Pearson Edexcel Level 3 GCE

Time 1 hour 30 minutes

Paper reference **9HI0/2C**

History

Advanced

PAPER 2: Depth study

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

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

Sources Booklet

Do not return this Booklet with the question paper.

Turn over ▶

P69334A

©2022 Pearson Education Ltd.

Q:1/1/1/

P 6 9 3 3 4 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 Bertrand Barère, *Memoirs*, published in the early 1840s. Barère, a lawyer and journalist, was a prominent member of the Committee of Public Safety in the years 1793–94. Here he reflects on Robespierre.

In the Convention, Robespierre proposed the dreadful law of 22 Prairial*, which undermined revolutionary justice. The law reduced the number of jurors and established an oppressive system of justice. In effect, it created a system of assassination that used revolutionary law as a sword. I demanded a delay, but in vain. Everyone in the Convention was frightened because of Robespierre's support among the Jacobins, or else was coerced by the system of terror he had organised. As a result, the law was passed due to the forced silence of the deputies, rather than their consent.

The Committees of Public Safety and General Security complained that neither committee had known about the new law prior to Robespierre's proposal. This was true, even though this law related to the functions of the Committee of General Security, and it was proposed by Robespierre, a member of the Committee of Public Safety. The deputies of the Convention were astonished to learn that our committees had no part in it; the law was the work of Robespierre, Couthon** and St-Just. This horrible law was passed and its consequences were deplorable: mass executions took place and prisoners of all classes were held in the same prisons and accused under the same law.

*law of 22 Prairial – enacted on 10 June 1794

**Couthon – a member of the Committee of Public Safety and a close ally of Robespierre

Source 2: From Germaine de Staël, *Considerations on the Principal Events of the French Revolution*, published 1798. De Staël was the daughter of former French Finance Minister, Jacques Necker. She was a prominent writer, intellectual and advocate of moderate reform in France during the 1790s. Here she reflects on the Committee of Public Safety and Robespierre.

The appalling Committee of Public Safety was not composed of twelve men of superior talent. This committee of terror exercised unrestricted power alone. The power of these twelve men was due to the atrocity of their crimes and nobody dared to criticise them.

No name from the Terror will remain, except Robespierre. He was neither more able nor more eloquent than the rest. However, his political fanaticism appeared both calm and stern, which made him feared by all his colleagues. He became ambitious when he triumphed over his rival demagogue, Danton. Robespierre was fond only of power. He sent counterrevolutionaries and revolutionaries to the scaffold. His behaviour created an atmosphere of terror in the midst of the actual Terror that the government introduced. The desire to rule compelled Robespierre to distinguish himself from others. Robespierre acquired the reputation of high democratic virtue and so was believed to be incapable of self-interest.

Robespierre devised the idea of a festival celebration to honour the Supreme Being. This was an attempt to base his political ascendancy on a religion founded on his own views – a common practice among those who wish to seize supreme power. At the festival celebration, however, he decided to walk at the head of the procession, in order to claim pre-eminence over his colleagues. From that time on, he was vulnerable. Shortly afterwards, Robespierre's colleagues denounced him to secure their own safety.

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

Sources for use with Question 2.

Source 3: From a speech made by Fyodor Dan to the Eighth All-Russian Soviet Congress, 23 December 1920. Dan was a leading Menshevik. Here he comments on the policy of War Communism in the countryside.

So, we have seen, first and foremost, the adoption of a purely coercive policy towards the peasants. Yesterday, we were given figures that showed that during the last year the government extracted more grain from the peasants than the Tsarist government did in the last year of its life. I have to say that a food policy based on violence is bound to fail. War Communism has forcibly seized 300 million *pudy**. This has led to a decrease in the sown area everywhere of almost 25 per cent, a reduction in livestock and profound agricultural decline.

We consider that this policy of ever-deepening coercion of the peasants will be fatal. We warn you that this policy of deeper and more intense coercion of the peasantry can only lead to an unbridgeable gulf between town and country. Then the peasants, no longer in fear of the Tsar and landowners, will become the basis for a bourgeois counterrevolution in Russia. Everyone who holds the interests of the revolution dear must protest against this coercion. We must demand that the working class be allowed greater initiative, and remember that it is far easier to build socialism with a willingly-involved peasant class.

**pudy* – plural of *pood*, a Russian unit of weight equivalent to 16.4 kilograms

Source 4: From Victor Serge, *Memoirs of a Revolutionary*, published 1951. Serge was a Russian revolutionary and writer who joined the Bolsheviks in 1919. Here he comments on the policy of War Communism in the countryside.

The social system in these years was called War Communism. Anyone who, like myself, went so far as to consider it purely temporary was looked upon with contempt. The system for providing food had to be maintained since it catered primarily for the starved and battered proletariat, the army, the navy, and the party activists. And so requisitioning squads were sent out into the outlying countryside, only to be driven away, or sometimes even massacred, by peasants wielding pitchforks. Savage peasants would cut open a commissar's belly, fill it with grain and leave him by the roadside as a lesson for all.

This was how one of my comrades, a printing worker, died. It took place not far from Dno*. I went there afterwards to explain to the desperate villagers that it was all the fault of the blockade by the interventionist powers. This was true, but the peasants continued, not unreasonably, to demand both the abolition of requisitioning and the legalisation of the free market.

No one dared admit that this War Communism system would not work. The party did not know that, in February 1920, Trotsky had asked the Central Committee to abolish requisitioning. Rozhkov, the Marxist historian, wrote to Lenin saying that we were heading for a catastrophe: there must be an immediate change in the economic relationship between town and countryside.

* Dno – a railway town in north-west Russia

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

Acknowledgements

Source 1 from: https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.66298/page/n7/mode/2up

Source 2 from: Considerations on the Principal Events of the French Revolution By Germaine de Staël
© Liberty Fund Inc, 2008

Source 3 from: The Soviet Union: A Documentary Reader Vol 1 By Edward Acton and Tom Stableford
© University of Exeter Press, 2005

Source 4 from: Memoirs of a Revolutionary By Victor Serge © New York Review Books, 1951