

---

**HISTORY****9769/72**

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

**May/June 2019****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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

*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>To what extent does the evidence of Document D corroborate the claims of Document B on the methods of the authorities in dealing with African-American activists?</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Similarities</i></p> <p>In Document B, it is claimed that a prison guard was prepared to shoot black prisoners dead. The willingness to shoot activists dead is corroborated in Document D which confirms the death of ‘Hampton, and another Panther’ by the police. According to Document B, the authorities in Soledad encouraged the ‘Aryan Brotherhood’, an organisation described as ‘its own counterpart to the Ku Klux Klan’, with the clear implication that the intention was to foment violence against African Americans. Similarly, Document D states that ‘the FBI sought to turn violence-prone organizations against the Panthers’.</p> <p>Document B refers to the lenience of the Grand Jury at the trial of O.G. Miller who, it claimed, had committed ‘justifiable homicide’ and in Document D it is made clear that ‘the judge who headed the investigation into these deaths’ intended to exonerate the police.</p> <p><i>Differences</i></p> <p>According to Document B, prison authorities in Soledad directly engineered confrontation between African Americans and whites by sending ‘black and white prisoners to exercise together in the yard’ to provide the circumstances in which they then might interfere. However, in Document D, it is stated that the FBI and police relied on informants to provide the intelligence on which they could act. Document B suggests that the prison authorities at Soledad ignored their own rules – of segregation – when it suited them, whereas Document D accuses the FBI of breaching the laws of the country as they ‘engaged in lawless tactics’ that were contrary to their obligation of ‘preventing criminal conduct’. Document B suggests that the authorities in Soledad were prepared to pit whites against African Americans, whereas in Document D the implication is that the FBI and police sought to set African Americans against each other ‘in an effort to aggravate ‘gang warfare’.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><i>Provenance</i></p> <p>In assessing the reliability of the documents, answers might argue that as the author of Document B was a radical African-American activist (described as a Communist and staunch crusader for racial and social justice) that her account might be suspect. In support of this view, it might be argued that her comments suggest a degree of anger, for example, in calling O.G. Miller ‘a hard-line racist’ and the sense of outrage evident in the reference to ‘unavenged murders of my people’. However, her account has integrity in that it states the facts and is written four years after the event when the details of the incident in question were well established. Answers might expand on the various examples of cases of the murder of African Americans and the leniency of the courts to those accused of the crime. Indeed, reference might be made to the McDuffie case of 1980 which is mentioned in Document E.</p> <p>Document D might be considered as equally or more reliable, in that the US Senate Committee report was based on the testimony of numerous individuals by a body that was specifically charged with investigating government operations. The fact that the report was ‘a comprehensive examination’ suggests it was thorough. Further, the Committee was predominantly white, yet it was critical of government agencies that were controlled by other whites. Some answers might allude to the reputation and record of the head of the FBI, J Edgar Hoover.</p> <p>In addition, answers might argue that Document B focuses on one incident only, even if it refers to ‘the untold numbers of unavenged murders’, about which it is unspecific. Similarly, Document B is concerned with the prison service only. By contrast, Document D is more wide-ranging, concerned with the activities of government agencies over many years (late 1960s/early 1970s), even if the Hampton case is highlighted. Also, the report was based on how the FBI and the police had operated, though the document emphasises the monitoring behaviour of both authorities in Chicago.</p> <p>Answers may conclude that Document D does corroborate Document B in many respects, even if there are differences of emphasis and approach by government authorities. Given the greater range of Document D and its apparent impartiality, answers might conclude that the claims made in Document B are upheld.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that violence was the main form of white resistance to greater equality for African Americans? 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>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.</p> <p>Evidence for the view that violence was the main form of white resistance is provided in Documents B and D. Document A concentrates on how the economic and political system was used to uphold white supremacy, and Documents C and E, but also Document B, emphasise segregation as a means of resisting greater equality for African Americans.