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 two sections in this question paper. Answer one question from Section A and one question from Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.
• Answer the questions in the spaces provided
  – there may be more space than you need.

Information

• The total mark for this paper is 70.
• The marks for each question are shown in brackets
  – use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.
• The quality of your written communication will be assessed in all your responses
  – you should take particular care with your spelling, punctuation and grammar, as well as the clarity of expression.

Advice

• Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
• Check your answers if you have time at the end.
6HI03/B – Politics, Protest and Revolution

SECTION A

Answer ONE question in Section A on the topic for which you have been prepared.

You should start the answer to your chosen question in Section A on page 3. Section B begins on page 11.

B1 – France, 1786–1830: Revolution, Empire and Restoration

Answer EITHER Question 1 OR Question 2.

EITHER

1 ‘Absolute monarchy collapsed in France in 1789 due to the actions and personality of Louis XVI.’
   How far do you agree with this view?
   (Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)

OR

2 ‘In the years 1815–24, Louis XVIII failed to gain widespread support in France for the Bourbon monarchy.’
   How far do you agree with this view?
   (Total for Question 2 = 30 marks)

B2 – Challenging Authority: Protest, Reform and Response in Britain, c1760–1830

Answer EITHER Question 3 OR Question 4.

EITHER

3 ‘Britain was on the verge of revolution in the 1790s.’
   How far do you agree with this view?
   (Total for Question 3 = 30 marks)

OR

4 ‘The ‘Liberal Tories’ had a conservative rather than an enlightened approach to governing Britain in the years 1822–30.’
   How far do you agree with this view?
   (Total for Question 4 = 30 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 30 MARKS
SECTION A

Put a cross in the box indicating the first question you have chosen to answer ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then put a cross in another box ☐.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☐  Question 2 ☐  Question 3 ☐  Question 4 ☐
SECTION B

Answer ONE question in Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.

You should start the answer to your chosen question in Section B on page 13.

B1 – France, 1786–1830: Revolution, Empire and Restoration

Study the relevant sources in the Sources Insert.

Answer EITHER Question 5 OR Question 6.

EITHER

5 Use Sources 1, 2 and 3 and your own knowledge.

‘Louis XVI’s reluctance to accept limitations on his royal power brought about the collapse of constitutional monarchy in France in 1792.’

How far do you agree with this view?

Explain your answer, using Sources 1, 2 and 3 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 5 = 40 marks)

OR

6 Use Sources 4, 5 and 6 and your own knowledge.

How far do you agree with the view that growing foreign opposition led to the collapse of the French Empire in the years 1807–14?

Explain your answer, using Sources 4, 5 and 6 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 6 = 40 marks)
B2 – Challenging Authority: Protest, Reform and Response in Britain, c1760–1830

Study the relevant sources in the Sources Insert.
Answer EITHER Question 7 OR Question 8.

EITHER

7 Use Sources 7, 8 and 9 and your own knowledge.

How far do you agree with the view that popular unrest in Britain, in the years 1815–20, did not challenge the political system?

Explain your answer, using Sources 7, 8 and 9 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 7 = 40 marks)

OR

8 Use Sources 10, 11 and 12 and your own knowledge.

How far do you agree with the view that, in the years c.1780–1830, the labouring classes in Britain secured important social and economic gains?

Explain your answer, using Sources 10, 11 and 12 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 8 = 40 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 40 MARKS
SECTION B

Put a cross in the box indicating the second question you have chosen to answer ✗. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ✗ and then put a cross in another box ✗.

Chosen Question Number:

- Question 5 ✗
- Question 6 ✗
- Question 7 ✗
- Question 8 ✗
Sources for use with Section B. Answer ONE question in Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.

B1 – France, 1786–1830: Revolution, Empire and Restoration

Sources for use with Question 5

SOURCE 1
(From Peter Davies, *The French Revolution*, published 2009)

Louis XVI went along with the revolution in public, but was privately scheming. In 1791 he accepted the revolutionaries' first constitution and, in 1792, he signed the decree for war against Austria. In both, the King was acting in a deceitful manner. At the royal session of 23 June 1789, he had already indicated that his ideal regime consisted of enlightened despotism moderated by occasional constitutional concessions. The King's motives for declaring war were, also, anything but noble. He hoped that if the war went well, he would receive the credit; and if it went badly, the revolution would start to crumble. In short bursts and in irregular fashion, Louis also attempted to stand up to the revolution, as in November 1791 when he vetoed a law which prescribed death for all émigrés. He was walking a tightrope and ultimately lost his balance.

