

Paper Reference(s)

9846/01

Edexcel

History

Advanced Extension Award

Monday 24th June 2002 - Afternoon

Time: 3 hours

Materials required for examination
Answer Book (AB16)

Items included with question papers
None

Instructions to Candidates

In the boxes on the answer book, write your centre number, candidate number, paper reference, surname and other names, and your signature. Examining body should be left blank.

Answer ALL questions in Section A and ONE question in Section B.

Information for Candidates

The total mark for this paper is 60: 40 marks for Section A and 20 marks for Section B.

You will not be credited for using the same information in more than one answer.

Advice to Candidates

You are advised to spend two hours on Section A (Question 1) and one hour on Section B.

You are reminded of the importance of clear and orderly presentation in your answers.

Turn over

M15508

A

W850/S9846/S7570

This publication may only be reproduced in accordance with Edexcel copyright policy.
Edexcel Foundation is a registered charity © 2001 Edexcel

Edexcel
Success through qualifications

SECTION A

Question One

Study sources 1 and 2 and then answer questions (a) to (c) which follow;

SOURCE 1

Taken from 'The Pursuit of History', a book written by John Tosh published in 2000. John Tosh is Professor of History at the University of North London.

Line

1 It is only in the past thirty years that any measure of agreement has emerged among
social historians as to what their subject is really about. Until that time the term 'social
history' was understood in three quite distinct ways, each one marginal to the interests of
historians in general. There was, firstly, the history of social problems such as poverty,
5 ignorance, insanity and disease. Social history meant, secondly, the history of every day
life in the home, in the work place and the community. As G.M. Trevelyan put it, 'Social
history might be defined negatively as the history of the people with the politics left out'.
Lastly, there was the history of the common people, or working classes, who were
almost entirely absent from political history and who featured in economic history only
10 in an inert and undifferentiated way as 'labour' or 'consumers'. In Britain this kind of
history was dominated by historians sympathetic to the labour movement.

None of the approaches mentioned explains why social history, for so long the poor
relation, now enjoys such prominence. What has happened in recent years is that its
subject matter has been redefined in a much more ambitious manner. Social history now
15 aspired to offer nothing less than the history of social structure. The notion of 'social
structure' is a sociological abstraction of a conveniently indeterminate kind which can be
– and has been – clothed in any number of theoretical garbs. But what it essentially
means is the sum of the social relationships between the many different groups in
society. Under the influence of Marxist thought, class has had the lion's share of
20 attention, but that is by no means the only group to be considered: there are also the
cross cutting ties of age, gender and occupation.

Social structure may seem to be a static, timeless concept, partly because it has been
treated this way in the writings of many sociologists. But it need not be so, and
historians tend naturally to adopt a more dynamic approach. Against the background of a
25 durable social structure, those individuals who move up or down are often particularly
significant and social mobility has been much studied by historians. Beyond a certain
point, social mobility is incompatible with the maintenance of the existing structure and
a new form of society may emerge. Urbanisation, in particular, needs to be studied as a
process of social change, including the assimilation of immigrants, the emergence of
30 new forms of social stratification, the hardening distinction between work and leisure,
and so on.

As social history has raised its sights, so its research techniques have become more
demanding. There is probably no other field whose primary sources are so varied, so

35 widely dispersed and so uneven in quality. The vast majority of extant historical records
were, after all, created by large corporate institutions such as government, church and
business. While this suited the political historian well enough, and up to a point the
economic historian too, it poses major problems for the social historian. The limited
40 scope of the earlier social history is partly explained by the tendency of historians to take
the line of least resistance and follow the trail through the records of institutions with an
avowedly 'social' function – schools, hospitals, trade unions and the like; the result was
work of a narrowly institutional character. But the new social history demands a great
deal more. Social groups do not leave corporate records. Their composition and place in
the social structure have to be reconstructed from a broad range of sources composed for
quite different and usually more mundane reasons.

45 An even greater problem is posed by the mass of the population which lived outside the
charmed circle of literacy. Their conditions and opinions became the subject of
systematic social surveys only during the nineteenth century. Until then the picture we
form of the lower classes is inevitably dominated by those activities which brought down
on them the attention of the authorities: litigation, sedition and - most of all – common
50 crime and offences against church discipline. At times of popular discontent this
attention was particularly intrusive, and whole areas of society which normally remain
'invisible' may be illuminated by legal and police records. In more settled conditions,
judicial activity was less intense, and it is therefore much more difficult to build up the
profile of the local community. Before any generalisation can be made with confidence,
55 a vast quantity of court records has to be sifted, usually in conjunction with other sources
such as manorial records, tax registers, wills and the records of charitable institutions. In
Britain, as in other countries, there is almost limitless scope for further work along these
lines.

Turn over

SOURCE 2

Taken from 'In Defence of History', a book written by Richard Evans and published in 1997. Richard Evans is Professor of Modern History at Cambridge University.

