



# History

## Advanced Subsidiary

### Paper 1: Breadth study with interpretations

#### Option 1D: Britain, c1785–c1870: democracy, protest and reform

Wednesday 18 May 2016 – Afternoon

**Time: 2 hours 15 minutes**

Paper Reference

**8HI0/1D**

#### You must have:

Extracts Booklet (enclosed)

Total Marks

51

### 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.
- There are three sections in this question paper. Answer **ONE** question from Section A, **ONE** question from Section B and the question in Section C.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

### Information

- The total mark for this paper is 60.
- 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.

Turn over ►

P49958RA

©2016 Pearson Education Ltd.

1/1/1/1/1/1



P 4 9 9 5 8 R A 0 1 2 8

PEARSON

## SECTION A

Answer EITHER Question 1 OR Question 2.

**EITHER**

- 1 Was parliamentary concern for the suffering of working children the main reason for factory reform in the years 1819-48?

(Total for Question 1 = 20 marks)

**OR**

- 2 Was pressure from outside parliament the main reason for the reform of parliament in the years 1852-70?

(Total for Question 2 = 20 marks)



Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross ☒. 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 ☒

16 marks

It could be argued that the suffering of working children was the main reason for factory reform in the early-mid 19th century but other factors such as industrial protest were also important.

Often working as "scavengers" in textile factories or miners for coal, the ~~at abundance of the~~ traditional, cottage-industrial relationship of master and apprentice had been replaced by a factory system that allowed for many children to be employed and, by 1821, 49% of the working population were under the age of 20.

A key reform was the Mines Act. A Royal Commission initially set up to investigate idleness and immorality in mines ~~be~~ where men often (due to the extreme temperatures) worked naked in the presence of women, found instead the terrible conditions under which women and



P 4 9 9 5 8 R A 0 3 2 8

(Section A continued) children worked. The Mining Act forbade children and women from working in mines and was an important piece of legislation.

The Factory Act of 1833 was also of significant importance when studying the role of child labour in factory reform. The Act prohibited children under 10 years of age from working in textile factories; those under the age of 13 were to have two hours of education each day and children were to work no more than 12 hours a day. This Act was, however, very minimal and only applied to children working in the textiles factories. The reality was that Parliamentary concern was not for suffering children: the Factory Act was implemented due to the disproportionate high casualty rate within the textiles industry that was hard to ignore. The governments of the time were loath to act; the laissez faire approach to the economy was heavily



(Section A continued) influenced by capitalist ideology which viewed the right to work as integral even for children. This half-hearted approach can be seen in the factory inspectorate that was established in 1833. The inspectorate consisted of four officials to survey over 4000 factories and this shows the lack of care shown by the establishment regarding factory regulation for children.

More important was the industrial revolt that arose in the early 19th century. Established in ~~180~~ 1811, the Luddite movement was a collection of skilled weavers who feared that the introduction of automated looms would marginalise their artisan craftsmanship. In 1812, 1000 looms were destroyed with an approximate £10,000 caused in damage; more chilling was the assassination of William Horsfall in 1812, an employer who utilised new machinery and cheap, unskilled labour. Although arrests and executions caused



(Section A continued) the Luddite movement to die down quickly, the ferocity deeply affected government

Following poor harvests in 1828 and 1829, ~~the~~ protest resumed and the destruction of threshing machines during the swing riots in the ~~south~~ agrarian south (namely Kent) caused major unrest. This unrest was followed very promptly by the 10 hour movement in 1830. This group peacefully demonstrated for legislation that would limit the working day to 10 hours. Whilst the violence of the swing riots could be repressed with violence, the 10 hour movement could not and eventually the Ten Hour Act was passed in 1847.

The issue the government had was that laissez faire capitalism had put too much power in the hands of individual employers. With no regulation, factory owners could pay very little for long, hard hours and the industrial



(Section A continued) protest was a reaction to this from the working-classes whose lack of representation and protection meant that in periods of ~~economic~~ depression (namely following the end of the war of the Seventh Coalition in 1815), the middle-class employers were well insulated from the decline whilst the workers were not.

Although such parliamentary actions as the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1836 did soften the economic blow for the working classes, industrial discontent was still ~~in~~ rife. Events such as the pentridge rising<sup>ad</sup> and march of the blanketeers all illustrate how industrial reform in the period were mainly in reaction to industrial protest rather than a need to protect children.

