

Pearson Edexcel Level 3 GCE

History

Advanced Subsidiary

Paper 2: Depth study

Option 2C.1: France in revolution, 1774–99

Option 2C.2: Russia in revolution, 1894–1924

Tuesday 23 May 2017 – Afternoon

Sources Booklet

Paper Reference

8HI0/2C

Do not return this booklet with the question paper.

P49964A

©2017 Pearson Education Ltd.

1/1



Turn over ►



Pearson

Sources for use with Section A.

Answer the questions in Section A on the option for which you have been prepared.

Option 2C.1: France in revolution, 1774–99

Source for use with Question 1(a).

Source 1: From Gouverneur Morris, *A Diary of the French Revolution*, which was eventually published in the 1880s. He was the American Ambassador to France in the years 1792–94 and, as a conservative, was critical of the French Revolution. Here, in an entry dated 21 December 1792, Morris comments on French attitudes towards Louis XVI during the King's trial.

The majority of the Convention stir up national hostility in order to justify dethroning the King and to encourage the adoption of a republican form of government. It was very easy to create such opinions. The rage which has been excited was terrible and the Convention is still in a great dilemma: fearing to acquit, fearing to condemn, and yet urged to destroy their captive Monarch. The violent section declares against him. Even the pro-monarchy and aristocratic parties wish his death. They believe that such a catastrophe would shock national feeling, awaken the people's traditional attachments and turn this tide of hostile opinion into the channels of loyalty. Thus he has become the common object of hatred to all parties.

5
10

Source for use with Question 1(b).

Source 2: From Antoine Claire Thibaudeau, *Memoirs of the Convention and Directory*, published 1824. A lawyer and politician, Thibaudeau was a member of the National Convention and the Committee of Public Safety. Here, he comments on the nature of the Terror.

The Terror in France subjected the whole nation to its bloody impact. In a repressive state, the rulers, the courtiers and certain classes and individuals are not affected by the terror they inspire. They are like gods who hurl thunderbolts without fear of being struck. In France however, under the reign of terror, no one was able to escape. The Terror hovered over everyone's head striking them down indiscriminately. It was as random and swift as death itself. The Convention, as well as the people, supplied its own victims. Danton and the officers of the commune of Paris perished on the same scaffold to which they had previously dragged the Girondists.

15

The people applauded the death of both executioners and victims. Marat, whose ferocity seemed to symbolise the Terror, would have been guillotined had he not been killed earlier by the dagger of a courageous woman. And Robespierre, the high priest of the Terror, was reserved as its last victim. The Terror did more harm than good to the Republic because it exceeded all limits, led to atrocious suffering and sacrificed friend and foe alike.

20
25

Option 2C.2: Russia in revolution, 1894–1924

Source for use with Question 2(a).

Source 3: From letters written by the Tsarina Alexandra to her husband Tsar Nicholas II in September and November 1915. The Tsar was then at Russian army headquarters near the military front.

Gregory* did beg you to name Protopopov as Minister of the Interior. You had such a good impression of Protopopov. He happens to belong to the Duma (and he is not on the political left) and so will know how to deal with them. God bless your new choice of Protopopov – our Friend* says you have done a very wise act in naming him.

5

I must give you a message from our Friend, prompted by what he saw in the night. He begs you to order the army to advance near Riga. He says it is necessary, otherwise the Germans will settle down firmly for the winter and it will cost endless bloodshed and trouble to make them move.

* Gregory/our Friend = references to Rasputin

Source for use with Question 2(b).

Source 4: From R. H. Bruce Lockhart, *Memoirs of a British Agent*, published 1932. Lockhart served as a British diplomat in Moscow from 1912 to 1918. Here, he comments on the problems facing Kerensky's government in 1917.

It is important to realise that from the beginning the revolution was a revolution of the people. From the first moment neither the Duma nor the intelligentsia had any control of the situation. Secondly the revolution was a revolution for land, bread and peace – but above all for peace. There was only one way to save Russia from going Bolshevik and that was to allow her to make peace with Germany. It was because he would not make peace that Kerensky went under. It was solely because Lenin promised to stop the war that he came to the top.

10

15

It will be argued that Kerensky ought to have shot both Lenin and Trotsky. The soldiers who put forward this view always ignore the psychological arguments. The old regime having broken down, the type of leader (i.e. a Kerensky) whom the first revolution threw up, was bound to be a man who would not shoot his opponents. It was the first stage of a natural process. Secondly, even if Kerensky had shot Lenin and Trotsky, some other anti-war leader would have taken their place and would have won through on his anti-war programme.

20

BLANK PAGE

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.