SOURCE 2

Crown and Legislative Assembly both fell in August 1792. Wrangling had continued between Louis and deputies over refractory clergy*, émigré nobles, and the appointment to government of Brissot and his allies, with the King making his views clearer than perhaps at any previous point in his reign. But this in-fighting was minor compared to the developments that counted: military setbacks, the threat of invasion, and the popular response to crisis. A Brissotin ministry was no more effective in directing affairs than its Feuillant predecessor, and they, together with the royal family, were held directly responsible by revolutionary agitators for military defeat. The urban crowds filled the vacuum left by the ineffectual authority of the elite.

*refractory clergy – priests who refused to take the oath of loyalty to the constitution.
France's economic decline was a real political concern in the early 1790s. Late 1791 and early 1792 saw further anxiety and disorder due to a poor harvest and shortages of imported goods, notably sugar and coffee. The latter were staples of the urban diet and much valued by workers. Grain prices rose by 25–50 per cent across the country and, between late 1791 and the summer of 1792, the assignat slipped from 85 per cent to under 60 per cent of its face value. Such economic disruption became a vicious circle: in 1791 unemployment was already a serious problem in Paris, and by 1792 across the cities and towns of France, there was less and less of a manufacturing economy to offer work. The luxury trades also sagged deeper into depression as the social elite continued to emigrate.
Napoleon’s programme of conquest meant he could never rest from conflict. His agreements with other powers, such as the Treaty of Tilsit (1807) with Russia, or his Austrian royal marriage alliance (1810), were simply practical arrangements to serve French interests. His alliance partners never trusted him and his demands on them bred a desire for revenge. His inability to defeat Britain led to the ‘Continental System’ but the economic damage inflicted on Napoleon’s conquered countries was a major grievance. The extension of Napoleonic rule generated increasingly powerful resistance, ultimately threatening its very survival. The Emperor’s refusal to acknowledge anything except French self-interest eventually drove the other powers to work together for long enough to ensure his defeat. His inability to compromise forced them to conclude there would be no lasting settlement. A return to war was the only course of action.

The break with Russia was the turning-point in Napoleon’s fortunes. Russia was invaded and Moscow occupied but the Tsar did not make peace. Napoleon now faced either endless further war without a clear prospect of victory, or retreat. Both were equally disastrous. The French army’s methods assumed rapid campaigns in areas sufficiently wealthy and densely peopled for it to live off the land. But what worked in Lombardy or the Rhineland failed utterly in the vast, empty and impoverished spaces of Poland and Russia. Napoleon was defeated by his failure to keep the Grand Army supplied. The retreat from Moscow destroyed the Army. Of the 610,000 men who had crossed the Russian frontier, only 100,000 returned. Under these circumstances, the final coalition against the French was joined by all those anxious to be on what was now clearly going to be the winning side.

Bonaparte spent much time and energy trying to make the Continental System work. In vain. The system was counterproductive. It produced a vast amount of smuggling from which the British benefited. Outside France, to those who suffered from French imperialism, the System seemed designed as much to boost French exports as to ruin Britain’s. This impression was reinforced by Bonaparte’s Trianon Decrees (1810) which admitted some British goods under tariff arrangements which shamelessly favoured French producers. Consequently, governments not directly controlled by the French, although part of the System, made little or no effort to enforce it. This was something Bonaparte’s pride could not tolerate, and it tipped him into two disastrous wars with Spain and Russia.
Sources for use with Section B. Answer ONE question in Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.

B2 – Challenging Authority: Protest, Reform and Response in Britain, c1760–1830

Sources for use with Question 7

SOURCE 7
(From Norman McCord, British History 1815–1906, published 1991)

Most popular demonstrations of discontent stemmed from economic and social problems rather than any widespread revolutionary intent. Indeed, Lord Liverpool’s government was not indifferent to suffering, or unsympathetic to those protesting against justified grievances. In July 1816, for instance, groups of unemployed miners marched towards London with the intention of petitioning the Prince Regent to obtain work for them. Magistrates, acting for the Home Secretary, intercepted the marchers, persuaded them to abandon their plan, and promised to put their petition before the Prince Regent. Furthermore, considering the nature of contemporary European society, the Six Acts (1819) appeared distinctly mild and there was no sustained effort to implement the legislation.