Overall, ~~factory reform such as~~ reforms such as the Municipal Corporations Act, the Master and Servant Act ~~and~~ (1823) and the Public Health Act (1848)



(Section A continued) all show how ~~government~~  
~~and~~ parliament responded to industrial  
protest and adopted a new view on  
dealing with the grievances of the  
working classes ~~in~~ by 1848. The  
suffering of children was more a  
peripheral factor and was much  
less pressing ~~for~~ a government afraid  
of revolutionary and radical sentiment  
following the French Revolution, and  
therefore it can only be said that  
industrial protest was the main cause  
of factory reform.





(Section A continued)



P 4 9 9 5 8 R A 0 9 2 8

(Section A continued)

**TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 20 MARKS**



## SECTION B

Answer EITHER Question 3 OR Question 4.

### EITHER

- 3 How accurate is it to say that in the years 1834-70 trade unions had no significant impact in Britain?

(Total for Question 3 = 20 marks)

### OR

- 4 To what extent did attitudes to poverty change in the years 1834-70?

(Total for Question 4 = 20 marks)



P 4 9 9 5 8 R A 0 1 1 2 8

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 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

19 marks

Attitudes towards the poor certainly fluctuated following the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 in that they started off very punitive and contemptuous and reverted to the traditional sympathy.

The creation of workhouses under the Act shows the popular opinion that the poor were in their predicament through their own laziness and ~~idleness~~ idleness.

The Utilitarian views of Jeremy Bentham (outlined in his work: "Principles of Morals and Legislation") sat very well with the new middle-class that industrialisation had fostered. For men who had risen in the ranks and ascended from the working classes, payment of 4s 8d per pauper in order to discourage idleness in workhouses was well spent. The rich had traditionally been so as a result of the poor beneath



(Section B continued) them and had <sup>often</sup> held  
a fatalistic attitude that <sup>poverty</sup> ~~poor~~  
would always exist and needed to  
be paid for. New newly enfranchised  
~~the~~ middle-class did not share this  
view and ~~so~~ therefore politics changed.

This view changed dramatically, however,  
and after 1845, public opinion  
had been permanently altered: ~~the~~ the  
Andover workhouse scandal revealed  
the dark side of the workhouse  
system first advocated by Bentham.  
Malnourishment, overworking and sexual  
abuse from staff illustrated how  
less-eligibility had gone too far.  
In 1846, 61 paupers had deliberately  
committed crimes in order to avoid  
Andover. However, the impact was  
not as immense as sometimes portrayed.  
After having stated, in the face of  
massive parish-based distaste for the  
new poor laws, that outdoor relief  
could be given in 1838, the  
Poor Law Commission was replaced with  
a ~~the~~ Poor Law Board ~~that restricted work~~



(Section B continued) in 1845 that restricted almost all ~~form~~ of outdoor relief in the Outdoor Relief Regulation Order in 1852. Despite this, the new Board did neglect the ~~for~~ public opinion that workhouses needed to be reformed and the Metropolitan Poor Act (reforming medical treatment of the poor) was an example of this.

What ultimately proves that the attitudes of the public towards paupers did change was the work of individuals. Henry Mayhew's "London Labour and London Poor" empirically documented the lives of paupers in London and showed the ~~failings~~ of the system. This 1851 publication was crucial because it was factual: whilst Charles Dickens' "Oliver Twist" did highlight the issues two decades previously, it was Mayhew who made paupers more real. Thomas Carlyle's 1843 "Past and Present" similarly outlined key ~~failings~~ in the system - both were widely read.



(Section B continued) There are also arguments that the societal view of poverty was unchanged. Samuel Smiles' "Self Help" outlined the importance of independence and the ability of ~~the~~ individuals to better themselves. This view, in 1859, perfectly reflected the principles upon which the Poor Laws of the 17th century were ~~amended~~ amended. Smiles advocated education as a key instrument in tackling poverty ~~and~~ and measured spending of money rather than the excessive spending visible pre-1834 (with 2% of Britain's Gross National Product being spent ~~on~~ on paupers).

Smiles' views were adopted by the Charity Organisation Society which believed in calculated spending on the deserving rather than all the poor. The organisation viewed excessive spending as damaging society and resulting in idleness and lethargy.

Overall it seems that attitudes did change. Victorian values of respectability



(Section B continued) and independence were preserved and the concepts of less eligibility and self help were still very much a part of the contemporary thinking as Smith's work shows. At the same time, revelations at Andover and the Mayhew's showing that poverty is the result of insufficient wages rather than indolence did change public opinion and charitable organisations such as the "Workhouse Visiting Societies" (1856) show how a more caring, reformed approach was taken regarding the poor - contrasting the heavyhandedness of the Poor Law Amendment Act and the workhouses.





