



---

**HISTORY**

**9769/72**

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

**May/June 2017**

**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 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

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 **15** printed pages.

**Special Subject: Source-based Question**

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

**Introduction**

- (a) This question is designed to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.
- (b) Examiners will be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.
- (c) The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (d) In marking an answer examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

**Question (a)****Band 3: 8–10 marks**

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

**Band 2: 4–7 marks**

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

**Band 1: 1–3 marks**

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

**Band 0: 0 marks**

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

**Question (b)****Band 4: 16–20 marks**

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

**Band 3: 11–15 marks**

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

**Band 2: 6–10 marks**

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

**Band 1: 1–5 marks**

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

**Band 0: 0 marks**

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

**Special Subject: Essay Question**

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

**Introduction**

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

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

- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 4 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

**Band 5: 25–30 marks**

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

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

**Band 4: 19–24 marks**

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary.

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

**Band 3: 13–18 marks**

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

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

**Band 2: 7–12 marks**

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated.

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

**Band 1: 1–6 marks**

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

**Band 0: 0 marks**

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

**Section A**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>How far does the evidence in Document D corroborate the evidence in Document B about the part played by Martin Luther King at major civil rights demonstrations?</b></p> <p>Similarities: In both documents King is accused of raising expectations and then deflating them. Document D states that the SNCC ‘heard that Dr King would not appear at the march he himself had called’ which corroborates the point made in Document B about King in Albany that ‘you come in, get people excited and started, and then you leave town’. Linked to this point is the fact that King did not consult with the leaders organising the demonstration. It is clear in Document D that King’s decision not to appear was taken without consulting others for the author complains that ‘We tried repeatedly, but unsuccessfully, to contact Dr King to discuss the situation’. Later, he claims that ‘once again we were fooled’ when referring to King’s decision to turn around the march, implying he had no knowledge of his intention to do so. This is in line with the complaint made by Shuttleworth in Document B, who chides King with the words ‘it’s hard for me to see how anybody could decide that (to call off the demonstration) without me’. He is also aggrieved that King had made arrangements to announce this decision to the press without Shuttleworth, despite the latter’s understanding that ‘we were to make joint statements’. Also, both documents stress that the part played by King at demonstrations was conditioned by his relationship to the federal government. In Document D, the charge is made that King turned the march around ‘in compliance with a compromise agreement made by King with the Federal Administration’. This chimes with the confession made in Document B that ‘We made promises to Washington that we’re going to call off the demonstrations’.</p> <p>Differences: These are less definite but on King’s position at a time of negotiation the two documents appear to differ. In Document B, King is adamant that his decision to call off the demonstration was because ‘we can’t have negotiations with all this going on’. However, in Document D ‘King pledged that the march would go ahead the next morning’ despite the fact that he had earlier agreed to cancel the march in return for a hearing promised by Judge Johnson. Some candidates may interpret this more as an indication of the inconsistency of King than a significant difference in his approach. The emphasis on the relationship between King and the press is also treated differently. In Document D the emphasis is on the importance of King’s presence to the march, which is described as ‘newsworthy’. Specifically, his presence would moderate the forces of opposition for without him ‘it seemed likely that the lives of many black people would be endangered’.</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
	<p>However, in Document B the press is presented as a medium for King to communicate his views in scheduled press conferences. Nonetheless, some candidates might argue that in both documents the part played by King's relationship with the press was a positive one for the civil rights movement.</p> <p>Provenance: The views expressed in the documents were recorded several years after the event and both may be regarded as simply the recollections of individuals whose memories may not be entirely reliable. That might be more the case with Document B as much of it is based on recalled conversation. On the other hand, the criticisms made by both authors may be considered sincere, at least, as they were writing just after the death of King, a time when his legacy was being debated. Further, candidates may know that the accounts in both documents accord with events and may be considered to be accurate in the main. For example, it is a fact that King had close relations with Kennedy, Johnson and officials at the White House. King's commitment to non-violence is incontestable and his reluctance to expose people to danger may explain his hesitancy to demonstrate which is revealed in these documents. Also, the reference to the 'fears that were well-founded on the bridge that Sunday' is an accurate comment on the violence meted out to the marchers by the Alabama State Troopers that day.</p> <p>The personal experiences of the two authors might be considered. Shuttleworth formed the ACMHR in 1956 and it became one of the many affiliates to the SCLC. As such, he had close links with King. By 1963, Shuttleworth had suffered prolonged and very serious violence and the planned march in Birmingham for that year was extremely important to him. For King to call it off without Shuttleworth's approval would have hurt him hugely. Candidates might pick up on the reference to events in Albany in Document B and link them to Forman. Forman had played a key role in organising the march in Albany in 1961 and opposed King's intervention there. As a leading figure in SNCC who initiated the protest in Albany, he resented the intervention of King and the way he took control. Two years later, he still harboured a grievance against King.