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INTRODUCTION

In his seminal work on modernization, Cyril Black has partially defined it as the process by which “historically evolved institutions are adapted to . . . rapidly changing functions.” This process has also been discussed in terms of the substitution of inanimate for human power in the process of industrial production, and of the centralization of coordination and control—that is, the organization of the action of the members of a social system about one or more foci.

Problems of definition notwithstanding, nineteenth-century Tsarist Russia lagged very much behind the rest of western Europe in adaptation of institutions, development of industry, and centralization of social and governmental power. In fact, much of what Alexander Vucinich has recently termed “the unrelenting clamor” for a critical national “self-examination” by Russian intellectuals of this period can be seen as an attempt to come to grips with the apparently insuperable problems attendant upon modernization.

There can be little doubt that the revolutionary modernizers—lawyers, journalists, teachers, students of the humanities and social sciences, philosophers, novelists, and poets—were among the first and most outspoken critics of the Russian system. They became vociferous proponents of a new one, as well. Consider, for example, Ivan Turgenev’s comment in 1885 that the fall of Sevastopol should serve as the chief catalyst of a new era of national emancipation from both “the shackles of political oppression and the debilitating burden of the lingering vestiges of the feudal system.”

Only relatively recently, however, have historians of Russia turned their attention to the other side of the coin, to the “managerial modernizers”—that is, the bureaucratic and industrial administrators, tech-
nicians, and scientists,7 and their efforts to modernize. According to Kautsky's paradigm, this group is produced by the preceding one.8 But in Russia the two existed side by side and were frequently from the same social milieu. However, the managerial modernizers had the advantage of at least being at the center of power and, in most cases, of having the emperor's ear.

Seeking out the development of modern Russia, historians have generally located the main thrust of modernization in the reigns of Alexander II and Nicholas II, while giving comparatively little attention to the reign of Alexander III.9 Yet it is clear that despite this regime's attempts to prevent concomitant political reform and to retard the pace of social reform, it did force the pace of economic modernization during this period.10 Thus the reign of Alexander III deserves far more consideration than it has heretofore received.

Among these "managerial modernizers," Russian ministers of finance played a significant role in such undertakings, as they did in almost all internal policies of the Russian state. This was inevitable, in view of their power of the purse over other ministries and departments and their influence on Russia's ability to wage war, expand her boundaries, and other such policies. Most of them were men cast from essentially the same mold, products of the same class background, and recipients of the same type of education at the same schools, all calculated to produce not so much innovation as unity of purpose and outlook.11 Needless

7 See Kautsky, Political Consequences of Modernization, p. 149, and also his article "Revolutionary and Managerial Elites in Modernizing Regimes," Comparative Politics 1, 4 (1969): pp. 441-467.
8 Kautsky, Political Consequences of Modernization, p. 149.
11 Allen A. Sinel, "The Socialization of the Russian Bureaucratic Elite, 1811-1917: Life at the Tsarskoe Selo Lyceum and the School of Jurisprudence," Russian History/Histoire Russe 3, 1 (1976): pp. 1-2. See also John A. Armstrong, The European Administrative Elite (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), pp. 233ff. While it is true, then, that most of the Russian finance ministers were cut from the same pattern, it is also important to note that they were either by background, training, or experience much better equipped for their jobs than the majority of their colleagues in the other ministries. For example, Yegor Frantsevich Kankrin (1823-1844) wrote widely on economic subjects; Mikhail Khristoforovich Reutern (1862-1878) had traveled widely in Europe and the United States to study governmental budgetary processes. Additionally, Bunge's predecessor Ivan Alekseyevich Veshnyaginskiy (1887-1892) was a professor of mechanical engineering with business experience as a director of the Southwestern Railway Company and several other enterprises. Then, of course, there was Sergius Iulevich Witte (1892-
After the attempt on Alexander II’s life in 1866, Bunge retreated somewhat into the background because of increased government reaction. Concentrating on his teaching duties and writing extensively on political economics, he also served from 1871 to 1874 as elected rector of Kiev University, a clear indication of his great popularity with both Polish and Russian students and of the trust reposed in him by university and even governmental authorities. In addition, Bunge served as financial counselor to the Kiev city duma, chairing its commissions that were responsible for compiling the budget, and supervising expenditures.

When Russia’s internal politics underwent yet another change, one that portended a new era of reform under the tutelage of Loris-Melikov, Bunge’s reputation as an educator, economist, and city administrator led to his appointment to the post of deputy minister of finance under A. A. Abaza in 1879. For two years Bunge served in this capacity, helping to develop projects for reducing the redemption payments of the peasants and for the repurchase by the peasants of land that they cultivated. These projects served to improve the monetary system generally. In addition, his proposed reorganization of the duty on sugar was another step toward such improvement.

With the assassination of Alexander II in 1881 and the removal of Loris-Melikov and Abaza from positions of immediate power, Bunge was named minister of finance of the Russian Empire, capped a brilliant career as teacher, administrator, and economist with one of the most powerful and important posts the autocracy had to offer. A learned man of liberal views, his approach to government was kindled, in the words of one historian, “by a warm concern for the welfare of the Russian people.” He was decidedly not one of Alexander III’s reactionary ministers. But he was a loyal servant of his imperial master—a position of which public opinion was critical, but, in the main, understanding. Still, for all of his finer qualities, he could not escape the twin furies of Russia’s poverty and indebtedness which had hounded his predecessors. Initially he shared the opposition of the Council of State to putting the ruble on a gold basis and hoped to raise the value of the currency by withdrawing the notes issued during the Turkish War of 1877–1878. But, faced with the evil heritage of that war and also with a growth in population and commercial and industrial activity which had, in turn, increased demand for money in circulation without any corresponding expansion of transport and banking facilities, Bunge took up the cause...
of permitting transactions in gold at the rate of the day. He also pleaded with the Council of State for convertibility, but it vetoed the project.

These initial setbacks did not seriously affect Bunge's general financial policy, for he saw the solution of the monetary problem in a general growth and strengthening of the economy. This, in turn, would create favorable conditions out of which a sound currency would emerge as a natural consequence. Therefore he proceeded toward his goal indirectly by trying to improve the Russian balance of payments and thereby to increase the country's gold reserve. A new fiscal expedient which Bunge introduced at this time was the restriction of imports, an attempt to force the country to live more within its means, thus opening a new age of protectionism after the cautious free trade policy of the "reform era." As a consequence, Bunge deliberately raised the tariff on various items, including iron and steel, achieving by 1885 a 20 per cent increase in duties for most imported goods. Emerging from the necessity for an active balance of payments and from the government's eagerness to abandon the paper ruble, Bunge's new protectionism thus not only produced new government revenue but also aided Russian industrialists as well by reducing foreign competition.

The same long-term approach characterized Bunge's attitude toward the budget. Here he acted to improve the sources of revenue, rather than simply to balance the budget immediately. However, improving the sources of revenue meant easing the burden on the taxpayers, especially the peasants. So Bunge completed a recasting of the tax structure that had begun under Mikhail Khristoforovich Reutern (minister of finance, 1862–1878) with abolition, except for the redemption dues, of all direct taxes for the peasants. Thus the infamous "soul tax" of Russian serfdom disappeared (except in Siberia, where it remained until 1909). In search of new revenue, he introduced a number of new taxes, mainly indirect, such as duties on matches, alcohol, tobacco, and other consumer items, but the notorious tax on salt was abolished. As a result, the tax burden on the peasants was reduced by as much as one-quarter. Nevertheless, what Bunge ultimately achieved was to replace direct by indirect taxation, whereas the tax base remained largely the same—an issue which he realized very fully and which he would subsequently make strong recommendations to change.

Bunge sought to shift the burden for the resulting shortage in income by maintaining that the cause of the country's budgetary difficulties lay in the cost of the war and naval ministries (over 32 per cent of average annual expenditure between 1881 and 1886) and of the service of the public debt, which had increased by 50 per cent since the Turkish War (nearly 30 per cent of average annual expenditure). But regardless of who was to blame, his programs were clearly costly. Adding to this cost was his establishment in 1882 of a Peasant Land Bank, through which peasants could acquire, singly or in groups, additional lands. A Nobles Bank, founded a little later (1885), attempted a somewhat analogous relief measure on behalf of the nobility, whose economic fortunes were likewise on the decline.

To meet the growing budget deficit, Bunge increasingly found that recourse to new foreign borrowing was necessary—a situation which, in turn, made the improvement of Russia's balance of trade all the more imperative. However, export surpluses, achieved mainly by import cuts, were not sufficient to balance Russia's external accounts, especially since agricultural prices in the 1880s were falling. At the same time, agricultural production did not increase sufficiently to make up for falling prices. Although the import of foreign capital declined because of the Turkish War,
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no new agrarian regions were being opened up. Moreover, the period of Bunge's administration was not favored with good harvests.

But rural welfare was not the only area of Bunge's concern, for at the same time he turned to factory legislation. As yet there had been no effective government measures for improving the lot of the growing number of factory workers in Russia who worked under deplorable conditions. He therefore introduced laws to protect, first, children and then, somewhat later, women against the abuses of long hours in the factories. Subsequent legislation (1886) provided for a broadening of the powers of the Factory Inspectorate, an agency that had been created to investigate periodically conditions under which the laboring classes worked. As part of a larger comprehensive law dealing with the entire relationship between employer and employee in the factory, these measures greatly helped to smooth the advance of industry in Russia, but they were not of immediate benefit to the budget.

Finally, under Bunge the entire system of railroad construction and management was overhauled, because, under private ownership, it had come to constitute a serious drain on the resources of the finance ministry. Further, the high and chaotic freight rates had come to have a detrimental effect on the national economy. Consequently, under his administration the government began to construct railways at its own expense once again. It also repurchased some private companies and established a common Russian railroad network composed of both state and private lines for the first time. From this time onward, the rolling stock could be interchanged and traffic coordinated. In addition, the new system added greatly to the efficiency of Russian railroads because it permitted the drafting of a unified freight tariff, one which could be tailored to the needs of the entire Russian economy. While these measures, too, promised long-term advantages, their immediate impact was to weigh heavily on the already overstrained budget.

In this fashion Bunge attempted to patch the worn fabric of the Russian national economy in those areas where he felt that it needed immediate attention—agriculture, labor legislation, and railway transport. Thus he provided the economy with a foundation from which were launched the reforms of his successors.

The last year of Bunge's tenure was calamitous. The government's financial condition, already strained by the annual deficits, was further weakened by a series of foreign crises, which, in turn, endangered the Russian bonds in the London stock markets and eventually led to the fall of the ruble to its lowest level in history. Under fire for his financial policies and bitterly denounced by industrialists and conservatives alike for his championing of labor legislation, Bunge resigned under intense pressure in 1886, while somberly warning against an increase in taxes. What one historian has called "the noble experiment of improving the prosperity of the people" was not ended with his resignation, however. Instead, from his appointed position in the honorific but, on the whole, powerless role of chairman of the Committee of Ministers, Bunge continued the struggle on behalf of moderate reform and rational "modernization."

It was from this vantage point that during the remaining eight years of his life Bunge closely surveyed Russia's modernizing experiences. His concern for the impact of this process and his continued identification with the "moderate-liberal" wing in the Council of State led him, in 1894, to set forth his views in a lengthy and, on the whole, significant memorandum. This document was mentioned by the noted Soviet historian P. A. Zaionchkovskii in his Rossiiskoe sa-

45 Ibid. The problem of the underdevelopment of Russia's vast and largely uninhabited eastern regions would, from this time onward, remain a matter of central concern. See below, in introduction.


49 Von Laue, Sergius Witte, p. 21. Despite the relative progressiveness of these measures, Bunge's concern for Russia's factory workers continued to be reflected in his later recommendations.

moderzhavie v kontse XIX stoletiia\(^{58}\) as a document found in the archives of Alexander III, as well as in Bunge's own papers,\(^{59}\) under the title "Zagrobye zapisiki," or "Notes from the Grave."\(^{60}\) Beyond indicating that it consisted of an unsigned and undated record written by "a clerk," Zaionchkovskii mentions that on the first page the tsar had written "the notes of N. Kh. Bunge," thus making their attribution certain. Tangentially, though, Professor Zaionchkovskii passed lightly over the contents of the memorandum, which began:

Although I have neither a diary nor a set of notes to leave, I consider it my duty to your Imperial Majesty, my most August student, to frankly express my thoughts on the events of the election at Columbia University's Russian Archive in the 1950s that a printed version of the memorandum minus, of course, the introduction, as mentioned. Further, the consistent use of the past tense in regard to Alexander (the greatest discrepancy between the printed version and the original memorandum addressed to Alexander as "my most August Student") suggests that the printed version was made after the death of the emperor. This means, then, that either Bunge himself made changes in the memorandum before his own demise a year later, or changes were made by those who prepared it for print after his death. In any case, the Russian Ministry of Finance, by then under the leadership of Bunge's protégé, S. Iu. Witte, is the logical candidate for having made this printed version and it is this version that is contained in the latter's archive at Columbia University.

The significance of this document in the context of both imperial Russian bureaucratic politics and the process of modernization is two-fold: First, it represents a policy statement by Bunge himself. Although not doctrinaire, and decidedly not the founder of any particular "school" of economic thought,\(^{65}\) Bunge was clearly identified both in the minds of Alexander III's conservative advisers and in the mind of the sovereign himself as one of the exemplars of the so-called liberal bureaucrats—a Konstatinovets.\(^{66}\) His identification with this liberal "party"—or, as Zaionchkovskii calls it, "coalition of interests"—was further underscored by the fact that, after 1886, Bunge was a member of the Gosudarstvenenny sovet (Council of State), a body that was noted as a stronghold of liberal bureaucrats who had formerly held high ministerial rank before being removed because of their views. Its membership included Bunge's immediate predecessor as finance minister, A. A. Abaza; Count L. T. Loris-Melikov, former minister of the interior and the man identified with the abortive "constitution" signed by Alexander shortly before his death; A. V. Golovnin; and Baron

\(^{58}\) Rossiiskoe samoderzhavie v kontse XIX stoletiia. (Politicheskia reaktsiia 80-kh-nachala 90-kh godov [The Russian autocracy at the end of the nineteenth century (Political reaction of the 80s and beginning of the 90s)]) (Moscow, 1970), pp. 26–27.

\(^{59}\) TsGAOR (Central Archive of the October Revolution) fond (record group/archive group) Aleksandra III, delo (item/unit) 617; Also TsGIA (Central State Historical Archive), Biblioteka kollektsii pechatnykh zapisok (Library Collection of Printed Memo-

\(^{60}\) Rossiiskoe samoderzhavie, p. 26.

\(^{61}\) Ibid.

\(^{62}\) TsGAOR, fond (record group/archive group) Aleksandra III, delo (item/unit)617, 1.1 as cited in Zaionchkovskii, Rossiiskoe Samoderzhavie, pp. 26–27.

\(^{63}\) Rossiiskoe samoderzhavie, p. 26.

\(^{64}\) See especially below, pp. 159–173, and compare with Zaionchkovskii, Rossiiskoe samoderzhavie, p. 27.


\(^{66}\) Zaionchkovskii, Rossiiskoe samoderzhavie, pp. 61, 88. The term Konstatinovets was apparently applied to those members of the liberal bureaucracy who were in favor of the systematic reform of the Russian economic and political system and who took their lead from the Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolayevich. It is their almost exclusive emphasis on these two aspects that leads Zaionchkovskii to term their outlook an interest in "bourgeois transformation." Historically, their efforts were directed at change during the early reform era (1861–1872), but the appellation fits Bunge perfectly, not only because of his association with this group in his days of early govern-
ment service, but also because of his whole subsequent orientation, which identified him in the minds of the extreme reactionaries as a "liberal." Consequently they attacked him repeatedly and most viciously and were ultimately successful in securing his removal from the Ministry of Finance. See Institut Mirovoi Literatury Imennoi M. Gor'kogo Akademi na nauk SSSR (Institute of World Literature [in the] name [of] M. Gor'kii of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR) delo (item) 12, list (folio/sheet/list) 1, as cited in Zaionchkovskii, Rossiiskoe Samoderzhavie, p. 89.
Nikolai of the Department of Education. Of this group, Baron Nikolai and A. A. Abaza headed two of the council’s three departments. Consequently, because the council discussed various proposals, amended them, and on occasion even rejected some of them by a majority vote, this “liberal bloc” was considered to be dangerous by the reactionaries around Alexander III. Thus the document must be viewed as an attempt to restate the general views of this group to the emperor, views to which Bunge was irrevocably committed. Second, the general ideas expressed in the memorandum reflect the general desiderata of the liberal bloc, a group of goals which had been expressed and fought for for many years. These goals are decidedly not original formulations of Bunge’s, yet he worked assiduously for their enactment. Here the influence of three men in particular is noteworthy: P. A. Valuev, minister of the interior from 1861 until 1868; the Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevitch, until 1881 the chairman of the Gosudarstvennyi Sovet and intellectual leader of the liberal bureaucrats, and D. A. Miliutin, reforming minister of war under Alexander II. Thus the memorandum represents a continuation of previous trends of bureaucratic reformist thought.

Certainly then, the document generally reflects a liberal bureaucratic point of view. But this view itself was not monolithic, nor was it the incontestably prevailing view of Alexander III’s regime. And the liberalism of the view is relative, especially in its racist and ultranationalist implications. It is impossible, therefore, to determine whether in such sensitive issues Bunge is catering to unalterable attitudes of the emperor’s or is expressing his own.

The main thrust of this document, then, is found in Bunge’s belief in Russia’s need to “free herself from the tutelage of other nations in foreign affairs; her need to systematize (uporiadochit’) and strengthen the institutional structure of the state, a task necessitated by loopholes (proably) in the reform of Alexander II”; her need to “preserve ‘Russia for the Russians’”; and her need to “develop the material and spiritual life of the Russian people.” While these aims may appear disparate and unrelated, they are not. Bunge’s conception was unified, and all these themes are related to each other and interdependent: all relate to the concept of streamlining the cumbersome Russian state machine, thereby making it more efficient and enhancing its social and economic productivity, while adapting its existing institutions to new and vital tasks.

Bunge was convinced that most of Russia’s problems had originated during the reign of Nicholas I, and he argued strongly that the “ground had been prepared” then for all of the various ills afflicting Russia under Alexander III.

In his view, the Crimean War had clearly demonstrated to the world that Russia lacked sufficient unity to fight a major war. Furthermore it had shown that her soldiers were poorly armed and equipped; that her railway system and paved roads were inadequate for a European power; that her serfs were totally unprotected by law; and that no free public opinion, no truly “free” press existed anywhere in Russia. Finally, it had shown that the institutions of local government lacked any freedom of action, and that they “operated only according to the will of the officials appointed to them.”

Initially and characteristically, however, Bunge attempted to vitiate some of the impact of these criticisms by exonerating Nicholas of much of the responsibility for Russia’s shortcomings during his reign. Indeed, he argued that even the freedom of action of Nicholas himself was circumscribed by the views and strivings of both his collaborators and the people who surrounded him. These people in turn, according to Bunge, although distinguished by their devotion to the dynasty, rarely possessed a broad and firm knowledge of Russia. Hence, the emperor received an incorrect understanding of the actual state of the country and, most important, of the dominant mood of the intelligentsia and the people. Thus, Bunge argued, the far-reaching administrative reforms planned at the beginning of his reign, as well as the liberation of the peasants, remained unrealized, not through lack of desire by the emperor, but because of the pressures for inaction at the court.

As disingenuous as this argument was, Bunge attributed Russia’s “thirty-year” stagnation to these causes. However, Bunge also maintained that in an attempt to remedy the causes of Russia’s stagnation, the Emperor Alexander II and his advisers had gone...

67 See TsGIA (Central State Historical Archive, Leningrad), fond (record group/archive group) Fillipova, delo (item). 1, Dnevnik [Diary], entry for July 24, 1892, list (folio, sheet, list) 37, and A. F. Koni Sobranie Socheniia [Collected Reminiscences] 2: p. 2999, as cited in Zaionchkovskii, Rossisskoe samoderzhavie, pp. 100–101.


70 Zaionchkovskii, Rossisskoe samoderzhavie, p. 91.
to the opposite extreme, seemingly feeling that the state alone could remedy all of society's ills by a policy which gave society too much autonomy and which abandoned proper control over its activity. This only produced chaos in the local administration, finances, and the law, and it engendered a situation in which the state was "forced to give with one hand and take away with the other." Thus, in his view, many of Russia's problems, rather than being solved, were simply exacerbated during Alexander II's regime, creating the situation with which Russia was currently faced.

Having thus assessed the two preceding regimes, Bunge defined what he believed to be Russia's outstanding problems and advanced his solutions to them.

The first area of concern, and the one to which Bunge devoted the least space and attention, was Russia's foreign policy. Here, as elsewhere, Bunge's strong nationalist bias is quite clear. Having inveighed strongly against Germany, especially its lack of gratitude for past services and what he deemed Bismarck's unstated enmity for Russia, Bunge was no less harsh in his judgment of the French. While recognizing that it was the Triple Alliance that had motivated the rapprochement between Russia and her Western ally, he nevertheless openly deplored Russia's association with France, because of the latter's internal instability and lack of continuity in its ministries. Such a difficult situation was largely avoided by the Emperor Alexander III, who, in Bunge's view, successfully freed Russia from the tutelage of both Germany and France. His conclusion and recommendations were therefore quite clear: Preserve friendly relations toward the government and people of both nations; avoid overreaction to the fervor of foreign newspapers; and avoid plans which could lead imperceptibly to war. Chiefly, though, Russia should occupy herself with matters of internal reconstruction, gathering her strength and preparing for the necessity to defend against an invasion by an enemy.

Bunge's recommendations for strengthening Russia internally followed naturally from this line of argument. In the main, his recommendations were for greater centralization and more state control, in areas ranging from relations with the national minorities to education. In the former case, Bunge considered the disparate elements of the Russian state a potential danger, not only because of their very heterogeneity but also because this heterogeneity made the state less efficient. Hence, he insisted that the creation of a "Russian state system" throughout the empire was necessary. By this, he meant unequivocally the extension of Russian political, social, and educational institutions to all parts of the empire. The same need for homogeneity demanded, in his view, the establishment of Russian as the official state language and the maintenance of the Orthodox church as the official state church. Centralization, then, entailed Russification. This approach, closely akin to that of S. S. Uvarov72 earlier in the century, may strike the modern reader as strangely discordant with Bunge's alleged liberalism. However, it must be borne in mind that even classical liberalism consciously contained many elements of nationalism. Further, the insistence on a unified national language, culture, and religion were perfectly consonant with liberal ideals, despite their similarity to conservative policies.73 Bunge could therefore espouse these causes and avoid the charge of capitulating to the rather more narrow conception of these same goals held by his imperial master and his more conservative advisers.74

It was ostensibly out of this same concern that Bunge examined at length one of imperial Russia's touchiest problems—the question of her Jewish population. Bunge's anti-Semitism is a good deal harder to rationalize than his nationalism. While institutional anti-Semitism was endemic to most European countries (as the Dreyfus case in France was to demonstrate), nowhere did it reach such virulent proportions as at the imperial Russian court.75 Alexander III was a notorious anti-Semite who looked with apparent equanimity on bloody pogroms of Jews and who was encouraged in these attitudes by his equally anti-Semitic and ultraconservative procurator of the Holy Synod, adviser and tutor to the future Nicholas II, Konstantin Pobedonostsev. Thus, it is difficult to account for Bunge's anti-Semitic views: Are they his own? Or do they represent a belated attempt by this generally outspoken man to once again please his royal master and, at the same time, to curry favor with the conservatives who had ousted him from the finance ministry? This latter view is particularly ungenerous to Bunge. It is difficult to estimate precisely what he would have gained by such uncharacteristic behavior, especially since his views seemed not to be politically motivated.

