



GCE AS/A LEVEL

2100U30-1



S25-2100U30-1

MONDAY, 19 MAY 2025 – AFTERNOON

HISTORY – AS unit 2

DEPTH STUDY 3

Reform and protest in Wales and England c.1783–1848

**Part 1: Radicalism and the fight for parliamentary reform
c.1783–1832**

1 hour 45 minutes

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

A WJEC pink 16-page answer booklet.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Use black ink or black ball-point pen. Do not use gel pen or correction fluid.

Answer **both** questions.

Write your answers in the separate answer booklet provided, following the instructions on the front of the answer booklet.

Use both sides of the paper. Write only within the white areas of the booklet.

Write the question number in the two boxes in the left-hand margin at the start of each answer,

for example

0	1
---	---

.

Leave at least two line spaces between each answer.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

The number of marks is given in brackets at the end of each question.

You are advised to spend approximately 50 minutes on each question.

The sources used in this examination paper may have been amended, adapted or abridged from the stated published work in order to make the wording more accessible.

The sources may include words that are no longer in common use and are now regarded as derogatory terminology. Their inclusion reflects the time and place of the original version of these sources.

Answer **both** questions.

0	1
---	---

Using your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the challenges facing the government in the period from 1812 to 1820.

[30]

Source A Lord Byron, a famous poet and radical sympathiser, speaking in the House of Lords, opposing the Frame Breaking Bill that applied the death penalty to machine breaking (27 February 1812)

During the short time I recently spent in Nottinghamshire, not twelve hours elapsed without some fresh act of violence; and on the day I left the county, I was informed that forty frames had been broken the preceding evening without resistance and without detection. Such was the state of that county, and such I have reason to believe it to be at this moment. But whilst these outrages must be admitted to exist to an alarming extent, it is also true that they have arisen from circumstances of the most unparalleled distress. The perseverance of these miserable men in their lives and work, tends to prove that nothing but absolute poverty could have driven a large and once honest and industrious body of people into the commission of outrages so hazardous to themselves, their families, and the community.

Source B Report of the Secret Committee of the House of Commons on the disturbed state of the country (19 February 1817)

[It appears] that attempts have been made in various parts of the country to take advantage of the distress in which the labouring and manufacturing classes of the population are at present involved, to induce them to look for immediate relief, not only in the reform of Parliament or the plan of universal suffrage and annual election, but in the total overthrow of all existing establishments.

This hope has been actively encouraged by several Societies. ... It has been proved that some members of these Societies endeavoured to [raise] an insurrection. ... The intended insurrection took up the symbols of the French Revolution. A tri-colour flag and cockades were actively prepared; the flag was openly carried and displayed at the first meeting which took place in Spa Fields. ...

In Manchester and some other places, the greatest enthusiasm for insurrection was seen before the meeting in Spa Fields in London on 2 December [1816]; and the taking of the Tower and the ruin of the Bank [of England] were publicly and confidently predicted.

Source C Mrs Arbuthnot, a Tory sympathiser and friend of several Cabinet ministers, writing in her private diary about the Cato Street conspiracy (February 1820)

23 February 1820 – Detection of a most horrible conspiracy for murdering Cabinet ministers. It has been known for some months that a band of radicals, with Thistlewood at their head, had formed a plan for assassinating the ministers when they were assembled at a cabinet dinner. The mode of proceeding was to have been that Thistlewood should knock at the door and pretend to be the bearer of government documents to be signed, which Thistlewood would instruct the servant to deliver immediately to the Ministers. While he was gone on this message, Thistlewood would have admitted his accomplices who, to the number of thirty or forty, were to rush into the dining room and commence the work of slaughter. Fortunately, it always happens that, in the midst of such a set of ruffians there is always one or more who betray their secret. One of the group acted as a spy and revealed the whole plot to the Secretary of State.

0	2
---	---

Historians have made different interpretations about **the extent of the Liberal Tory reforms**. Analyse and evaluate the two interpretations together with your understanding of the historical debate to answer the following question:

How valid is the view that the Liberal Tory reforms in the period from 1822 to 1829 represented a significant attempt to change the direction of government policy? [30]

Interpretation 1 Anthony Wood, in this extract from his book *Nineteenth Century Britain: 1815–1914* (1960), presents an interpretation that suggests there was a purposeful attempt to introduce reforms.

Since the beginning of 1820, Lord Liverpool had been aware that the government needed new blood and had been hoping to give the Tory cabinet a more liberal tone. This would win over the moderate reformers and would make a Whig government impossible. ... Three men – Canning, Peel, and Huskisson – were the main force in the new policy that was so striking in the last years of the Tory reign. ... But Lord Liverpool remains the man who had made all this possible ... it was he who was fundamentally responsible for the new turn that governmental policy was to take.

Interpretation 2 Michael J Turner, in this extract from his book *The Age of Unease: Government and Reform in Britain, 1782–1832* (2000), presents an interpretation that suggests there was not a significant change in the direction of government policy in the period from 1822 to 1829.

The “liberal Toryism” of the 1820s did not mark a sudden transformation in ideas, intent or methods. The new ministers developed policies which they had already been considering outside the cabinet. They shared an interest in improvement and efficiency, and in the 1820s reforms could be implemented in a time of prosperity and relative social peace, a wholly different context to the economic distress of the postwar years.

END OF PAPER