</p> <p>Candidates may conclude that Document D does corroborate Document B in many respects especially as the points of difference identified above might be interpreted in ways which limit the contrast. In addition, candidates might regard the views of King in both sources as less than convincing evidence given the jaundiced stance of the provenance.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Martin Luther King was an inspiration to other civil rights activists? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).</b></p> <p>Evidence for the view that King was an inspiration to other activists is particularly obvious in Documents C and E but also in Documents A and D. On the other hand, there is considerable evidence to suggest that King was not an inspiration and, possibly, someone who de-motivated activists.</p> <p>The evidence in Document C is entirely supportive of the view that King was an inspiration. King’s skill as a speaker is emphasised. The ‘delivery’ of the speech, the evocation of ‘a profoundly American spirit’ and ‘his words’ are described in ways which the author clearly found inspiring. Further, the author says he was ‘in tune with the message’ and that his ‘political outlook was already in place’ and yet he was still uplifted by the message. He observed ‘ordinary people’ who he thought were ‘becoming empowered through his words’ and ‘a tide of people leaving with such a sense of satisfaction and hope’ which supports the view that King was inspirational to many or most people there. The author admits to feeling ‘so good about that struggle’ because of the effect it had on ordinary people. Most candidates will relate to the speech (‘I have a Dream’) delivered by King and how it has been acclaimed ever since. They might add details about the size and composition of the crowd that assembled that day for the March on Washington. Some might question the evidence as hyperbolic, referring to King’s performance as ‘Shakespearean’. In addition, as someone who had worked with King on the speech, it might be argued that it is unsurprising that the author presents the speech as inspirational. Some candidates might question the feelings expressed as overly emotional from a man reminiscing about an event 50 years ago in which he played a part as speech writer and participant of an event that has assumed mythical proportions.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
	<p>Document E is similar but concentrates on King's achievements. It eulogises about King describing him as 'one of the most powerful figures in the country', whose personal qualities of independence (from 'political parties or other dominant interests') and incorruptibility ('free of the taint of political ambition', etc.) are clearly admired. These qualities are presented as reasons for King's inspiration to others: 'not merely millions of Negroes, but millions of whites' and who enjoyed 'popular confidence and trust'. However, the author might be considered guilty of over-doing things, not least in the phrase, 'your image has more purity than any American has attained in decades'. Such praise may be explained by the fact that the author is described as a close friend of King. Yet, the evidence is also critical of King (see below) and many of the points made in support of King are borne out elsewhere.</p> <p>For example, Document D confirms that 'hundreds stood ready to march, including many white Northerners'. Similarly, the idea that King was a celebrity figure, as Document E suggests, is implied in Document D when it refers to 'his newsworthy presence'. Given that the author of Document D was largely critical of King, these remarks suggest that even his opponents conceded the appeal of King. Also, in Document A, King claims that since Albany 'our movement had taken the moral offensive, enriching our people with a spirit of strength'. Further, 'no one would silence him (the Negro) again'. Candidates might dismiss these claims as unreliable given they are claims made by King himself but events that followed Albany, as catalogued in the other sources, might be cited as proof of these claims.</p> <p>In arguing against the view that King was an inspiration, candidates are likely to highlight the incisive criticism of King in Document B. The comments made suggest that King disappointed the author for changing his mind, for his failure to consult and his inconsistency and lack of steadfastness on principles (implied in the last sentence as a contrast to that of the author). There is also a suggestion that he felt King was more concerned with his public image (holding a scheduled press conference) and his standing with those in authority (notably in Washington). Throughout, the tone is strident and angry climaxed with the charge that 'You're mister big but you're soon to be mister [expletive]!' Candidates may explain the tone as the bitterness of someone who feels let down but Document D goes some way to support Document B in terms of King's dithering on whether to march or not. Document D expresses particular frustration at King's decision to turn around on the bridge. In the final sentence, Document D declares 'relations between the SNCC and the SCLC were at a very low ebb'. Candidates might argue that the tone of Document D is less hostile than that of Document B.</p> <p>The documents provide evidence that King was uninspiring in terms of the strategies and tactics he used. Document A says it was a mistake 'to protest against segregation generally' and, as a result, not only was 'our protest ... so vague that we got nothing' but also it left the people 'very depressed and in despair'. To emphasise the point, King believes that if they had concentrated on an issue such as the buses or lunch counters, and won, then the victory 'would have galvanised support and boosted morale'. As a confession of his own errors, candidates might regard this as an honest and reliable comment not least because it might be cross referenced to Document B and the barb made about King's role in Albany.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
	<p>Document E also draws attention to a failed strategy. The adoption of a boycott (of businesses in Alabama) is described as ‘not the best selection of alternatives for action’ in large measure because ‘you are hitting at sacred structures of economic interests’. Candidates may comment on how a boycott would be regarded as a challenge to established principles of free economic activity and pose hardship for African Americans. Further, the strategy is considered ‘not the logical tactic’ at a time when the movement was campaigning for voting rights. Candidates might elaborate on that issue. As these criticisms on strategy come from a close friend of King, candidates might assess them as holding some weight.</p> <p>In judgement, candidates are likely to recognise the inspiration that King provided to a diverse range of people and to large numbers, even if some of the evidence, such as that in Document C, is rather one-sided, the evidence in Documents A and E is more balanced. The counter-argument is equally flawed by the hostility of the authors of Documents B and D, yet Documents A and E admit that King’s actions, sometimes at least, alienated people.</p>	