In any case, his arguments were tortured, and his comments appear in an unpleasant light when compared to the favorable reputation which he enjoyed among Russia's leading Jews. Indeed, as minister of finance, Bunge had been extremely critical of Minister of the Interior N. P. Ignatiev's proposals of March, 1882, which advocated "temporary administrative

72 Sergei Semenovich Uvarov (1786–1855). Minister of education (1833–1849) under Emperor Nicholas I, he was a noted advocate of the principles of "Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality" in education. This made him a bulwark of the autocratic regime.
74 Shapiro, Rationalism and Nationalism, p. 31.
regulations” directed against the Jews. After proposing some fourteen regulations, Ignatiev had selected six of these for “urgent” implementation. The first two regulations abrogated the right of residence and forbade the building or purchase of homes outside of cities and towns in the Pale of Settlement. The third regulation prohibited the ownership, administration, or exploitation of lands in any form in rural districts of the Pale. The fourth prohibited the sale of liquor in its villages. The last two regulations restricted Jewish craftsmen and mechanics to the towns of the interior provinces and forbade Jewish commerce on Sundays and Christian holy days. Arguing from the standpoint of national interest, Bunge was troubled by the threat that such measures posed to economic stability and property, and to hopes for industrial development and foreign investment. If the extreme measures proposed by Ignatiev were approved, he argued, the Jews would have no choice but to emigrate, which would severely damage the country’s economic life.76

Despite his objection to Ignatiev’s anti-Semitic program, Bunge commented unfavorably on the disproportionate number of Jews in the institutions of higher education as compared with their numbers in the population as a whole, as well as on the large numbers of Jews involved in trade and commerce. He therefore advocated measures to deal with what he termed their “pernicious” influence. While the Jews were not dangerous per se, he did consider them a menace because they constituted “a state within the state” and because of their insistence on their own language and their special profession of faith. He charged that the Tel mud by which they lived was full of “barbarous fanaticism and thoughtless prejudices.” His solution was not to expel them, as many Russian bureaucrats suggested,77 but to “contain” them culturally. He would abolish “everything that set Judaism apart”—the “moral-juridical code” of the Talmud as well as Judaic genetic disfigurement which could be dealt with at best by the expulsion or eradication of Russia’s Jews.79

Rather, his views tend to reflect a form of cultural and political pessimism which saw as necessary the construction of defensive barriers against the destruction of Russian values and Russian institutions by Jewish culture and commerce.80

Entirely consistent with the aim of preserving Russia’s values and institutions were Bunge’s recommendations that the “privileges” of other national minorities—the Baltic Germans, the Finns, and especially the Poles—be curbed and in some cases eliminated totally for the welfare of the state as a whole. It was especially important, in his view, that the growth of “Polonism” be checked through the reinforcement of the Russian language in the schools of Poland and through the reunification of the Uniates of Western Russia with the Orthodox church. Still, he candidly allowed that insistence on speaking Russian and restrictions on Polish Catholicism had only increased, not reduced, the enmity which the Poles felt toward Russia and the restiveness with which they reacted to Russian rule. Nevertheless a means did exist for drawing the Poles into a closer rapprochement with Russia: the opening of zemstvo institutions in Poland, which could be of vital importance, provided that property and educational qualifications were established.81

Finland, Bessarabia, the Central Asiatic provinces, Georgia, and Armenia likewise elicited his concern. Here, as with Poland, he felt that centralization of government control in areas too long ignored was necessary. Again he insisted on Russian as the official language and the promotion of the Russian Orthodox church among the people—whether they were Lu-


78 See Rogger, “Jewish Policy of Late Tsarism,” p. 43. However, it should be pointed out that earlier practice (i.e., prior to 1881) made such ownership difficult, primarily because of residence laws. But it was not impossible. In fact, there were government efforts to settle Jews on the land in the reign of Nicholas I. The decisive change came with the Temporary Regulations of 1881.

79 Rogger, “Jewish Policy of Late Tsarism,” p. 50. It is interesting to note that Bunge does mention in passing that Jews are distinguished by “obvious facial features,” but he does not elaborate beyond this.

80 Rogger, “Jewish Policy of Late Tsarism,” p. 50.

81 Bunge did suggest, however, that among these educational qualifications be a certificate attesting to a knowledge of the Russian language and that only people so identified could be electors and representatives to these institutions.
theran, like the Finns, or Muslim, like the peoples of Central Asia. Russia's major error, in his view, lay in the fact that her rule in all of these areas had been mild and unsystematic from the outset. Inevitably, with the advent of national sentiment among these peoples and their consequent animosity toward Russia, she was compelled to take more severe disciplinary measures. The result was a vacillating policy that satisfied no one.

But the goal of strengthening Russia required still other measures, measures that were more managerial than political in nature and which affected both the "legislative" and "administrative" branches of the government. Here Bunge advanced a series of proposals, the capstone of which was the idea of reorganizing the legislative branch, the Council of State. This could best be done by regularly including on it more "experts"—people who were not only familiar with general questions pertaining to the state, but who also had access to local information. In his view, this would eliminate the practice of absentee membership in this important body. It would also greatly increase its contact with the real condition and needs of the Russian people.

Further, Bunge recommended that the council's function be expanded to include coordination and discussion of draft laws originating in the administrative branch, that is, in the various ministries. The obligatory discussion of these ministerial drafts in the various departments of the Council of State would, in his view, give Russia's laws a much broader perspective than they had had previously and avoid the narrow specialization of the ministries. Logical ancillary to this latter reform was to break down the formal barriers within the administrative branch itself, the legal and customary boundaries that separated the various ministries. Bunge asserted that it was essential that "in a monarchy . . . ministries not consider themselves as units that are separate from one another." What he recommended, then, was a significant change in the Russian legal and "constitutional" order in the interests of centralization and efficiency. Whether or not Bunge had in mind a more profound change, say to the point of creating some form of ministerial responsibility on the western model, it is difficult to say.

At the same time, of course, such a change could serve to enhance his own power and control over the nature and volume of legislation, since he was simultaneously chairman of the Committee of Ministers and a member of the Council of State. In this respect, his recommenda-

82 In this instance, Bunge went so far as to propose that a system of review of draft legislation be introduced in the Committee of Ministers, a system which would oblige the Council of State to discuss the legislation complete with ministerial alterations and suggestions. Such thorough review and discussion would be especially appropriate, in Bunge's view, in connection with "great legislative works and reforms."
Here he boldly proposed a method that would permit the suspension of the zemstvo governments in order to allow the central government to temporarily "right" matters that had gone wrong, by the use of a "provisional" or "temporary" administration. These provisional administrators would be required to possess certain property and educational qualifications. Thus he was not opposed to zemstvo administration, but he wished it to be closely supervised and regulated by the organs of the central government. Instead of being a contradiction to his "liberalism," however, this recommendation is another aspect of his desire for greater central control of all internal activities that ultimately related to the welfare of the state. Further, one should not ignore the polemical character of this section, and, indeed, of the entire memorandum. In regard to the zemstvos, Bunge was not only urging greater governmental control over their activity as an end in itself but was also urging this expedient as an alternative to more drastic proposals by reactionaries with whose ideas he was constantly taking issue throughout the document.

Probably the most compelling sections of Bunge's memorandum, though, are those dealing with village organization and education. The former, he admitted, was far from satisfactory. He objected not only that the regulation of the agricultural economy was poor and disorganized and that the government's estimates of agricultural income from the peasants and of expenditures "had neither rhyme nor reason," but he also protested that no one preplanned these estimates. No one saw things in terms of the country's needs as a whole, and the fact that the central government had no reliable agents in the provinces who would supervise the collection and expenditure of taxes, as did the French prefect, only exacerbated the problem. In his view, the land captains (zemskii nachalniki) had failed miserably in the crucial area of village organization. As a consequence, the individual village gatherings had come to play too preponderant a role in village government. It was precisely this influence of outmoded village institutions and the lack of recognition of change that, for him, spelled potential disaster for Russia. Communal ownership was not only "disordered," but a total failure. Further, it was incumbent on the central government to create a new form of organization in the villages and thus to take account of the growing heterogeneity of their populations.

The impending and inevitable disappearance of the commune [mir] clearly required a new type of settle-

85 Bunge further added that these persons should have resided in the zemstvo administrative area "if not permanently, then at least ... for a certain part of the year." Further, he suggested that "several people" from the crown administration, either from the judicial or fiscal institutions, "might be included" in such a provisional administration.
ple trained in modern foreign languages, science, and technical subjects. Bunge’s plan would, he argued, produce such skilled individuals at all levels of the Russian educational system, up to and including the universities. Moreover, the curriculum and methods of the universities would be drastically changed to accommodate this new goal, and technical institutions would also be specially created. This plan obviously would have altered the mission of Russia’s educational institutions, a mission which, under Minister of Education D. A. Tolstoi, had come to emphasize the classics. Tolstoi’s program was, in the main, a reactionary policy, one that the regime considered an excellent agent of acculturation—as well as a means of diverting youthful attention from the attraction of revolutionary theories. Yet it did not serve Russia’s long-term needs. Thus, the question at issue was not one of giving the state much greater control over its educational institutions. Such control was a matter of accepted principle. Rather, the entire issue was a continuation of the classical-realist debate that characterized discussions of Russian higher education in this period. With his proposals, Bunge was clearly electing the realist approach as more suitable for Russia.

As a means of improving the material well-being of the Russian people, Bunge advanced proposals which in some cases would only slowly be implemented over the next two decades; in others, they would not be implemented at all. First, he called for expanding the functions of the Peasant Land Bank to promote increased private ownership of land among Russian peasants; this was the second of his proposals to attack the issue of land distribution. For the age, many of Bunge’s proposals concerning labor and the peasantry, taxation, and education were forward-looking and reflected a concern for humanistic values that characterized the best of bureaucratic reformist thought in the nineteenth century. Thus they constitute the capstone for Bunge’s program of reform and are clear evidence of his personal humanistic values. Furthermore, they reflect the positive, enlightened aspects of bureaucratic interest in reform that rarely are given sufficient attention by historians.

For the age, many of Bunge’s proposals concerning labor and the peasantry, taxation, and education were forward-looking and reflected a concern for humanistic values that characterized the best of bureaucratic reformist thought in the nineteenth century. Thus they constitute the capstone for Bunge’s program of reform and are clear evidence of his personal humanistic values. Furthermore, they reflect the positive, enlightened aspects of bureaucratic interest in reform that rarely are given sufficient attention by historians.

The fact that such values were ultimately central to Bunge’s concern is underscored by the final section of his memorandum. Its pseudosophical nature makes it appear something of an afterthought, an excursus in which Bunge attempted to come to grips with the latter a clear-cut gambit to check what he considered the pernicious influence of socialism among the workers. Precisely what kind of literature would be available Bunge did not indicate, yet one can speculate that it would be progovernment, promonarchist, and decidedly antisocialist, an intellectual zubatovshchina, as it were. Further, as an indication of the lengths to which he was prepared to go to defuse growing worker activism, Bunge advanced a profit-sharing plan for the workers—a departure from standard practice anywhere in Europe, and most certainly a radical innovation for Russia.

87 Sinel, The Classroom and the Chancellery, pp. 133–134, 144.
ficials. In his view, socialism attempted to satisfy—or claimed to satisfy—these needs. So the problem for the state was how best to satisfy these needs short of socialism and, at the same time, how, short of coercion, to keep the people strong in their faith and firm in their obedience to the existing moral and political order. Given the relative boldness he had shown earlier in advocating labor reforms, in easing the more onerous burdens placed upon the Jews, and in altering Russia’s administrative institutions, his answers are disappointing. Nonetheless, they are indicative of the basically moderate nature of his social views. His solutions are: Strengthen the family unit. Strengthen the belief in morals, institutions, and law. Enhance the material well-being of each and every person. Expand the dimensions of private ownership and, at the same time, prevent the “concentration of property in only a few hands.” But how? These have long been the stated desiderata of politicians and statesmen, and the platitudes offer no solutions per se. Unfortunately, neither did Bunge.

Yet he should not be faulted for stumbling here. In the preceding pages of his memorandum, he had developed a blueprint that was clearly more enlightened than the views and recommendations of the ultra-conservative circle around the throne. At the same time, his proposals placed great emphasis on the adaptation of already existing institutions to different functions, so that they would better serve the commonweal and the interests of the state. It is a measure, too, of Bunge’s sensitivity that he sensed the possible dichotomy between the two. This was certainly not modernization as conceived by some Russian officials—organizing Russian society for material growth alone, while neglecting the human sector. To Bunge, humanistic values were also clearly important. In this he was largely atypical of the imperial bureaucracy in the last two decades of the empire, an atypicality which justly earned him the description by one of Russia’s leading Marxist historians as one of the two truly remarkable men ever to occupy the post of minister of finance.89 His memorandum is surely a seminal document in Russia’s drive to modernize.

THE YEARS 1881–1894. A MEMORANDUM FOUND IN THE PAPERS OF N. KH. BUNG

[I.] [THE PROBLEMS FACING RUSSIA]

From the history of the past fourteen years it can be concluded that the Emperor Alexander III had in mind the solution of the following problems:

1. To free our foreign policy from the tutelage of foreign powers.
2. To satisfy the popular feeling that Russia should belong to Russians.
3. To regulate and strengthen the internal governmental order, which was needed because of gaps in the reorganization undertaken during the previous reign.¹
4. To develop the spiritual and material strength of the people.

The solution of these problems was urgently necessary. But did they fully correspond to those problems which the Emperor Alexander III had conceived as being worthy of treatment?

For an answer to this question it is necessary to look briefly at the past.

The Emperor Alexander III ascended the throne at a difficult time. Society was deeply agitated, both by the terrible crimes of its secret enemies and by the government's apparent powerlessness in its struggle with them. Many people did not then understand and even now still do not understand why the glorious deeds of the Absolute Tsar-Liberator—the abolition of serfdom; the granting of incorruptible public courts; a great free press; the abolition of corporal punishment; the creation of self-government, beginning with rural obshchinas and towns and ending withuezd and guberniia zemstvo institutions, along with the undoubted love of the people for their emperor for the boonsthus granted—were not only not accompanied by the sympathetic enthusiasm of the younger generation, but, on the contrary, only served as a basis for the appearance of anarchists, terrorists, and enemies of the dynasty and the social order among all classes. Of course, both good and even bad frequently entered Russia from outside,² but there is no doubt that the bad seed, whatever may have been its origins, here fell on well-prepared ground.

The question is, when and by whom was this ground prepared? It was prepared in the reign of the Emperor Nicholas I.

The Crimean War showed that Russia did not have the hoped-for unity, that our soldiers were poorly armed (our guns were flintlocks, not automatic weapons), and that our communications were in woeful condition. The amount of railroad track, including that in Poland, came to 963⅔ versts (Kolb in translation of Korshak, vol. 10, p. 269)³ and paved highways, with the exception of Finland, Poland, and the Caucasus, altogether amounted to 5625 versts (according to the information from the Ministry of Ways of Communications). To this must be added the fact that the personal and property rights of 20 million serfs were not sufficiently protected by the law; that our courts, as Khomiakov said,⁴ were totally “black lies”; that there was no public opinion, because the press, expressing only that which the censor decided, was often ignorant and obtuse; that all classes spoke and acted according to the instructions of the administration and did not display independent thought and firm conviction; and, finally, that all of the local institutions were the kind of mechanisms which operated according to the will of the officials appointed to them.

However, there is no doubt that the goals of Emperor Nicholas I were lofty and honorable. Close familiarity with the history of the years between 1825 and 1854 persuades one that, at the very beginning of his reign, the sovereign was concerned with under-

² Alexis Stepanovich Khomiakov (1804–1860), Russian public figure, writer, and thinker; one of the original founders of the ideology of the Slavophiles. A great landowner from an old noble family, Khomiakov completed the curriculum in physics and mathematics at Moscow University and then served for a time as an officer in the Russian army, where he participated in the Russo-Turkish War in 1828–1829. At the end of the 1830s he conceived the ideas of Russia’s special path of development, putting them in opposition to the “subjugation to the West.” His article “On the Old and the New” (1839) represented the first fully developed conception of Slavophilism. At the beginning of the 1840s, in disputes with the “Westernizers,” he became a propagandist of Slavophilism. See Nicholas Riasonovsky, Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophiles (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952), and Andrey Walicki, The Slavophile Controversy. History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought (Clarendon: Oxford University Press, 1975)—TR.
³ I.e. during the reign of Alexander II (1855–1881)—TR.
⁴ It would be unfair to blame the West alone. One need only recall Bakunin, the founder and teacher of destructive anarchism, in order to recognize the contribution made to Europe’s revolutionary era by Russians “by origin” but, of course, not “by spirit.”
taking the reorganization of the entire government—a proposal of administrative wisdom. The question of the liberation of the serfs had not yet come up before 1848, when the revolutionary movement in Europe slowed it down. Further, the military, finances, science, art, and public welfare were the objects of the monarch's constant solicitude. The emperor took a direct personal part in the case of the restoration of metallic exchange and the elimination of ladzh. Finally, the compilation of the Code of Laws attested to his consciousnes of the necessity to follow firm laws and not the personal judgment of overwhelming power nor the precedents of previous decision, which were often contradictory and which permitted arbitrary interpretations.

Straightforward and truthful, the Emperor Nicholas I was a man of duty, order, discipline; during his reign he acknowledged an obligation to the people, who trusted in his providence.

Given the outstanding moral quality of the sovereign, and given his energy and enlightened understanding of the governmental problems facing him, the paucity of results achieved in the course of his thirty-year reign is striking, but easily explained. The Emperor Nicholas I wanted to do everything through the administration itself. He realized that officials were not always sufficiently intelligent, zealous, and incorruptible, and that officialdom rarely permitted public independence. There was no zemstvo and town self-government, but there were committees of zemstvo duties and of popular rations (food supply), departments of social charity and town dumas, which were directly subordinate to the gubernia administration. There were delegates from the estates in all of these institutions and even in the courts, but these delegates either turned into government functionaries or were in possession of honorable sinecures which were paid by rank, order, and sometimes even by bribes.

The agricultural system, with its rural and volost administration, with its transfer from the authority of the Ministry of Finance to the management of the Ministry of State Properties, founded in 1837, was made strictly dependent on the new administration and, having lost part of its independence, found itself under the authority of the general police and under the guardianship of the local officials of the Ministry of State Properties.

But not one local institution had an administrative bureaucratic character. The government willingly permitted public initiative in matters of industry and trade, preferring them to state or bureaucratic enterprises. At the end of the reign of Nicholas I, there were about thirty joint-stock companies. If at the present time Russian capitalists have the ability to combine and direct their strength toward the creation of private industrial enterprises, before the Crimean War they were not able to at all. There existed in Russia almost exclusively one form of commercial industrial association—the family, which did not distinguish itself by durability: the son would abandon the father's business, preferring either state or military service or the destruction of the business, and would often pursue the vices, rather than the virtues, of the father.

All of this produced a negative mood in educated society and the appearance of a spirit of opposition among both the Slavophiles and the Westerners. The former sought their ideals in ancient Russia, the latter in the social life and civilization of Western Europe. But the supporters of both tendencies came to believe that it was necessary to serve the sovereign not behind the desk of a chancellery alone and not solely in the ranks of the military, but in social action as a moral obligation for everyone. But there was little opportunity in a system where state enterprises took the place of private enterprise and where local social demands were satisfied by means of administrative decree. In short, dissatisfaction grew in the most varied forms and led some representatives of the intelligentsia to a feeling that was scandalous for Russia: a desire for failure in the Crimean War, since this failure would open the government's eyes.

Consequently it is impossible not to recognize that the freedom of action of Emperor Nicholas I himself was tied closely with the views and the strivings of both his collaborators and those people who surrounded him. Viewing himself completely as autocrat, notable for firmness of character and inflexibility of will, the emperor did not often find one on whom he could rely, one to whom he could entrust fulfillment of a task. He saw that not a single person sympathized with his designs, and that others did not desire their realization. Not sympathizing with reform, these people deterred the sovereign with ominous prophecies of the future, by references to public opinion, about which no one could know, because as far as it existed in Russia it could not be expressed. What passed for public opinion was generally gossip, only in the capitals, and chiefly there.

It could not be otherwise. By not permitting discussion of social and governmental questions either in the press or in conferences of experts assembled for discussion.

---

1 For further information on this see Skornik [Collections] of the Imperial Russian Historical Society 74 (St. Petersburg, 1898)—TR.

2 Russian term referring to the increase which is produced in the exchange of one form of money for another—TR.
this purpose by the supreme power, the sovereign, not aware of it himself, fell under the influence of his closest circle. This circle usually consisted of certain ministers and people of high authority who were close to the court, who were distinguished by their devotion to the dynasty, but who rarely possessed a broad and firm knowledge of Russia. Therefore, such people frequently either endeavored to champion trends “of the moment” or, not understanding an issue, opposed it. In this way information that was sufficiently precise, and likewise reliably illuminating, obviously could not reach the Emperor Nicholas I. Only rumors reached the drawing rooms of the capital, while the opinions of the administration, which gave a more or less trustworthy idea of the local society or population, were adapted to suit the views of the authorities and rumors of the monarch’s desires, fears, and hopes. It was this way because it was believed that it was mandatory that dispatches and reports correspond not to reality, but to his moods and his expectations.

Thus the emperor, who always desired to know the truth, received an incorrect understanding of the actual situation of the state and all the more so of the prevalent mood of the intelligentsia and the people.

That the Emperor Nicholas I, the autocratic sovereign, was limited in his will is shown by the fact that the far-reaching reform conceived at the beginning of his reign⁴ and prepared for twenty years—the liberation of the peasants⁵—remained unrealized during his reign.

The Emperor Alexander II and his closest associates understood the causes of the thirty-year stagnation in the period preceding the Crimean War. But turning to the awakening of social life, they then went to the opposite extreme. It seemed to them that everything could be accomplished if society, not concerning itself with the basis of the governmental order (the autocratic monarchy), was given as great a degree of independence and freedom as possible.

In accordance with this, the peasant Gathering was granted, without control, the power to order the division and redistribution of the land, the southern savings banks, the emergency bread stores, the distribution of taxes and duties, and so forth. Accordingly, zemstvo and town governments were established completely without control, although their authority was confined to sufficiently narrow limits. Peasant self-government was made subject to the authority of the Gatherings: in the towns, to dumas; and in zemstvos, to zemstvo assemblies. There was no correct establishment of control by the state or its administrative organs.

Therefore, the peasants tested this lack of control in their social life and suffered from the tyranny of their own elected officials. Still, at first, while a land mediator existed, there was a power which could sometimes serve as protection against the violation of the law. With the abolition of arbitrators, there remained only the necessary members of the uezds and gubernia attempts cannot always disavow the desire to have a large number of readers. According to all accounts, the periodical press, which has a not insignificant influence among us (and at present renders a serious service) rarely departs from its pedagogical assignment. It sometimes finds itself in the middle of the hidden struggle which takes place between the various ministries concerning damage of the successful conduct of this or another well-planned measure. Sometimes the administration uses the influence of the press by distorting facts and introducing errors to the sovereign—at the same time annoying the enlightened segment of society, which sees the patent fraud, but cannot expose it. Sometimes, and of course this is the least of its sins, the periodical press creates simple-minded superficial views on the very most important social and governmental problems. Of course, even in Western Europe the periodical press has many dark aspects, to say nothing of its venality and of its service to stock market swindles. All of this is just criticism. But because of it, both the supreme power of the state and educated society can soon recognize the truth, because the press is a more independent expression of opposition opinion and judgments.

⁴ To a certain extent this state of affairs existed even during the reign of the Emperor Alexander III. With all his accessibility, the sovereign can only hear a limited number of people. The significance of courtiers that had existed previously declined during the reign of Alexander II and completely disappeared with his successor. The majority of information reached the sovereign by three paths: first, through confidential agents who even gave anonymous mem-

⁵ See Sbornik [Collections] of the Imperial Russian Historical Society 74—TR.
niiias who were concerned with peasant affairs—powa-ers who lacked the opportunity to act locally, espe-
cially in land courts. Because the one did not have the
right to settle a question and the other only investig-
gated, the restoration of rights was slow.

The towns, with the exception of the few larger ones
and ones with more educated populations, which in
general conducted their affairs successfully, generally
played a small part in the reform of urban government,
since their economy was entirely in the hands of
elected officials and there was no accountability or
legal supervision as regards the compilation of the
budgets. Therefore complaints of the government's
lack of action and of its indifference toward the various
kinds of disorders were frequent. And it goes without
saying that the latter complaints came from the in-
telligentsia, the dumas, and the local councils; the
poorer the results attained by self-government, the
greater was the displeasure.

The zemstvos, having rendered an unquestionable
service to Russia with respect to the organization of
medical departments, the creation of public education,
and other fields of the local economy, likewise did not
justify expectations. This disappointment was partly
a result of the fact that within certain limits they acted
without control, arousing complaints against their ad-
ministration (no one having undertaken the curbing
of the abuses), and partly as a result of the fact that
this lack of control created a demand to exceed the
limits established for the activities of the zemstvos.
These circumstances irritated the central administra-
tion, which in some instances considered it impossible
to do anything legally to counteract the disorder, and
in other instances found it difficult to draw a distinc-
tion between the legal and the illegal. Actually, some
zemstvos had no objection to raising questions of a
general governmental nature, encroaching in the area
of internal policy (these occurrences were, however,
very rare). But it goes without saying that similar in-
creases of power could not be tolerated. But there were
other instances when it was necessary for the zemstvos
of certain guberniias to act according to a prescribed
plan. For example, this was necessary in stopping ep-

demics and epizootics, the compilation of statistical
information, and when the demand for the unification
of the activity within one guberniia was not considered
as illegal, since it was related to state concerns and
not to local self-government. From the formal stand-
point, the administration's view was legal, but in es-

cence the matter demanded a solution which would
conform to the public benefit in the sense of satisfying
numerous appeals.