(Section B continued)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



P 4 9 9 5 8 R A 0 1 7 2 8

(Section B continued)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

(Section B continued)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 20 MARKS



P 4 9 9 5 8 R A 0 1 9 2 8

## SECTION C

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

- 5 Historians have different views about the reasons for the abolition of the slave trade. Analyse and evaluate the extracts and use your own knowledge of the issues to explain your answer to the following question.

How far do you agree with the view that slave uprisings 'must be placed alongside the work of European abolitionists' in the ending of the slave trade?

(20) 16 marks

As Reddie rightfully points out, it was mainly the different type of protest ("calculated... violence") that made slave resistance an important factor in the abolition of the slave trade in 1807. Reddie's argument partially feeds into an economic one, slave revolts were not a new occurrence and since the trade began, one in ten colonies experienced some kind of resistance; it was the slave resistance, coupled with the changing economic environment that was key. At the time of abolition, economist Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations" and capitalist ideology highlighted the sheer cost of subduing African slaves: during the Haitian Revolution, 1000 sugar plantations were burnt by freed slaves and 2000 Europeans killed. Sugar was the main export of what was then



(Section C continued) Saint Domingue and therefore this loss represented massive financial implications. Revolution spread to British colonies and by 1791, 3000 men were needed to be garrisoned in Jamaica — ~~and~~ when revolts did occur, regular soldiers were needed to supplement these militias. Such a garrison was costly. For a Britain dealing with French wars and domestic unrest, expensive colonial repression was an unwanted burden.

To say that this contributed to the end of the slave trade is rather unsupported, however. The 1794 revolts in Grenada and St Lucia had negative repercussions in the British establishment as an anti-black feeling furthered the position of the east-India lobby which caused Wilberforce's annual bills for abolition to fall on deaf ears. There is also the issue of timing and why, at this point, would slave resistance become more important. James Walker's



(Section C continued) interpretations may be the answer.

The argument that the transformation of public opinion was ~~the~~ most important is one grounded heavily in evidence.

In 1789, the "Plan and Section of a Slave ship" became one of Clarkson's most iconic pieces of propaganda and it is he who arguably caused abolition. Thomas Clarkson travelled over 35,000 miles on his tour of Britain; collecting pieces of evidence and testimony as well as helping to establish 1200 branches of the Society for Effecting the Abolition of the Slave Trade which he helped form in 1787, a year after he published his ~~of~~ essay on the wrongs of slavery. So momentum was his conversion of popular belief that abolition was inevitable. The "national voice of widespread and strident opposition" is exemplified by Manchester, where one ~~of~~ fifth of the population had signed an abolition



(Section C continued) petition.

Extract 1 puts too much emphasis on the role of slave resistance and so does extract 2 on Clarkson. What neither truly illustrate is the economic and financial argument for abolition. Although still profitable, a newly industrialised Britain moved away from traditional mercantilist policy and adopted the kind of capitalist, free-trade, laissez faire approach of Adam Smith. A worthy argument of Patrick Richardson's was that the older colonies needed ~~slaves~~ to ~~enter~~ the slave trade to be abolished in order to maintain their monopolies. Older colonial planters could breed slaves and sought to reduce competition from newer colonies by lobbying for abolition (or rather, ~~ceasing~~ to oppose it). Richardson argued that wartime privateering and industrialisation were more important avenues and Smith's views of paid labour ultimately killed the



(Section C continued) Slave Trade.

Also important were the humanitarian campaigns caused by individuals such as Mary Bickett Carl, whose "a poem on the African slave Trade" resulted in over 300,000 ~~human~~ women boycotting sugar. Individuals such as Equiano and Wedderwood also dramatically altered popular perceptions of Blacks and the trade.

Overall it cannot be said that slave uprisings must be placed alongside the work of European abolitionists in the ending of the slave trade. Neither may be the most important and Walcott's dismissal of abolition being "monocausal" seems most applicable. More likely is that the work of Europeans opened British eyes to the violent struggles of the slaves themselves and without such British intervention, the revolts would have carried on fruitlessly, as they had always done - making the work of European abolitionists more important.





(Section C continued)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



P 4 9 9 5 8 R A 0 2 5 2 8

(Section C continued)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



(Section C continued)

**TOTAL FOR SECTION C = 20 MARKS**  
**TOTAL FOR PAPER = 60 MARKS**



P 4 9 9 5 8 R A 0 2 7 2 8

**BLANK PAGE**

