



**GCE AS/A LEVEL – NEW**

2100U30-1



**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**

TUESDAY, 23 MAY 2017 – AFTERNOON

1 hour 45 minutes

### **ADDITIONAL MATERIALS**

A WJEC pink 16-page answer booklet.

### **INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES**

Use black ink or black ball-point pen.

Answer **both** questions.

### **INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES**

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

You are advised to spend around 50 minutes on answering each question.

The sources and extracts used in this unit may have been amended or adapted from the stated published work in order to make the wording more accessible.

**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**

*Answer both questions.*

**QUESTION 1**

Study the sources below and answer the question that follows.

**Source A**

With respect to the different cities, towns and boroughs, they all exercise a variety of separate and distinct voting rights. In the greater part of them the right of voting is invested in the freemen but an infinite number of peculiar customs is to be found. In some places the number of voters is limited to a select body of thirty to forty; in others it can be as many as 10,000. In some places a freeman must be a resident, in others his presence is only required at an election. The remaining rights of voting are even more complicated. This creates endless misunderstandings in defining and settling these numerous distinctions.

[From a pamphlet on voting rights published by the Society of the Friends of the People, a moderate Whig organization in favour of reform (9 February 1793)]



**QUESTION 2**

Study the extracts below and answer the question that follows.

**Interpretation 1**

The problems confronting Lord Liverpool after 1812 were real and dangerous and needed strong action. All the evidence that came from magistrates, army officers, and government spies indicated the existence of networks of local political reform societies, the circulation of inflammatory and subversive literature, the constant movement of delegates between the provinces and London, the purchase and manufacture of arms and secret military drilling. The severe hardships in the industrial areas frequently led to widespread rioting; government powers to repress disorder were limited and the small peacetime army stretched to the limit. If Liverpool can be accused of over-reacting it was because of limited information about the extent of seditious activities; firmness at the outset would make more severe action unnecessary later on. The real criticism of the Six Acts is that for the most part they were ineffective and misdirected as the scenes at the time of the Queen's trial a year later showed.

[Norman Gash, an academic historian specialising in the political history of the nineteenth century, writing in his specialist textbook, *Aristocracy and People: Britain 1815-1865* (1979)]

**Interpretation 2**

The actual threat to the security of the nation posed by radicalism after 1812 was minimal. However, for Lord Liverpool's government, the Spa Fields riot seemed to provide both the firm evidence of an insurrectionary conspiracy and the necessary excuse for a legal crackdown that would thwart both it and reform in general. Such extreme measures had been easier to pass through the Commons during wartime than while the country was at peace – as it was now. However, on the way to the opening of Parliament in 1817 a window had been broken on the Prince Regent's carriage by a stone thrown from the crowd. By inflating this incident into an attempt on the Prince's life, Liverpool secured the suspension of Habeas Corpus and the renewal of the Act against Seditious Meetings. By the early nineteenth century the government possessed a very large permanent army to suppress revolt and it also subjected the manufacture of arms in the country to close scrutiny, making it difficult for radicals to arm themselves.

[Edward Vallance, an academic historian specialising in the history of radicalism, writing in a general text book, *A Radical History of Britain* (2009)]

Historians have made different interpretations about the threat posed by radicalism during Lord Liverpool's governments from 1812-1822. Analyse, evaluate and use the two extracts above and your understanding of the historical debate to answer the following question:

How valid is the view that the governments of Lord Liverpool mainly over-reacted to the threat of popular radicalism in the period 1812-1822? [30]

**END OF PAPER**