Regrettably, the administration's easy, impartial
relations with self-government were an exception. The
lack of control of rural self-government was not, in
fact, without influence on the administrative author-
ities, who could readily complain about the lack of
agencies for action in the provinces more than about
their own lack of power, feeling themselves straitened
by the legal protections. In the towns, it was difficult
for the administration to arrange things according to
its will, but it was still more difficult to subordinate the
zemstvos to its influence, since they were places
where the majority of participants, both in their as-
semblies and in their councils, consisted of members
of the nobility. The zemstvos, as was noted above,
under the influence of a consciousness of their uncon-
trollability and the urgency which arose from need,
were often in conflict with the administration. This
discord was reinforced by the fact that the bureau-
cracy, imbued with the spirit of the past, could not
reconcile itself to its new position and attempted, in
every instance in which a small opportunity presented
itself, to show its power. It was powerless to deny the
zemstvos even the most innocent declarations and de-
sires, as is shown by the courts of lower instance find-
ing support in the higher courts.

Thus, the administration, and in particular the gov-
ernors, was put in an untenable position by decrees
concerning the organs of self-government. Moreover,
the reform of finances and the judiciary reduced their
power still further.

The creation of excise management withdrew the
profitable drink tax from the authority of the govern-
ers. The introduction of the Judicial Regulations re-
sulted in an independent system of justice.

Finally, the general struggle of all ministries to free
their local agencies from the influence of governors
who were subordinate to the minister of the interior
led to a situation in which the governors saw their
power markedly reduced. It was limited by a policy
which, in its turn, probably carried out the demands
of two other agencies—the police and the judicial
courts. It was impossible for the governors to interfere
in investigations of felonies as before, or to review
judicial verdicts, or to take paternal measures of pun-
ishment. Later, when further reform called for the
creation of special gubernia offices, primarily of a
collegial character, such as peasant affairs, urban af-
fairs, alcohol, and others, then the governors turned
out to be only representatives. Although clothed with
a certain authority, they were not fully empowered
chiefs, as they often desired to be.

"The chiefs of the gubernia" did not always ac-
quiesce in this new order of social life. Indeed, many
of them complained that power had been taken from
them, argued against tying them absolutely to the law
and for giving them the right to act in the name of
the general good and according to their own percep-
tion. In a word, many thought that the solution to a
retreat from decisions approved by the supreme power
lay in a demand for privilege to act according to the
general good.

Of course, such a right was not, and could not, be
given.

But instead of the establishment of control over local
self-government, instead of the establishment of certain obligations concerning supervision of the guberniia authorities, and instead of the regulation of internal guberniia management, the governors preferred to tolerate deviation from existing enactments which were justified by circumstances, but which were, of course, undermining the authority of the law, and even the authority which strengthened their own power.

In this way two tendencies took shape: the one legal, that is, placing the uncontrolled right of local self-government within certain limits; the other arising, as that is, placing the uncontrolled right of local self-government within certain limits; the other arising, as a matter of fact, from the striving of the local administrative powers for the restoration of their authority, even though this aim was a violation of the law. The solemn proclamation of the abolition of corporal punishment, and then the continuation of this practice in spite of the law, is one of the most prominent examples of such a deviation.

Such a situation was the beginning of the trend in which the government gives with one hand that which it takes away with the other. To promulgate laws, to grant rights, and then allow their illegal violation was not sincere reform.

In the minds of those who were excited and electrified by a spirit of total reform, such trends, begotten by obvious misunderstandings and wrong judgments, sometimes elicited only selfish opposition, sometimes only a hostile feeling.

Thus, many reforms, after the first outbreak of enthusiasm, brought disappointment. The peasants, who valued and understood the freedom granted to them as good for all, did not find in self-government a desirable land settlement, one which sufficiently defended them from falsehoods, but rather one which gave rise to communes in which there were both the dominant kulaks and the miroedov, who were in several instances, although more rarely than formerly, free from the absolute rule of the local administration.

The landlords, in their turn, although they were materially rewarded for the land taken from them, did not find a recompense for their forfeiture of power and felt themselves separated from the peasants, with whom they had such common interests. Town and country alike grumbled, seeing in the government neither a defense against the abuses of their own self-rule nor an ally in resolving questions which were unforeseen by the status of the towns and villages. The guberniia authorities felt their own activity paralyzed by concerns which were taken from their purview and vested in local self-government, as well as by the assignment of greater independence to various guberniia departments because of their direct subordination to the central administration. Freedom of the press was destroyed by the prohibition against speaking about subjects which dealt with the supreme power, religion, or morals (at one time it was impossible to discuss classical and practical education freely). The judicial department acted on a level with the tyranny displayed by the administration; the educational reforms settled into ultraclassicism, in spite of the prevailing mood of society, and its advocates outraged public opinion by maintaining that people who did not receive a classical education would not be made capable of independent intellectual work.

Those were the conditions under which it was necessary for the revered sovereign to solve the problems confronting him at the beginning of his reign, which were enumerated at the beginning of the present memorandum. In the following section, I propose to elucidate how much of what was planned by the sovereign was realized and how much the results corresponded to the expectations of the sovereign and Russia.

II. [FOREIGN POLICY AND THE PROBLEM OF THE RUSSIAN MINORITIES]

FOREIGN POLICY

The sovereign’s aim of freeing Russia from the tutelage of foreign powers was undertaken right away, without ceremonial declarations. For a long time Russia had gone hand in hand with Prussia, to the clear detriment of her own interests. As the stronger state, Russia had sometimes presented categorical demands (for example, in 1850, at the time of the discord between Prussia and Austria), and as a result of this drew down upon herself the enmity of the German people. But when Prussia then smashed Denmark and next Austria and France, and then attained the unification of Germany under its domination, then Germany stopped being content with Russia’s friendship and began to seek predominance in alliances which would fetter Russia and extend her own influence in European affairs.

Although Bismarck spoke much about his efforts to support the friendship of Germany and Russia and about how much he promoted this after he became chancellor, the means he chose for the support of this friendship when he was in power were very peculiar. First of all, a number of them are related to the alliance with Austria in 1879, concluded behind Russia’s back, and then the Three-Power Alliance (The Three Emperors’ League) with Russia, which, in essence,

11 The generality of the mir or other members of the commune—TR.

12 The Three Emperors’ League (Dreikaiserbund) was formed in 1873 between Russia, Austria, and Germany at the urging of Bismarck. The signatories ostensibly pledged themselves to cooperate in the preservation of the European peace, but covertly it constituted an attempt by Bismarck to isolate France and prevent a Franco-Russian alliance. In 1881 a three-year agreement between the three signatories provided for the benevolent neutrality of the other two if one of them was at war, with the exception of a war with Turkey.
for Austria it was advantageous to protect herself from the feeble clerical policy, by abolition of ecclesiastical titles, and by compulsory religious instruction in the elementary schools. In foreign policy he was such a strong supporter of the alliance with Austria and Germany to Germanize the French in Lotharingia (Alsace), the Danish in Schleswig, and the Poles in Poznan. The Poles strove for the Polonization of the Little Russians in Galicia. We therefore attempted to Russify our Ukraine.

Even in the 1840s the German nationalist patriot Friedrich List chose as the epigraph for his book "RUSSELL SHOULD BELONG TO RUSSIANS"

The revival of the Three-Power Alliance after Bismarck confirmed Emperor Alexander III in Russia's rapprochement with France. The latter, having been weakened by Germany's dominant position in Europe, was now acceptable to Russian popular sentiment. This rapprochement appeared desirable for a long time but turned out to be impossible, as a result of the republic's internal instability. A country in which even the very form of government struggled for its existence, a country in which ministries were changed several times in the course of the year and the head of the government himself did not have a decisive influence on the course of foreign or domestic policies: Could such a country be considered a desirable ally? Here coalitions were established between parties, often without any other basis except for a desire to preserve power. Could such arrangements inspire confidence that a matter arranged with one ministry would not be repudiated by another? Several of these fears were eliminated by the intelligent and tough policies of Carnot. But there is no doubt that the revival of the Triple Alliance "by the very nature of things" created Russia's nearness to France, which, in its turn, promoted the establishment in later times of a firmer and more enduring order.

Such fear turned out to be exaggerated, and Emperor Alexander III successfully managed to solve the problem of freeing Russia from foreign tutelage in matters of foreign policy.

Preserving amiable relations toward the government and people, not departing from the path of peace and reacting indifferently to the fervor of foreign newspapers, not getting carried away by plans which could imperceptibly lead to war, Russia under Alexander III was occupied by matters of internal reconstruction, concerned with the possibility of gathering strength and of preparing for the necessity to endure the onslaught of an enemy.

The entire strength of the rapprochement between Russia and France was based on politics. For France it was important to be assured of the impossibility of a new onslaught; for Russia it was important to be free from the influence of the neighboring German Empire, not only directly, but indirectly, while at the same time not abandoning the position of a friendly neighbor.

The agreement was renewed in 1884, but allowed to lapse in 1887 due to Austro-Russian disagreements and rivalries in the Balkans—TR.

13 Francesco Crispi (1818–1901), trained as a lawyer, and in his early years a republican and follower of Garibaldi. Founder of two leftist journals, L'Oreto and Le Precusore, he entered politics as minister of the interior in the Depretis cabinet (1887). Upon the latter's death he became prime minister for the first time (1887–1891). His administration was characterized internally by an anticlerical policy, by abolition of ecclesiastical titles, and by compulsory religious instruction in the elementary schools. In foreign policy he was such a strong supporter of the alliance with Austria and Germany that relations with France were almost broken off—TR.

14 It is necessary, of course, to ascribe the revival of the Three-Power Alliance after Bismarck not to the German government's inimical mood toward Russia, but to its desire to have dominance in Europe. Regarding the entry of Austria and Italy into this union, for Austria it was advantageous to protect herself from the feeble impulses of Italy in the Italian Tyrol and, given the ethnic diversity of the Austrian population, to continue to lean on the German element, at the same time that Italy was desirous of achieving a broadening of her own influence on the Mediterranean Sea until the time came for the realization of the plans of her irredentists. Marie François Carnot (1837–1894), president of the French Republic, assassinated at Lyons in 1894 by the anarchist Caserio—TR.

15 It is necessary, of course, to ascribe the revival of the Three-Power Alliance after Bismarck not to the German government's inimical mood toward Russia, but to its desire to have dominance in Europe. Regarding the entry of Austria and Italy into this union, for Austria it was advantageous to protect herself from the feeble impulses of Italy in the Italian Tyrol and, given the ethnic diversity of the Austrian population, to continue to lean on the German element, at the same time that Italy was desirous of achieving a broadening of her own influence on the Mediterranean Sea until the time came for the realization of the plans of her irredentists.

16 Friedrich List (1789–1846), German economist, who, in his National System of Political Economy (1841) brought the national school to full flower. Following earlier writers like Jean Sismonde de Sismondi and Adam Muller, he stressed human and national welfare rather than individual wealth and propounded a theory of the relativity of economic policy, contending that each nation passes through definite stages in which different policies should be applied. He declared that the German customs union should adopt a policy of protection in the interest of the harmonious development of the productive forces in its existing "agricultural-manufacturing" stage, while awaiting a later development in which free trade would be feasible. For a fuller discussion of the impact of his ideas on Russia, see Theodore H. Von Laue, Sergius Witte and the Industrialization of Russia (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966)—TR.
Economy the words “Et la patrie et l’humanité,” justly emphasizing “native land” over “mankind.” Now they have come somewhat too far, and they assume that the task of nationalism is not to realize those things which are common to all mankind but to abolish such universals. One would think that the socialists would constitute an exception to the general rule, because many of them do not recognize the motherland, and they preach cosmopolitanism. But this does not prevent them, particularly in the German press, from preaching a deep hatred for the Slavs. Just as the Negroes were never recognized as human beings, so at present the natives of one country do not recognize foreigners and those born abroad as humans similar to themselves. The arch-nationalists have no objections even to searching genealogies so that persons from a foreign family are regarded as newcomers, new arrivals, and “foreigners.”

This is no place to review the extent to which Darwin's teachings on the struggle for existence and the victory of the strong over the weak were reflected in contemporary national views. It is only necessary to point out the similarity of the latter to Darwinism. It is obvious, however, that the truth lies not in the extremes, not in groundless cosmopolitanism, not in knowing neither tribal particularism nor in the state as a political aim, and not in egotistical nationalism, which rejects in all other peoples except “ours” the right to existence.

The Emperor Alexander III justly recognized that in Russia the Russian state system should predominate—that is, Russian state power and Russian institutions (of course adapted to the living conditions of foreigners and people in the outlying districts). Further, the Russian nationality should hold sway (i.e., the liberation of Russians from foreign dominance), as should the Russian language as the general state language. Finally, respect for the roots professed by the Russian people and its sovereign should have primacy.

But, I make bold to say, according to the thoughts of His Majesty, first, the state power should exercise dominion over foreigners, not as the power of a conqueror to whom they acknowledge their defeat as long as they cannot overthrow it, but foreigners should now become as sons and not remain perpetually adopted children of the country. Many of them, scattered across the territory of the state, having neither an historical past nor a tradition of a developed society, should be merged with the native population.

Second, he felt that the Russian state institutions and laws should not forcibly interfere in any of the foreigners' historically developed ways of life, especially in those instances where it would be to their detriment and without benefit for the state as a whole. Such interference should be, rather, conducive to the rapprochement of aliens and foreigners with the native population, to the consolidation of the unity of the state, and to the strengthening of respect for the government and its authority. This is an area of government activity so extensive and multifaceted at the present time that the country with the most diverse population, even under a federated form, as, for example, Switzerland, is obliged to have general laws and general institutions. This need is an insistent one where a lower level of civilization excludes the possibility of establishing a contractually free arrangement, and more so where such an agreement is incompatible with the political life of the country.

Third, he felt that a state language should predominate, but that this dominance should be the consequence of general needs existing in the state. But his linguistic policies do not aim at the forcible eradication of all other languages and dialects of aliens and foreigners. Such an attempt generally turns out to be fruitless.

Fourth, he felt that a state church should be protected and respected, but should not hamper the freedom of conscience of foreigners and even of the sectarians, who have fallen away from the church through religious error. The persecution of heresies only arouses fanaticism and intensifies its display. It follows that the dominance of the church ought to be based on the selflessness of its representatives, and not on police power. Not by strong external force, but only by convictions, examples, and the virtuous lives of the clergy can a new son of the church be gained or can the return of those who have fallen away from it be secured. With the use of the force of the law against them, those who do not belong to the church consider themselves martyrs who endure for the sake of the truth which they have discovered.

To enter a squabble on the basis of these matters would significantly weaken the strength of the state and create needless internal and foreign enemies for it.

Guided by the basic position set forth in the discussion of measures which touch upon the dominance of the Russian people—the establishment of Russian institutions, of a state language, and the protection of the dominant church—it is necessary to consider the following questions: 1) foreign immigration and the colonies of foreign settlers; 2) the Jews; 3) the Baltic nationalities; 4) the Poles; 5) the Finns; 6) the Bessarabians; 7) the Muslims; and 8) the Georgians and the Armenians.

Foreign Immigration and Colonies and Foreign Settlers

Foreign immigration was promoted and protected by the Muscovite Tsars. Doctors, architects, masters were invited from abroad and settled in Moscow in the "German" section. Peter the Great brought in foreign teachers who were summoned for the purpose of training Russians. Under Anne Ivanovna the teachers were converted into officials. Despite the reaction
against foreigners under the Empress Elizabeth Petrovna and Catherine II, the number of foreigners in the different branches of state service was great up to the first half of the nineteenth century. However, it is undeniable that the German element would have disappeared quite quickly if not replenished by Russian subjects, the Baltic Germans.

The immigration of foreigners of diverse nationality rather than whole groups of settlers did not constitute an inconvenience but, on the contrary, carried with it strengths in which Russia was not rich.

However, this cannot be said about the immigration which provided for settlements of foreigners in colonies. The idea of the peopling of uninhabited places by foreign settlers with a view toward developing the national wealth occurred and was realized in the first years of the reign of the Empress Catherine II.

This is not the place to set forth the history of the formation of our colonies, which were composed primarily of German sectarians. It is enough to note that in the first years of the reign of Catherine II, the stream of immigration was significant and that after a period of various adversities the colonies began to prosper (in particular, Sarent). However, under Alexander I the necessity of stopping the influx of foreign settlers was recognized by the demand that settlers not come to Russia empty-handed, but with the means for their own maintenance, and, finally, that immigration be undertaken only by those who desired to take up residence near their kinsmen who were already in Russia. Under Emperor Nicholas I colonization was continued on the basis of special permits (Anhalt Ketensk and other colonies).

Foreign colonization received a new impetus during the reign of Emperor Alexander II after the abolition of serfdom. However at first, as Haxthausen attests, the colonists took possession of vast empty lands which they themselves bought. But with the appearance of free, unoccupied country estates, their purchases were significantly intensified and, on the one hand, there began an intensified colonization, primarily by Germans in the southern steppes of Russia, and, on the other hand, in Poland and the Volynsk guberniias, there were many settlers, Germans from Poland and Czechs, who were allotted a place for settlement on state lands. These new colonists, who did not even take Russian citizenship, founded an entire settlement on Russian soil and remained members of another state which summoned them to the exercise of military duties. The extensive privileges with respect to taxes, customs duties, self-rule, schools and churches, and other privileges which were allotted to all colonists in general, were sometimes given with the protection of a foreign diplomat. The colonists prospered and grew rich, but existed totally estranged from the Russian population and had almost no influence on the agriculture of the Russian peasant.

It appears from the foregoing that prohibiting colonists—or, as they are called here, “foreign settlers,” aliens, etc.—from acquiring landed property, along with their subordination to general control, was urgently necessary.

With this in view, according to the royally sanctioned proclamation by a committee of ministers of March 14, 1887, foreign ownership and acquisition of landed property was forbidden in twenty-one guberniias, that is, in ten guberniias of Kingdom Poland and in eleven guberniias of the western region of Russia. And, according to the royally sanctioned order of the Council of State of July 15, 1888, foreign settlers in the southwestern territories were joined either to towns or to volosts. However, the exclusive right to fill the post of starshin and clerk was reserved for the Russian population. The royally sanctioned proclamation of the Committee of Ministers of 1892 took a further step with respect to the Volynsk gubernia.

Recognizing the need to stop the settlement of foreigners in the western regions of Russia for reasons dictated by state security, and then considering every exclusive right and privilege which had been given to foreign settlers to the detriment of the indigenous population as an absolute harm, it is still impossible not to note that the measures taken were insufficient in and of themselves. The influx of foreigners was stopped, an end was put to their acquisition of land in frontier areas, and general control over the colonists was broadened. But apparently little was done about Russian schools and about the Russian language among foreigners who became Russian subjects. Essentially the laws that were promulgated were purely negative. They counted on opposition to the invasion of foreign elements, but they did not promote the Russification of the foreigners who had become Russian subjects. They could even lead to the eviction of the colonists from Russia and to the abolition of those parts of the cultures which were brought in by them.

Desiring to prevent the settlement of the western regions by foreigners at that time, we lessened the possibility of making use of those technological strengths in which we are poor. “Russia for the Russians” should remain our motto. But why not make use of that which the foreigners can give? Not a single country in the world excludes foreign capital and talents. In that is the measure of our policy.

---

17 Sarent, a town and government located approximately seventy miles north of Penza in southwestern Russia—TR.
18 August Franz Ludwig Maria, Baron Von Haxthausen-Abbensburg (1792–1872), Westphalian nobleman, writer, traveler, and ethnographer. His Studien über die innern Zustände, das Volksleben, und insbesondere die ländlichen Einrichtungen Russlands (3 v., Hanover and Berlin, 1847–1852) was the first systematic foreign study of Russian peasant institutions and practices and was widely read and quoted by Russia’s Slavophile intellectuals—TR.
19 Small rural districts—TR.
20 Village elder—TR.
The Jewish Question

Our Jewish question arose with the partition of Poland. Even then the Jews strove for the right of general residence in Russia but did not receive it. In spite of all the intrigues of the Jews under Emperor Alexander I, the Position of Jews of 1804 allowed only the entry of excellent students who had received a diploma and of technologists. However, in spite of the prohibition of immigration into Great Russia, the Jews penetrated into Voronesk gubernia and in 1812 kept a public house in Moscow.21 Finally, at the beginning of the century the Jews turned up in St. Petersburg. Then the creation of a special status of zemledel'tsy evreii22 by the Position of Jews of 1804 served as the basis for a request by the Jews for allotting lands to them; their intercessor was the Duz d'Richelieu.23

Under the Emperor Nicholas I, larger-scale measures were taken. To prevent smuggling, Jews were ordered to be evicted from areas within a fifty-verst line of our frontiers. In 1827 the eviction of the Jews from Kiev followed. Recruitment among the Jews was promoted with great rigor by receiving those who were eligible for conscription; this, in its turn, touched young men of tender years by their placement in the cantonments.24 Finally, in 1844 the kahals25 were abolished. Among the free professions, the Jews were permitted to enter only medicine, but they were denied access to the medical faculties of the Russian universities. Finally, an experiment was made of converting Jews into landowners, but it was completely unsuccessful. All of this severity and even the conversion of Jews into landowners produced no results. The expulsion of Jews from within fifty verst of the border did not take place. The kahals remained under the aforementioned Jewish societies, and Jews were landowners only by title, remaining largely engaged in industry.

Under the Emperor Alexander II the rights of Jews were significantly broadened, but following this broadening various restrictions were made.

Commerce in the first guild, the trades, higher education, and the exercise of military service were opened to Jews in all places beyond the limits of the areas regularly inhabited by them.26 Along with this wide permission to receive a higher education in almost all educational institutions on equal terms with Christians, the Jews were given access to all spheres of government service by law. If entrance into the latter was difficult for them, then it was only because certain influential persons did not sympathize with the influx of Jews into the administration, and because university boards did not select Jews for teaching posts. Further, the liberation of the peasants created an opportunity for the Jews, at least within the boundaries of their Pale of Settlement, for the acquisition of uninhabited landed property, and the introduction of zemstvo and town jurisdictions made the Jews participants in local self-government.

The privileges given were great, but in fact they were expanded beyond the limits of the rights that had been granted. In all significant commercial, urban, and industrial locales, there were masses of Jews who did not have the right of legal residence.

The number of Jews in the educational institutions has turned out to be huge,27 if one takes into consideration the percentage of Jews in respect to the general population. Frankly, this must be expected, because the acquisition of a higher education placed them in the privileged classes—that is, those enjoying the rights of service. And then, education to its fullest degree granted them privileges with respect to the exercise of military duties to which the Jews were so

---

21 Pub—TR.
22 Agricultural Jews—TR.
23 Prince N. N. Golitsyn, “Istoriia Russkago zakonodatel'stva o eveiakh” [History of Russian legislation on the Jews], v. 1, 1649-1925 (St. Petersburg, 1886); pp. 757, 776, 798. The duc d’Richelieu was Armand Emmanuel De Plessis (1766-1822), minister of state under Louis XVIII. He fled France after 1789 and took up service under the Bourbons, he returned to France. It was in this capacity that he championed the cause of Russia’s Jews. With the restoration of the Bourbons, he returned to France. See Michaud, Biographie Universelle Ancienne et Moderne (Paris: Ch. Delagrave et Cie) 35: pp. 537-542—TR.
24 Bunge refers here to the practices of Nicholas I’s rekruchina. Until 1827, Jews had usually fulfilled their military duty by the payment of a special tax. However, in that year Nicholas decided to force Jews to serve in person. The remarkable aspect of this plan was that this policy was viewed, and used, as a punitive measure to help reduce the size of the Jewish population and to make it pay tax arrears. The former goal was sought first by drafting Jewish boys of twelve for a six-year preliminary cantonment (a large military camp); then at the age of eighteen, they were enlisted for twenty-five years of service. Like other subjects, Jews could still send representatives in local self-government.
25 According to the explanation of Prince Golitsyn, a “kahal” signified a society, assembly, or council (p. 155). Our legislation
26 SNOW: THE YEARS 1881-1894 IN RUSSIA [TRANS. AMER. PHIL. SOC.]
27 I.e., beyond the so-called Jewish Pale of Settlement—TR.
antipathetic. Finally, belonging to groups of artisans, manufacturers, and traders and, consequently, almost exclusively to the urban population, the Jews naturally should have entered into the educational institutions in a comparatively greater proportion than the Christians.

As early as the reign of Emperor Alexander II, the government noted what strength and what influence the Jews had acquired in the state. Therefore, in 1864, their right to purchase agricultural property even in their Pale of Settlement was limited, and in 1874 they were permitted to trade in intoxicating beverages only in their own homes. In addition, certain limitations were introduced in 1870 with respect to the number of Jewish members in the city dumas and zemstvo assemblies.

