of the SNCC in 1960 may be cited as an important factor and so allowance for its subsequent work would be permissible. In the same year Kennedy was elected and, similarly, he offered promise of change without which some may argue the reforms of the 1960s would not have occurred. Reference to the campaign of 1960 to breach the rules against the 'whites only' lunch counter could be included. Candidates should offer a judgement. Was the boycott more important than other factors? Was the boycott of immediate or long term significance? Weaker answers may provide a chronology of events from 1954 to 1960 albeit with comment on the importance of different events.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

|                |                              |                 |              |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 12</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>           | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|                | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b> | <b>9769</b>     | <b>75</b>    |

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.

|                |                              |                 |              |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 13</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>           | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|                | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b> | <b>9769</b>     | <b>75</b>    |

**3 Assess the importance of the Congress of Racial Equality to the civil rights movement 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 – with explanation to the fore. CORE was started in 1942 in Chicago by black Americans and white Americans who believed in peaceful protest. It confronted discrimination head on. It applied pressure to governments in the 1940s which introduced various reforms against segregation. Well established at the time momentum was added to the civil rights movement after 1954 it was active in many of the prominent campaigns of the period: the Freedom Rides (1961) and the Washington March (1963). From the mid-1960s there was a degree of division within CORE as some advocated links with more radical activists.

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. Candidates should focus on CORE and its contribution to the civil rights movement. However, in assessing its importance some candidates may do so by comparison with other organisations for which credit may be appropriate so long as the emphasis is on CORE. Given the time span and range of activities associated with CORE judgements may vary considerably. Perhaps its importance was greater at certain times rather than consistently and perhaps some of its campaigns and strategies were more significant than others? The judgement should be based on the history of the organisation. CORE's importance in generating support for and shaping the civil rights movement might be considered. The longevity of CORE, operating throughout this period, might serve as an indication of its importance. Indeed, in some respects it acted as a model for other organisations in terms of structure and strategy. For example, its training programme in non-violent protest was widely emulated and, as such, it had an enormous influence on this strand of the civil rights movement. However, it was challenged by the emergence of more aggressive organisations advocating violence and Black Power in the 1960s. Nonetheless, it survived this. In addition, CORE helped define the objectives of the civil rights movement. It wanted to end discrimination and to integrate black Americans and white Americans. Although later organisations advocated separation the founding platform of CORE held the support of the majority, ironically given the shift in its leanings towards these emerging organisations. CORE was prepared to work with other civil rights organisations such as NAACP and SCLC with which it co-operated in many campaigns. Yet, it clashed with Martin Luther King in the early 1960s as he was initially reluctant to provoke white violence as CORE was. Further, CORE was instrumental in promoting or supporting high profile campaigns. It organised the Freedom Rides of 1961, the March on Washington, 1963, and the Freedom Summer of 1964. Candidates might assess the success of these initiatives. CORE also had an impact politically, working with Congress and LBJ on the legislation of 1964-68. Again, details and an assessment of the contribution of the organisation would be sensible.

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.

|                |                              |                 |              |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 14</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>           | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|                | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b> | <b>9769</b>     | <b>75</b>    |

**4 'White Americans were less accommodating in their attitudes to civil rights after 1968.'**  
**Discuss. [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. White resistance was evident throughout the period but this varied from region to region and in the ways it was demonstrated. The death of Martin Luther King, the splits within the civil rights movement and the widespread violence and disorder in hundreds of cities in 1968 and Nixon's victory in the race for the presidency later that year is the context against which the resistance of white Americans to the civil rights movement should be set. White resistance was, to some extent, conditioned by these developments.

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. This may be interpreted as a 'turning point' question and answered by comparing the situation before 1968 with that afterwards. Alternatively, candidates may concentrate on the later years only and with justification. Answers should show awareness of continuity and change when applied to various criteria. A narrative or description of events will not be credited as much as analysis and evaluation supported by a range of examples from the period. From 1968 white politicians were less accommodating in their attitudes to civil rights. Nixon won the presidency with his 'Southern Strategy' which pandered to the opposition of white Americans in the south to the desegregation of schools. His victory was over H Humphrey, Vice President to Johnson, and associated with concessions to the civil rights movement. The racist Governor Wallace of Alabama polled 10 million votes. The presidential campaign was evidence of the hostility of the white electorate to civil rights for black Americans. The institutions of government were less responsive to the movement's appeals as a decade earlier. Although the Supreme Court declared, in 1969, that segregation must end 'at once', and the judgement of 1971 effectively ordered bussing across America, in 1974 it changed course and limited the authority of state courts to order bussing which had been introduced to bring black children to school. Nixon and Ford denounced bussing and the resistance of local populations to the practice was widespread. Support for substantive reforms in Congress was weaker than in the 1960s and there was no appetite to emulate the progress of the mid-decade. However, the affirmative action policy introduced by Johnson was developed by Nixon and with federal-funded projects to provide job opportunities for black Americans. However, the scale of the programme remained small and Carter's administration made little impact, partly because of the constraints of the economic climate. White violence to black Americans continued. The KKK remained active and indiscriminate persecution of black Americans was widespread, at least in the south, and went largely unchecked. The scale of such resistance is difficult to gauge and so makes comparison with the years before 1968 equally difficult to assess.

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.