

Section I 25 marks

Attempt Question 1

Allow about 1 hour for this section

Answer the question in a writing booklet

Extra writing paper is available

In your answer you will be assessed on how well you:

- present a detailed, logical and well-structured answer to the question
- use relevant issues of historiography
- use relevant sources to support your argument

Using the Source, answer the question that follows.

The Two Faces of E.H. Carr

'A History of Soviet Russia' on the other hand was clearly written by Carr the bureaucrat, the man who, as Haslam notes, had been a civil servant for so long that he instinctively identified with government (of whatever political hue) and was interested almost exclusively in what went into the making of policy. A lot of the 'History' is written like a civil service minute. And its extreme lack of interest in failed alternatives to the Bolshevik Revolution seems to derive from the civil servant's lack of interest in anything which does not impinge directly on the formulation of policy. This lack of interest, in turn, is one of the things that makes the 'History' so tedious for so much of the time: it's a history without drama, without the sense of openness and contingency that are the essential elements in an exciting historical narrative.

Moreover, while one of the things that made 'What is History?' so exciting was its plea for history to become more sociological, it was impossible for any reader of the 'History' to detect the faintest influence of sociology, or indeed the slightest interest in the social history of the kind that the English Marxist historians and - increasingly - non-Marxist social historians like Keith Thomas or Peter Laslett were practising. The 'History' was resolutely political and showed no real consciousness of the social processes at work in the events it was describing.

And yet the two books were linked in more ways than one: for example, in 'What is History?' Carr declared that historians should only be interested in causes of historical events insofar as their explanation served the making of policy in the future. This always seemed wrong to me: for causes, even those that are not 'accidental' (a category to which Carr paid far too little attention in his book, though in his later thinking he came to assign more weight to it), may be discerned that have not the remotest implications for policy decisions or political principles at the time at which the historian is writing. Or was Carr simply dismissing the whole of history before modern times as irrelevant and uninteresting? Certainly on occasion he seemed to come close to this, for all his fondness for Classical allusions in his work.

Carr's insistence that history should be politically relevant was an inspiration in the heady days of 1968. But it also brought problems, especially in its linkage with the idea that the vast majority of human beings in the past were of no interest to the historian because they had made no contribution to political change. It was precisely this idea that the social historians of the 1960s set out to challenge. Their manifestos appeared in three special issues of the 'Times Literary Supplement' published in 1966, like a clarion call to a younger generation that was dissatisfied with the concentration on political history of the historical establishment - an establishment which in this case at least seemed to include Carr himself, for all his dissident views in other respects. Who could resist, for example, the young Keith Thomas's call for the application of anthropological theory to the study of early modern witchcraft? Here indeed were people in the past who had suffered from what Edward Thompson called 'the enormous condescension of posterity', people to whom theory was restoring a posthumous dignity and rationality.

Richard J. Evans, The Two Faces of E.H. Carr, <http://www.history.ac.uk/ihr/Focus/Whatishistory/evans10.html>

Question 1(25 marks)

With reference to the source and other sources, why have approaches to history changed over time?

Section II 25 marks

Attempt Question 2

Allow about 1 hour for this section

Answer the question in a writing booklet

Extra writing paper is available

In your answer you will be assessed on how well you:

- **present a detailed, logical and well-structured answer to the question**
- **use an appropriate case study**
- **present a balanced treatment of the historians and the areas of debate selected for discussion**

Question 2(25 marks)

'The main concern of historians is seeking the truth.'

With reference to the above quotation, assess TWO areas of historical debate that highlight differing interpretations of your chosen case study.

Identify your case study at the beginning of your answer.