These restrictions, as well as many other measures taken against the Jews, were unsuccessful.28

With the imposition of limits on the right to purchase landed property, there appeared long-term leases and the purchase of land under aliases-agreements which protected the Jewish buyer against the abandonment of his land by the false owners and others. The prohibition against dealing in intoxicating beverages in rented locations led to the purchase of land or country estates in villages by Jews, and when the acquisition of landed property was forbidden, there appeared the long-term leasing of peasant homes. Finally, there was not even a need for this, because, in the so-called commerce already referred to, it was necessary only for the Jews to seat a Christian behind the counter in the capacity of proprietor of the pub and to supervise the sales himself in the capacity of guest. The limitation on the number of Jews who were members of the dumas and zemstvos and even of their participation in local self-government by preserving their right to serve as electors did not deprive them of the opportunity to influence the elections and to decide on those elected Christians who were their obedient instruments and who were defenders of their interests.

Thus, the laws of Emperor Alexander II which dealt with the Jews were not successful. They strengthened the power of the Jews. When the extent of this situation was discovered, the government began to limit the rights that had been given, which again led to complaints to the government, which, as I have said, gave with one hand and took away the gifts with the other.

Such was the status of the Jewish question when Emperor Alexander III ascended the throne. Although the Jews had penetrated the administration only in very small numbers, they turned out to be quite numerous in the free professions. The number of Jewish doctors, pharmacists, barristers, writers, and journalists grew quickly. In railways affairs and in private credit institutions they occupied first place. Both large-scale trade everywhere throughout the empire and small-scale trade, especially in their own Pale of Settlement, were more or less in their hands. The liquor trade and even simple usury, primarily in their own Pale of Settlement, made the mass of people completely dependent on the Jews. There existed a de facto state of oppression that caused the Jewish pogroms at the beginning of 1881, which, although revolving in their display, showed the abnormal state of relations between the Jews and the rest of the population.29

These events served as the basis for measures taken in the past reign with respect to the Jews.

At the beginning of 1882, former Minister of the Interior N. P. Ignatiev30 introduced in the Committee of Ministers the idea of evicting the Jews from the villages, towns, and mestechki31 and also the idea of limiting the right of Jews to settle in the villages. With imperial approval the following decrees were issued by the committee on May 3, 1882:

1. In view of the provisional nature of the measures and pending a general review in the prescribed order of the laws concerning Jews, they were henceforth prohibited from settling again outside towns and mestechki.

This applied exclusively only to already existing Jewish colonies which were occupied by landowners.32

2. To temporarily suspend the perpetuation of deeds of purchase and mortgages in the name of Jews, and at the same time even the witnessing of lease agreements for landed property outside the boundaries of towns and mestechki, as well as the power of at-


29 Russia is wrongfully blamed for the pogroms against the Jews. In the course of twelve years this phenomenon was not a rarity in Prussia, Austria, or Rumania. These sad events are unjustly ascribed to religious intolerance. Their causes are purely social and economic.

30 Nicholai Pavolich Ignatiev (1832–1908), military and public official, son of Pavel Nikolaevich Ignatiev, completed training at the General Staff Academy in 1851 and from 1856 was attached to the diplomatic service. In 1859 he was named minister plenipotentiary to China and helped write the Peking Treaty of 1860. From 1861 to 1864 he was director of the Asiatic department of the foreign ministry and from 1864 to 1877 ambassador to Turkey. In February-March, 1877, he was sent to Berlin, London, Paris, and Vienna with the task of seeking the neutrality of the European powers in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878 and was an active participant in the preparation of the Treaty of San Stefano of 1878. Ending his diplomatic activity, he was named adjutant-general in 1878 and minister of the interior in 1881–1882. In this post he came under the strong influence of K. P. Pobedonostsev, procurator of the Holy Synod. With Ignatiev's participation, the paper "On Strength and Extraordinary Protection" was written, and the "Sacred Brotherhood" for the struggle with the revolutionary movement was founded. From 1877 until his death he was a member of the State Council and was known for his strong reactionary views—TR.

31 Small towns—TR.

32 Emphasis in the original—TR.
torney for the management and disposal of this property.

3. To prohibit the Jews from conducting trade on Sundays and the twelve Christian holidays and that, in addition to said closing of trade locations which belong to Jews on the stated days, the very same order is observed as established with respect to the general closing of trade locations among the Christians.

4. Those measures set forth in points 1 through 3 apply only in guberniias of the Jewish Pale of Settlement.

Following the issue of this resolution, a commission was formed under the chairmanship of Count K. I. Pahlen to draft laws concerning the Jews; it continued to meet for a long time. Obviously it never concluded its work, and, after the departure of Count Pahlen, it was chaired by von Plehve. Former Minister of the Interior Count Tolstoi was quite indifferent to the Jewish question. Apparently he did not know the Jews very well, for he considered them identical with the kulaks, but several people in positions of high authority looked otherwise on the Jewish question. This unfavorable view of the Jews was supported very energetically by the governor-general and governors of the North and Southwest regions.

The most serious measures taken during the reign of the late sovereign dealt with: 1) the discharge of military obligations, the extension of recruitment to the privileged persons, if the individual subject to recruitment did not report or hid himself; 2) the limitation on the number of Jews attending the gymnasiuims to a certain percentage (a special law was not composed for this purpose); 3) the elimination of Jews from zemstvo and town governments, pending review of the laws on Jews.

But as regards the Jews, the most sensible approach was not so much new decisions as it was a stricter enforcement of both the old and the new laws, which had previously been enforced only very inconsistently. The removal from Moscow of those Jews who did not have the right of residence took extremely severe forms. According to the stories of people who had experienced anti-Semitism, they were not even given time to get out of town, and, since they could not take any hotel rooms, they were then forced to spend the cold nights before Easter under the open sky in the Jewish cemetery. Then, when migration began among the Jews of Poland, they were at first not permitted to go abroad. If the decree concerning the renewal of the strength of the Jews in the western guberniias was sometimes enforced with great mildness, that was only because the venality of the police softened the severity of the executors of the laws, who, however, managed to put this or another of the laws into practice. Those who now cross our western border can see for themselves the absence of Jewish money changers and smugglers, who not too long ago were still at the railway stations offering their services to travelers. Finally, the energetic activity of the governor of Volynia led to the complete removal of Jewish shops in certain villages, but, at the same time, not only was the price of the goods purchased by the peasants raised, but there came to be a complete shortage of those goods. Incidentally, this situation was attested to by the circular of the governor of Volynia himself, who recommended to the peasants that they establish public shops, not understanding that this advice given to peasants could have no practical significance.

For a correct assessment of the measures taken to solve the Jewish question, it is necessary to ascertain and to define exactly what the essential harm of Judaism is.

The Jews, of course, are sharply distinguished by obvious racial features; they profess a special faith; they have their own language, which, although unusual, is in the service of God. However, the essence of Judaism consists not in this, but in the totality of

---

33 Count Konstantin Ivanovich Pahlen (1833–1912), state secretary and member of the State Council. After completing the law curriculum in the juridical faculty of the University of St. Petersburg with the degree of Candidate of Law in 1853, he joined the Russian bureaucracy. From 1855 he was in the service of the chancellery of the State Council. Transferring to the Ministry of the Interior after the Crimean War, Pahlen occupied the post of vice-director of the Department of Special Police. In 1864 he was named governor of Pskov and in 1867 was made a state secretary and deputy minister of justice. In 1878 he became a member of the State Council and in 1879 was made a member of the special commission for the preliminary examination of the matter of the introduction of justices of the peace in the Baltic guberniias. In this same year he participated in the work of the commission of the State Council on the question of the reform of the prison system, and in 1883 he was made chairman of the commission established to review the existing laws on Jews in the empire. In 1884 he was made a member of the special commission for the compilation of draft laws on local government.

34 Vyacheslav K. von Plehve (1846–1904), a Russian state figure who served from 1867 in the imperial justice division and was prosecutor in the investigation and trial of the members of the revolutionary terrorist organization Narodnaya volyia [The People's Will]. He was director of the Department of Policy (1881–1884) and deputy minister of the interior (1884–1894). As minister and state secretary of Finland (1899–1902) he conducted a reactionary and repressive policy of Russification. Appointed minister of the interior in 1902, he conducted an equally repressive policy toward the revolutionary movement and the workers' movement alike until he was assassinated by the Socialist Revolutionaries in 1904.

35 Count Dimitri A. Tolstoi (1823–1899), Ober-procurator of the Holy Synod from 1865 to 1880, combined the responsibilities of this post with those of minister of public enlightenment beginning in 1866. Generally considered to be a bitter opponent of the progressive reforms of the 1860s, in opposition to these reforms in 1871 and 1874 Tolstoi conducted a series of counter reforms in the primary and secondary schools. In 1882 he was made minister of the interior and was associated with the reactionary policies followed under Alexander III.

36 I myself heard this from Count Dmitrii Andreivich Tolstoi.

37 Volynia was a territory in northwest Russia bordering on Tsarist Poland and Galicia in the west, Grodzensk and Minsk in the north, and Podolia in the south during the imperial period.
civil and everyday rules which are elucidated by the Talmud. The Talmud is not dogma, but a civil code, full of barbarous fanaticism and thoughtless prejudices. According to Jewish talmudic teaching, there is only one chosen people of God—the Jews. And this God is the God of the Jews and of no other people. All other peoples are intended for the service of the Jews. The rabbi is not a clergyman—he is an official who is in general charge of the affairs of the people. The kahal is not a society of believers, but a social union, which has its responsible people, its finances, schools, hospitals, and so forth. Thus, Judaism is a cosmopolitan social union [alliance Israélite], and in each individual nation it constitutes a state within a state. As Napoleon I stated in the Council of State on April 30 of 1806, "Il faut considérer les juifs comme une nation et non comme une secte—c'est une nation dans la nation." The kahal often gives to one Jew or another the exclusive right to conduct business with a certain landowner, and the landowner cannot secure another supplier or buyer from among the Jews except the one named for him by the kahal. Sometimes such a Christian approaches one of the Jews with a public deal, with the result being an increase in the cost with which the bargaining began being divided between the people bargaining. The kahal imposes a kherim on one Christian or another—for example, on an excise official for strictly prosecuting abuses. No exception is to be found in villages or mesteckhi among Jewish merchants from whom the Christian could buy a bit of meat for his family. The chief means of the Jews' predominance is money. Among no other people does the worship of the golden calf reach the heights of adoration it does among the Jews. The Jewish bedniak looks upon the richer Jew as upon a higher being, who was called to a dominance chiefly over the goyim (not the Jews). This explains the relation of the Jews to the state and to the population of those countries in which they live, and thus elucidates that role which they have in industry. The Huguenots, having migrated to Germany after the Edict of Nantes, kept their French family names, but made them German (for example, Dubois-Reymond, Verdy-Duvernois, Perponcher, Faucher, and others); Germans and French, both Catholics and Protestants, merged into one nation. The Jews, however, stand apart from the general population and treat the state and its government as something independent of them. Germans, Englishmen, Frenchmen who are not Jews are Germans, Englishmen, or Frenchmen first and then are Catholic or Protestants, and so on. Germans, Englishmen, Frenchmen who are Jews first and then Germans, Englishmen, or Frenchmen. In all countries they learn the local language (they have no living literary language of their own), but this is not an adoption of a national element. It is, rather, one of the conditions for life and successful activity among the goyim. Since money constitutes the means for dominating and exploiting those who are not Jews, then even the relationship of Jews to industry has a distinctive character. Handicrafts, commerce in its various forms, and credit operations—these are the chief spheres of their activity.

Jewish agricultural settlements do not exist, because agriculture cannot serve as a source of gain from non-Jews. According to the evidence of history, the Jews in Italy grew vineyards in the first century of Christianity. Prince Peter Vasil'chikov saw colonies of Russian Jews in Palestine who were thus engaged in viticulture. In Bessarabia there are Jewish workmen on tobacco plantations, but there are no Jewish gardeners, ogorodniks, and plowmen. There exists no love of nature among them. Rich Jews value gardens only

---

38 The kahal, an assembly of the Jewish people. After the dispersion of the Jews, local kahals stood at the head of the different Jewish societies in Eastern Europe and became cultural and civil intermediaries between them and the government. By the Charter of 1551, all cities and towns with a Jewish population were to have their separate kahal boards, their size corresponding roughly to that of the given community. The sphere of the kahal's activity was very large. Within the area allotted to it, the kahal collected and turned over to the exchequer state taxes, arranged the assessment of imports and exports, member of the illustrious Vasil'chikov family, and traveler—

41 Poor peasant—TR.

42 Our Jewish agricultural colonies are engaged chiefly in industry and trade. In Europe one never hears of Jewish agriculturists.

43 The other matter of land ownership, or land lease, represents an opportunity to conduct work by the hands of goyim and to speculate. This kind of economic activity is not in the least antithetical for Jews.

44 Poor peasant—TR.

45 Truck farmers—TR.
as a hygienic means for the preservation of health. Of all the aspects of industry, the Jews are most disposed toward those which do not necessitate a long wait for earnings. In Odessa the Jews are employed to pour off the grain in bread shops—for difficult work, but work which is paid by the day. They prefer that kind of agricultural work in which the harvest with its uneven results is received after several months of hard work, and even more so they prefer occupations in which several turnovers of capital can be made in the course of a year.

There is no doubt that small trade, handicrafts, credit are all badly needed in the villages, but in the hands of Jews these industries are an instrument for the destruction of the settlers. The Jews say: We are blamed for the fact that we are tavernkeepers, buyers, moneylenders, that we squeeze the juices out of the agricultural population. But are there not the same tavernkeepers, buyers, and moneylenders among the Christians, people who are greedy for easy profit? This is true, but the fact is, such people do not enjoy the respect of society among decent Christians, but among decent Jews such persons have distinguished reputations and are deemed worthy of respect. Of course, there are honorable exceptions among Jews, people who were raised in more moral circumstances and prepared to introduce into their activities a purer social principle. But such exceptions are very rare, because belonging to the kahal creates a solidarity which deprives a man of the individual freedom which is given to the Christian.

The foregoing explains why all measures concerning Jews are unsuccessful.

The limitation on the right of Jews to reside anywhere; their removal from villages, in certain cases, and from towns in others; the prohibition on their acquisition of property, in particular agricultural property; the removal of Jews from participation in joint-stock companies (that was practiced particularly often among us in the past), and other limitations with respect to occupations in industries and commerce; the blocking of Jews’ paths to an education in the general educational institutions; their prohibition from entering government service and from participating in the affairs of local self-government, and so forth, in guberniias with a significant Jewish population: all of these measures turned out to be either ineffective or else to have fallen short of achieving the stated goals, such as giving the Jews complete equality of civil and political rights with the rest of the population. All of these limiting measures only intensified the Jews’ struggle for existence, increased their misery, fanaticism, and alienation from the rest of the population. In a word, they increased the harm which the Jews caused to the state and the people.

Driven from the villages, the Jews overcrowded the urban settlements as poor proletarians; driven from the large cities, they increased their misery in the small ones.

It is impossible to plan on the expulsion of the Jews from a state in which they number in the millions in a fashion similar to the one in which the Tatars were exiled from Crimea and the Cherkassians from the Black Sea coastal regions of the Trans-Caucasus; these Mohammedans [sic] departed under the influence of religious enthusiasm, to be further from the giayour. But there is no basis among the Jews for withdrawing from the goyim condemned by God to the service of the Jews. For a massive expulsion of the Jews to have an effect, we would need a rural population with only slightly undeveloped commercial enterprises. The Jews by themselves cannot form colonies. That is why hardly anybody goes to the Argentine Jewish colony; that is why only a few of the comparatively more well-to-do and work-loving Jews can leave Russia for Germany, France, and England, and then only if there are no obstacles raised against them. The richer and less numerous discriminate in their choice of means of gain, selecting those where one can scarcely block their way; for the greater part, they will remain and will dominate the mass of the Jewish proletariat which is brought in extremis. This proletariat remains, and its harm as a parasite on the population is redoubled by repressive measures.

Equally, all attempts to draw the Jews closer to the rest of the population by the assignment of equal rights to them produced negative results. Our government, a short while after granting great rights to the Jews, was convinced that the educational institutions were overcrowded by them; that their influence on other students was not salutary; that if the Jews did not predominate in the free professions, in literature, in industrial enterprises, in commerce, in the banks, in law, then they certainly constituted a great force. This was shown especially clearly in the Great Russian guberniias, where the most capitalistic and educated Jews gained access.

In other countries, such as Austria and Germany, the dominance of Jewish capital and the Jewish intelligentsia was shown to be complete. In Galicia great amounts of land were bought up by the Jews, who cultivated the fields with hired laborers who were frequently the former owners of these very same lands. The periodical press in Germany is partly, and in Austria is chiefly controlled by Jewish hands. Finally, the greater number of the banks and banking houses belong to Jews.

Thus, the rights and privileges given to the Jews not only did not lead to a merging of the Jews with the rest of the population, but, on the contrary, assisted in their achievement of dominance and influence. From this there developed both among us and in the West an anti-Semitism which cannot be ascribed to racial or religious hostility. The Jews unjustly contend
that hatred for them has a source independent of the
wealth which they have acquired, that they are de-
spised for their moral superiority (there are no drunk-
ards and beggars among the Jews), and finally that
Christians do not tolerate Jews because they crucified
Christ. The Jews are wrong: The causes of the rise of
anti-Semitism can be attributed not to wealth, not to
their frugal way of life in the mass, not to the absence
of beggary among them, and even more so not to the
religious mood of Christians. The most confirmed and
zealous Christian, of course, recalls the words spoken
by Christ concerning his torturers: "Forgive them, Lord,
for they know not what they do." The Christian
can only follow the words of his godly teacher and not
adhere to Old Testament teachings about remote pun-
ishment, nor necessarily view them as descendants in-
nocent of the crimes of their forebears. Finally, it is
known that not all of the Jewish people were guilty
of the crucifixion of Christ. Only a small part of them
were guilty; further, the first Christian apostles and
their disciples were Jews.

The limitation of the rights of Jews, to say nothing
of the oppression and persecution of them, is not so
much produced by religious motives related to the
wealth of the Jews, or the difficulty of competing with
them in commercial matters, or hostile racism, as by
the necessity of self-defense, the defense of racial
and religious unity from the Jewish yoke. Finally, the state
requires protection from being dominated by a race
which unflaggingly strives to subordinate the interests
of every country to the interests of Jewdom.

The lack of success of those measures which have
been tried for the solution of the Jewish question by
means of both expanding and restricting the rights of
Jews leads to the belief that legislation produces only
a vicious circle; all that it sought led either to the
triumph or to the suffering of the Jews. But it was not
any better for them than for the native population.
There is no doubt, however, that the means exist for
the struggle with it. Those rights which were given the
Jews for dwelling outside the Pale of Settlement are sufficient to do
this. It just does not follow to believe that the character of
a race which has been dispersed over the entire face
of the globe with a social and religio-civil order rec-
ognized as sacred and durable for a thousand years
could be altered by laws and decrees in such a short
time. Not just years, not decades, but perhaps many
centuries are required for the achievement of the de-
sired results; and proper results will come about only
where good, well-considered measures are introduced
without vacillating first in one direction and then in
another.

First of all, in countries similar to Russia, Galicia,
and Hungary, it is necessary to put an end to the idea
of exiling the Jews. The expulsion of several million
people from Russia (6 to 8 million out of the popu-
lation), people who are incapable of agricultural col-
olonization, is a chimera incapable of realization.

Thus it is necessary to protect the population from
the influence of Judaism and to transform Judaism
itself. The former is impossible without limiting the
rights of Jews. These limitations should not, however,
be extended further than necessary. And once they are
applied to the Jews, it is necessary to insure against
permitting them to transgress the limits established
and against the administration's altering these limits
with arbitrary directives. More than anything else, it
is necessary to train the Jews to respect the law, which
they have always considered themselves as having the
right to avoid, the more so since the duty to abide by
the law was never applied to them.

The reform should be directed toward the abolition
of everything that sets Judaism apart. The strength
of Judaism resides in the moral-juridical codes, codes
which consecrate the religion into a social order; these
codes, by necessity, should be abolished. Judaic insti-
tutions, the Jewish kahal and Jewish finances, Jewish
self-government, the public rabbis, and the special
Jewish schools associated with its existence—these are
what it is necessary to abolish. Is it not strange that
all of these institutions protect themselves against our
laws and maintain the Jewish spirit, and that Judaism
itself is protected from heresy by the government? The
appearance of such heresies in a more humanistic
spirit than in the Talmud is even desirable; perhaps
the utilitarian character of Judaism would be en-
hanced to a greater degree by such heresies.

The establishment of general principles is, of course,
much easier than investing them with the form of law.
This is especially true, too, of their execution.

There is no doubt that allowing the Jews the right
of general settlement in Russia would be premature
at present, and even the free choice of locations within
the borders of the Pale of Settlement should be subject
to certain limitations, at least until that time when the
character of Judaism changes to any degree. Some say
that if Judaism is an evil, then its binding itself to a
certain region, and especially to the western frontiers,
entails the return sacrifice to this evil of those parts
of the empire in which it is most important of all to
establish Russian popular strength. This is true, but
it is not necessary to calculate on the diffusion of this
evil throughout the entire state, especially since by
confining it to a more limited area it is incomparably
easier to carry on the struggle with it. Those rights
which were given the Jews for dwelling outside the
limits of the Pale of Settlement are sufficient to do
this.

As regards Jews living within the limits of the Pale,
that hatred for them has a source independent of the
wealth which they have acquired, that they are de-
spised for their moral superiority (there are no drunk-
ards and beggars among the Jews), and finally that
Christians do not tolerate Jews because they crucified
Christ. The Jews are wrong: The causes of the rise of
anti-Semitism can be attributed not to wealth, not to
their frugal way of life in the mass, not to the absence
of beggary among them, and even more so not to the
religious mood of Christians. The most confirmed and
zealous Christian, of course, recalls the words spoken
by Christ concerning his torturers: "Forgive them, Lord,
for they know not what they do." The Christian
can only follow the words of his godly teacher and not
adhere to Old Testament teachings about remote pun-
ishment, nor necessarily view them as descendants in-
nocent of the crimes of their forebears. Finally, it is
known that not all of the Jewish people were guilty
of the crucifixion of Christ. Only a small part of them
were guilty; further, the first Christian apostles and
their disciples were Jews.

The limitation of the rights of Jews, to say nothing
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much produced by religious motives related to the
wealth of the Jews, or the difficulty of competing with
them in commercial matters, or hostile racism, as by
the necessity of self-defense, the defense of racial
and religious unity from the Jewish yoke. Finally, the state
requires protection from being dominated by a race
which unflaggingly strives to subordinate the interests
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The lack of success of those measures which have
been tried for the solution of the Jewish question by
means of both expanding and restricting the rights of
Jews leads to the belief that legislation produces only
a vicious circle; all that it sought led either to the
triumph or to the suffering of the Jews. But it was not
any better for them than for the native population.
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time. Not just years, not decades, but perhaps many
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sired results; and proper results will come about only
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without vacillating first in one direction and then in
another.

First of all, in countries similar to Russia, Galicia,
and Hungary, it is necessary to put an end to the idea
of exiling the Jews. The expulsion of several million
people from Russia (6 to 8 million out of the popu-
lation), people who are incapable of agricultural col-
olonization, is a chimera incapable of realization.

Thus it is necessary to protect the population from
the influence of Judaism and to transform Judaism
itself. The former is impossible without limiting the
rights of Jews. These limitations should not, however,
be extended further than necessary. And once they are
applied to the Jews, it is necessary to insure against
permitting them to transgress the limits established
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with arbitrary directives. More than anything else, it
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self-government, the public rabbis, and the special
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what it is necessary to abolish. Is it not strange that
all of these institutions protect themselves against our
laws and maintain the Jewish spirit, and that Judaism
itself is protected from heresy by the government? The
appearance of such heresies in a more humanistic
spirit than in the Talmud is even desirable; perhaps
the utilitarian character of Judaism would be en-
hanced to a greater degree by such heresies.

The establishment of general principles is, of course,
much easier than investing them with the form of law.
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There is no doubt that allowing the Jews the right
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at present, and even the free choice of locations within
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even that. Further, although there is no doubt that Jews are less harmful among an urban population than among an agricultural one which is at their mercy as merchants, usurers, and tavernkeepers, there is also the fact that overcrowding in the urban centers by Jewish settlers—people who in the mestechki, suburbs, in uezd, and even in certain gubernia towns did not earn their living by handicrafts and commerce—constitutes an evil. And the artificial transfer of Jews to a city might lead to the formation of a proletariat which is both economically and hygienically dangerous—and equally dangerous in its political relations. Having allowed that there will not be beggary among the Jews, since neither congestion nor poverty is widespread among them, we should recognize that the lessening of the opportunity to exist by legal work only increases their exploitation of the rest of the population. Given the miserable conditions of the Jews, it was impossible to demand that the sanitary regulations in the cities which they overcrowded be complied with in any way. In the final analysis, it is from the masses who are led to the most extreme poverty and despair that bitter people will emerge, either those who are most needy or, their corollary, those who break the law and disturb the public safety and order.

