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.
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 ‘Given the scale of the opposition which they faced throughout France, the survival and victory of the Jacobin Government in Paris in 1793 was a remarkable achievement.’ How far do you agree with this opinion?

(Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)

OR

2 To what extent did the Charter establish a constitutional monarchy in France in the years 1815–30?

(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 ‘The impact of the French Revolution increased the pressure for reform in Britain in the 1790s.’ How far do you agree with this opinion?

(Total for Question 3 = 30 marks)

OR

4 To what extent did 1822 mark a significant change in the nature of Lord Liverpool’s Government?

(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.

‘The deteriorating economic climate brought about the downfall 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 and 5 and your own knowledge.

‘Effective cooperation between the European powers was the decisive factor in the collapse of Napoleon’s empire in 1814.’ How far do you agree with this view?

Explain your answer, using Sources 4 and 5 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 6, 7 and 8 and your own knowledge.

‘The Peterloo Massacre was of little significance for the country as a whole.’ How far do you agree with this opinion?

Explain your answer, using Sources 6, 7 and 8 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 7 = 40 marks)

OR

8 Use Sources 9, 10 and 11 and your own knowledge.

How far do you agree that there was a definite improvement in the standard of living in the years to 1830?

Explain your answer, using Sources 9, 10 and 11 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 Colin Jones, The Great Nation, published 2002)

The political temperature in a rapidly polarizing situation was raised by the deteriorating economic situation and by related financial problems which the state was facing. The 1791 harvest was poor, causing food prices to start rising by the turn of the year. Many localities in northern France experienced subsistence riots, which culminated in the murder of Mayor Simmoneau of Étampes, just south of Paris, in early March 1792, for failing to agree to the fixing of bread prices. The capital itself was rocked by food riots in January and February 1792 over shortages of sugar (by now a staple of popular diet). This particular deficiency was caused by a deteriorating situation in the Caribbean colonies: after sporadic troubles earlier in the year, a full-scale slave revolt had begun in Saint-Dominique in August 1791, causing plantation production and profits to plummet. The consequences of crisis in colonial trade, which had been the most profitable sector of the eighteenth-century economy, were worsened by the slump in luxury trades caused by the emigration of wealthy noble plutocrats. The plight of workers thrown into unemployment by these changes was made all the more poignant by the erosion of poor relief provision. Many charitable institutions, including hospitals, monasteries and nursing communities, had lost out in the Night of 4 August. Voluntary giving, which the church had always encouraged among the laity, seemed to dry up, worsening matters.

SOURCE 2
(From David Andrews, The Terror, published 2005)

Among those who had been republicans since Varennes, and those who had come round to this conclusion more recently, there was no doubt that the king was a perjured traitor. He was seen to be working with Marie-Antoinette, the émigré princes and the powers of Europe to arrange, not merely the defeat of the Revolution, but the massacre of all patriots. If they could have read the correspondence of Marie-Antoinette, who in March had discussed French military dispositions with the Austrian diplomat Mercy-Argenteau, and who continued to supply strategic nuggets of military information in letters to Axel von Fersen throughout the summer, their worst fears would have found added fuel.

SOURCE 3

In 1792, demands for a republic returned and developed, put forward by the Parisian sections and upheld by the Jacobins. The great Parisian club, at the centre of a national network, had since the preceding summer abandoned any reference to constitutional law in its struggle against the Feuillants. In July, it recommended the election of a new Constituent Assembly, that is to say a Convention, and therefore a second Revolution.
France's twenty-year dominance had relied on the divisions of its enemies, most of whom had at some time tried to be its friends, or at least its accomplices, in a free-for-all from which ideology and principle had been absent. In 1813–14, in the face of Napoleon’s limitless aggression, the European states began to cooperate and plan a durable peace. Castlereagh, the foreign minister, intended to show that Britain was not – or no longer – the irresponsible, greedy power, happy to leave the Continent in flames while it gathered in colonial spoils. He created a partnership among the coalition, intended to continue after the war. He negotiated the Treaty of Chaumont (1814) – in which Britain promised to pay for another year of war if necessary, and the Allies pledged themselves to maintain peace for twenty years. It was a practical vision of a Europe of independent sovereign states, equal in rights, status and security.

Napoleon, to the dismay of his ministers and generals, refused all Allied offers for a negotiated peace. His stubborn pride helped Castlereagh to keep the coalition together and this sealed France’s fate.