</p> <p>Both Documents B and D provide evidence for violence as a form of white resistance. Both show that violence was widely used by law enforcement agencies as well as white citizens. A prison guard is accused of shooting dead three African Americans in Soledad, and the police killed Hampton and another Panther in Chicago. The Ku Klux Klan (KKK) are mentioned in Document B, and answers may explain its activities and how many of its members were employees in government law enforcement agencies. However, answers may stress that the KKK was limited geographically and in membership. Further, it is clear in both Documents B and D that the judicial system was inclined to favour whites, in that many accused of the murder of African Americans were excused on grounds of ‘justifiable homicide’. Answers might elaborate on how there was, effectively, a dual judicial system: one for blacks and another for whites. Answers might set Documents B and D in the context of an increase in violence following the death of Martin Luther King. The activities of the Black Panthers, mentioned in Document D, might be explained.</p> <p>In discussing Document A, answers may argue that economic, political and cultural repression were other important forms of white resistance; it claims ‘both parties have betrayed us’ and ‘most of the time’, and is explicit in stating that ‘the American political system, like all other white institutions in America, was designed to operate for the benefit of the white race’. Answers might explain how the voting rights of black voters was made difficult despite the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and how employment opportunities in public institutions were restricted. However, there are examples of African Americans gaining public office during this period. (In the 1960s, only a few dozen blacks held elective office, but, by 1980, the number was about three thousand, the first black mayor was elected in 1967, and more in the 1970s, and black votes probably explain Carter’s victory in 1976.) Before the 1960s, economically successful African Americans were few though ‘radically changing the systems by which it (the country) operates’. Nonetheless, progress was slow, and the vast majority were disadvantaged.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>However, in the 1970s, partly because of affirmative action, more African Americans prospered, therefore, it might be argued that Document A is inaccurate in claiming that the problems of the African-American community cannot be solved ‘without radically changing the systems’ by which it operated.</p> <p>Document C makes it clear that segregation in education was deliberate as the court concluded ‘that the defendants have knowingly carried out a systematic program of segregation’ and ‘brought about and maintained a dual-school system’. The implication of the charges made against the defendants in Document C is that segregation in education was intended to give white children greater opportunities; this was the reason why the group of black parents brought the case to court. The building of new schools ‘in size and locations’, the enrolment policy and transfer system, hints at how this was done. Answers might argue that Document C is concerned with Boston only, but segregation in education was an issue in many places and not just in schools but universities too. Reference might be made to the struggle for equality of education since 1954 after the judgement of <i>Brown v the Board of Education of Topeka</i>, for example, the <i>Arkansas Nine</i> and the <i>Meredith</i> case. The situation in Boston in 1974 resulted in the bussing of African-American students to schools, but many white parents boycotted the desegregated schools, therefore, indicating how important segregation was regarded by whites as a means of resisting greater equality for African Americans.</p> <p>Segregation was also evident in housing as Document E makes clear. Projects in which black people were housed are described in terms which indicate that the white authorities in Miami, at least, deliberately segregated whites from blacks. Indeed, projects like the <i>Scott-Carver</i> estate were regarded as ‘a dumping ground’ and a means of placing blacks somewhere ‘other than in our own (white) neighbourhoods’. The segregation was so stark that discontent within the projects erupted in 1980, prompted by the acquittal of four officers for the death of <i>McDuffie</i>. The prediction of the author is that the segregation of the races by housing may be counter-productive, ultimately. Answers may regard the observations of the author as the clinical assessment of an academic looking for a rationale for the violence of the summer of 1980. However, these events were similar to other urban riots, such as those of 1967, and the subsequent <i>Kerner</i> report (1968) confirmed that white authorities deliberately intended that housing policy should reinforce segregation. On the other hand, the author had first-hand experience of life in the housing project in question – he states he was ‘raised’ in the <i>Scott-Carver</i> housing project – which might explain his antipathy to them.</p> <p>Segregation was also applied within the prison service and, as Document B explains, ‘was almost total’. Further, the document suggests that this was in line with the segregation evident ‘in an old Southern town’ which might prompt some answers to elaborate on the division of African Americans and whites in the Southern states. It might be argued that the denial of political and economic opportunities for African Americans, outlined in Document A, was a form of segregation.</p>	