From the foregoing one can say that, in the first place, the unconditional expulsion of Jews from the villages and the freeing of the peasants from exploitation will often combine with inconveniences for the settlers as far as the sale of their products and their purchase of manufactured goods are concerned. In the second place, the overcrowding of towns and mestechki by Jews, as a result of their expulsion from the villages, will lead to the deterioration of the position of those foci of the community in which safety, order, and organization constitute the special concern of the government. They thus need not only local but also general state attention.

If these considerations are combined with the above-mentioned awareness that the hope is vain of expelling the Jews in numbers which will decrease their number in the overall population to any noticeable degree, then it is obvious that it is necessary to alter the position of the Jews in the Pale so that their activity will be more useful for the general population and so that they are supported not only by the general but also by the local government at its various levels.

As for the cities, the multiple-class nature of their self-rule, even with the exclusion of representatives of Judaism on the basis of the new legal position on the Jews, does not debar them from the use of the remaining rights of urban inhabitants as far as these rights are secured for them by law.

But in the villages the matter has a different aspect. The mir and volost gatherings, the starosty, the starshiny, the volost courts, and volost governments cannot decide about the Jews as they can about members of village or volost societies. In this regard, a village society cannot force the Jews to discharge their social responsibilities, in particular the natural ones. The volost courts do not investigate matters which concern the Jews. Nor does volost law punish them. However dependent the Jews generally seem to be on the police and the local administration, toward the peasants they are in a privileged position—and they are not supported by local peasant institutions.

In order to avoid this abnormal situation, it is necessary to extend the law of the peasant institutions to other people living in the volost and, since by law representation cannot be given to these people, then in the volost administration and in the volost courts there should not be representatives from the government for this people, but rather their own representatives to review matters relating to the Jews.

It is obvious that this measure is essentially inconvenient, but if it is still impossible to give the Jews the franchise, then it would be very difficult to change it in some other way.

The second limitation on the rights of the Jews in the Pale concerns the acquisition of the right to own property. With respect to property in land, there is no question. Acquisition of land by the Jews, until they cease to strip the land, is not at all in the interests of agriculture, industry, and even the state. The final word on Jewish agriculture still has not been heard about from Austria-Hungary, but the state of affairs there already has begun to arouse fear, and it is not entirely without basis. But the acquisition of homes with kitchen-gardens and orchards both in villages and in the cities is another matter. The Jews with an enduring way of life depend on rural and volost government, but it is impossible to give preference to those Jews who have wandered from one place to another. It is even desirable that those settlements of Jews, in particular those which have available small gardens which can be tilled with their farmsteads, be given certain advantages.

As to the third limitation, the establishment of a definite percentage of the number of Jews to be admitted to educational institutions, it is desirable to change the measures which impel the Jews to enter educational institutions for the sake of education, and not for other strange aims, but chiefly so that education itself does not serve to strengthen Judaism.

Not dwelling on the other limitations of the forms for the protection of the local population from the pernicious influence of Judaism, it is necessary to note that they all demand review. This is necessary so that they achieve their aims and do not have the character either of social or religious oppression. At present, however, these measures do have just these characteristics and resemble persecution, regardless of how accidental the resemblance may be. It is incomparably difficult to adopt radical measures for weakening the specific strengths of Judaism.

First of all, attention should be paid to religion. The
government cannot, and should not, be called upon to compose a new, less fanatical, and more reasonable dogma for the Jews. But it is obliged to take note of the fact that it is from the general educational institutions that Jews who are more enlightened and possibly less tied to fanatical Judaism will come.

These aims might perhaps be attained by making attendance at the lower and middle educational institutions possible for the Jews chiefly from the upper classes and under conditions where Jewish religious law will be taught by teachers who are given permission to do so by the government, and who do it in Russian, and who pass the prescribed examination. We must draw up rules for the guidance and education of instructors of the Jewish faith who have experience, preserving, however, the right of general censorship and general supervision for the government. We must also see to it that in approving these leaders nothing leads to antigovernmentism and immorality. With the observance of the above-mentioned regulations, the number of Jews who are attending the general educational institutions will, in all probability, decrease. The fanatics will possibly be removed from education, and then there will be no need for the establishment of a quota for Jews who are permitted to attend the educational institutions.

All exclusively Jewish schools should not be allowed, unless they can be tolerant.

The abolition of special Jewish societies and their institutions, particularly the public rabbis, is a second very important problem. There should be a special department for registration of Jewish marriages, births, and deaths. Special Jewish finances should not be allowed to exist. As regards special Jewish social institutions—hospitals, almshouses, and others—one would think it desirable to combine them with heterodox institutions of the same nature. But if the Jews do not agree with this, then let such institutions be the concern of a private society which consists of both Jews and non-Jews, or only of Jews who want to participate by their own investments and donations, but not the entire Jewish social-kahal, even if it does not bear the latter appellation. Such a society should also be subject to supervision by general or local administration.

Finally, and most important, there is the social organization of the Jews—the issues of allowing their entrance to the urban or agricultural population and of granting them certain rights which are more limited than those which are enjoyed by the non-Jewish population, but which at the same time do not deprive them of the legal means of existence. At the present time the Jews are being driven from one place to another, even in the Pale. And they do not restrict themselves to only the means for life legally available to them but seek out illegal means as well.

Thus millions of proletarians are created who do not deter—rather, who aggravate—the evil which is inherent in Judaism.

**Russian Policy in the Baltic Guberniias**

For a long time the Russian government contented itself with the declaration made by the Ostsee barons and the urban societies of the Baltic region: “We are called to the throne of your Majesty”—*wir sind an den Thron eurer Majestät gefesselt*. This the dvorianstvo said in their address to the sovereign Nicholas Pavlovich⁴⁷; there can be no doubt of the sincerity of this declaration, because the local dvorians and burghers found it in their interest to be devoted to the power which defended their rights and privileges, privileges which were not always synonymous with the welfare of the rest of the population, and in particular with the state interests of Russia.

One can scarcely name another state in Europe (except Austria) in which there are areas so alienated from the whole, both by institutions and by language, as the Baltic guberniias are from Russia proper.

Even if from time to time the government became conscious that the order which had consolidated itself in this area could not be retained without harm to the state, then every attempt toward rapprochement with the rest of Russia met with a friendly rebuff from the dvorianstvo and citizens of the area who felt obliged to call attention to the rights which had been granted to them, to the laws which had become sanctified by a century and which rested on the tested devotion of the ruling classes. The only major reform carried out by the government in the course of the nineteenth century before the 1880s—the liberation of the peasants, after the war with Napoleon I—preserved extensive property, administrative, and legal rights for the dvorianstvo. The peasants, with the exception of those who had the right to redeem povinost⁴⁸ land—a right which was greatly limited after the emancipation—were turned into tenants of the so-called peasant lands; through fault of the pomeshchiks, power came to be in the peasant-tenants’ own hands. Under the Emperor Nicholas I the Ostsee question of the distribution of grozil⁴⁹ was shifted to a practical basis, thanks chiefly to the efforts of Iu. F. Samarin.⁵⁰ With Samarin’s removal it once again calmed down and subsided. Several times during the reign of Alexander II there were timid undertakings which did not lead to serious results.

The use of the Russian language in clerical work

---

⁴⁷ Nicholas I—TR.
⁴⁸ Povinost’ land, land acquired in return for service (usually of a military nature) rendered to the state—TR.
⁴⁹ Grozil, any of several coins. In Russia it was minted in the 1720s and was equal to 4 dengi or 2 kopecks. “Originally a coin worth 4 dengi or 2 kopecks, by the nineteenth century grozil simply meant ‘a minimal quantity of money.’”—TR.
and in the schools had little success. Indeed, it could not have been otherwise when the governors-general did not always turn out to be on the side of the Russian government. For example, how much Prince Suvorov was an ally of local privileges is seen from the diary of Count Valuev (contained in Russkaia starina), a man whom it is impossible to suspect of extreme nationalism. All that they managed to accomplish under the Emperor Alexander II was: 1) the construction of several Russian language schools and an insistence on the improvement of the teaching in them; 2) the introduction of new police regulations which were applied in the countryside but did not touch upon certain of the urban privileges, and, finally, 3) instructions about the use of the Russian language in clerical work and in dealings with the administration, instructions which resemble platonic love, because the government received in answer to requests about postponements of these measures an assurance that all would be fulfilled when the local population became more familiar with the Russian language which had been introduced in the schools at that time. Thus, the introduction of the Russian language there still seems impossible.

With regard to the Estonians and the Latvians, under the Emperor Alexander II the government adhered to the same erroneous policy of former times. Instead of the struggle between the nationalists and the German nobility leading to adoption of Russian principles and the Russian language, the government fostered the awakening of the Estonian and Latvian nationalities and the creation of a more intellectual class among them, in opposition to the Germans. Given this goal, protection for all intellectual and social movements among the Estonians and Latvians resulted;

likewise, the appearance of newspapers in the local languages was welcomed, as was the formation of Estonian and Latvian societies, circles, and so forth. It appeared to the government that in this way the German influence on the people would be weakened and that the sympathy of the latter would be inclined toward Russia. In fact, however, the creation of a nationalist spirit antipathetic to the German dvorianstvo among the Estonians and Latvians proved to be opposed to the general interests of the state. Thus, the only thing that was achieved was a more undesirably complicated relationship, but not a rapprochement between Latvians and Estonians and Russians. The antagonisms between the Germans, on the one hand, and the Latvians and Estonians on the other had developed not on the basis of nationalism, but on the basis of the privileges of the German nobility. Thus it was necessary only to break these privileges for the enmity between the ruling classes and the subordinate classes to disappear.

The late sovereign was the first to take a firm hand in the matter of the Ostsee question. Of course it was not easy to correct immediately the mistakes made over a whole century, but in five years the Russian language was made the dominant one in the schools, in business, and in the dealings of the local institutions with the local and central governments. Finally, with the introduction of judicial and administrative reforms, we should recognize that these reforms of the police and courts in the Baltic gubernias were in many ways better than those devised for central Russia. It is necessary, then, only to consolidate the series of reforms which were demanded by both Russian nationalist feeling and state interests.

It is impossible to say that everything has been done and concluded in the Baltic question. We must see that the taking of measures and the introduction of statutes are carried out with reasonable energy locally. It is not enough simply to establish new police and judicial instructions; it is necessary that their superiority be recognized and supported by able figures. It is not enough that the governors display a constant martial attitude in their dealings with foreign elements; it is necessary that they peacefully and firmly handle their affairs with the respect and sympathy of the local population.

But, aside from this, there is still one great question: the religious one, which is no less important than it is in the western gubernias. Regrettably, the local authorities and the central government itself were more preoccupied with the return to the bosom of orthodoxy of those Estonians and Latvians who have fallen away from it and with the naming of pastors who married those parishioners, or baptized and confirmed their children, than with the question of the position of Lutheranism. What I will say below about the disposition of Catholicism also totally applies to
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51 Prince Aleksandr' Arkad'evich Suvorov (1804-1882), an adjutant general and general of infantry in the Russian army. Grandson of Generalissimo Suvorov, he began his career as a cadet in a cavalry regiment with distinguished service in the Persian campaign. At the time of the Turkish War of 1828, he was made commander of the Finagorsk regiment at the special order of Emperor Nicholas I. In 1848 he was made governor-general of the Baltic provinces, in which post he served until 1860. During this period he had a distinguished military career.—TR.

52 Count Peter Aleksandrovich Valuev (1814-1890), descendant of an old Boyar family known since the fourteenth century, began service to the state in 1831, when he participated in legislative work under the leadership of M. M. Speranskii (see below, n. 94). From 1853 to 1868 he held various high government posts, including minister of the interior. Although a firm opponent of the revolutionary movement, he was strongly in favor of the reforms launched under Alexander II. Under Valuev's leadership, the zemstvo reform of 1864 was worked out. In 1870 he was associated with the reforms of the military, presenting to Alexander II the memorandum "Non-military Thoughts on Military Matters." From 1872 to 1879 he was minister of state properties and conducted the work of the Valuev Commission for the Investigation of Agriculture and Its Products. From 1879 until 1886, he was chairman of the Committee of Ministers. See P. A. Zaionchkovskii, Dnevnik P. A. Valueva. Ministra vnutrennikh del' [Diary of P. A. Valuev. Minister of internal affairs] (2 v., Moscow, 1961)—TR.
Lutheranism. The German teaching of canon law, German preaching, and German divine services will artificially support Germanism not only among the nobility of the Baltic area but also among the Lutheran Estonians and Latvians.

There was a time, about forty years ago, when the Lutherans and their pastors desired the introduction of the Russian language into the Lutheran divine services. But this aspiration was not fulfilled, out of a fear that the Orthodox communicants would defect to Lutheranism. And now, after the unification of Germany, the mood among the pastors is totally different; they do not consider themselves Russians who speak the German language, but rather as, to a degree, foreigners who are residing in Russia. They themselves do not desire the introduction of the Russian language into their divine services. In their advocacy of German services, they go further than Catholicism, which looks on language as an organ of faith, and not as an instrument of politics.

And within Russia, German maintains itself as the sole language of Lutheran faith and will without fail disappear at the same time that the obligation to use German as the language of the Lutheran divine service is repealed.

The fear that Lutheranism, by using the Russian language in the catechism, in sermons, and in the divine services, will lead to a spread in the damage to Orthodoxy there is scarcely a substantial one. It is to be supposed that the marriage between Orthodoxy and Lutheranism, which is rare at the present time, will be encountered more and more often, and the very fanaticism of Lutheranism will be weakened when the latter stops being conducted in German. I refer here, of course, to stundism adding its influence to Lutheranism. But people forget that the stundists rose up against Lutheranism and that the preachers of the stundists even subsequently turned to propaganda among the Orthodox. Finally, it is necessary to consider the fact that neither Catholicism nor Lutheranism occupied itself with propaganda in the course of the nineteenth century. But if they were so engaged, then the significance of this propaganda was destroyed in comparison with the appearance of schismatic sects and with their spread. The number of schisms of different sects is considered to be in the millions, whereas the number of those who were led astray to Lutheranism and Catholicism amounts to perhaps several tens of thousands in all.

The Polish Question

Russian policy in the Polish question represents a series of uninterrupted hesitations. These vacillations are explained not so much by changes in the views of the government as by relations between Poland and Russia themselves. At the end of the eighteenth century, nationalist stirrings were still weak, and only at the beginning of the nineteenth century did they begin to awaken. Before the last partition of Poland, Catherine II had a strong party in the kingdom; only the last partition of Poland awakened nationalist feeling for the first time to any great degree, and then only among certain factions of the Poles. The closeness of the Emperor Alexander I and Prince Adam Czartoryski gave the Poles the hope that this feeling would be satisfied. Although Czartoryski's dream was not realized, Kingdom Poland was given a constitution.

In the gubernias of western Russia, the Polish element preserved its influence, partly in administration and the courts, but chiefly in the schools in which Czartoryski and Czacki conducted successful Polish propaganda, in spite of the opposition of Novosiltsev.

53 Emphasis in the original—TR.
54 Stundism, a Russian Pietist movement first organized among Russians of German origin, but which spread rapidly among members of the Orthodox Church. Under the influence of Baptist missionaries and native leaders, several branches of the sect adopted the principle of adult baptism and became known as Baptists. The members of this group were characterized by their literal interpretation of the Scriptures and by their interest in a communism of economic goods—TR.
55 Nikolai Nikolaevitch Novosiltsev (1768–1838), president of the St. Petersburg Academy of Science (1803–1810) and member of Alexander I's "unofficial committee" of advisers. From 1804 to 1809 he was entrusted by the emperor with a series of missions in Western Europe to secure an anti-French alliance. From 1803 to 1824 he was trustee of Vilensk University and simultaneously trustee of the Vilensk educational district, in which Lithuania, Belorusia, and the right bank of the Ukraine were included. He conducted a policy of Polishization of education in these territories. During the period of the Congress of Vienna in 1814–1815 and the organization of Kingdom Poland, he played the role of adviser to Alexander I on Polish affairs. During the Polish uprising of 1830–1831, he had a role in the insurrectionist government. After its suppression, he emigrated and settled in Paris, his private residence there becoming a center for Polish nationalists. His program called for the creation of an independent Polish state by means of a military-diplomatic alliance of the Western European powers, especially of England and France against Russia—TR.
56 Tadeuz Czacki (1765–1813), founder of the lyceum at Krzemieniec in Volynia in 1804. Setting very high standards, the school was intended for sons of nobles, in order to train them for public careers and to instill in them a sense of Polish patriotism—TR.
There is no doubt that "Polonism" and Catholicism would have continued their peaceful gains if the uprising of 1831 had not placed obstacles in their path. However, it is impossible to say that Emperor Nicholas I, given the revolt, put an end to the autonomy of Kingdom Poland. The latter preserved its autonomous higher internal administration, which was subordinated to a vice-regent and had a special organ in St. Petersburg, The Committee on Affairs for Kingdom Poland.

The important measures against Polonism provided for a reinforcement of the Russian language in the schools, for the closing of Vilensk University and the Krzemieniecki Lyceum, for the opening of Kiev University, for the abolition of the Lithuanian Statute, for the introduction of the Code of Laws in the western regions, and, finally, for the Russian reunification of the Uniates of western Russia with the Orthodox Church.

The abolition of frontier customs boundaries between the empire and the kingdom was the sole measure taken by the Emperor Nicholas I with regard to unification of the government of Tsarist Poland with the government of the empire.

The liberal administration of the Emperor Alexander II aroused passionate hopes among the Poles in

---

58 The Lithuanian Statute appeared in the code composed in the Polish-Lithuanian state in the sixteenth century and continued to retain its influence in the former areas of this state in the form of a collection of their civil laws almost until the mid-nineteenth century. Mention of "The Statute of the Grand Duke of Lithuania" or "The Land Statute" is encountered in the sources as early as the last quarter of the fifteenth and the first part of the sixteenth centuries. However, these terms do not signify a single code, but the totality of landed "laws and practices," as well as the land and area "privileges" which were promulgated by the Lithuanian state for its radas (councils). The necessity for the codification of the laws arose from the existence of both laws of mixed character, the sources of which were old custom, and new charters or "privileges" of the grand dukes, as well as from the growing ability of the schlachta (landed nobles) to free themselves from the burden of grand-ducal power. This led to the issue in 1529 in the Vilensk Sejm of a code of Polish-Lithuanian laws, under the name of the Lithuanian Statute. The majority of researchers are of the opinion that this first, or "old," statute was never published and existed only in manuscript form. Prof. Leontovich, however, points to evidence of one act in 1552 which was printed. The statute of 1529 was not especially favorable for the schlachta and contained not a few antiquated and extremely severe resolutions. Therefore, in the Berest Sejm of 1544, the Lithuanian orders petitioned King Sigismund I for a reform of the statute, but a review and a new edition transpired only under Sigismund-Augustus in the Sejms of 1564, 1565, and 1566. Finally, the establishment of a new edition, known under the name of the Second Statute, took place in March of 1566.

59 Bunge here is talking about the return of the Uniates (see below, n. 70) to the Russian church, which was effected in 1839 as one in a long series of measures for the Russification of the Polish church. Among these measures were the secularization of the church's estates, giving the Catholic clergy fixed salaries, and providing for close surveillance of them.

---

60 Count Felix Lubenskii, a member of the old Polish nobility, director of justice in 1807 under the governing commission established by Napoleon, and later (1803–1813) minister of justice. He was closely identified with the interests of the schlachta. See R. F. Leslie, Polish Politics and the Revolution of November 1830 (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1969), pp. 80, 83.——TR.

61 Rzhond is a Polish word for government.—TR.

62 Nikolai Alekseevich Miliutin (1818–1872), Russian state figure who served in the Ministry of the Interior. As deputy minister in 1859, he took part in the drafting of the position of Feb. 19, 1861, and played a leading role in the work of the Editorial Commission. He supported the liberation of the peasants with land for purchase, but insisted upon the establishment of government controls over the peasantry. In 1862 he wrote a memorandum in defense of the land reforms under preparation. Later state secretary for the affairs of Kingdom Poland, he was the author of the decree of Feb. 19, 1864, on peasant reform in Poland.—TR.
The peasant reforms gave the revolutionary parties the opportunity to recruit soldiers, because at this time the agricultural population made a distinction between that which it could expect from the magnates and that which was done for them by the Tsar. In the western areas the government weakened the influence of the pomeshchiks over the peasants. With the aim of redeeming the peasant allotments, the practice of peasant agreements with pomeshchiks on the basis of the latters' demands was replaced by obligatory redemption under conditions more advantageous for the peasants. Moreover, the law of December 10, 1865, was issued: By its provisions the Poles were forbidden the acquisition of nominal purchasing in the southwest region, and it only allowed the acquisition of immovable property in land on the basis of the laws on inheritance. Further, the teaching of the Polish language was abolished in the gymnasia; finally, although no law was issued barring the Poles from state service, their admittance to crown service, owing to their recent abuse of their service positions, was in fact nearly completely discontinued.

Thus, as far as the Polish question was concerned, everything possible was done before the ascension of the late Tsar to the throne. Indeed, from 1880 to 1892 nothing was undertaken except the strengthening of the law of December 10, 1865, which aimed at the elimination of the different evasions of it by means of long-term leases, guarantees, raised purchasing (according to the officially approved decree of the Committee of Ministers in 1885), and by the abandonment of ceding lifelong ownership of land to people who do not have the right of inheritance. Thus everything that was done during the reign of Alexander III was defined by a more strict and consistent application of those laws which were aimed at weakening Polish land ownership.

A careful consideration of the Polish question shows that at the present time it is not on the road to the desired solution. On the contrary, it has entered into a new period, one full of great difficulties for the future. The chief radical measure, the liberation of the peasants from their duties to the pomeshchiks in return for the use of the land and the treatment of this use as a right of property, and similarly the allotment of strips of state land to peasants without land—have both bound the peasant to the government. The prosperity of the agriculturists quickly grew, and the population increased. But at the same time, the number of landless peasants also increased. In this way the mercy shown by the Tsar gradually lost its significance, wages decreased, and the peasants once again found themselves dependent upon pomeshchik employers.

Only one result was possible from this situation: immigration. Immigration to Brazil was retained as policy by the government itself, of course from the standpoint of altruism. But since nothing was devised with respect to guaranteeing sustenance for the surplus population other than the very constraints imposed on the exit of emigrants, it could arouse only enmity toward the government. Immigration to the United States continues, and many of the immigrants, having earned a living, are returning home. But this returning immigrant population is scarcely desirable for the interests of the state. The returning immigrants bring a new understanding with them which is not easily reconciled with the order and conditions of our life.

The question has been raised about an emigration of surplus Polish population to the eastern gubernias and to our Asiatic possessions; but if the reinforcement of the Polish and Catholic element is not at all desirable in the gubernias bordering Poland, then it can scarcely be advisable to organize Polish settlements in southeast Russia and in the Asiatic possessions. Is it appropriate to create a Polish-Catholic settlement where Russians are locked in a struggle with foreigners and Mohammedans and where it is impossible to count upon a coming together of the Polish Catholic population with the Russian Orthodox, especially when our policy with respect to the Catholics has been directed toward the maintenance of Polonism?

It is necessary to defend the expulsion of the surplus population to the West to the broadest possible extent, while not confusing it with considerations of whether it will be good for the immigrants in a new location. We should not forget that immigration has very frequently been accompanied by sacrifice and deprivation, and that it would not have been wise to display more sympathy for the Polish immigrants going to America than for Russians emigrating to Siberia. In this way misery drives an impoverished population to the bosom of socialism, and the wealthy dvorianstvo see in Austria conditions for the resurrection of Poland.

The introduction of the Russian language in the schools, in the administration, in the courts, and even in public use—in pastry shops and stores—after 1864 met with a very rapid success at first, but it did not last for long and then continued only under the influence of fear. The obligatory introduction of the Russian language into the schools both as an educational language between the students and the teachers and
even among the students themselves not only did not facilitate its spread, but strengthened a deep hatred toward it and toward everything Russian.

Two great errors were made with respect to the Polish language. The first occurred in 1863–1864, after the rebellion, when the government made up its mind to Russify Kingdom Poland and partly to de-nationalize it. The Francization of Alsace after it was joined to France and the Germanization of Poznan indicated the possibility of achieving this aim, but in Poznan the turn toward the diffusion of Polonism had already been observed. As regards our measures, when the Poles saw that their children would be prohibited from speaking Polish, there arose among them the idea that the Russian government had the aim of abolishing their native tongue.