**Section B**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>Assess the significance of the idea of non-violence in the development of the civil rights movement after 1954.</b></p> <p>AO1 – There is scope to assess the application of the policy of non-violence over the whole period from 1954 to 1980. The emphasis should be on the impact of non-violence and the effects it had, positive and negative, on the civil rights movement rather than examples of non-violence, for example: sit-ins, marches, lunch counter protests, boycotts, public meetings, etc. The latter should be used to illustrate the non-violence of the movement and the consequences of such actions.</p> <p>AO2 – In assessing the significance of non-violence a variety of points might be considered. Non-violence made it easier for moderates who supported the advancement of civil rights for African Americans to join the movement, including whites for whom the toleration associated with non-violence was crucial in opening the door. As such non-violence helps explain how the movement gained mass appeal which gave it more weight. The dignity and courage with which protests were conducted, reinforced by the ugliness of white violence, helped change attitudes. Non-violence made it possible to present the arguments for change more clearly, which violence might have obscured. As such opponents of change were obliged to debate the issues seriously rather than dismiss them, as violence may have allowed them to do. In this respect, it could be argued the agenda of the movement secured the attention at least of the politicians and the support of some (Kennedy and Johnson) which led to real reform. Also, the policy won the movement national and international support: Dr King was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1964. This reinforced the credibility of the movement and strengthened its hand in the USA. Non-violence necessitated training and education which produced a discipline and organisation that gave the movement a coherence and strength in contrast to the incoherence of riots: reference to the urban violence of 1965 and the disorder associated with 'Black Power' protest might be made. However, non-violence had its limits and candidates should consider some of the problems associated with it. The problems of control and organisation of a mass movement not least because of the plethora of different organisations with different agendas could be analysed. Non-violence exposed its advocates to the violence of its opponents, and maintaining the loyalty of its supporters and restraining its anger at white violence (for example, the assassination of Dr King) was difficult. Similarly, sustaining support in face of expectations and the challenge of more radical ideas of the 1960s was difficult. In judgement, candidates should weigh the positive impact of non-violence against its negatives. They may also set the period in a broader context. Non-violence was a key element of protest for change since the late nineteenth century and despite the violence of the 1960s pressure for change in the 1970s and since has mainly been non-violent.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>'In the years 1954 to 1980 unity between different civil rights organisations was more apparent than real.'</b> Discuss.</p> <p>AO1 –The emphasis should be on the degree to which different organisations supported each other. Attention might focus on the methods adopted, their objectives, attitudes to whites, the degree of co-operation between organisations and issues of leadership.</p> <p>AO2 – Some candidates might consider the history of the major organisations, e.g. NAACP, the SCLC, the SNCC, and CORE, but also the Black Muslims, the Black Panthers and the Organisation of Afro-American Unity. However, if they are studied discretely it is likely that the question of unity may be assessed only incidentally. Candidates may highlight the contrast between those organisations that were committed to non-violence as the means to protest and present their case (NAACP, SNCC) and those that adopted violent methods (Black Panthers), for example, in the riots of 1965. However, the distinction was often blurred. For example, H Rap Brown, leader of SNCC after Carmichael, promoted