

Comparison of national convention and nobility regarding louis xv's execution



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

COMPARISON OF SOURCEThe first source says that the people are relieved by the end of the tyranny and oppression caused by the king, and show much approval for the public and for liberty. It says that the victims protested his existence and that people are less hostile than before the death of the King. The second source says that the death of the King has spread dismay everywhere and that people feel that the execution was dangerous and excessive. The first source states that war and domestic discord had spread over France, as well as deep seated prejudices. It states that France has much tyranny, and oppression without any liberty or fraternity. The second source states that there was a possibility of peace, security, and fortune in the King's reign which has been lost, but there were many untold ills which will be more forgoing after the King's death, due to the irrationality of the National Convention.

See more at history1700s.com/index.php/articles/14-guest-authors/1564-renaissance-and-eloquence.html

The first source states that uncertainties and disturbances have followed with the death of the King, but that is was inevitable, and now only the good which [the people] have produced through the death of tyrant and the tyranny now remains.

It also states that unity must be had to ensure that no civil war takes place. The second source states that there are more untold ills which threaten [them], which will now be inevitable. It also says that horrible crimes and misfortunes, as well as accusations, inquisition, tyranny, and lack

<https://assignbuster.com/comparison-of-national-convention-and-nobility-regarding-louis-xvis-execution/>

of freedom have spread over France. The sources agree that civil war is a possible outcome because of the King's death. The first source wants to create unity to avert the destruction of a possible civil war, and the second source fears that a civil war is inevitable due to the unthinkable action of the National Convention, which will finish France off, and leave it completely defenseless. They also agree that public unrest could follow the death of the King. The first source states that they must overcome it to become united, and the second source states that the National Convention itself is created a severe unrest among the people by killing the King, which could end in civil war.

The first source believes that the death of the King has removed tyranny and oppression and that only good (such as liberty, unity, and fraternity) can come out of the death of the King in the long run. The second source believes the opposite; that France was much more peaceful, prosperous, and stable as a nation with the King, and, by killing him, the horrible crimes, tyranny, oppression, and confinement has gotten exponentially worse. The National Convention would have a strong bias to believe that only good can come of the King's death, because they wanted him dead so that they could take total control, free of any monarchy. They take no mention of any forgone negative occurrence of the King's death, and put it in a very positive light, saying that liberty, unity, and fraternity are in close grasp of France. The noble would have a bias against the death of the King because he would have had an easy life under Louis's reign, with wealth, power, and control over some of the population, as well as a societal status. Without the King, he is a common person, who no longer has those benefits, and is

held in contempt by the peasants. So, he would have believed France was secure before, and chaotic and sorrowful after, the King's death. I think the noble's source is more reliable because: it cannot be used as a piece of propaganda, as it is a personal letter, so it could be more truthful and less get-the-right-point-across.

There is also more proof of unrest in the population than of peace after the death of the King, with the Great Terror occurring shortly afterward, along with domestic unrest and violence, which was more rightfully predicted by the noble. It also states that the people thought the King was guilty, but in no need of execution, meaning that the noble would agree that some of the things the King did was wrong, and wasn't completely blanketed to subjective opinion. I would conclude that, after the King's death, the oppression, anger, and fear within the population grew evermore stronger than with a King in power. This is in most part due to the actions of Robespierre, who had many people over the September Massacres (convicted prisoners, who were possibly innocent) and the Great Terror (blind killings from any hint of suspicion, without trial), which is a prime example of how more fear and silencing was brought unto France by the National Convention (Committee of Public Safety). The differences between the sources show the strong divisions in the minds of the people and of the men in charge of France after the death of the King. Some more conservative people, such as the noble, wanted the monarchy to exist in some form, so they could feel secure and retain their status, or just didn't want change, while radicalists, such as the National Convention, felt the death of the King would bring a true cleansing to France, and would end the classist, tyrannical

acts of the government. These divisions cause a humungous clash that held to things such as the Terror, and the wars between France and other nations, which devastated the people of France.