

Paper Reference(s)

**9846/01**

**Edexcel**

**History**

**Advanced Extension Award**

**Monday 28 June 2004 – Afternoon**

**Time: 3 hours**

**Materials required for examination**

Answer book (AB16)

**Items included with question papers**

Nil

**Instructions to Candidates**

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

**Answer ALL parts of the question in Section A and ONE question from 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.

Printer's Log. No.

**M18644A**



M 1 8 6 4 4 A

W850/S9846/57570 5/5/5/3/

This publication may only be reproduced in accordance with London Qualifications Limited copyright policy. ©2004 London Qualifications Limited.

*Turn over*

**Edexcel**  
*Success through qualifications*

## SECTION A

### Question 1

Study Sources 1 and 2 and then answer questions (a) to (c) which follow.

#### SOURCE 1

Taken from *History: A Very Short Introduction*, a book written by John H. Arnold and published in 2000.

line

1 It is unfair and unreasonable to lump all political historians into one camp. However, it might be reasonable to say that within the 'political' story, change comes about through human competence or incompetence; it is affected by the strength of ideologies; and it is subject to a degree of chance.

5 At its crudest, political history remains stuck in a later nineteenth century mould: narrating 'great events', and passing judgement on 'Great Men' (or their flipside, 'Really Awful Men'). Whilst it would seem churlish to deny that there were and are some men and women (although curiously the latter are less frequently mentioned) who might be called 'Great', it is less clear on what grounds exactly that epithet should be applied, and whether it tells us anything about  
10 the person in question, or rather more about the tastes of the historian doing the labelling. At what point, for example, does 'Greatness' wear off, and simple 'competence' begin to apply? Do 'Competent Men' play no role in history?

15 More importantly, 'Great Men' theories of historical causation – and, indeed, theories that deal with the decisions made by not-so-great men – depend upon a belief that what causes events is the good or bad decisions taken by the individual in power. It is foolish to deny that political leaders wield power and that the choices they make affect the lives of others; but is it not equally foolish to forget the reactions and choices made by the rest of the people in general? Battles may be won by expert commanders, but they are also won by those willing to fight and die, by ideas that inspire people to combat, by the economic systems that support those troops,  
20 and by the manufacturing bases that provide their weapons. What happened in the past is undoubtedly affected – even dictated – by the decisions that people make. But what people intend to do, and what the outcomes of those intentions actually turn out to be, are not often the same thing.

25 Social historians tend to concentrate upon rather different evidence from political historians: in particular, the bureaucratic, localized records wherein one is more likely to find information relating to the common people. Some of this information may permit economic analysis – if, for example, one looks at tax returns, lists of merchandise and sales, records of income and outgoings. Economic pictures of change had increasing interest for historians in the twentieth century, largely because of the influence of Karl Marx.

30 Practically all historians writing today are marxists (with a small 'm'). This does not mean that they are all 'left-wing' (far from it) or that they necessarily recognize or remember their debt [to Marx]. But one key element of Marx's thought has become so ingrained in historians' ideas that it is now practically taken for granted: the insight that social and economic circumstances affect the ways in which people think about themselves, their lives, the world around them, and  
35 thus move to action. This is not to suggest that they are completely controlled by these circumstances. Marx himself wrote that:

‘Men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given, and transmitted from the past.’

40 Almost any interpretation of any topic will take for granted the utility of examining the society within which things took place, the economic positions and interests of the people involved. Although social history usually keeps one eye on economic elements – thinking, for example, about how material conditions might be influencing changes in society – its areas of interest are broader. Apart from studying the movement of goods and incomes, social historians also  
45 use further evidence – pre-eminently legal records – to analyse the thoughts, feelings, and behaviour of the general populace. Sometimes, this leads historians into different directions, asking other questions. The influence of anthropology and sociology has allowed social historians to investigate the patterns of behaviour they perceive in people’s daily lives: their family structures, their conduct in daily life, the way they arrange and give meaning to the  
50 social spaces around them.

Historians have also, in recent years, become increasingly interested in culture. ‘Culture’, as it is understood in this context, does not simply mean music, plays, literature and so on; it is taken to indicate patterns of thought and understanding, modes of language, rituals of life, and ways of thinking. Cultural historians have taken Marx’s idea, that economic circumstances  
55 affect the way people think and behave, and have changed its emphasis: arguing that the ways in which people think affect their relationship to society and economics.

## SOURCE 2

Taken from *'History and the Historians'*, a book written by John Warren and published in 1999.

line

1 Let us see if we can unravel Marx's ideas. There is a label to attach to his fundamental approach: historical materialism. This means that economic (material) conditions shape everything significant in human society. So, change in history must come about because of changes in economic conditions.