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
1(b)	In judgement, answers might acknowledge that segregation was a key form of white resistance to the civil rights movement and was evident in education and housing, in particular, but also in judicial, political and economic spheres. Given the pervasive nature of segregation, some answers might argue it was the main form of resistance. Others might regard violence by law enforcement authorities and the public, as well as political and economic repression, as equally, if not more, important forms of white resistance.	

**Section B**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>‘Direct action to promote African-American civil rights was successful only because of media coverage.’ Discuss this view for the period 1954 to 1980.</b></p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the importance of media coverage as one of the factors responsible for the success of direct action. Answers should focus on the role of the media but also consider other factors.</p> <p>AO2 – Explanations of how media coverage accounts for the success of direct action might include the way it persuaded others to join in; this was particularly the case with the ‘sit-in’ movement but also with all examples of direct action. The media exposed the intolerance (including extreme brutality) of the opponents of the civil rights movement, including the police, which helped inform others of the nature of the struggle. Media coverage also put pressure on politicians to act often intervening with federal forces and initiating legislation. Other factors which might be stressed include: the persistence and courage of protesters who could not be ignored, e.g. the bus boycott in Montgomery, the organisation of civil rights groups, the leadership of these groups in setting limited aims and the articulation of them. Some answers might challenge these points on the grounds that not all media was favourable to the civil rights cause and the violence of some protesters alienated potential support, e.g. the activities of Black Panthers.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>‘The achievements of Martin Luther King as a civil rights leader, 1955–1968, were limited.’ Were they?</b></p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the contribution of Martin Luther King to the civil rights movement. Some argue his role was limited while others regard his contribution to the movement as crucial.</p> <p>AO2 – In explaining how his achievements were limited, answers might argue that he was peripheral to the Montgomery Improvement Association, the lunchtime protests and the Freedom Rides. His relationships with SNCC and CORE were difficult. He experienced many failures, e.g. the efforts made to increase voter registration. His influence was confined to the Old South and when he tried to exert himself in northern areas, he was rejected, e.g. Chicago in 1966. He lost Johnson’s support because of his criticism of the Vietnam War. He lost white, middle class support with his campaigns for social equality. The counter-argument might be based on his eloquence as a speaker, his message of non-violence, his use of the media, his leadership of the SCLC whose influence declined after his death, his close relationship with the Kennedys, and his inspiration as a martyr to the cause.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p><b>Assess the view that the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) was the most effective pressure group within the movement for civil rights.</b></p> <p>AO1 – The question concerns the influence and impact of the SNCC. To judge whether the SNCC was the most important pressure group, not only should answers assess its contribution, but they should also compare it with that of other organisations.</p> <p>AO2 – Answers might argue that the SNCC was effective in engaging the students (youth) especially with the lunchtime sit-in protests and Freedom Rides of 1961. Also, the SNCC offered resistance to the violence of its opponents and, in that respect, challenged the non-violence of the SCLC. It was effective in the campaign in 1964 for gaining voting rights for African Americans and was influential at the Democratic Convention that year. It was also effective in encouraging whites to join the civil rights movement. In presenting a counter-argument, answers might consider some of the following. The SNCC was only founded in April 1961 so other organisations were clearly at the forefront of actions before then. Many of the protests it was associated with were in conjunction with other groups and, in the case of the Freedom Rides, CORE was, arguably, more influential. It weakened the movement by splitting from the SCLC. Its effectiveness was compromised by its involvement in radical liberation movements after Carmichael became its chairman in 1966 and it lost support because it backed the Black Panthers and violence.</p>	30