violent methods. Most organisations favoured a society where African Americans and whites were fully integrated, hence the emphasis on desegregation of education, buses etc. by SCLC, SNCC and CORE. Yet others, like the Organisation for Afro-American Unity, led by Malcolm X, aimed to separate African Americans from whites by creating two distinct states within the country. Candidates might argue that the latter view was that of a radical minority and, as such, there was greater unity on the future of society than might at first appear. In their attitude to whites, organisations differed a lot. Some were prepared to cooperate with whites at a local and national level. The access of the SCLC to Kennedy and Johnson is a case in point. Others did not trust the whites and shunned involvement with them. In the later 1960s, for example, the SNCC and CORE decided that only African Americans could hold leadership positions in their organisations. Protests were often uncoordinated with organisations operating independently. For example, the Freedom Rides were the initiative of CORE. When organisations combined, it often exposed divisions and weakened the protest, for example, in Albany (1961), Birmingham (1963) and Selma (1965). However, organisations did join forces on many occasions: the March on Washington (1963) involved the SNCC, SCLC, CORE, NAACP and the Urban League. The SCLC itself represented about 80 affiliated groups. CORE and SNCC cooperated on the Freedom Summer (1964). Leadership was a source of division. Prominent figures like Martin Luther King and Malcolm X did not necessarily enjoy universal support within the movement. Further, organisations split, for example, the Organisation for Afro-American Unity was a breakaway group from the Black Muslims and there was often division between local and national leaders, evident in the preparation and conduct of the protest in Chicago by the SCLC (1966).</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p data-bbox="316 248 1182 315"><b>How extensive was white opposition to civil rights for African Americans in the years 1968–1980?</b></p> <p data-bbox="316 349 1310 887">AO1 – Geographically, opposition was greatest in the South partly for historical reasons, but also because that was where the civil rights movement concentrated its activities. However, whites in northern towns and cities, such as Chicago and Detroit, also opposed the civil rights movement, highlighted whenever marches and demonstrations were organised. Nonetheless, racism was most entrenched in the South and, elsewhere, liberal attitudes served to limit white opposition. Whites who were prepared to take direct action against the civil rights movement were few in number. Organisations such as the KKK achieved notoriety by their actions but membership of the KKK was limited and in decline throughout the period. Large numbers of white citizens campaigned against any concessions to the civil rights movement, and were often well organised like the White Citizens’ Council. On the other hand, many white citizens supported the civil rights movement in joining marches and working with the various civil rights organisations. Church ministers were prominent in this respect.</p> <p data-bbox="316 920 1310 1391">AO2 – It is clear that sections of the police and state troopers opposed the movement and used their power to disrupt the activities of the civil rights movement. However, from 1968 to 1980 hundreds of demonstrations were completed with police cooperation. Possibly, police brutality of the period before 1968 necessitated a change of approach by the police thereafter. White political opposition was considerable, notably in Southern states, for example George Wallace in Alabama. However, there was majority support in Congress to secure important legislation on civil rights: for example, laws that strengthened the voting rights of African Americans; desegregation of the buses and education; and, laws on affirmative action. The legal system in many states, (dominated by whites) was biased against African Americans and civil rights activists, yet the Supreme Court (also dominated by whites) produced many decisions that advanced the civil rights of African Americans, for example, in education.</p>	30