This constitutes one of the chief reasons for the Poles' hatred of Russia, and, at the same time, Russianization itself appears to be very unlikely, because the Polish language is not a simple popular dialect, but a cultivated language, a literary language. The eradication of it is an idle and harmful dream. If, in spite of schools and the inculcation of the German literary language among the popular masses for about a century, there still remained in Germany the survival of other dialects which sometimes were understood only by local inhabitants, then how can we expect that one literary language can easily yield place to another language, although they stem from the same roots? We can only strive toward the goal that the Russian language, as the state language, occupies that same position in Poland as do the other languages and dialects which the people of other districts of Russia speak.

Instead of forbidding children to speak Polish among themselves at school, we should increase the number of public schools for men and women with instruction in the Russian language, but without excluding the Polish language. We should also give the children a taste for the Russian language and combine with this some kind of preference with respect to government and public service.

Another mistake was the identification of Catholicism with the Polish language. Presently sermons, prayers, and the study of the church law of Catholicism are not permitted even in those places where the native Catholic population of Belorussia and Little Russia speak dialects which have a greater affinity with the Russian language than with Polish and where the Polish language hitherto maintained its dominance in families and even served as a vehicle for the Polonization of the non-Polish population.

Regrettably, our government had no sympathy for introducing Russian into the Catholic religious services, an action which the late M. N. Katkov and P. N. Batiushkov—men whom it is impossible to suspect either of insufficient patriotism or of shortsightedness—energetically insisted upon. According to remarks reported to the Committee of Ministers by Count D. A. Tolstoi, there is an official report by Governor-General Kakhanov, and, according to the memorandum presented by the latter, it is clear that under the Emperor Nicholas I an interdiction was imposed on the use of Russian in churches of other faiths and that in 1866 Count D. A. Tolstoi, at that time ober-procurator of the Holy Synod, having agreed to use Russian in Catholic worship services, warned the committee that this measure would be a double-edged sword. Finally, it is clear that in 1885 Count Tolstoi categorically rebelled against the suggestion of the governor-general of the Northwest region with respect to the introduction of both local dialect and also the Russian language into Catholic worship services. Tolstoi referred at that time to the fact that the synod, having allowed the delivery of Polish Roman Catholic sermons in Russian, had declared against their being

---

65 Mikhail Nikoforovich Katkov (1818–1887), Russian journalist and publicist. In the 1830s he was close to the circle of N. V. Stankievich and was close to V. G. Belinskii, A. I. Herzen, and M. A. Bakunin. In the 1840s he broke his old literary ties and rejected his earlier liberalism when he had been fascinated with English political parties, for an openly reactionary attitude at the beginning of the 1860s. From 1850 to 1855 and from 1863 to 1867 he edited the newspaper Moskovskoe vedomosti [The Moscow register] and from 1856 to 1887 he published the journal Russkii vestnik [The Russian courier]. Both were influential and widely read in conservative and imperial court circles. After the 1863 uprising in Poland, he became outspokenly reactionary and nationalist and was an ardent supporter of the autocracy of Alexander III.

66 Pompei Nikolaevich Batiushkov (1811–1892), younger brother of the poet Konstantin Nikolayevich Batiushkov, received his education in Moscow under the supervision of the noted pedagogue P. M. Druzhinin and afterward in St. Petersburg, in particular in the boarding school of Pastor Mural'ta and in academic classes of the Artillery School. After entering military service, he soon transferred to the Ministry of the Interior and in 1850 was appointed vice-governor in Kovno. He subsequently held the post of deputy trustee, and later of trustee, of the Vilensk educational district and also served as vice-director of the Department of Spiritual Matters of Foreign Creeds. As real privy councilor, he was an honorary trustee, and manager of homes for widows, and for the care of poor children of noble rank. A member of many educational, charitable, and religious societies and brotherhoods, he was also a member of the council of the Ministry of Public Enlightenment. He was known as an author of publications on the history, archaeology, and ethnography of the northwestern and southwestern regions of Russia.

67 Mikhail Semenovich Kakhanov (1833–1900), governor of Pskov, director of affairs for the Committee of Ministers (1872–1880), and member of the Supreme Decree Committee. From Aug. 6, 1880, to Apr. 12, 1881, he was deputy minister of the interior to Count Loris-Melikov. From Apr. 12, 1881, he was a member of the Council of State, in the Department of State Economy. He was chairman of the Special Commission for the Creation of Draft Laws for Local Government from Sept. 4 to Oct. 20, 1881; the commission continued to meet until 1885.
printed in this language, fearing that "the printing of sermons imbued with the spirit of Roman Catholic teaching on dogmatic beliefs, combined with the known striving of the Roman Catholic faith for the propagation of its doctrines in Russian, would have resulted in their spreading not only in the western regions but also throughout the entire empire, primarily among simple people, and in this way would have served the purpose of Latin propaganda and harmed the Orthodox Church."

Even if Count Tolstoy was correct in believing that the support of other languages and of the Zmudst’, Lithuanian, and Belorussian dialects and their use in the language of worship would be to Russia's political detriment, nonetheless it is impossible to say this about the Russian literary language, which is intelligible to both Ukrainians and Belorussians. The true cause for banning the use of Russian in the Catholic worship services lies in the fear of strengthening sectarianism and Catholic proselitization to the detriment of Orthodoxy. This fear was baseless, first of all because it is extremely important for Russia that the Catholics of Belorussia and the Ukraine not turn to the Poles and, second, because it is not Russians falling away into Catholicism or Protestantism that is dangerous for the Orthodox faith—but that heresy which began in the midst of the Great Russian population and which recently has had great success among the Ukrainians and which could attain a general significance in time is the true danger.

Having touched upon the religious question, it is impossible to pass over the position of the Uniates in Kingdom Poland in silence. Reunited with the Orthodox Church and once again having fallen away, as the official reports of the governor of Siedlce and Petrokovsk’ attest, they remain in great part without any satisfaction of their religious needs. Those who have fallen away from Orthodoxy (and they are not a few) do not know either the satisfaction of a church or civil marriage, do not christen their children, and do not bury their dead according to Christian rites. Such a situation, created by carelessness, to say nothing of a governor's proselytizing, demands a solution, because nothing could be worse than the existence of a belief among the undeveloped masses of people which they manage without any religion.

Finally, it is desirable to eliminate still another basis for the alienation of the Poles and Russians. It was noted above that, independent of measures taken for limiting Polish land ownership in the western gubernias (namely, the prohibition against the acquisition of landed property by any means except inheritance by law, as well as the de facto limitation on admittance into the civil service, and military service) a policy exists of nonreplacement of Poles (or even of Russians who are married to Poles) when they are stationed in certain fortresses and serve in those branches of the military which are located near the western borders.

The Poles cannot, of course, dispute the fact that they generally used whatever means they could to achieve the Polonization of the western gubernias and to attain predominance over the Orthodox population in the capacity of great landowners. It is a known fact that with the exception of those who were not engaged in politics (the number of these was always insignificant), the Poles looked on state service and on public activity as a means of advancing Polish interests. Therefore, it is impossible to consider the government's establishment of these or other limitations as unjustified oppression. But in spite of all this, it is undeniable that such a situation is abnormal and thus demands a solution.

The results which the government reached by the means already referred to are quite poor. Russian land ownership, of course, was successful, but the question still remains of whether or not the Polish landowners were compensated enough for their losses of property in the western gubernias by the acquisition of land in the Kherson and Bessarabian gubernias, as well as in other areas bordering on the western gubernias. The very process of blocking Polish access to government service focused their activity on agriculture, which was unquestionably immensely successful and from careless pans turned them into calculating property owners. Hence, with the increase in the Russian peasant population, its dependence on the Polish landowning class also increased after several decades; of course the Poles took advantage of this dependence.

Considering that a satisfactory solution of the racial and foreign questions by means of struggle and de-

---

68 Zmud refers to the geographical area of coastal lowland in Lithuania which had its own special dialect—TR.

69 Precisely what heresy Bunge is referring to is unclear. What seems likely, however, is that he was referring to the appearance in the 1880s in the Saratovska gubernia of a new sect calling itself Golubcheke (good fellows), similar in character to the Molokani (lit. "milk drinkers") a Russian schismatic sect so called because they drank milk on the holy days. Basically, among other things, they rejected the Eucharist except as a celebration commemorating Christ and instead preached the central position of the gospels—TR.

70 Uniates were those adherents to the Orthodox church who subscribed to the agreement concluded at Brest in 1596 between the Roman Catholic Church and the majority of the Orthodox prelates in the Polish-Lithuanian state. According to this agreement, the former Orthodox Church had to recognize the Roman pope as its head and to accept Roman Catholic dogma, although Orthodox rituals and the Church Slavonic languages were to remain in use. Within the Russian empire, this religious union was formally dissolved in 1839 by the decision of sobor (council) of Uniate bishops (headed by Metropolitan Iosif Semashko of Lithuania) in Polotsk; thereby the Uniates were accepted in full and complete communion with the Orthodox Church—TR.

71 Pan, a master or gentleman in Polish. The term was usually applied to Polish noble landowners—TR.
struction is not only not desirable but also impossible, it is obviously necessary to find those conditions of life under which the Poles could be reconciled with the Russians. This consideration leads one to the belief that their equality with the native population depends on their actions. Conditions for such a reconciliation appear favorable at the present time because the antagonism between the Slavic and German races prompts the Slavs to close ranks more closely; and the attempt of the Poles to seek support in Germanism would be directed not just against Russia, but against all of Slavdom.

As regards measures which could draw the Poles closer together with the Russians, zemstvo institutions and state service suggest themselves.

The opening of zemstvo institutions, not only in the western gubernias but in Kingdom Poland, could be, with the observance of certain conditions, of vital use. Regarding such conditions, it is necessary to establish, in addition to property qualifications, educational qualifications, by decreeing that only people who have completed a course in an educational institution and who have a certificate attesting to a knowledge of the Russian language can be electors to, and representatives in, these institutions of local government. Moreover, Russian should, without fail, be the language both for the discussion of official matters and for clerical work.

In time, people from the local zemstvo institutions could be chosen for state service, at least in locations where the Polish population does not predominate. The only objections which might be made against this idea are the possibility that the zemstvos might unite the Poles and make it easier for them to attain their political goals and the circumstance that state service puts power in their hands which may be used against Russia. The former objection is not correct because conspiracies were formed and are formed outside social and governmental institutions and choose as centers of activity for themselves those societies and institutions which cannot be forbidden. For example, agronomic societies or credit societies, philanthropic societies, industrial societies, and, finally, church societies were favorite places for revolutionary activity in 1863. The latter objection is justified, but there is reason to fear such a possibility only in the event that the Poles occupy positions of government responsibility among a Polish population. And it is just such a responsibility as this which gives them the power or the opportunity to act against Russia.

The Question of Finland

Finland belongs among those districts to which we gave the least attention in the matter of strengthening the Russian state. This process of setting Finland apart began before 1886. Shortly after its subjugation, the half-Russified Vyborg gubernia was united with it. Then, during the reign of the Three Emperors and in the first years of the reign of our late sovereign, much was permitted which favored the formation of politically independent areas out of Finland. This occurred, of course, not by the instructions of the Russian sovereign and not as a result of treachery or the designs of the people who conducted Finland’s affairs, but as a result of an insufficient understanding by the central administration of Russia’s state problems. For their part, the Finns especially valued this setting apart, because it allowed them to live an autonomous life and not to bear, except in an indirect fashion, the burdens and adversities which fell on the entire empire.

In the course of the past eighty years, they succeeded in achieving much: first, the establishment of an autonomous customs system, which corresponded more to local needs than the one which covered the entire state; second, the introduction of monetary units which were independent of the fluctuation of the ruble; third, the solution of the periodicity of the Sejm; and fourth, the right of representatives to the Sejm to raise legislative questions. Even in those instances when measures were taken which should have brought Finland closer to Russia, something quite the opposite occurred. Thus, with the extension of military obligations to Finland, an autonomous Finnish army was created, one which was not intended exclusively for the defense of the entire state, but of Finland only. During time of war, people commanding soldiers could not, according to the regulations on military duty, use the Finnish army for military actions in gubernias adjacent to Finland, although the right of declaring war was recognized as belonging to the emperor-grand duke. The only sign of unification was the fact that Finland was, similar to the rest of Russia, divided into gubernias subordinate to governors. But the gubernias of Finland had nothing in common with the Russian gubernias except the name.

As regards the policies to which the government confined itself after the subjugation of Finland, it once again decided to support Finnish nationalism and the Finnish language in opposition to the Swedish intelligentsia and the Swedish language, in order to prevent Finland from gravitating toward Sweden, losing sight of the fact that Russian state aims were not achieved by this policy and that, on the contrary, it created a

---

72 The Sejm was the Finnish diet in the nineteenth century. Organized on the principle of representation of the estates or legal classes (soslovne predstavitel'stvo), a preponderance of the nobility were represented. The Lutheran clergy, the cities, and the peasantry were also represented as part of Finland’s autonomous position in the Russian empire—TR.

73 On the basis of the proclamation of Jan. 20, 1809, the Russian emperor became also the grand duke of the legally autonomous Duchy of Finland, giving him and his successors the right to issue decrees, manifestos, and laws with the concurrence of the Sejm—TR.
self-awareness in a people who were not living an autonomous political life and permitted the development of a new language at the expense of the Russian language. Regrettably, the proposed goal was achieved; regrettably, because the support and the development of Finnish nationalism strengthened the alienation of Finland from the empire and created the opportunity for the future inclination of the Finnish tribes who have settled certain parts of the St. Petersburg, Olonetsk, and Archangelsk gubernias toward Finland.

Then primary Swedish descent was retained for Finland, as was formerly enacted in its laws. But these laws were never positively approved by any kind of act for Finland itself. The Swedes alluded to them, although several of these laws were repealed by the Swedish government even before Finland’s subjugation to Russia. The supreme power also referred to them in its acts and manifestos. The law in force was not only not codified but was not even defined by the process of review and affirmed by new decrees.

In this way, beginning with the Emperor Alexander I, the Russian sovereign as the grand duke of Finland on the one hand recognized and confirmed in their unlimited expression the rights and privileges conferred upon Finland and, on the other hand, was never ashamed about putting into practice those or any other reforms recognized as necessary by him. The government did not seek the agreement of the popular representatives about the introduction of military obligations, reforms of the monetary system, and many of the other most important questions. While the convocation of the Sejm was not periodic, while only the government introduced new draft laws for its review, and while the reforms themselves concerned a further broadening of Finland’s rights and privileges, the question of the destruction of the rights of the Grand Duchy of Finland was not raised by the Finns. But when the Sejm began to be summoned for a limited term according to law, when the members of the Sejm were given the right to introduce drafts of new laws and to make proposals, and when it came to settle relations between the state and the province without harm for the state, then apparently the complaint must have been raised about the destruction of the rights given to Finland, rights which were confirmed by the sovereigns with their ascension to the throne.

During the reign of the late Emperor Alexander III, nothing could be perceived in the relations between Finland and the empire as a whole that demanded elimination. There were provinces in the Russian state in which it was impossible to take a step without a knowledge of Swedish (the former state language) or Finnish (the popular language), and in which the government limited itself to the founding of a single Russian gymnasium exclusively for those Russians residing in Finland. Nothing was done in these areas for familiarizing the Finns with the Russian language, although there were sufficient orders by the governor-general that Russian be taught in the schools. Likewise, with the establishment of a metallic unit for Finland, Russian paper money ceased to serve as a means of exchange, and it was accepted in Finland not at the usual rate of exchange, but only according to the desire of the local buyers and sellers. The postal service, which was never unified in the German states that were independent from one another, retained its autonomy in Finland up until the most recent times.

Emperor Alexander III eliminated several of these anomalies by using his power. As recently as 1891, the unity of the postal administration was established, and the acceptance of the Russian ruble at a fixed rate was made obligatory. Finally, the resolution of the question of the status of the Finnish army is imminent, as is the resolution of the problem of the customs barriers which separate Finland from Russia, and so forth. Both the measures which have been taken and those which are anticipated cannot but provoke dissatisfaction from the Finns, who, while the supreme power enlarged their rights, were silent and did not complain about the illegality of the orders of the government. But when the matter concerns the general interests of the state, they protest, citing the destruction of the privileges which have been granted to them. Regrettably, our press, having rendered a really great service to Russian efforts in Finland, did not keep within the boundaries of prudence: Its impassioned escapades against Finnish importunities bore the character not of just demands, but of challenges made by the strong to the weak. Included in the latter are several indications about those measures which it is necessary to undertake in Finland.

First of all, it is necessary to remove all assumptions about counting on the Russianization of Finland and on the subordination of Finland to the administrative structure and laws which are functioning in the central gubernias of the empire. The language which the people speak is not forgotten, particularly if it has reached a literary level. If a century is required for the degeneration of a language, for example the degeneration of Latin into the Italian or French languages, as is shown by history, then it is clear that the replacement of one language by another is completely impossible, and our desires should be limited to only a certain diffusion of the state language with a view toward facilitating dealings between Russia and Finland and closer ties between them. Likewise, there is no necessity for an administrative rearrangement of

---

74 "Primary Swedish descent" apparently refers to the Swedish law on inheritance that was preserved by Russia in Finland after 1809. See Dr. Friedrich Georg von Bunge, Dasliv- und estländische Privatrechts (2 v., Reval, 1847); and Baron Oscar von Rahden, Geschichtliche Übersicht der Grundlagen und der Entwicklung des Provinzialrechts in den Ostseegouvernements (St. Petersburg, 1845)—TR.
the duchy and the laws existing in it. Even those who are only slightly familiar with Finland cannot but recognize that this is a prosperous country with a literate population and one that is firm in its religious convictions, and further recognize that there is no reason to disturb the existing order there just so that the Finns can be brought under the general level of customs which exist in the rest of Russia. Russia itself demands more than a little improvement and amelioration and in many ways lags behind in those principles upon which citizenship and the internal well-being of Finland depend.

Thus, in order to understand the need for a special policy in Finland, it is necessary only to note the great difference between Finland and Poland. In political respects, Finland has stated no territorial claims. The Poles cannot forget that they once ruled from sea to sea, from the Dnieper to the Oder. The Finns want to preserve themselves. The Poles do not want anything but to oppose themselves to that which was created for them by the Russian government, and desire only one thing: the restoration of old Poland with its constitutional liberal institutions. One might say that the political question does not exist in Finland in the sense of separation from the Russian throne (of course it may be provoked by inappropriate actions). In Kingdom Poland, the political question and separation in the above-mentioned sense is everything. The extremist party in Finland goes no further than advocating the formation of an autonomous state from the grand duchy under the scepter of the grand duke, the Russian sovereign. The Poles want to have their own monarchy and their separate leaders, or their own republic. The Poles do not recognize the personal union of the Polish crown with the Russian crown. Owing to its internal policy, Russia acted differently toward Finland than it did toward Tsarist Poland. And it is proper that Finland was not made another Poland, a country which is inimical to us and which we may hold onto only by relying on the army.

To solve this difficult Finnish problem, it is necessary first of all to establish a firm order with respect to the planning, review, and the approval of laws destined for enactment in Finland, and then to set about composing a code of decrees to be effected for the reform of those laws and institutions which are outdated. The remainder of the government's legislative activity in Finland does not have a concrete form. These forms should be varied: First, decrees should be drafted which concern Finland proper and her internal interests, and second, decrees should be drafted which concern not only Finland but the entire Russian empire.

The first, that is the laws which concern Finland proper (with the exception only of administrative instructions based on already existing laws), it will be necessary to have the Finnish Sejm and Senate properly examine. This is true, too, as regards the minister state secretary's handling of the grand duke's dealings with the ministers of the empire about materials which are presented for official review. The procedures alluded to should determine whether or not the projected laws concern the entire state (in this event, a special order of review and confirmation of laws is necessary) and whether or not differences exist on this subject between the minister state secretary for affairs of the grand duchy and the ministers to whom he communicates those differences, which should be subject to review by the Committee of Ministers.

The second, that is laws which concern not only Finland but the entire empire (for example, the determination of the rights of the residents of Finland in the other parts of the empire, as well as the residents of the latter in the grand duchy of Finland with respect to the acquisition of property, the right of service, etc.), should pass through the Council of State or the Committee of Ministers, with the participation of the Finnish senators and members of the Finnish Sejm, setting goals for them either in the presence of, or to permit the giving of explanations to, the supreme power. Draft laws which are composed at the initiative of the Sejm or the state secretary of the grand duchy, or even the ministers of the empire, on receipt of the opinion of the Sejm and Senate and according to review in the State Council or in the Committee of Ministers, would be subject to official approval.

Once established, the order of legislative activity would be facilitated by codification, that is, the compilation in one whole of Finnish laws in connection with the review of obsolete decrees.

The fiction of the immutability of the laws as regards those rights and privileges confirmed by the supreme power should yield place to the principle of gradual changes which are demanded by life. If the voice of public opinion is heard with these changes and there occurs a weighing of local interests and class interests, then there seems to be no basis for displeasure among the people who are divided into the useful component parts of the one hundred races which inhabit the Russian realm.

It was noted above that, along with the codification of the laws of Finland, it would be necessary to enact vitally necessary reforms, first in the army, second in the customs system, and third in the mutual rights which should be extended to Russians, and not to Finns, who reside in other regions of the empire.

The army composed of Finns should constitute part of the Russian army. Since even Finnish jurists recognize that the right of declaring war and concluding peace belongs exclusively to the emperor-grand duke, then it is natural that the Finnish army may not be autonomous or have the limited obligation of defending only Finland. The customs system should be the same for all of Russia, including Finland, but there
seems to be a great difficulty under unification. This concerns not only the Tammerfors privileges alone, but also the distribution of customs receipts between Finland and the state treasury, and chiefly the total aggregate of indirect taxes which exist in Finland. Finally, it concerns, too, the competition of Finnish industry with Russian industry.

The Tammerfors privileges elapse in 1895. But the abolition of these privileges with certain sacrifices does not appear impossible even before the approach of this date. It is more difficult to find a basis for distributing customs receipts between the Finnish and imperial treasuries. The Finns believe that with the introduction of a single customs tariff, their foreign import trade will chiefly be conducted in St. Petersburg. If a law is enacted for the division of tariff receipts and a site established for the payment of customs duties, then a very significant sum is due to Finland's revenues. The distribution of duties according to the size of population will thus scarcely be in proportion to the consumption of the foreign products by the Finnish population and the rest of Russia. These difficulties are not devoid of significance, but they are not matters which cannot be overcome. The value of foreign production in Finland in recent years prior to the forthcoming abolition of the customs line between Finland and the frontier Great Russian gubernias is well known and may be taken as the basis for the apportionment of a certain part of the customs duties collected at all the borders of the empire, including Finland, for her use.

The most important and most difficult problem is the establishment of mutual rights for Finns who reside in other Russian possessions and for Russians who are not Finns but who reside in Finland. It is desirable that emigration be permitted with as few difficulties as possible, so that the transfer from service in Finland to service in the rest of Russia would be made easier and, at most, require only in the first instance a knowledge of the Russian language, and in the second knowledge of Swedish or Finnish, so that a person of the free professions—doctors, apothecaries, technologists, and others—generally enjoy the same rights as were presented to them by education, whether they are Finns or Russian subjects from other parts of the empire. It goes without saying that in order to enjoy electoral rights and to participate in local self-rule, it is necessary to establish a term of residence as a prerequisite for the acquisition of these rights, as well as the demonstration of a knowledge of the Finnish or Swedish languages (on the part of emigrants to Finland) or of Russian (on the part of Finns who are emigrating to other parts of the empire).

In conclusion, one should note that the general state aims are not at all established as questions of religion or questions of the rights of the supreme power in Finland or as the question of the organization of internal self-rule and civil laws. All of these matters in practice do not raise any doubts, and if they encounter the need for a more precise law, then this should follow in its own time.

Through establishment of a stable order for legislative activity dealing with Finland and through careful definition of its problems, many misunderstandings could be averted in the future, misunderstandings which would be not dangerous, but nonetheless extremely undesirable. Currently the Finns explain measures which are made on the basis of state interests as simply the claims of Russian chauvinism, as a repudiation of historical rights given them and reaffirmed by four emperors, and the pressure of the Russian press. With a firm, clearly delineated order it would be made clear to all that those measures which are passing through established state institutions deliberately begin with the participation of the Finns themselves, not according to passions or petty personal entusiasms, but with careful regard for everything which involves not just the interests of a particular area's demands but also those of the state.

And even if the question of Finland is not solved, it is desirable, nonetheless, that more attention be paid to the Finns who inhabit the St. Petersburg and Olonetsk gubernias, where in several settlements the people not only do not speak, but do not understand, Russian. Such villages are even found near the capital!