Line

1 For a long time political history dominated the concerns of those who called themselves historians. 'History is past politics,' as Sir John Seeley, Professor of Modern History at Cambridge in the late nineteenth century, put it, 'and politics is present history'. History as a university subject, when it emerged during the
5 professionalisation process of the nineteenth century, was emphatically the political history of the nation-state and its relations with other nation-states. The history of high politics and international diplomacy was king. History was made by great men. They were taken to be morally and politically autonomous individuals, whose decisions reflected in the first place the peculiarities of their own personality rather than wider
10 forces of any kind. So dominant was this approach within the profession that social and economic historians actually had to set up their own separate university departments to get a foothold in the academy, and to claim that their own specialism constituted a separate discipline entirely distinct from history proper. Two world wars reinforced rather than undermined the dominance of the 'kings and battles' approach. Even in the
15 1990s, the view that history is essentially political history remains widespread within the profession.

Declarations by eminent historians dismissing the history of the great majority of human beings in the past as trivial, meaningless or impossible to study are legion. The
20 great Sir Lewis Namier, for instance, thought that the history of every age was shaped by a handful of men who possessed the necessary freedom of will and action for this task; and history was therefore no more than the business of finding out what made them tick. 'Whatever theories of "free will" theologians and philosophers may develop with regard to the individual,' he wrote, 'there is no free will in the thinking and actions of the masses, any more than in the revolutions of the planets, in the migrations
25 of birds, and in the plunging of hordes of lemmings into the sea'. The point of history was to study 'people who mattered', in the words of Namier's assistant and disciple John Brooke, and 'the workers, the peasants, collectively, had hardly ever mattered', so 'a historian rarely had to take notice of them'.

More recently John Vincent has claimed that because history depends on written
30 sources, and most people in the past could neither read nor write, 'history can speak directly only of minorities'. The history of pre-literate or illiterate societies, he has declared, is 'unsound'. These arguments have generally failed to convince the modern historical profession. Historians have displayed great ingenuity in exploiting unwritten sources to construct the history of pre-literate social groups, assisted by many kinds of
35 written records compiled about these groups by the state and by their social superiors. There are many reasons why the history of the powerless masses before the modern era is worth studying. The history of their experience of death and disease, marriage and sexuality, belief and emotion, has much of relevance to tell us about the human condition.

40 At the end of the twentieth century historians are writing about almost every conceivable kind of human activity in the past, as well as about animals, plants, the natural environment and the built and constructed world of machines and human habitations. 'History from below' has tried to adopt the perspective of ordinary men and women in the past, to write about their experiences and to look on the state, politics
45 and society with their eyes; under the influence of neighbouring and rather remoter disciplines, there have been studies of the body, of medicine and science, of health and disease, of popular culture, of seemingly irrational and inexplicable folk-beliefs in the past; under the tutelage of the social sciences in Germany and America there have been quantitative structural studies of urban and rural communities in the past, of religious
50 practice, of crime and criminality. Virtually everything of meaning or importance to contemporary humanity now has a written history; and that means everything of importance to all kinds of people, not just to the small elite of the educated and powerful. However humble or powerless, however illiterate or uneducated, almost every group of people in the past has now been rescued from what E. P. Thompson
55 called, in a phrase which has struck a resounding blow against the arrogance of political historians, 'the enormous condescension of posterity'.

Turn over

(a) Study Source 1

In what ways, according to the author of Source 1, has the discipline of social history changed over the past thirty years?

(6 marks)

(b) Study Source 2

Richard Evans maintains that traditional political historians focus on the influence of 'peculiarities of their own personality' on the decision making of 'great men' and neglect the 'wider forces' at work (lines 7-9). In relation to one significant decision in political history you have studied, explain the importance of both the 'peculiarities of personality' of the decision-maker or decision-makers involved in making it, and the 'wider forces' at work.

(14 marks)

(c) Study Sources 1 and 2

Some historians have argued that 'the history of the great majority of human beings' is both 'impossible to study' (Source 2, lines 17-18) and also unworthy of study, because these people 'hardly ever mattered' (Source 2, line 27).

Making reference to both sources, and to your wider historical reading, assess the validity of this view.

(20 marks)

(TOTAL: 40 marks)

SECTION B

Answer ONE question from this section

You will not be credited in this section for repeating information that you have used in Section A.

2. 'On the face of it the skills of the historian and of the imaginative writer are utterly different. In reality they are remarkably similar.' How far do you agree with this view? Develop your answer by specific reference to any period or periods you have studied.

(20 marks)

3. 'The history which avoids making moral judgements is not history at all.' How far do you agree with this view? Develop your answer by specific reference to any period or periods you have studied.

(20 marks)

4. 'War is the locomotive of history.' How far do you agree that war has been the most significant factor in bringing about change? Develop your answer by specific reference to any period or periods you have studied.

(20 marks)

5. 'Historians should not attempt to write the history of the very recent past because the problems involved are insuperable.' How far do you agree with this view? Develop your answer by reference both to the time through which you have lived and any historical period or periods you have studied.

(20 marks)

(END)

BLANK PAGE