Pearson Edexcel Level 3 GCE

Wednesday 3 June 2020

Morning (Time: 1 hour 30 minutes) | Paper Reference **9HI0/2H**

History

Advanced

Paper 2: Depth study

Option 2H.1: The USA, c1920–55: boom, bust and recovery

Option 2H.2: The USA, 1955–92: conformity and challenge

Sources Booklet

Do not return this booklet with the question paper.

Turn over ▶

P62417A

©2020 Pearson Education Ltd.

1/1/1/1/1/

P 6 2 4 1 7 A

Pearson

Sources for use with Section A.

Answer the question in Section A on the option for which you have been prepared.

Option 2H.1: The USA, c1920–55: boom, bust and recovery

Sources for use with Question 1.

Source 1: From Frederick Lewis Allen, *Only Yesterday: An Informal History of the 1920s*, published 1931. Here Allen is recalling the initial impact made by some of the first radio broadcasts.

In the winter of 1921–22, radio became a sudden craze. Soon everybody was talking, not about the telephone, but about radio. A San Francisco paper described the discovery that millions of people were making: 'There is radio music in the air, every night, everywhere. Anybody can hear it at home on a receiving set, which any child can construct in an hour.' In February President Harding had a set installed in his study, and a golf club announced that it would install a radio to enable golfers to hear church services on Sundays. In April, passengers on a train heard a radio concert, and a prominent pastor broke all records for modernising Christianity by broadcasting an Easter sermon from an airplane.

Newspapers brought out radio supplements and thousands of previously utterly unmechanical people puzzled over articles about radio parts such as tubes, circuits and crystals. Every other man you met on the street stopped you to tell you how he had sat up all night with earphones clamped to his head, and had actually heard the baseball star, Babe Ruth! How could one bother about the controversial political issues of the day if one was facing such momentous questions as how to construct a loop aerial?

Source 2: From an article written by the author, Jack Woodford, in *The Forum* magazine, published April 1929. *The Forum* regularly invited essays on controversial issues of the day. Here Woodford is commenting on radio as an advertising medium.

Do you remember, a few years ago, the joy we felt when the wonder of radio came to our attention? Ah, at last, here was something overwhelming that was going to broaden American life and culture. Something that was going to bring peace on earth and good will to men. And now we know what we have got in radio – just another medium – like the newspapers, the magazines, the billboards – for advertisers to use to pester us. A blatant signboard erected in our living rooms to bring us news of miraculous fuel-saving motor cars and cigar lighters that always light.

Formerly, we still had some constructive leisure time, but now there is very little danger that Americans will resort to the vice of thinking! Instead of hearing the pick of the country's brains, we hear potential Presidents explaining how it is possible for them to be both 'wet and dry', both 'for and against' every issue put before the voters of this splendid nation.

Friends sit around the radio sipping gin and listening to so-called music mixed in with long lists of the bargains to be had at 'Whatsit's' Department Store. Thus dies the art of conversation. I predict that in two years, at the present rate of advertising, no one will be listening; radio will be dead. We can put up a headstone over the grave, inscribed *Killed by Advertising*.

Option 2H.2: The USA, 1955–92: conformity and challenge

Sources for use with Question 2.

Source 3: From a press conference given by George McGovern, an anti-war Democratic Party Senator, 15 June 1971. Here McGovern is describing a meeting with Daniel Ellsberg six months earlier. Ellsberg was a Defence Department official who was seeking to reveal a top-secret government survey of the Vietnam War which became known as the Pentagon Papers.

Ellsberg came to me with those papers. He had first gone to the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and wanted him to publish them, but he had refused, saying it was illegal. I told Ellsberg pretty much the same thing.

I said, 'Why don't you do it?'

Ellsberg said, 'I could be prosecuted.'

So I said, 'Am I supposed to be prosecuted? I have been against the war. You were for the war; you were one of the creators of our policy. Why shouldn't you take the risk if you feel strongly about it? Why do you ask a U.S. senator? I'm sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States. I've told young people who were against the war that if they can't fight, they should be prepared to go to jail. If these papers are as revealing as you say they are, then you must consider whether it is worth breaking the law to leak them to the press. If it is, then you should be prepared to go to jail.'

He was very disappointed and – I think – somewhat indignant that I, like the Chairman, refused to release the papers. A few days later, he released these Pentagon Papers to the *New York Times*.

Source 4: From the concluding judgement of Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black in the case *New York Times* v. United States (Pentagon Papers), 26 June 1971. Here he is commenting on the decision of the Court. The justices had voted 6-3 in favour of allowing the publication of the Pentagon Papers.

I support the view that the Government's case against the *New York Times* should be dismissed. The First Amendment to the Constitution gave the free press the protection it must have to fulfil its essential role in our democracy, to serve the governed, not the governors. The Government's power to censor the press was abolished because only a free press can effectively expose deception in government. The most important duty of a free press is to prevent the government from deceiving the people in the process of sending them to distant lands to die in foreign wars.

In my view, far from deserving condemnation for their courageous reporting of the workings of government that led to the Vietnam war, the *New York Times* should be commended for serving the purpose that the First Amendment saw so clearly.

We are asked by the Government to judge that, despite the First Amendment, laws restricting freedom of the press are necessary in the name of 'national security.' The Government does not even attempt to pass an act of Congress to restrict the press. Instead, it takes the dangerous view that the courts should 'make' a law restricting the freedom of the press in the name of presidential power and national security. To rule that the President has the power to halt the publication of news by using the courts would wipe out the First Amendment and destroy the fundamental liberty and security of the very people the Government hopes to make secure.

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.