Instructions

• Use black ink or ball-point pen.
• Fill in the boxes at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
• You must answer two questions on the option for which you have been prepared.
• There are two sections in this question paper. Answer one question from Section A and one question from Section B.
• Answer the questions in the spaces provided – there may be more space than you need.

Information

• The total mark for this paper is 40.
• The marks for each question are shown in brackets – use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.

Advice

• Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
• Check your answers if you have time at the end.
SECTION A

Choose EITHER Question 1 OR Question 2 for which you have been prepared.

You must start your answer on page 3.

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

Study Sources 1 and 2 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

1. How far could the historian make use of Sources 1 and 2 together to investigate the changing position of women in society in the United States in the 1920s?
   
   Explain your answer, using both sources, the information given about them and your own knowledge of the historical context.

   (Total for Question 1 = 20 marks)

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

Study Sources 3 and 4 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

2. How far could the historian make use of Sources 3 and 4 together to investigate the impact of the Reagan Presidency on the size of the federal government budget deficit?

   Explain your answer, using both sources, the information given about them and your own knowledge of the historical context.

   (Total for Question 2 = 20 marks)
Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ✗. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ✗ and then indicate your new question with a cross ✗.

Chosen question number:  Question 1 ✗  Question 2 ✗
SECTION B

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

You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.

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

EITHER

3 ‘The New Deal only resulted in bigger federal government which was willing to spend more money.’

How far do you agree with this statement?

(Total for Question 3 = 20 marks)

OR

4 How far do you agree that the NAACP was primarily responsible for changing the status of black Americans in the years 1944–55?

(Total for Question 4 = 20 marks)

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

EITHER

5 ‘It was mainly the influence of the “beatnik” generation that shaped the rebellious attitudes of young people in the 1960s.’

How far do you agree with this statement?

(Total for Question 5 = 20 marks)

OR

6 To what extent did President Johnson’s Great Society programme improve the quality of life for poor people in America?

(Total for Question 6 = 20 marks)
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 ‘Women Smokers’, an article in *The New York Times* newspaper, 29 February 1920. This was ‘Leap Day’, when women traditionally challenged male-dominated conventions. Here the writer is reporting and commenting on an interview with a tobacconist about women who smoke.

In spite of disapproving church sermons, in spite of campaigns waged by the Women’s Christian Temperance Union, in spite of warnings from the Peace Societies, the number of women who smoke is on the increase. The question put to the clerk behind the counter of one of the many tobacconist shops was, ‘Do you find you are getting any women customers?’

He replied, ‘Oh, yes and a very great and noticeable increase. I think I might truthfully say that today 50 per cent of our patrons are women. Do you know, it’s really very funny. The men who come into the shop to buy cigarettes for their lady friends buy perfumed ones. And when the ladies come in themselves they buy the strong ones. They insist upon getting the same kind as the men. They want a man’s smoke every time.’

What are the anti-tobacco organisations doing in the face of the spread of this habit? According to the Board of Temperance, Prohibition, and Morals of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the increased use of tobacco among women during 1919 was appalling. In a recent statement the Board made an earnest appeal to women to refrain from the use of tobacco in the name of the country’s welfare. It said, ‘no nation can maintain the vigour which has been characteristic of the American people after its women begin the use of cigarettes.’

**Source 2:** From ‘Ladies of the Ticker’, a column by the journalist Eunice Fuller Barnard in the literary magazine, *The North American Review*, April 1929. Here she discusses the female contribution to the great bull market of the 1920s.

All through the recent bull market, women by the hundreds have sat in the special stockbrokers’ rooms set aside for them. Day in and day out loud-mouthed widows, gum-chewing blondes and spinsters who look as if they belonged in a church meeting, observe, pencil in hand, from the opening of the market till its end. Five years ago the average stock market trader still frowned on the woman customer. Some even now do so officially. But they are like a king ordering back the rising tide. There are even brokers who believe that women, quite as much as men, made the speculative stock market of 1927–29. In many instances even waitresses and telephone girls, cooks and washerwomen are said to have invested their meagre incomes on a wealthy employer’s advice and made modest fortunes. One thing necessary to a woman’s participation in the market was of course money of her own to invest. And that she has undoubtedly achieved as never before. Why should she not, with her increasing leisure, learn to buy stocks and shares for the family’s future, quite as well as fur coats and antique furniture?
Option 2H.2: The USA, 1955–92: conformity and challenge

Sources for use with Question 2.

Source 3: From Jerry Hagstrom, Beyond Reagan – The New Landscape of American Politics, published 1988. Hagstrom was a political journalist. Here he is commenting on President Reagan's economic policies.

On the economic front, the 1980s do belong to Reagan. Tax cuts, tax reform and a defence build-up is what the conservative president wanted, and that's what he got. But these policies led the budget in opposite directions. Reagan kept government from interfering with business in order to lower the deficit. When an international over-production in grain caused prices to plummet, Reagan tried to get the government out of agriculture – a move that was stopped by both Democrat and Republican members of Congress.

Reagan's pure free market face had a blemish: defence spending. The administration's historic peacetime defence build-up performed like a Democrat tool of industrial planning, overwhelmed his desire for a balanced budget and skewed investment toward military production.

Whether they admitted it or not, defence spending turned the Reaganites into economic activists who vastly increased federal government expenditure. The defence budget played a role in reversing the 1982-83 recession in many ways similar to previous Democrat schemes to spend their way out of an economic downturn.

Source 4: From a memo written by Murray N. Rothbard to students of Mises Institute Business School, Alabama 1987. Rothbard was a free market economist and academic. Here he is commenting on President Reagan's economic policies.

The Myths of Reaganomics

One of the most curious sights has been to see the Reaganites completely change their tune. At the beginning of the Reagan administration, the conservative Republicans in the House of Representatives were convinced that deficits would disappear immediately. They received a terrific shock when they were asked by Reagan to vote for the usual annual increase in the statutory debt limit. These Republicans, some literally with tears in their eyes, protested that never in their lives had they voted for an increase, but they were doing it just this once because they 'trusted Ronald Reagan' to balance the budget from then on. The rest, alas, is history, and they never saw fit to cry again. Instead, they found themselves adjusting rather easily to the new era of huge permanent deficits.

One way in which Reagan has tried to seize the moral high ground is to move his speech-making away from reality even more sharply than usual. Thus, the proposer of the biggest deficits in American history has been calling strongly for a Constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget, trying to make Congress take the blame for our deficit economy. Reagan's words have been calling for reductions in government expenditure; his actions have been precisely the reverse.