History
Advanced
Unit 3
Option B: Politics, Protest and Revolution

Friday 10 June 2011 – Afternoon
Time: 2 hours

You must have:
Sources Insert (enclosed)

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.
• Keep an eye on the time.
• Check your answers if you have time at the end.
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 because it could no longer rely on the army or the cooperation of the privileged orders.’ How far do you agree with this opinion?

(Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)

OR

2 ‘Napoleon’s domestic reforms in the years 1799–1807 were essentially conservative in intent.’ How far do you agree with this judgement?

(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 ‘Before 1785, pressure to reform the political system in Britain was extremely limited.’ How far do you agree with this opinion?

(Total for Question 3 = 30 marks)

OR

4 ‘Brutal repression explains the defeat of radicalism in Britain in the 1790s.’ How far do you agree with this judgement?

(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.

‘Mistakes and misjudgements by Louis XVI explain the downfall of the monarchy 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 that the Russian Campaign of 1812 ‘sealed Napoleon’s fate’ (Source 4, line 29)?

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.

‘It was the lack of effective policing which created the danger of riot and revolution in the years 1815–30.’ How far do you agree with this opinion?

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 that in the years c1780–1830 the opportunities of the labouring classes in Britain were limited and their lives damaged by the extensive economic changes in these years?

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 ☐
(Section B continued)
(Section B continued)
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

Robespierre woke to Paris in tumult. Rumours of the royal flight filled the air and he had to fight his way to work through crowds of people heading in the same direction to find out what had happened at the Tuileries. He pushed his way through and was in his seat in the Assembly by 9 a.m. to hear what had happened. There was stunned silence. Hoping to save the constitutional monarchy, Bailly, mayor of Paris, was maintaining that the king had been kidnapped against his will, and there was no reason for the Assembly to distrust his ministers. However, on Louis’ desk in the Tuileries he had left behind – in his own handwriting – a list of complaints against the Assembly and the constitution it was drafting. This detailed account of his reasons for fleeing Paris was tantamount to a confession of guilt.

SOURCE 2
(From Colin Jones, *The Great Nation*, published 2002)

The progress of the war contributed to the sense of crisis. In early August, news filtered through to Paris of the Brunswick Manifesto, in which the allied commander-in-chief, the Duke of Brunswick, threatened with death any citizen opposing the allied advance, and threatened violence against the city of Paris if the royal family was harmed. In June, Louis had specifically requested his fellow monarchs not to allow the conflict to become like a war between states: ‘such conduct’, the king maintained ‘would provoke civil war, endanger the lives of the king and his family and mean the overthrow of the throne, cause the royalists to be slaughtered and throw support behind the Jacobins’. The Brunswick Manifesto ignored the king’s warning – and proved him right.

SOURCE 3
(From D. G. Wright, *Revolution and Terror in France 1789–1794*, published 1974)

War deepened the gulf between moderates and extremists that had appeared at the time of Varennes. It made the Revolution international and hence more extreme as it was now under attack by the crowned heads of Europe. Extreme methods were deemed necessary for survival. It intensified irrational fears and panics: that for example traitors lurked round every corner, ready to deliver the Revolution into the hands of foreign enemies. Such views were characteristic of the sans culottes, whom war pushed further into prominence. The sans culottes were also motivated by economic grievances. The harvest of 1791 had been mediocre and grain prices rose quickly in winter. Civil War in the West Indies created a serious shortage of sugar, a shortage aggravated by speculators.
The catastrophic outcome of the Russian campaign sealed Napoleon’s fate. Not only did it cost him hundreds of thousands of his best soldiers; it punctured the general conviction that he was invincible and tarnished the aura of superiority surrounding his person. ‘It seems to me that the spell has been broken as far as Napoleon is concerned; the Dowager Empress Maria Fyodorovna wrote with satisfaction to a friend in the first days of 1813. ‘He is no longer an idol, but has descended to the rank of men, and as such he can be fought by men.’

She was right. As the master of Europe was seen to stumble and fall, every person who held a grudge against him, every nation which resented his dominion, every group with a dream of change took heart. As the extent of the disaster became known in the first few months of 1813, it became apparent that the future of Europe was open to an extent it had not been since the 1790s.

Despite the disaster of 1812 in Russia, Napoleon was able once more to raise a new army 700,000 strong. But in the summer of 1813, for the first time, he found himself having to confront simultaneously the armies of Russia, Austria and Prussia. In the south-west there was Wellington, grinding forward relentlessly towards the Pyrenees. In October Napoleon suffered a decisive defeat at Leipzig, the bloodiest battle of them all, where a total of nearly 100,000 men fell. The triumphant allies closed in remorselessly on France itself – for the first time since 1793.