5 What do historians, who are not primarily Marxist, owe to Karl Marx? It seems very obvious to say that social and economic history owes much to Marx, and this is true within limits. After all, Marx offers a way of relating economic history to social history (and to political history for that matter) through historical materialism. This is very seductive. In short, Marx offers the historian not only a model on which to base his methodology but also a purpose. Marxism makes it possible for historians to tackle some of the 'big issues' – change through time, the impact of industrialisation, the causes and effects of imperialism, political and social revolution – by offering hypotheses on what is likely to be most significant in an otherwise off-putting avalanche of historical data. Yet the relationship between Marxism and the discipline of economic history is less direct and more tenuous than one might expect. It would certainly be untrue to say that economic history owed its being to Marx. After all, the experience of the Industrial Revolution itself was likely to arouse interest in economics. This, rather than Marx, explains the growth of economic history in the USA at the end of the nineteenth century. Significantly, American economic history and mainstream history tended to drift apart – hardly a characteristic of Marxist historiography.

20 Marxist class analysis has helped to stimulate an interest in cultural history. In particular, the study of popular culture has increasingly developed into an accepted branch of academic history since the late 1970s. This is not to say that those involved in the study of popular culture owe their discipline or methodology purely to Marx. Interest in popular culture was a feature of growing nationalism in Europe in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and, if we look at it historiographically, then the dissatisfaction with traditional, event-based political and diplomatic history was not restricted to Marxists. In any case, those who now study popular culture are as likely to be influenced by anthropology as they are by Marxist theoreticians.

30 One area where Marxist influences are more clearly identifiable is 'history from below': the attempt to recapture the experiences, attitudes, value-systems and perspectives of those left out of traditional history (and most published primary sources). However, Eric Hobsbawm admits to some limitations to the Marxist contribution to 'history from below'. He accepts that Marxists – or, in fact, socialist historians in general – were tempted to study ordinary people as and when they could be seen as contributors to the forward march of the labour movement. This led to a concentration on institutions and organisations which represented the workers, rather than the workers themselves.

40 The relationship between Marxism and women's history is somewhat problematic. Marxism certainly played a part in the attack on elitist (and male-dominated) political and diplomatic history, and so helped to open the door to a much wider definition of what constituted the discipline of history. Practitioners of Marxist and feminist history wish to make their contribution to political and social change. Both Marxism and women's history share an awareness of exploitation, but also frequently wish to point to achievement: in other words, to demonstrate the extent to which those discriminated against were able, against all the odds, to make their own histories. However, women's history is offering an alternative way of

structuring the past to that offered by class analysis and economic determinism. In one form, it seeks to recapture the experience of women and so offer 'her-story' as opposed to 'his-story'. On the other hand, in the form of gender history, it seeks to explore how the power structures in society are based on gender rather than on class. Marxism has little part to play in such analyses.

**(Maximum marks)**

**(a) Study Source 1**

To what extent, according to the author of Source 1, do political and social historians differ in their approaches to analysis of change in history?

**(6 marks)**

**(b) Study Source 1**

The author of Source 1 acknowledges that there were and are some men and women who might be called 'Great'.

Using your own knowledge, identify an historical figure from any period you have studied who, in your judgement, deserves to be called 'Great' and explain why you believe this to be so.

**(14 marks)**

**(c) Study Sources 1 and 2**

'Change in history must come about because of changes in economic conditions.' (Source 2, lines 3–4.)

How far do you agree that this view has been highly influential, and how persuasive do you find it? Develop your answer by reference to both sources and to your own historical knowledge.

**(20 marks)**

**(TOTAL FOR SECTION A: 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.

(Maximum marks)

2. 'Imagination is chief among the qualities needed by the historian.' To what extent do you agree with this view? Develop your answer by specific reference to your own historical reading and study. (20 marks)
- 

3. 'Heritage history is not real history: it presents a view of the past which is bland and unquestioning.' How far do you agree with this observation? Develop your answer by specific reference to your own studies and your experience of 'heritage history'. (20 marks)
- 

4. 'History shows that empires benefit neither rulers nor ruled.' How far do you agree with this view? Develop your answer by specific reference to any historical period or periods you have studied. (20 marks)
- 

5. 'Information technology has in practice had little impact on the process of historical inquiry.' To what extent do you agree with this statement? Develop your answer by specific reference to your own studies and to historical works you have read. (20 marks)
- 

**TOTAL FOR PAPER: 60 MARKS**

**END**

**BLANK PAGE**