SOURCE 8
(From Jeremy Black and Donald M. MacRaild, Nineteenth Century Britain, published 2003)

Post-war depression and demobilisation aggravated the situation in 1815. Population growth led to under-employment and unemployment. These, combined with low wages and limited social welfare contributed to poverty for those without work as well as for many of those who had jobs. Poor harvests and pressure for political reform compounded these difficulties. New machines threatened jobs on the land and in industry. Discontent and disorder were widespread. The Luddites broke machines in Yorkshire, Lancashire and the East Midlands (1811–16) and the threat from John Heathcoat’s bobbin net machines led to the destruction of his factory in 1816. Handloom weavers rioted in Carlisle in 1819. Political awareness was heightened by the growth of the press. Radical papers attacked the government and focused on local issues – by 1817 sales of William Cobbett’s Political Register, a radical weekly, were estimated at 60–70,000.
The 1815 Corn Law, prohibiting imports of foreign wheat until the domestic price reached eighty shillings a quarter, was passed amid widespread rioting in both London and the provinces. Middle class reformers regarded the Corn Law as a blatant example of the self-interest and political strength of the landed elite. Working class radicals blamed the Corn Law for the high bread prices which provoked renewed rioting later that year. In 1816–17, spies and *agents provocateurs* infiltrated scattered groups of reformers throughout the industrial districts. The discovery of plots to march on Manchester, perhaps stimulated by *agents provocateurs*, was used to justify the arrest of leading reformers. When, in 1819, the government conferred retrospective approval on the conduct of the magistrates at Peterloo, public opinion was outraged. Public protest meetings were held, driven by a wave of revulsion on the part of the Whigs, the middle classes, and working class reformers.
B2 – Challenging Authority: Protest, Reform and Response in Britain, c1760–1830

Sources for use with Question 8

SOURCE 10
(From an article by R. M. Hartwell, The Standard of Living, published 1963)

Some of the social gains of this period should be mentioned to challenge the claims of the ‘pessimist’ case. These gains include (i) the increasing social and economic independence of women, (ii) the reduction in child labour, (iii) the growth of friendly societies, trade unions, savings banks, mechanics’ institutes and co-operative societies, (iv) the growth of literacy (more of the population could read and write in 1850 than in 1800), and (v) the changing character of social disorder, which was much less brutish and destructive in the 1840s than in the 1780s.

SOURCE 11
(From an article by E. J. Hobsbawm, The Standard of Living during the Industrial Revolution, published 1963)

Poverty cannot be measured purely in terms of material deprivation of food and clothing. The Industrial Revolution eventually killed off many of the expanded domestic industries it had created. The fate of domestic workers – the half million or more handloom weavers of 1830 or the army of seamstresses – is just as much a part of the social impact of the Industrial Revolution as the fate of the factory population. Poverty and dirt alone are not the issue. The change from one way of life to another is equally at stake. The historian forgets at his peril that the problem of the social impact of the Industrial Revolution is not whether men live by white or brown bread, no meat or roast beef, but that it was inhuman.

SOURCE 12
(From N. Longmate, Milestones in Working Class History, published 1975)

A survey of UK wages in 1810 and later years reveals some large regional variations, with wages in Glasgow usually from 1s. to 5s. lower than those paid in Manchester or Bolton. At the top of the scale were the print workers on London morning newspapers, earning £2 8s. a week, an income which many a curate or governess would have envied. At the very bottom were labourers, both urban and rural, earning in Manchester 15s. a week, in Glasgow 11s., with farm workers averaging 13s. a week.

The earnings of the cotton ‘mule-spinners’, at 25–30s. a week, showed clearly that new machinery was by no means a threat to the livelihood of those who learned to master it. Engineers, a trade barely known twenty years earlier, already earned 28s. a week, another indication of changes still to come. With the exception of the handloom weavers, most of these rates of pay remained stable during the following twenty years, apart from minor variations due to the state of trade.

* 1s. = 1 shilling.
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