Napoleon was to have no peace with honour. Despite the dramatic series of French victories in early 1814, despite continuing quarrels between the Russian and Austrian Emperors and their marshalls and generals, the allies with the possible exception of Austria seemed no more inclined towards peace than ever. Soon after negotiations re-opened at Chatillon, Lord Castlereagh knocked heads together to bring about a declaration of renewed solidarity among the four allies, and it soon became clear that they, and not Napoleon, were negotiating from strength.
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 Douglas Hurd, Robert Peel, published 2007)

Peel had defended the handling of the Peterloo Massacre in 1819, but he worked hard to prevent a repetition by insisting, as Home Secretary, on the responsibility of the magistrates to handle an outbreak before they called in the military. If a magistrate could rely only on the authority of his own loud voice reading the Riot Act, and a handful of decrepit constables alongside, there was a real danger of calling in the Army too soon, and then of the quick use of firearms by frightened men against a threatening crowd.

We at once see that an important piece was missing from the board. There was no Chief Constable, no police station, no bobby on the beat, no civilian force to investigate the crime or control the riot. Any Home Secretary today must find it hard to imagine how, without police, Peel could even begin to cope with his responsibilities.

SOURCE 8
(From R. J. White, Waterloo to Peterloo, published 1957)

Jeremiah Brandreth was the traditional rebel: the stalwart, desperate fellow who burns with desire to strike a blow for – something, although he may not know precisely what. He possessed one fixed idea: that the Government must be overthrown and the poor men of England given better food and brighter living. He talked not of ballot boxes, but of rum, guineas, bands of music and pleasure parties on the Trent. But first, always first, came the desperate and dangerous task of overthrowing the Government. It was his fierce obsession with the immediate task that gave him his hold over his associates, the product – like himself – of the rough, often brutal, always passionate world of the poor.

SOURCE 9
(From Norman McCord, British History, 1815–1906, published 1991)

The Liverpool Government was soon left in no doubt that the transition to peace in 1815 was not to see the beginning of a period of domestic tranquillity. A rapid reduction in the Royal Navy, and the paying off of the large fleet of hired merchant shipping, which the war effort had required, was made necessary by the demand in Parliament for economy. This produced sudden and large-scale redundancies among seamen and sparked off the great strikes of 1815. Apart from substantial reductions in the armed forces, the first post-war years saw dislocation in export markets, together with poor harvests and high food prices. The combined pressures brought on a rash of disturbances in many parts of the country.
B2 – Challenging Authority: Protest, Reform and Response in Britain, c1760–1830

Sources for use with Question 8

SOURCE 10
(From J. L. and Barbara Hammond, *The Village Labourer, Volume II*, published 1911)

To the upper classes, the fact that the labourers were more wretched in 1830 than they had been in 1795 was a reason for tightening the law. They were not deliberately callous and cruel in their neglect of all this growing misery and hunger. The writings of Adam Smith, Malthus and Ricardo had robbed poverty of its sting for the rich by representing it as nature’s medicine, bitter indeed, but less bitter than any medicine that man could prescribe.

SOURCE 11

Robert Owen, writing in 1815, did not make fine distinctions between various forms of wealth creation. What he saw was an expansion of the British economy proceeding so fast and so far as to justify revolutionary status, even if he did not use the phrase ‘industrial revolution’. He looked around him and saw paupers going from rags to riches in just a few years. In Lancashire in 1780 it was recorded that within a single decade ‘a poor man who had not been worth £5, now keeps his carriage and servants, and is become Lord of a Manor, and has purchased an estate of £20,000.’

SOURCE 12
(From E. J. Hobsbawm, *Industry and Empire: An Economic History of Britain since 1750*, published 1968)

There is no dispute about certain classes of the population, whose conditions undoubtedly deteriorated. These were the agricultural labourers, about one million men in 1851. There were further, the declining industries and occupations displaced by technical progress, of whom the half million handloom weavers are the best known example, but by no means the only one. They starved progressively in a vain attempt to compete with the new machines by working more and more cheaply. Their number had doubled between 1788 and 1814 and their wages had risen markedly until the middle of the Wars; but between 1805 and 1833, they fell from 23 shillings a week to 6 shillings and 3 pence. There was also the non-industrialised occupations which met the rapidly growing demand for their goods, not by technical revolution, but by sub-division and ‘sweating’ – e.g. the innumerable seamstresses in their garrets or cellars.