In worrying about the spread of parochial schools in those areas where settlement is allowed without the Russian language prevailing, where Orthodoxy has its spokesmen and defenders, it would not hurt to think about educational activity among the above-noted foreign population, which is part Lutheran, part semi-barbarian and semiliterate.

---

**The Bessarabian Area**

Most was done for the rapprochement with Russia in Bessarabia in those areas where there is a Mohammedan population. Here Russian institutions were introduced, as well as general Russian gubernia administration, the judicial statutes of 1864, Russian zemstvo and urban regulations, and finally Russian educational institutions, with instruction in the Rus-
sian language. But this unification concerned only the more educated class. It is seen from the reports of the governors that the foremen (starshini) and the elders (starostii) who stand at the head of the agricultural administration are often totally unfamiliar with the Russian language. This can be explained only by the extreme negligence of the administration and the absence of solicitude with respect to the spread of schools. Moreover, while not a single popular college was left behind in Bessarabia, it has been forgotten that in the part of Bessarabia which was returned to Russia by the Berlin Treaty, all Rumanian institutions were kept twelve years after the conclusion of peace.

The Muslim Question

The Muslims are settled among us in the Caucasus, Central Asia, the eastern guberniias of European Russia, and Tabriz guberniia.

In spite of difficulties and an almost century-long struggle with a mountain people, the establishment of Russian state power there has occurred long after the subjugation of the Caucasus. There is a multiracial population there now, including masses of mountain Muslims evicted from Turkey. Great security and order have been established in the country, as well as the liberation of the peasants from bondage or servitude, and so forth. But before the reign of the Emperor Alexander III, the Caucasus were completely separate from Russia; they had their own budget and their own central administration, independent of the ministry and its deputy.

The countries named the Steppe and Turkestan governor-generalships, and even the Caspian region, after conquest easily fell under the influence of Russia because the establishment of Russian power there was synonymous with the consolidation of peaceful citizenship and the abolition of slavery. But if the Caucasus were somewhat detached from the empire before the '80s, then it had a government more or less in conformity with those which existed in Russia, including judicial institutions and, in general, the order established by law and affirmed by the supreme power. It is impossible to say this of our central Asian possessions, which resembled Persian satrapies before the last decade. The governors-general, subordinate only to the minister of war, in fact combined in themselves all powers, even legislative powers, and handled almost all spheres of government and ordered the local economy according to their own discretion—not on the basis of legal resolutions, but according to their own personal understanding of what constituted the common good.77 If great confusion is not to occur there from the assignment of unlimited power to the governors-general, then it is necessary to place the chief official in special service.

During the reign of the Emperor Alexander III, an attempt was made to set about regulating these relations. Regulations were published for the Transcaucasian area subordinating the local administration to the central administration. Regulations were published for the Turkestan and Steppe governor-generalships by which a firmer order of administration was provided, as well as the establishment of a more regular arrangement of courts, limiting the right of ownership, delimiting the state economy from the local economy, and, finally, extending the power of the central institutions to the border regions. The above-noted decision will shortly afterward be the subject of statutes dealing with the Caspian area. Such a joining of the eastern regions with the internal native oblasts of the empire, however, constitutes the only means for more durable ties, the formation of which presupposes the dominion of a state language and the predominance of Russian civic institutions over the native ones which have a religious character.

The above was explained in detail to illustrate that it is impossible to force another language upon the people. But by means of schools, the demands of not only those engaged in governance but also of those who have social responsibilities can be brought to the attention of the literate stratum of the population through the language of the dominant tribe. This centralization of authority will be so much easier the fewer the number of languages and foreign dialects which are cultivated and which attain a literary importance.

Of course it is not possible to teach the Russian language in a school of foreigners who are totally unfamiliar with it without, at the same time, allowing the use of the native language. But there is a great difference between purely practical ways of instruction and philosophically worked out languages which have as their aim their own literary development and the awakening of national self-consciousness in the people. A closeness of foreigners with Russia and Russians will not be reached by this means; rather, a wedge will be driven between them which could decisively split the still not completely solid state economy.

The correct solution of this question of Russian schools among the Mohammedans is very difficult, because all literary, all scientific, and all civil existence among them is based on the Koran. It is obvious that a Russian school may not be a Mohammedan one.

77 It is necessary only to remember the expenditures under Governor-general Cherniav for the construction of roads that were later abandoned and the expense for the intended reorganization of taxes in Fergansk oblast.
The government may not take upon itself the teaching of the Koran and the propagation of its teachings, either in Arabic or in Russian. It can only demand the teaching in the mekhteb and medrisse of nothing except the Koran and Russian literacy. But all our attention should be so directed that the Muslims recognize the superiority of Russian schools and so that they are convinced that the schooling does not concern the conversion of a Mohammedan into a Christian, and they should gain through these schools the full rights of citizens of the state to which they belong. It might be hoped that Muslim fanaticism can be overcome most rapidly in this way.

In matters which concern the Mohammedan religion and social institutions, it would follow that the government not look after the construction of mosques, or the preservation of vakufs, the medrisse and the mekhtebs in which the Koran is taught—in a word, all that which serves to support Mohammedanism. Rather, the government should see to the superiority of all Russian institutions, schools, and philanthropic institutions. To whom do we give advance notice of the decline of the vakufs and of the abuse of their governance by the Mohammedans themselves, when the decline of the vakufs might only enhance the importance of Russian institutions in the eyes of the foreigners, if they are well constructed? What is the guarding of the interests of Mohammedanism to our government if the Mohammedans themselves destroy them? Is it not better if the Mohammedans themselves recognize the primacy of Russian institutions over Muslim?

The Georgian and the Armenian Questions

These two questions only recently arose with the simultaneous appearance of a Georgian and Armenian literature. Their whole significance lies in the future, and this significance depends on how much our schools promote the separateness of these peoples and how much our civil system is successful in strengthening itself in territories which are allied to our country by trust, but not by language. Here it is necessary for us to remember that our problem does not consist in the absorption of these people by Russia. That is impossible. Rather, it consists in the fact that Russia must preserve the meaning of the state, which provides for the protection and education of foreigners and promotes their ties with other parts of the empire.

It is necessary to supplement this sketch with some additional paragraphs on our internal policies with respect to the Kalmuks, Kirghiz, and Buryats: to reveal how our neglect promoted the conversion of the first two to Mohammedanism and led to the confirmation of the Buryats in Lamaism, and thus to discourse about how little was done for the establishment of Russian civil rule, the Russian language, and Orthodoxy in those areas where to have done so would have been comparatively easy, and, finally, to sum up everything said in the present chapter.

Our periodical press very often points to Austria's internal disorder, which is produced by her multiracial population and by the struggle between the Germans, the Magyars, the Slavs, and the Rumanians. In Russia, they say, this disorder does not exist, although Russia contains a number of peoples and thus is more heterogeneous in its culture. However, the press forgets that in Russia there is no means for the expression of dissent among her constituent races and that, overall, the Russian people rule the other people by the strength of their numbers. But the border regions are far from being united with the state. Foreigners and the various races do not have the advantage of proximity with the Russian population and intimacy with all Russians, so that there is no basis on which to plan for the resolution of the problem, since it is necessary to act so that Russia belongs to the Russians.

No one can say that the limitation on the right of the Jews to residence, to the acquisition of property, or to their employment in industry were not felt as constraints by them. Thus, there is the secret struggle between the Jews and the administrative power, which, as the executor of the laws which limits them, not only is not loved by the Jews, but beyond that there is not even respect, especially when for money it relaxes the severity of the existing decrees. Thus, too, it is impossible to count on a reconciliation between Russia and Poland. Measures which have been taken with respect to the predominance of the Russian language in the schools, with respect to the Uniates, and with respect to prohibiting Poles from entering state and public service, made all Russians more onerous to the Poles than before.

In Kingdom Poland, Russia is supported only by force and by the sole support of state power, the peasantry, which was enlisted on the side of Russia by the reforms of 1864, but which might again, together with the rapidly increasing population, fall under the influence of the gentry landowners and of the Polish intelligentsia, which is so hostile to us.
In the Baltic region, Russian power had everything on its side over many years, but this lasted only while Russia supported Latvian and Estonian nationalism, preserved almost inviolate the privileges of the dvo-
rianstvo and the burghers, and finally regarded the state of the Russian language with complete indifference to the law. The central power now having declared its right to establish Russian state principles, a solidarity among foreign elements has begun to arise—but not in support of the Russian state. Therefore a very firm and intelligent internal policy is necessary, so that alienation from the state in this area may not take on new and undesirable forms. In Finland, as a result of a whole series of decisions and measures that have been recently taken to promote the closeness of the grand duchy with the other parts of the empire, there began to arise a harmful estrangement from Russia, which, in the schools, was closely connected with religion (as if the school teacher prepared students for confirmation, the first sacrament). The masses might quickly become imbued with this feeling, a feeling which would make the Russian government hateful to them.

Finally, the entire Muslim East and various races in the Transcaucasus, Siberia, and Central Asia constitute a spontaneous element over which Russian power dominates, but over which Russian culture does not, thus constituting an area which is still a long way from being adopted by the peoples there. In a state surrounded on all sides by numerous races and foreigners and which includes in its population about six million Jews, the government should follow a careful and deliberate policy with respect to the outlying districts.

Of course we might say that Russia is so strong that the multiracial elements do not represent the same kind of danger as they would if they were inimical to her. Indeed it is not difficult for the state power in Russia to compel respect for itself, to demand knowledge of the Russian language from a literate population which comes into contact with the Russian administration, and to demand respect for the dominant religious creed, and so on. But this is not enough. That which is achieved by force is not always durable, and if it engenders bitterness and enmity, then it leads both to the internal and to the external weakening of the state. On the one hand, the army necessary to keep the entire area submissive (as, for example, in Kingdom Poland) and, on the other hand, the hostile relations of the outlying regions excites hopes in neighboring states, which, if not completely justified, do constitute the basis for political considerations and calculations with which it is necessary to reckon, since it is impossible to regard them as dreams.

It is necessary to remember that Russian state power should not be exercised in the outlying districts as a conquering power, but as a power which the entire population considers as a blessing given to it; that the Russian state system should rest upon recognition of the superiority of Russian state institutions; that the multiracial population should realize not only the necessity to use, but also the benefit to be derived from the use of, the Russian language; that the respect for the dominant church should have as its source the spirit of Christian meekness and love, both that of the pastor and that of the flock, for every man. Regrettably, we should be aware that our internal policy has erred much with respect to the outer regions. Following conquests, Russian power was almost always notable for its unusual mildness. Often the subjugated peoples did not feel any kind of oppression at the beginning; rather they found in the new government the protection and defense which it was impossible to expect from the former ruling power.

This mildness comes from the fact that the conquered people regarded the conquering Russians as the dominant race. Thus it was with the Poles in the provinces annexed from Poland and in Kingdom Poland itself. Thus it was in the Baltic gubernias, in Finland, and even in the Muslim East, where we constructed mosques and supported the vakufs.

Then, during the course of time, there ensued a moment when racial pretensions arose—the desire not only to exist independently, but to do this at the expense of the entire state, even regarding all of Russia with a certain arrogance which became unbearable. Then Russian national feeling was awakened, and certain demands were absolutely and suddenly put forward, and relations were changed which had been established in the course of many years and even of an entire century. The relations that then arose stemmed from the inimical feelings of numerous races toward Russia.

Thus one extreme followed another: After mildness, one might say there followed discipline, a severe insistence on making up for lost time in everything that had been lost as a result of a series of indulgences. True, this insistence did not always turn out to be enduring, but the harm consisted not only in the vacillation of the government alone, but chiefly in the conditions under which it acted and in the form of its action. The actions were accompanied by pompous journalistic outpourings which promoted mutual irritation, and the measures which the government took did not always bear the imprint of calmness and consistency. Therefore, complaints that these measures were sometimes impetuous and occasioned by passion were not without basis.

---

81 Even the Jews hardly constituted an exception. Under Polish rule they were, of course, more oppressed.
III. [REFORMING THE STRUCTURE OF GOVERNMENT IN RUSSIA]


THE HIGHER STATE INSTITUTIONS

The central administration, in the form in which it now exists, took shape in its main outlines under the Emperor Alexander I.

Namely, the Council of State (Gosudarstvennyi sovet) was established for legislative matters; for administrative matters, the ministries and the Committee of Ministers; for judicial, the Ruling Senate; for spiritual, the Holy Synod.

However, in the course of time there arose, parallel with these institutions, the following committees: the Caucasian (1842), the Siberian (1852), the Affairs of Kingdom Poland (1864), and others which conducted matters entrusted to the Council of State and the Committee of Ministers. A matter came before these committees directly upon official decision.

Under the Emperor Alexander II, yet another committee was established, the Chief Committee, for matters which concerned the liberation of the serfs. Even with regard to the liberation of the peasants, this committee conducted affairs which were subject only to official review according to individual cases and which demanded a change of the decrees of the main redemption institutions which were already enacted, and so on. In short, it dealt with matters which could not be resolved by the administrative power.

Finally, under the Emperor Alexander II himself, the Council of Ministers was established in 1861. The chief feature of this body was that it existed only in the presence of the sovereign emperor; the subjects of this agency embraced not only administrative matters but also legislative matters subject to further discussion by the Council of State.

Toward the end of the reign of the Emperor Alexander II, there spread a rumor of an impending reorganization of the Council of State.82

However, with the ascension of the Emperor Alexander III to the throne, this project, attributed to Count Loris-Melikov, was abandoned. What was the object of drawing up this project? There were rumors that it attempted to recruit zemstvo figures to state service as a counteraction against the anarchists; but these rumors, of course, were without foundation. Opposition of that kind is possible where there are parties and their representatives. We had nothing similar, so it was not possible.

In Russia there are no parties in the Western European sense. There are the views of different circles and, in particular, of the newspapers, which have risen in importance in recent years as spokesmen for the mood of these circles. But there is neither a conservative party, nor a liberal or a radical party which stands for carrying out certain principles and upholding certain institutions—parties which defend definite and real interests. They speak sometimes of a dvorianstvo party, of liberals. But this so-called dvorianstvo party does not express the aspirations of the majority of the dvorianstvo and strives only for securing material advantages, cheap credit, tax immunities, and privileges in state service for itself, just as a merchant and a manufacturer seek material security. Just as with the terms liberal and radical, these are names, but not parties. Therefore, the draft proposal for the reform of the Council of State could not render any kind of counteraction to anarchism. Rather, it would have been only an imitation of that parliamentarianism which, however, saw its reputation undergo a radical change in European opinion at the end of the nineteenth century.

With Count Ignatiev’s advancement to the direction of the Ministry of the Interior, an experiment was made for encouraging the so-called “experienced people” to pursue a vocation in state service. By itself this idea had a certain merit, but the means for realizing it were erroneous. Would it not seem better to summon people from various soslovie [classes] from different locales who enjoy the confidence of the government, who have general esteem, and who possess local knowledge, for dealing with one or another of the questions confronting the state? But the experienced people were placed without any ties with the ministries which they could make use of in the working out of state questions. Nor did such ties exist with the Council of State, which they could assist by furnishing it with local information. The compilation of legislative drafts which were subject to their examination was entrusted to them directly in order that they be brought into conformity with existing legislation, and these drafts were worked out according to a form which was demanded by prac-

82 Loris-Melikov’s proposals would have created a minor change in the usual legislative procedure: the establishment of a commission to which the zemstvos and municipalities of the larger cities were to send representatives and which was to examine, in a purely advisory capacity, legislative bills before they were submitted to the Council of State. Since the Council of State itself was largely a consultative body, the net effect of this proposal was to “water down” the impact of popular participation. Compare this with the more far-reaching proposal of P. A. Valuev discussed by Leonard Shapiro in Rationalism and Nationalism in Russian Nineteenth Century Political Thought (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), p. 117—TR.
tice. The experienced people themselves apparently feared falling under the influence of the ministerial chancelleries. Further, not only they, but also the ministers themselves, did not report the order in which the drafts were to be introduced to the Council of State. Nor did they consider how it was to review statutes worked out by a conference of these experienced people. No clear and firm programs, either in formal relations (that is, with respect to the order of the drawing up of drafts, their introduction into the Council of State, and their review) or in the essential nature of the drafts were ascertained. Therefore the labors of the experienced people were totally unsuccessful.

They busied themselves with two main subjects: the question of the liquor trade, from the standpoint of improving public morals, and the question of immigration. Both drafts were drawn up. In order to bring the former before the Council of State, it was necessary to revise it so that it was in agreement with the Department of Alcohol Excise and with other statutes. With its amendment a doubt arose as to the possibility of certain conditions being realized. Such conditions were, for example, the number of places selling alcohol conforming to the size of the population, and even the establishment of a standard price. Obviously, the ministers could not come to an agreement on the price level and worked out their own draft on which, however, agreement was not reached either between the minister of finance and the experienced people, or between the ministries of the interior, state property, finance, and justice themselves, who had jointly introduced the draft. The draft was not accepted by the Council of State, and it was suggested that it be turned over to special guberniia offices for a resolution of certain questions. Subsequently, the further working out of the law concerning the liquor trade emerged without the participation of the experienced people and led to the law of May 15, 1885, which remained without effect, not only because the problem was resolved unsuccessfully but also as a result of the agitation in the press, which spawned complete chaos in the public mind.83

The draft dealing with the immigration question was simply retained; it was not amended, it was not discussed, and apparently the Ministry of State Properties, the department most closely concerned with it, discovered that it was not safe to raise such hopes in the people, hopes which could not be satisfied. Afterwards the questions of immigration and assistance to the immigrants were raised several times, but such questions led to nothing substantial except the officially approved report of the three ministries, in addition to those of the Council of State and the Committee of Ministers. They led to nothing significant, because this was not a law that anyone determined as established; rather, it was a decree based on existing decisions and, as a matter of fact, one which led only to the foundation of transitional immigration control points and to the allocation of a definite sum from the state treasury that was far from sufficient. Whether it had in mind the establishment of a different order of deliberations of the experienced people or not, as one of the ministers (M. N. Ostrovskii)84 hinted at the time that they were still conferring, it is difficult to say.

When Count Ignatiev raised the chaotic idea of a zemskii sobor (lit. —TR 'a land council' or representative body in old Russia) shortly afterward, reform work passed on to the ministries. Only now and then were there formed independent conferences and commissions (the Stoianovskii,85 for the review of civil code; the Filosofov,86 concerning contracts and deliveries; the Perets,87 concerning the rights of service in the guberniia; and the Kakhanov,88 concerning local administration).

With Count Tolstoi's assumption of direction of the Ministry of the Interior, the question about any new "method" for summoning representatives or experts for the discussion of government measures was, we might say, finally abolished. Similarly, rumors about the reorganization of the Council of State were silenced. Meanwhile there is no doubt that there existed, and still exists, the need to have such a composition of the Council of State as would permit thoroughly worked out laws with the participation of experts.

The Council of State does not contain a sufficient number of persons who are familiar with general state questions and who have access to local information. Of the 72 members of the Council of State, 10 members do not take part in its work, as is evident from the leaves of absence; about 10 members are not at the sessions because of old age; and 19 belong to the various ministries. Thus, of the 72, there remain only

83 Bunge refers here to the imperial decree addressed to him to draw up a report for a tentative plan for a vodka monopoly. This procedure was, of course, delayed and not implemented until the financial administration of Sergius Witte—TR.

84 Mikhail Nikolaevich Ostrovskii (1827–1901), minister of state domains under Alexander III from 1881 to 1893, associated primarily with Ignatiev, Katkov, and other conservatives around the emperor—TR.

85 Nikolai Ivanovich Stoianovskii (1820–1900), Russian legal figure associated with the Chief Censor's Office (1850); he occupied the post of deputy minister of justice in 1862. During his period of service there, he was charged with the task of rapidly liquidating the old legal institutions and with introducing certain aspects of the new ones established according to the law of Oct. 11, 1865—TR.

86 Alexei Illarianovich Filosofov (1799–1875), an adjutant general of the Russian army, and from 1852 onward a guardian of the Grand Dukes Nikolai and Mikhail Nikolaevich—TR.

87 Yegor Abramovich Perets (1833–1899), state secretary (1878–1883) and member of the Council of State—TR.

88 For a description of Kakhanov, see n. 67, above—TR.
The Ministry of Justice is one of the most important administrative institutions. Its activities are vital for the effective functioning of the state. The Ministry plays a crucial role in the legislative process, and its decisions are often the basis for the development of new laws and regulations.

Legislative works would have gained much in terms of greater precision in wording, because the work of the State Chancellery would not consist of the filling in of the whites or the embers of the drafts. A study of the premises of the law and a short note supplementary to it, the acceptance of those premises, with various alterations, in the Council of Ministers, and finally the permission of the sovereign emperor to work out a draft on the accepted premises or according to instructions given by official power—these provisions would eliminate those things which have proved unsatisfactory in legislative works and which are so fresh in the minds of everyone.

I make bold to make a statement on the district zemskii nachalniks [land captains—TR]. This project was worked out twice in the Ministry of the Interior. The first draft was changed from beginning to end as a result of instructions by the Minister of Justice. The second project therefore turned out not to correspond in detail with the views accepted in the departments. Finally, it was necessary to work out a third draft as a result of instructions in a resolution issued by the late sovereign. Whereas if a single, general basis approved by the supreme power were accepted in guidance from the outset, then even the Ministry of the Interior and the Council of State would have come to the goal declared by them by means of a single path.

Legislative works would have gained much in terms of their agreement with other, existing laws, and also in terms of greater precision in wording, because the work of the State Chancellery would not consist of the writing of a new draft as now, as well as in the verification and editorial finishing of the draft introduced into the Council of State.

I do not refer here to the improvements demanded in the higher judicial institutions, since I do not consider myself sufficiently competent. Therefore my discussion concludes with this consideration of the higher administrative institutions.

The Ministry

There can be no doubt that the Russian ministers are not what they are in England or in France, but apparently resemble those in Germany. Here ministers concern themselves not only with state and administrative matters, but also with a great amount of clerical work. Their decision is often demanded on matters which, without any inconvenience, could have been assigned to the directors of the various departments. Much could be gained from such a system in terms of management itself, because the ministers cannot now spare as much time as they ought to on legislative
questions and on paramount administrative matters. Examples of such excessive clerical responsibilities include the compilation of estimates, the utilization of income and the property entrusted to the ministries. If a separation of state business from chancelleries which are entrusted to secondarily responsible persons, people who do not interact directly with the ministers, did not exist in England and France, then self-government would have been impossible even there. Such a division of function here would represent a significant improvement. The minister of finance, one of the most greatly burdened of officials (but, of course, not the only one), is forced to concern himself with business from twelve to fourteen hours a day. Even then, he still does not have time to do everything with appropriate thoroughness.

The other complicated question is the division of the functions of departments among ministries. This question is far from having the importance that is ascribed to it. Nonetheless, management and the state could gain from its proper solution, particularly in those instances where control over the ministries belongs to the sovereign, as well as in the matter of their mutual relations with one another.

In a pure monarchy, it is important that the ministries not consider themselves units that are separate from one another. (I first heard this truth from N. A. Miliutin, who in jest called the altercation between our high administrative institutions “our constitution.”) Thus the minister of finance to a certain degree critically regarded all the other ministries’ expenditure of sums from the state treasury, to say nothing of those from the state comptroller—which constituted a direct obligation on the part of the minister.

Thus, too, the Ministry of State Properties guards the interests of agriculture and the branches of industry connected with it from financial measures which could cause damage to them. The situation becomes dangerous when a ministry becomes an exclusively categorical umpire over its own affairs. This danger could exist if, for example, the power of the minister of finance over railway tariffs were not sufficiently restrained, not only by the other ministries but especially by local institutions, the voices of which reach the government.

THE INTERNAL SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

The internal system of government, in cases of guberniia, uезд, urban, and rural institutions, represents much that is disordered and unsettled. Principally, the higher administration simply does not have clear, definite, and forceful ideas on this subject.

The Governors

A proper degree of agreement between the old institutions and the new did not exist in the peasant, judicial, and zemstvo reforms of Alexander II. As a matter of fact, if the old institutions did not hamper matters, if there was not an obvious incongruity between them and the new ones, then they remained in being. If new ones were needed, then they were either added to the existing ones or were left isolated by themselves.

The governors, vice-governors, and the guberniia government ceased being what they were before. But they did not do what, according to the spirit of the new reforms, it was necessary for them to do: They saw only that the rise of the new courts, the new excise administration, the striving of each ministry for the greatest independence and sovereignty from the other ministries in the sphere of those guberniia administrations that were subordinate to them, and especially the assignment of self-rule to the peasant and the appearance of zemstvo and urban statutes—that all of these detracted from their power. At least it seemed that way to them, because the position of their power was not clear. Also obvious was the evidence that with the establishment of the administration of excise, the income of the administration—that is, of the police, guberniia administration, and the governors themselves—ran short. The governors even became confused about what was justice, acting in the name of the sovereign and demanding the observance of a legality which denied their usual right of domestic reprisal. It seemed an anomaly to them that in villages where they had constant residence, where they commanded the economy of the local inhabitants, the merchants, shopkeepers, and landlords decided what streets to pave, where the lighting should be intensified, where to build a school, from whence to bring in water—all of this without seeking their permission. Finally it was intolerable to them that the zemstvo institution which existed in the guberniias under their jurisdiction drew up the estimates of income and expenditures, collected the taxes and made disbursements, while they, the governors, could stop these orders only in instances where the Senate found that their protests had legal grounds. In their opinion it was necessary in such situations to take into consideration not the law, but the situation as perceived by them, based on considerations which were not seen and not understood by the zemstvos and the towns.

