Pearson Edexcel Level 3 GCE

History

Advanced
Paper 2: Depth study
Option 2C.1: France in revolution, 1774–99
Option 2C.2: Russia in revolution, 1894–1924

Wednesday 13 June 2018 - Afternoon
Sources Booklet

Paper Reference
9HI0/2C

Do not return this booklet with the question paper.

Turn over ▶

P51893A

©2018 Pearson Education Ltd.

1/1

P 5 1 8 9 3 A

Pearson

Sources for use with Section A.

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

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

Sources for use with Question 1.

Source 1: From Germaine de Staël, *Considerations on the Principal Events of the French Revolution*, published 1818. The daughter of former French Finance Minister, Jacques Necker, de Staël was a prominent writer and intellectual in France during the 1790s. Here she reflects on the record of the Directory.

We have to give credit to the Directory. The first twenty months constitute a particularly remarkable period of administration. The Directory came to power in the most unfavourable circumstances. Paper money had fallen to almost a thousandth of its normal value and there was not as much as 100,000 francs in cash in the treasury. Food supplies were so scarce that popular discontent was barely contained and the revolt in the Vendée was still going on. Civil unrest had produced bands of outlaws, who committed horrible atrocities in the countryside. Finally, almost all the French armies were disorganised.

In six months, the Directory raised France from this deplorable situation. Coins smoothly replaced paper money; old and new property owners lived peacefully side-by-side; country roads had become perfectly safe; the army was very successful; the liberty of the press made a come-back; elections followed their legal course.

France would have been free if the nobles and priests had enjoyed the same treatment under the law as other citizens. But liberty cannot be compromised. If you persecute one individual in the State, justice will never be established for all, particularly when 100,000 individuals are placed outside the protective circle of the law. However, when the Directory was established, revolutionary measures spoiled the Constitution. The last four years of the Directory were so poor, from every perspective, that people easily attributed the disorder to the institutions themselves.

Source 2: From a confidential Paris police report written in late 1797. Here the report considers the state of the country at that time.

A great amount of public anxiety has been caused by the financial situation. Investors are profoundly and painfully affected by the subject. Violent grumblings can be commonly heard against public poverty, and critics of 18 Fructidor* say that the cause of poverty is due to that event. The number of jobless workers has increased in Paris, and there are rumours that unemployment is just as great in the regions. This great distress, with winter coming, raises the fear of unfortunate consequences.

Rumours are rife that another 18 Fructidor is going to take place any time and that the Directory is going to purge the two Councils once again. Some people, speaking of the present Constitution, say that it is not at all popular and that it is an aristocratic government. The only difference, it is said, between the Constitution of 1791 and that of 1795 is that the implementation of the laws, instead of being carried out by one king, is carried out by five Directors. Fears about the future in political terms, complaints and even grumblings about financial matters, and the desire for peace: such was the mood and the character of public opinion yesterday and again today. An exterior calm nevertheless continues to exist.

* 18 Fructidor (4 September 1797) - a coup carried out by the Directors to remove elected monarchist deputies from the Councils

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

Sources for use with Question 2.

Source 3: From a letter written by Lenin to the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party, 14 September 1917.

On July 3-4* it could have been argued that the correct thing for the Bolsheviks to do was to take power, for our enemies would in any case have accused us of revolution and ruthlessly treated us as rebels. However, to have decided in favour of taking power at that time would have been wrong, because the conditions for the victory of the revolution did not exist.

(1) We still lacked the support of the working class that is the vanguard of the revolution. We still did not have a majority among the workers and soldiers of Petrograd and Moscow. Now we have a majority in both Soviets. It was created solely by the history of July and August, by the experience of the ruthless treatment handed out to the Bolsheviks, and by the experience of the Kornilov revolt.

(2) There was no country-wide revolutionary upsurge at that time. There is now, after the Kornilov revolt; the situation in the provinces and the assumption of power by the Soviets in many localities prove this.

(3) Therefore, an insurrection on July 3-4 would have been a mistake; we could not have retained power either physically or politically. We could not have retained it physically even though Petrograd was at times in our hands, because at that time our workers and soldiers would not have fought and died for Petrograd. We could not have retained power politically on July 3-4 because, before the Kornilov revolt, the army and the provinces could and would have marched against Petrograd.

*July 3-4 - the July Days

Source 4: From Alexander Kerensky, *The Prelude to Bolshevism: The Kornilov Rebellion*, published 1919. Kerensky was Prime Minister of the Provisional Government at the time of the Kornilov Affair.

The Kornilov adventure was the prologue to the Bolshevik coup. Had there been no Kornilov affair in August, there would not have been a Bolshevik takeover in October 1917. And that is really the great crime, the unforgivable sin against our native country of those naïve dreamers, skilful politicians and bold adventurers who undertook to save Russia by means of a 'White General'. In his proclamation to the Russian people, General Kornilov, in spite of all evidence to the contrary, stated that the Provisional Government acted under the pressure of the Bolshevik majority in the Soviets. Whether Kornilov himself laboured under a delusion, or lied, is of no importance. But, there was nothing, nothing whatever, of the kind at the time in the Soviets, which were clearly leaning to the right.

Before the Kornilov rising there had not been a Bolshevik majority in a single Soviet. Nevertheless, Kornilov proved himself to be a remarkable prophet. Within a week after the Kornilov rising, the Soviets were taken over by the Bolsheviks. Then everywhere Bolshevik majorities came into being, and there began under the motto 'All power to the Soviets' the fatal conflict of the unrestrained masses against responsible leadership and order in Russia.

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

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.