



General Certificate of Education  
Advanced Level Examination  
June 2013

## **General Studies (Specification B)**

## **GENB4**

Unit 4 Change

### **Insert**

#### **STIMULUS MATERIAL**

These texts are to be read in conjunction with the questions in unit GENB4.

The questions arise from the texts, but they should **not** be answered by reference to the texts alone.

---

## Text A

### Dynamic and fast-growing

Mitt Romney is not the first Mormon to run for the United States presidency. The first Mormon to run was, in fact, the first Mormon: Joseph Smith Jr., the founder of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. The son of a Vermont farmer, Smith began having religious visions in the 1820s: an angel named Moroni came to him, he said, and led him to unearth a set of golden plates inscribed with the history of the Israelites and revealing a new Christian testament, which he translated using crystal spectacles and published as the Book of Mormon.

Persecuted and harassed, Smith's growing band of Mormon followers headed west, first to Ohio and Missouri, and then on to Illinois. In 1844, Smith announced his candidacy for the US presidency, running as an independent. He was accused of trying to set himself up as a religious king, arrested, jailed, and then murdered by a mob of 200 armed men, their faces painted black with wet gunpowder.

Under the leadership of Brigham Young, most Mormons headed west again to Utah Territory, there to implant a religion that now has some fourteen million followers worldwide, including six million in the US. One of those who made the trek to Utah was Miles Romney, an English carpenter from the county of Lancaster. His great-great-grandson is now running for the presidency.

Polls suggest that there is still lingering suspicion of Mormonism among US voters. More than one in five Americans say they would not vote for a Mormon candidate – a statistic that has hardly changed since 1967. Much of the distrust centres on polygamy, a tradition the church declared immoral in 1890 but practised enthusiastically up until that point: Joseph Smith had 30 wives, and Brigham Young had 55. Mitt Romney's great-grandfather was positively restrained, with just 12.

The Mormon Church is one of the richest, most dynamic and fastest-growing faiths in the world, yet for many Americans it is indissolubly associated with the unorthodox set of 19th-century beliefs and traditions pioneered by Smith and Young; baptising the dead to bring them into the Church, the wearing of 'temple garments' or sacred underwear, symbolising the covenant with the Church, the belief that God lives on a planet called Kolob and that humans can become gods of their own planets.

While the Christian Right takes issue with the Mormon Church on theological grounds, the liberal Left cites the Church's opposition to abortion and gay marriage and its stress on abstinence – from tea, coffee, alcohol, tobacco, and sex outside marriage. Not until 1978 did the Church admit black people to the priesthood: better late than never, but a full 14 years after the Civil Rights Act.

Missionary work is deeply embedded in Mormon tradition. Romney carried out his mission in France, and not surprisingly made few converts in a country where alcohol, tobacco, and sex outside marriage are 'sacred'.

Source: extract from 'One nation under a planet called Kolob', BEN MACINTYRE, *The Times*, 10 January 2012  
© Times Newspapers Limited 2012

---

**Text A continued****The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints: Statistics (Year ending 2010)**

Worldwide membership	14 131 467
Missions	340
Missionaries	52 483
Temples in operation	136
Temples under construction	15
Congregations	28 660
Universities and colleges	4
Pastors in training	369 373
Value of humanitarian aid (since 1985)	\$1.3 billion
Languages into which Mormon literature has been translated	166

Source: © 1998–2012, LDSChurchTemples.com. All rights reserved.

**Turn over for the next text**

**Turn over ►**

---

## Text B

### Inventing the wheel

The successive stages in man's technical progress are readily associated with particular well-known periods in his historical development: fire...writing...the wheel...sails...bronze...iron...water power...steam...explosives...electricity...light alloys...wireless...television...nuclear energy...automation...flight...rockets...space travel...

In any age, people view each major discovery or achievement as the inventor's final answer to an old question. Real 'progress' is only achieved when certain problems, some of them centuries old, have been solved.

Wherever we can penetrate the darkness which hides the early history of mankind, we find traces of astonishing technical achievements. Remember, for instance, such examples as the gigantic age-old stone monuments, the Hanging Gardens of Babylon, and the clay tablets, weapons, jewellery, fortifications, palaces, burial chambers, ships and tools unearthed by archaeologists – and then think of the most outstanding discovery of all – the wheel.

These technical achievements presuppose technical means such as fire, tools for working hard stone or the finest jewellery, and levers and rollers to move heavy weights.

Very little is known of the science and technology of those days. We do not know who discovered the lever, the roller or the wheel. Nor can we say when these fundamental achievements of man's brain and hand became the daily tools of his craft; the wheel must have been 'discovered' and forgotten again many times.

We live in an artificial technological world from which it is now virtually impossible to escape, since it provides all the material aids to our existence, whether they be clothing, houses, lighting, heating, cooling, air-conditioning and sanitation, or supplies of drinking water, gas, electricity, vitamins, medicines or vaccines.

Source: extract from *Science as History*, HEINZ GARTMANN, Hodder & Stoughton, 1960

---

**Text C****Not.com**

*Private Eye*'s attitude to the web revolution can probably best be expressed by the editor's reply to a reader who asked in June 1995 about the newly launched 'WWW page'.

"Sir – I was wondering if you had any plans to put further sections of the *Eye* on the net?

...No. Go and buy the mag. (Ed.)"

It took Rupert Murdoch exactly fifteen more years to come round to this point of view.

"I couldn't see what the advantages were," says editor, Ian Hislop, now. "The culture of everything being free isn't mine. It's the hippy base of the net moving on to the next generation who don't want to pay for anything. Well, that's not me. I don't see why, if you pay journalists and writers, anyone should get it for free. And I thought 'This isn't going to help'."