It has been common among Bonaparte’s biographers to attribute his eventual failures to age, lack of concentration, deterioration in his health, increasing weight, and tiredness, and to a progressive decline in his mental faculties. There is some truth in this. It is also true that the French army was in slow but irreversible decline. So many experienced junior officers and NCOs, who should have been training the new intakes, had been lost in Russia. More than 200,000 fine horses had been left there, too, and they could not be replaced either. From this point on, Bonaparte always complained that he did not have enough cavalry, or that it was of poor quality.

Moreover, there was another dimension to Bonaparte’s decline. He had once been ‘a man whose time had come.’ In the second half of the 1790s, Bonaparte was an embodiment, all over Europe, of the protest against the old legitimists, their inefficiency, privileges, and misuse of resources. He was, above all, the embodiment of the talents and genius of youth. Thus he prospered and conquered. By 1813, however, he was out of date. His time had gone.
B2 – Challenging Authority: Protest, Reform and Response in Britain, c1760–1830

Sources for use with Question 7

SOURCE 6
(From R. J. White, Waterloo to Peterloo, published 1957)

Nor should it be forgotten that, while many supporters of Lord Liverpool's government deeply regretted the sufferings incurred at Manchester, and were prepared to criticize the way in which the situation had been handled, the Government lost little or none of its hold upon the opinion and the voters of the country as a whole. The Royal Address was approved with the customary large majorities at the opening of Parliament in November. The Six Acts which came before Parliament before the adjournment at the end of December met with general approval, even if they gave rise to strenuous debate in many of their details.

SOURCE 7
(From Donald Read, Peterloo; the 'Massacre' and its Background, published 1958)

The memory of Peterloo remained a force in politics in Lancashire for many years after 1819. A generation later, its name was constantly invoked by the Chartist leaders, whose campaign was, in so many respects, similar to that of the Peterloo Radicals. At the first great Chartist meeting near Manchester in 1838, the Peterloo banners were once more carried in procession. Even as late as the election of 1874, the memory of Peterloo was still a force in local politics.

SOURCE 8
(From E. P. Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class, published 1963)

Peterloo outraged every belief and prejudice of the 'free-born Englishman' – the right of free speech, the desire for 'fair-play,' the taboo against attacking the defenceless. For a time, ultra-Radicals and moderates buried their differences in a protest movement with which many Whigs were willing to associate. Protest meetings were held: on 29 August in Smithfield, with Dr Watson in the chair, and Arthur Thistlewood as a speaker; on 5 September a much larger meeting in Westminster, with Burdett, Cartwright, Hobhouse and John Thelwall among the speakers. When Hunt made his triumphal entry into London ten days later, the Times estimated that 300,000 were in the streets.

No one who studies the response to the news of Peterloo can suppose that the tradition of the 'free-born Englishman' was merely notional. In the months which followed, political antagonism hardened. No one could remain neutral; in Manchester itself, those loyal to the government were placed in extreme isolation, and the Methodists were the only body with a popular following to come to their side.
The evidence relating to real wages has given rise to enormous debate over the years, a debate known as the ‘Standard of Living Controversy’. The most recent estimates by Charles Feinstein, as yet unpublished, suggest that real earnings may have grown by around 20 per cent between the 1770s and the 1830s, with much of the gain coming in the final twenty years. The earning figures receive some support from a study of family budgets by Sarah Horrell and Jane Humphries. They, too, found gains were slow in the early part of the period. One reason for this was the reduction in women’s and children’s contribution to family earnings as industrialisation developed. Even when a definite improvement in real earnings did begin, family budget evidence suggests sharp reductions in periods of depression.

It is difficult to find words for the humiliation and suffering which the coming of industrial society brought to the English country labourer. Everything conspired to impoverish and demoralize them. They lost what little traditional right and security they had. They did not even gain the hope of improvement which capitalism held out to the urban labourer: the legal equality of rights in the liberal society, the possibility of ceasing to be a proletarian. Instead, another, less human, more unequal hierarchy closed in upon them – the farmer who talked to them like a squire, the squire who stopped them poaching for partridge and hares. There was a collective conspiracy of the village rich to take their commons, and give them instead charity in return for their servility. They did not even sell their birthright: they simply lost it.

Even if it is accepted, as now seems likely, that there was, on average, a slow improvement in the years to 1830, this will be an average of limited significance because of the variations which it conceals. There can be no simple or uniform answer to questions about the standard of living. We know that there were marked fluctuations in prices, and that temporary depression could hit employment and earnings hard in some parts of the country. Even if we had more reliable indications of movements in wages, earnings, and prices, there are other variables to be taken into account in considering the condition of the people – housing, health, diet, levels of education, and opportunity, for example.