**Alexander III DBQ’s**

Source A:

1. Leo Tolstoy argues that Alexander III should pardon the assassins, instead of executing them. He argues that pardoning them will prevent further revolutionary movements, and in fact calm the population of Russia. He warns the tsar that if he does execute the assassins, there will simply be a new group of revolutionaries who will step up and take their place: “evil breeds evil, and in place of those three or four, thirty or forty will grow up…” His plea to Alexander the III comes from the thought that forgiveness will breed forgiveness, and thereby the action will lead to peace.
2. Yes, I agree that it would have been the best course of action. If Alexander III had pardoned the Assassins he would have showed a will to make compromises. The People’s Will’s main goal was to get their opinions across, and thereby hopefully influence a change in favor of them. Therefore the pardoning would have represented the idea of acknowledgment, from the tsar’s side.

In case you decide to disappear the assassins:

* Fortify opposition movement, They become radicalized
* Western opposition, in terms of ideology,
* Opposition to what? To the tsar. To the government, to the autocracy.
* Goals, or aims of opposition
* **Theme:** Millions of people against tsardom, but they were not united in their ideologies, or aims.
* The people’s will- populists, believed in the revolution for the people
* Radicalized opposition, all over the political spectrum.
* Tolstoy (war and peace, key player in the Zemstvos, Author and Philosopher)
* Believed in NON-VIOLENT resistance.

Source B:

1. Alexander III praises his father by highlighting the successful changes that Alexander II made in Russia. He describes how Alexander II, emancipated the serfs, but still was able to maintain good relations with the land lords. Alexander III further explains how his father “established justice in the realm”, through his judicial reforms and the instating of the Zemstvos.
2. He makes it clear that he fully intends to maintain autocracy, in saying that it is god’s will, that Russia moves on form the “wicked murder” of his father. He is of the belief that control must remain in Russia, despite the revolutionary act of his father’s assassination.

* Manifesto of unshakable Autocracy
* The nature of Tsardom

Source C:

1. Pobedonostsev argues that the right to vote is only a mask covering up the fact that there is really no valid suffrage, that instead decisions are made by the selected ‘elite’,” the real rulers are the dexterous manipulators of votes…”

He also argue that the belief that the more people who abide, or follow, political and social rights, the more likely the whole of the nation will be to follow them, is a false belief that has been proven otherwise, “Experience proves a very different thing. The history of mankind bears witness that the most necessary and fruitful reforms… emanated from the supreme will of statesmen.”

1. No, this argument does not improve my opinion of Alexander III’s reactionary policies, neither does it worsen it. Alexander the III’s reactionary policies were a reaction to the assassination of his father, which he indirectly saw as an attack on the hold of the autocratic power in Russia.

* Alexander III’s tutor, he basically raised the tutor (mr.P was practically th most powerful person in Russia at the time)
* Alexander III, wouldn’t do anything without the consent of mr. P

Source D:

1. Pobedonostsev argues that by focusing on children’s intellectual standing, those very same children are being robbed of vital skills needed for their future survival, “the vast majority of children must learn to live by the work of their hands…to close the door to such preparation…is to place a burden upon the lives of the masses who have to struggle for their daily bread.”

He further argues that by taking away the skills manual labor skills of the children it impacts the entire family unit, “…by tearing the child from the domestic hearth…they deprive his parent of a productive force which is essential to the maintenance of the home.”

1. This argument does change my opinion of Alexander III’s reactionary policies, because the point that Pobedonostsev makes is quite valid, taking into account the economic situation the peasants were in after Alexander II’s reforms. Alexander II’s emancipation of the serfs had consequence for the former serfs, seeing that they were burdened with redemption dues, for the land that they had received. Therefore taking away the children of the households, would prove to mean a decrease in the prospected income of the families.

* The peasants shouldn’t receive education, it’s a waste
* The class division was a rejection of western idea, wanting to keep Russia, backwards and

Source E:

1. The main aims of the May laws were to ban the Jewish people from working the more important, and higher paying jobs. Alexander III Instated the may laws in order to create room for Russians to acquire higher paying jobs, and thereby by satisfying their outcries for revolution. The results were that large numbers of Jews emigrated from Russia, and relocated to the United States, United Kingdom, other parts of Europe, and Jerusalem. Which in turn left Russia with a deficit in educated intellectuals able to take on the civil service jobs, previously occupied by the Jewish people.
2. No, this information does not change my opinion of Pobedonostsev. In fact it agrees with my previous conceptions of his theories. His statement that explains his belief that, “one-third of the Jews will convert, one-third will die, and one-third will flee the country”, indicates that he strongly believes in Alexander III’s counter reforms, he is one of the people who believe in the ‘Russian’ way of reforms.

* They were banned from the civil service jobs, they were ‘expellled’ form Russia, but not from the entire republic.
* This is sometimes to believed to be the act that spurred on the first Holocaust.

Source F:

2. The Famine lead to more reaction from the people, specifically from the Zemstvos in the local communities. The local Zemstvo leaders devised plans to relieve the hungry people in the community. The Famine further lead to dissatisfaction among the peasants, seeing that the country suffered losses of around two million people.

* Attempts at modernization (the grain export – resulted in Famine)
* Sergei Witte- the starvation of people will cause a revolution, he wanted forced industrialization. How? Borrow money from France (millions and billions of rubles)
* Most Russian farmers were subsistence farmers(growing enough to live through the winter)
* Theory: if Russia modernized its agriculture they would be able to have enough to supply the country, and parts of Europe
* Grain export = modernization
* Most machinery came from the west
* Short term (famine) vs. long term (modernization)

Source G:

1. The tsar was embarrassed by the success of the Zemstvos, because it showed that his hold on power was in fact not very strong, because they were able to make decisions for themselves, and enacted them too. The Zemstvos had more power over the people during the famine than the tsar, simply because they weren’t helping the people out of a need to maintain power, but in fact to help the people.

* The decentralization of power in Russia was working; it goes against the autocracy, against what god is saying.