So, apart from a slightly peculiar early and temporary alliance with MSN for a bells-and-whistles animated *Eye* website in 1998 – "We were so ignorant about technology we didn't realise it was the great evil," laughs Hislop – the magazine has only ever used its website, private-eye.co.uk, as a sales and marketing tool. "We had a very, very early website," recalls former IT boffin Steve Mann, "and Ian said, 'Oh, if it sells one subscription it will be worth it,' and if you think about it now, probably the bulk of our subs are coming online." And, since pressure from users of Twitter helped stave off the Trafigura\* superinjunction, the magazine has had a presence there, too. "Even I noticed that had a huge effect," jokes Hislop. "I thought straight after that we should be saying to those people who read Twitter, 'You've just heard of Trafigura. If you'd like to have read about it previously, there's this magazine called *Private Eye*.' I would imagine that most people think the *Eye*'s Twitter posts are basically spam. What I can't see is that it is an alternative. I'm not putting the whole magazine up, or saying, 'I'm going to give this to you for free'."

As a result, the *Eye* was celebrating its highest circulation figures in eighteen years in 2010, while newspapers like *The Guardian*, which had spent the previous two decades enthusiastically seeking out new and expensive ways to give away all their content and more online, have seen their sales drop by around a third in the same period.

Source: adapted from *Private Eye, The First 50 Years*, ADAM MACQUEEN, Private Eye Productions, 2011

---

\* The oil company Trafigura, in 2009, sought to ban the press from referring to its dumping of toxic waste in the Ivory Coast.

**Turn over for the next text**

**Turn over ►**

---

## Text D

### The English Country House

The English aristocracy lived in castles until Tudor kings and queens brought something like peace to the country. Thereafter, they built large houses for themselves, on large estates, from which they could supervise the farms and villages whose produce and whose rents kept them in growing luxury.

The grand families who occupied these houses did their best to make them as much like the houses in which royalty lived as they could. They filled them with fine furniture, paintings, glassware, porcelain, and fitments in the latest high fashion, so as to make them a fit object of envy to the guests that they received – and these guests might very well *be* royalty, if the families and their houses were grand enough.

It was not unusual for these houses and their parks and chases to be the scene of country balls and sporting events, hunts and horse-racing; and there were those 'stately home' owners who built rather stately 'hotels' in their grounds for the reception of visitors curious to see how the other sixteenth lived. It is even said that Horace Walpole, the novelist, who built a fancy house in the 'Gothic' style at Strawberry Hill, Twickenham, in the late 1700s, was so besieged by sightseers in the summer months that he issued tickets for admission.

Such houses were periodically sacked by invading forces or confiscated by revolutionaries, elsewhere in Europe; but in England, aristocrats were largely spared this unwelcome attention, so their collections and their pretensions grew.

In the course of two world wars, many country houses were commandeered for use as hospitals for invalid officers. Their staffs were scattered, their sons commissioned, and their treasures were put in storage, or covered with dust-sheets. Unable to maintain them, their owners placed them in the hands of the National Trust, or sold them to the new-rich who *could* maintain them, or to hotel chains and insurance companies.

Now, of course, they are put to all manner of new uses: they are highly superior museums, or conference centres, or wedding venues; their estates are the sites of equestrian events, agricultural shows, operatic performances, and safari parks. It is probably true to say that they have never been livelier places than they are now.

Source: AQA 2012

**Text E****Readiness and Resistance to Change**

Jeevan Vasagar, of *The Guardian*, sat in on a meeting of Cambridge admissions tutors. At present, 59.3 per cent of admissions to Cambridge are from state schools and colleges, though 87 per cent of A-Level exam candidates are from such schools. Among other observations in Vasagar's report, published in *The Guardian* on 10 January 2012, was this one:

*'The phrase "a good school" comes up repeatedly in the tutors' discussions. It is used most frequently about private and grammar schools, but also some comprehensive schools, and has a double meaning. "A good school" is a high-performing one [...] but when a candidate comes from "a good school", they are also cut less slack.'*

The following letter by Dr Selina Todd (St Hilda's College, Oxford) was published in *The Guardian* on 13 January 2012:

As an Oxford admissions tutor, I recognise some elements of Jeevan Vasagar's examination of the Cambridge admissions system, but not the division between "good" and "poor" schools. Some of us welcome applications from comprehensive school students, not because these candidates can do well in spite of their school, but because their education offers them an excellent foundation for university. Many comprehensives offer imaginative lessons, encourage independent study, and provide an unparalleled social education. Being educated alongside pupils from a wide range of backgrounds gives these candidates the ability to negotiate cultural and social difference in debate, and the confidence to relate abstract or scholarly theory to the wider society in which they live.

They also know that academic success is founded on hard work and effort, not on family background and wealth – the criteria for entry to private schools – or the innate "talent" that selective schools claim to identify. Most importantly, comprehensives still provide far more students with the opportunity to do A-levels and apply to university than do private or state selective schools. They therefore send us candidates who would never otherwise have had the chance of a university education, but who go on to excel. Any weaknesses with comprehensive schools are due to the lamentable lack of government investment in them. It is a tribute to their teaching staff that their students continue to shine.

Source: excerpt from 'So who is good enough to get into Cambridge?', JEEVAN VASAGAR, *The Guardian*, 10 January 2012.  
& letter by DR SELINA TODD, St Hilda's College, Oxford, *The Guardian*, 13 January 2012.

© 2012 Guardian News and Media Limited or its affiliated companies. All rights reserved.

**END OF STIMULUS MATERIAL**

**There is no stimulus material printed on this page**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COPYRIGHT-HOLDERS AND PUBLISHERS

Permission to reproduce all copyright material has been applied for. In some cases, efforts to contact copyright-holders have been unsuccessful and AQA will be happy to rectify any omissions of acknowledgements in future papers if notified.

Copyright © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.