All of these complaints and lamentations were not baseless: The position of the central power in the guberniia was not sufficiently defined, and a modus vivendi was established that was completely useless for the administration. With the reform of the zemstvo institutions in 1890, attention was directed to the erroneous structuring of gubernatorial power. But one must confess that the main question escaped the government’s attention—namely, how to give more power to the governorship. The government concentrated its attention on strengthening the governorship, which is
not the same thing. The strength of the administrative power lies not in its unlimited authority, its judgment, or arbitrariness; rather, it lies in the accuracy and the firmness of the right of control over all branches of the government administration and local management which is placed at the disposal of the governors.

In order to place the gubernatorial power on such a high level, it is necessary that it be related to all of the branches of government and local administration to a greater or lesser degree. It should not be only an organ of the minister of the interior, although, of course, its obligations toward the latter are important and essential. From this perspective it is necessary that the governors be chosen not only from among the candidates presented by the minister of the interior but from those presented by all of the ministers, in order that their dismissal at the demand of the minister of the interior or of any other minister thus go through the Committee of Ministers. Only then will the real strengthening, not of the power but of the significance of the governor, be realized. Whereas now, if he does not have the direct protection of the minister of the interior himself, then he must grovel in St. Petersburg, not only before the directors of the departments, and wait for them in their anterooms, but he must also feel dependent and subordinate before the chinovniki89 whom the minister of the interior sends to the guberniia. Of course, the minister of the interior will rebel against such a change in the appointment of governors. He says that he commands no one, but this is not correct. It is impossible to say that senatorial assignment and dismissal of arbitrators may have detracted from the power of the governors and the minister of the interior. Likewise, senatorial appointments and dismissals of members of the judiciary department may surely limit the arbitrary authority of the minister of justice. But such limitations serve justice itself, though they may be an inconvenience to the minister.

If the governor must be the real head of the guberniia—that is, must, to a greater or lesser degree, supervise the various branches of the administration and not only be considered a chinovnik of the minister of the interior, then it is necessary to establish corresponding institutions. Right now there are not even enough so-called offices in which the affairs of the various ministries are reviewed, decided, or controlled. It is only necessary to impart a final organization to these offices and to form councils [soviets—TR] from them consisting of representatives of all branches of the state administration: interior, war, finance, state properties, state control, zemstvo, and urban and rural societies. Such a council would be obliged to review matters which are concerned not with general state administration but with local matters: for example, the protection of personal safety and the safety of private property; the fulfillment of military obligations; the billeting of soldiers; measures concerning the collection of taxes and the extraction of income from state properties; the construction of schools; the verification and revision of the accounts and the balances of different departments, institutions (chiefly the urban and zemstvo institutions), and societies; the decisions of zemstvo councils and urban dumas; and, finally, the larger issues of rural administration, their estimates, and expenditures. By itself this council ought to replace a great number of the varied institutions and offices over which the governors preside even now. The council ought to give its opinion on matters which go to higher institutions, such as the ministries, the Senate, and others, as well as on matters which demand authorization by the gubernatorial power in certain instances. Similarly, there ought to be an examination by the council of the information concerning the guberniia which is contained in the official reports of the governor. Of course the councils ought to have the right to state their observations concerning the different branches of the administration which are not themselves subject to their counsel in an official report. But matters that are purely executive, administrative, and of a police nature ought, on the basis of law, to be withdrawn from the conduct of the councils, so that delay is not introduced into a process which demands rapid and decisive action.

After the model of these guberniia councils, it would follow to organize uezd offices so that they have a more limited number of areas of authority. The elements for such uezd offices exist in the following positions: the zemstvo police officer, tax inspector, postmaster, the uezd land captain, the justices of the peace in the towns, the chairman or members of the uezd council, and people from the division of education.

No complicated procedures or new institutions are suggested in the above-mentioned proposals. It is only suggested that we establish regular control, unify the different collegial institutions, and, in certain instances, change oral discussions to written dealings between different departments, dealings which absorb no small amount of work and which do not expedite the examination of current matters in the least.

Local Self-Government

Turning to the local institutions—zemstvo, urban, and rural—it is impossible not to advocate, first of all, a broadening of the sphere of their activity. In general, at present, the local institutions are totally different from what they were one hundred or even fifty years ago.

The local institutions, which in previous times strived and, in certain special instances, strive even now to play a definite political role, are turning more

---

89 Bureaucrats or functionaries—TR.
and more into institutions for the local economy. In addition, they are intended not only for the fulfillment of local social needs but also for the needs of the state, in part because certain state needs might be fulfilled sooner and better by decrees of the local authority. It is necessary to number educational institutions, sanitary measures, and others among the local social needs. Among the needs of state is responsibility for military billeting.

But there exist among us other views about local institutions. One group wants the local institutions to operate through the chinovniki, to form the government in this way, because various deficiencies would be eliminated, just as if chinovniki were sinless. Still others believe that it would be better if the local economy were returned entirely to the control of the treasury administration; they would summon elected representatives from the local populations to review the management of accounts. A third group thinks that the entire local economy should be given over to the uncontrolled direction of elected representatives from the local population. The first approach essentially consists of removing the population from the direct participation in the discharge of its debt, and gives rise to utter indifference toward local interests and increases the responsibility of the state for all the errors of its agents. The second places the administration face to face with the elected representatives and entrusts to them the easy role of critic, making the fiscal administration subject to the discussion of elected representatives who are unfamiliar with such matters, a situation which turns out to be not only fruitless, but productive of harmful antagonisms between both sides. The third sacrifices both local and governmental interests to chance; at the same time, the government ceases being the government and remains a confused spectator where such a situation occurs, nevertheless bearing responsibility for it.

There is a middle way in all this. The government should retain a broad right of control and privilege concerning the responsibility of the elected representatives upon whom accountability for the local economy is laid, but it should not seek an increase in its responsibility. Rather, it should seek a broadening of its right to bring these representatives into positions of liability for the management of the local economy. In this regard, the local administration should be granted some autonomy, given the circumstances, but not the right and the opportunity, to overstep the boundaries delimited by the law or the determination of whether or not the matter introduced to it agrees with the general interests of the state. Thus, in Prussia, the public school is not only maintained at the expense of the local economy, as with us, but even its conduct belongs to the local institutions, which, in their turn, cannot use them (the schools) as a tool for the conduct of antisocial, antireligious, and antigovernment ideas.

Two main obligations are charged to the locally elected institutions: the compilation and the execution of estimates, and the accountability appropriate to this function.

On this basis the crown government is obliged

1. To see that the estimates are compiled in proper time, according to established directions and forms, so that all obligatory expenditures are included in proper measure, so that nonobligatory expenditures do not exhaust the financial means of the locales and are for useful aims, and so that the apportionment of collections and the payment of taxes are just and correct.

2. To have control of the implementation of estimates, that is, of the effective and advisable application of sums and of the presentation of timely accounts.

It goes without saying that supervision, surveillance, and control should not exclude independent action and should not turn into a simple reminder which has no other consequence than to indicate the weakness of the controlling power. It is here that the incompleteness and inadequacy of legislation is usually revealed.

When the zemstvo and urban (to a lesser degree this may now be said of rural) institutions make a wrong or even illegal decision, when they dissipate the property of the local population, and when they do not offer accounts or verify the actions of their various organs, then the central administration uses a single negative measure: It does not approve illegal decisions or remand them (only the elders, village elders, and clerks in volosts and villages take turns at administrative power). It is obvious that in such cases more effective measures are necessary. It is necessary to foresee the exercise of administrative power by people who are guilty of abusing the management of the local economic institutions and of misusing their responsibility. Because of this, it is necessary that, at the request of a certain number of elected persons, reports be sent concerning the management of sums and expenditures made by the local institutions for verification by people from the central government. The idea that the zemstvo or urban dumas themselves or the rural and volost societies should be given responsibility is a completely just one. But it should not preclude the participation of the crown government in those instances when the elected representatives from the zemstvos, cities, volosts, and villages do not live up to their responsibilities.

The problem for the common government, then, consists chiefly in the fact that to persecute dishonesty, it has to take the majority of people in the elected institutions under its protection. But if by this it has to enter into a struggle with this majority, a majority which patronizes abuses by its agents, then how is it to act in such a situation? Making just one agent re-
sponsible obviously does not meet the goal. In these instances there are two ways out: Either increase the discretionary power of the administration of the guberniia, and, in case of need, the power of the central administration to choose the elected institutions and to designate them as quasi-zemstvo or urban administrations; or establish a provisional, that is, an elected, administration.

Instead of taking administrative measures to close the zemstvo assembly and to transfer zemstvo affairs to the administration of the treasury, it would appear advisable to let the minister of the interior, in agreement with the Committee of Ministers, introduce a provisional administration entrusted to those persons mentioned earlier. These would be people who by law comply with the property and educational qualifications and the qualification of residence for a term of one to two years, until new elections can be held according to established procedure. Thus, people who have property in guberniias, uezds, or towns, and who, if they do not reside there permanently, at least dwell there for a certain part of the year, might be given the right of the entry into such provisional management of matters, as might people who satisfy the educational qualifications of having attended higher or middle educational institutions and who have served in the localities for a certain number of years. Further, several people from the crown government who belong to the administrative branch or to the courts and to the institutions of state revenues and properties might be included in the composition of such a provisional administration.

In response to my proposal it might be argued, of course, why not arrange the local institutions with such an elected administration at once, if it represents a greater opportunity for correct action? Concerning this, it is necessary to note that the participation in local administration of those who are established in the local population is again necessary to a certain degree. Only when this active element has betrayed its responsibilities it is necessary to take measures for quieting their actions.

The Land Captains

The question of the creation of the institution of the zemskii nachalnik [land captain] was raised by the late Count D. A. Tolstoi, who was responsible for it in the first place. Count Tolstoi suggested placing responsibility for the supervision of peasant self-government, the investigation of judicial matters, and, finally, various obligations concerning policy and administration on the zemskii nachalnik. In this way Count Tolstoi hoped to create a “strong force” in the provinces and, at the same time, strengthen the power of the governor, to whom the district zemskii nachalniks are subordinate. At the same time, having given the position of district zemskii nachalnik to members of the dvorianstvo, Count Tolstoi wanted to underscore the importance of the dvorianstvo and to give it power over the provinces and material benefits in terms of salaries.

Count Tolstoi’s plan, basically correct, erred in many details. Control over peasant self-government was necessary, but it was necessary to ascertain mainly what should be subject to control, that is, to define an order of legal relations in the villages for the rural administration.

The proximity of the judicial and administrative power to the people who were needed in the courts or who should be concerned with the direction of the administration was vitally necessary, but the composers of the draft project who were brought in by Count Tolstoi and about whom he did not have intimate knowledge did not bother to determine the relationship of the districts of the zemskii nachalniks either to the justices of the peace or to the local police. Finally, along with the transformation of the jurisdictions of the zemskii nachalniks into dvorianstvo institutions, an exceptional matter was managed. Applied to the dvorianstvo, it did not make sense. Who, indeed, can sort out matters among local dvorianstvo if not the dvorianstvo itself? But Count Tolstoi, demanding that the matters between peasants without fail be sorted out by the hereditary dvorianstvo, permitted the working out of matters between the dvorianstvo in neighboring courts by judges who might not be from the dvorianstvo.

Fortunately, as a result of decrees by the Emperor Alexander III, the duality of the courts was partly removed by abolishing justices of the peace outside the cities. Then, with the working out of a draft project under Count Tolstoi’s successor,90 the most detailed project that remained was coordinating the decrees remaining in force concerning the police and the courts. Nevertheless, oversights and flaws remain.

The creation of the district zemskii nachalniks unquestionably answered the needs which then existed, and the actions of these people in general dispelled much of the prejudice against them. The joining of administrative and judicial power in one person, decreed by the late emperor to the Council of State, turned out in practice to be a fortunate idea. The only regrettable aspect was the fact that the district zemskii nachalniks were turned exclusively into chinovniks of the Ministry of the Interior; thus the most significant parts of judicial matters were withdrawn from the authority of the Ministry of Justice. There are many

90 Count Tolstoi’s successor as minister of the interior was Ivan Nikolaevich Durnovo (1830–1903). Durnovo started his career as a deputy minister of internal affairs (1882–1885). He was subsequently director of properties of His Royal Highness’ Chancellery Concerning the Institutions of the Empress Maria (1886–1889) and minister of the interior (1889–1895) — TR.
people and institutions which are within the jurisdiction not of a single main administrative department, but under the jurisdiction of several. The district zemskii nachalniks could thus be subject to the authority of both the minister of justice and the minister of the interior. Then too, the district vezd nachalniks did not satisfy the general local demands in terms of the power which they had over all the estates. In this respect, Count Tolstoi’s idea (one which has been made into a regulation since his suggestion) that the local dvorianstvo should not be subordinated to the local administration, an administration composed of that very same dvorianstvo, is not only strange, but is also a great error. It deprives the dvorianin of a means of defense against the dvorianin which was given to the dvorianin against the peasants. By this mistake the responsibility of the district zemskii nachalnik was converted into a dvorianstvo privilege. This contradicts all of the former examples of our history. Menshikov, Bezborodko, Razumovskii, Speranski, 

91 Aleksander Menshikov (1673–1729) was the son of a stableboy, and, according to tradition, started life as a street peddler. Illiterate, unscrupulous, and ambitious, Menshikov became a close friend and companion of Peter the Great. As such, he was created a Prince of the Holy Empire in 1706, held high offices in the civilian administration and in the army and navy, and accumulated a large fortune. Following Peter’s death, he exercised great influence over Catherine I (r. 1725–1727) as one of the members of the Supreme Privy Council. He reached the pinnacle of his power and influence during the reign of Peter II (r. 1727–1730) when he affianced his daughter Maria to the boy emperor, who was then only eleven years old. Personal illness and a court cabal eventually brought about his downfall and exile in 1727—TR.

92 Aleksander Andreieievich Bezborodko (1747–1799) attended the Kiev academy and began state service in 1765, when he was appointed to the chancellery of the governor-general of the Ukraine, Count Rumiantsev-Zadunaiskii. In 1767 he was appointed a member of the Ukrainian general court, and two years later, when the war with Turkey began, he left state service to participate in the war. When Rumiantsev was named commander-in-chief of the Russian troops in the war against the Turks, Bezborodko transferred to his army, where, in the following years, he distinguished himself militarily, in the process receiving many of Russia’s highest military decorations and being rewarded with land and serfs. In addition, he took part in many of Russia’s diplomatic negotiations and conferences of the time—TR.

93 Andrei Kirilovich Razumovskii (1752–1836), a nephew of A. G. Razumovskii, the consort of the Empress Elizabeth Petrovna (r. 1741–1762). A diplomat and, after 1815, a prince of the empire, Razumovskii served in the Russian navy from 1769 to 1775. From 1777 he was in the diplomatic service, serving as ambassador to the court of Naples from 1777 to 1784, as ambassador to Sweden from 1786 to 1788, and as ambassador to Austria from 1790 to 1799 and again from 1801 to 1807. Primarily responsible for Austrian adherence to the coalition against France, he was in Alexander I’s suite as a counselor on foreign affairs from 1813 to 1814. In this same capacity he was one of the leaders of the Russian delegation to the Congress of Vienna in 1814–1815—TR.

94 Mikhail Mikhailovich Speranski (1772–1839), Russian state figure and close advisor to Emperor Alexander I (r. 1801–1825). In 1809, at Alexander’s request, he composed a plan for the reorganization of the government which would have involved the introduction of constitutional forms in Russia. His career was eclipsed following the Napoleonic invasion of 1812, and the reforms were never enacted. In 1826 he was made in Count Tolstoi’s opinion, would not have the honor to be district zemskii nachalniks. Experience soon showed that in certain vezd not even a sufficient number of dvorianstvo could be found, and in others it was necessary to forbid the election of the “semieducated,” who did not satisfy even the very most requisite requirement of education. Finally, in Viatsk guberniia it was necessary to select the district zemskii nachalniks not from among the local landowners, but to gather them from all of Russia. It would have been quite sufficient to reserve the right of occupying the position of district nachalnik for local landowners or even home owners, after having surrounded their elections with appropriate guarantees.

Village Organization

In many minds, everything was accomplished by the creation of the district zemskii nachalnik. Sufficient power was established in the provinces for the supervision of the villages and the preservation of order within them. But included in this is also our error. A new element is beginning to arise in the villages: artisans, merchants, and private landowners. And the existence of communal ownership by isolated peasants, which itself constitutes the important question of our time, will soon disappear, and there will be a rapid growth of misery as a consequence of the disorder of the land under communal ownership. The heterogeneity of the agricultural population urgently demands a new organization of the villages and volosts. Not touching upon the question of the all-class volost, a question still not yet matured, we must give the volosts and villages that kind of organization under which the already existing multiclass nature of its membership would bear the same duties as the general local administration would have, and so on. This subject is a very difficult one, and we should have compiled preliminary information on the composition of our rural population. It is necessary to undertake this task with the first popular census. When the multiclass nature of the villages, settlements, and others is determined, then a type of settlement might even be established for which it might be necessary to devise one or another kind of local organization.

There are villages where the new industrial elements are only beginning to arise, where kustar industries were a member of the Imperial Criminal Commission at the trial of the Decembrists. During the years from 1826 to 1839 he participated in the work of the Secret Committee for the Peasant Question and served as head of the second section of the emperor’s private chancellery, which concerned itself with the codification of the law. Under his leadership the first Complete Collection of the Laws of the Russian Empire [Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiskoi impieri] (1830) in 45 volumes and the Code of Laws of the Russian Empire [Svod zakonov Rossiskoi impieri] (1832–1839) in 15 volumes were prepared and published—TR.

Kustar industries, or, usually kustarnye promyshlens ("cottage industries"), were an important branch of Russian economic life. They were developed especially in the central provinces where the poor
are developing, where artisans are appearing, as well as merchants and people of the free professions—teachers, artists, and others. The urban population is on a level with the rural population. Sometimes that same urban population becomes the predominant one, and agriculture is moved aside to a secondary position. Meanwhile our legislation does not contain exact principles for such settlements of small towns, and so forth.

In law there is no statement concerning instances in which the village is obliged to change into a mestechka or a settlement. The necessary petition of the local population (which often desires to avoid the taxes and expenses connected with the upkeep of a town police) keeps villages which have turned into towns in an unsettled state for many years, lacking a fire brigade, paving, and illumination of the streets and other things.

Our legislation is still unfamiliar with the idea that with the development of public life an agricultural society stops being exclusively an agricultural one; that from its midst and from outside, industrialists, artisans, and merchants begin to enter, and that this heterogeneous population to a certain degree insures the development and welfare of these localities. To consider these new conditions in a village from its rural and agricultural composition exclusively would be to preserve its former organization and administration. We must consider a village with a mixed population an urban settlement, independent of the village's petitions, as soon as it fulfills certain fixed criteria. But there is little such consideration now in villages with a mixed population which do not come under fixed criteria according to which they would be subject to treatment as towns. It is necessary that the agricultural element not stand by itself and, as a result of this, have special privileges. Now the artisans and industrialists in the village have special rights; they come under the protection of imperial laws, and their property is protected by volume ten of the Code of Laws. Nonetheless the usual law hangs over the peasant agriculturalists, a law which is often enforced by arbitrary countrymen.

The other large problem is the matter of regulating the village order, for the organization of the rural economic administration is far from having been satisfactorily settled even in Western Europe. It is even more unsatisfactory here than in Germany, France, and England, but here in many locales its organization is convenient for us; this is true in the large villages, whereas in the West, the villages are scattered over great distances, taking in separate households and farms.

The main basis for regulating the administration of the agricultural economy is the drawing up of estimates of income and expenditures, the apportionment of taxes, and the payment of expenses. In France these estimates are compiled and approved by the prefect, but we have nothing similar. Our agricultural economy reacts according to need, or expenditures are simply prescribed, and the village Gathering does the apportionment. It is apparent that there is no rhyme or reason in the entire peasant economy from the vo- losts to the rural communities and the mirs. Further, nothing is preplanned, and nothing is seen in terms

---


99 The village gathering, or sel'skii skhod (sometimes also referred to as sel'skoe obschestvo, or village assembly), was the representative and governing organ of the agrarian commune (see n. 107). As the self-governing organization of the peasantry, it was recognized and regulated by imperial legislation. In the regulations (uchrezhdenie) for the administration of the state domains, compiled under the direction of Minister of State Domains Count F. D. Kiselev and issued on Apr. 30, 1838, the more important responsibilities of the village assembly were: the election of village officers; the release of members of the community and the acceptance of new ones; the allotment and the redistribution of arable land among the peasants; the regulation of the use of the communal woodland and hayfields; the apportionment of "soul" tax obligations; the collection of state and local taxes; the fulfillment of the military conscriptions quota; and, in general, the meeting of the economic and legal needs of the community. Those powers of the sel'skoe obschestvo among the state peasants were largely carried over into the polozhenie of Feb. 19, 1861. By its terms the liberated serfs were to form in each village a sel'skoe obschestvo. Its organ, the sel'skii skhod, according to article 51, was granted the powers: 1) to elect local village authorities and delegates to the township assembly; 2) to sentence to banishment (by two-thirds vote) from the community any undesirable members; 3) to release members from the community and to accept new members; 4) to appoint guardians for minors; 5) to permit the division of household property within large families; 6, 7) to apportion the arable land and common land of the village among households; 8, 9) to present complaints and appeals concerning communal affairs and to petition the authorities concerning communal needs; 10) to establish taxation to cover communal expenses; 11) to apportion state taxes and other obligations; 12) to establish the remuneration of village officials and to check their accounts; 13) to select the required number of recruits for military service; 14) to apportion the obrok and barshchina owed to the landlord in the case of temporally obligated peasants; 15) to prevent or to recover arrears on various obligations; 16) to make loans and grants; and 17) to grant power of attorney on behalf of the community. In 1889 the peasant mir was put under the control of the zemskii nachalnik. See Sergei Pushkarev, George Vernadsky, and Ralph T. Fisher, Jr., eds., Dictionary of Russian Historical Terms from the Eleventh Century to 1917 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), p. 71, and Y. Taniuchi, The Village Gathering in Russia in the Mid-1920's, University of Birmingham Centre for Russian and East European Studies, Soviet and East Europe Monographs no. 1 (1968), p. 4—TR.
of a whole, and expenditures and income do not correspond for the entire year. It is easy to guess how much arbitrariness and illegality there is in this situation, how little rumor contributes to the calculations of the starosta\textsuperscript{100} and starshin\textsuperscript{101} in determining these matters. The establishment of district zemskii nachalniks was to introduce some supervision of the agricultural administration by the foremen and village elders, but this supervision is still insufficient for a correct ordering of the economy. It is necessary to establish a definite form and order for the compilation of the mir and volost budgets and to allow for much wider participation in the matter of tax inspection, which should entirely oversee the taxation of the local population (both state taxes and agricultural taxes) and, finally, oversee volost and mir taxes. The economy of the state consists not only of its finances but also of the whole of its social economy, which itself has a compulsory character, setting forth means which should be obligatorily applied to the population. But the expenditures have as their aim the satisfaction of the needs not of one or another person, but of the sum of the entire population.

IV. [THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SPIRITUAL AND MATERIAL STRENGTH OF THE PEOPLE]

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SPIRITUAL AND MATERIAL STRENGTH OF THE PEOPLE ALWAYS CONSTITUTED THE BASIS OF THE SPECIAL SOLICITUDE OF OUR SOVEREIGN. NEVERTHELESS WE NOT ONLY FELL BEHIND THE WEST, BUT ARE CURRENTLY FALLING BEHIND TO A GREATER AND GREATER EXTENT.

The trend which was prevalent in the reign of Nicholas I, as noted above, if indeed it did not exclude private initiative in public affairs, then it excessively limited it in the areas of spiritual and material life. The administrative and governmental institutions should not only have been filled up but even replaced by private activity. The disappointment which everyone felt at the time of the Crimean War led to a new internal policy in the reign of the Emperor Alexander II, who expected everything from private initiative. But we were not sufficiently prepared for this initiative, and it manifested itself sometimes in such regrettable forms that right-thinking people once again began to howl about supervision and control by the state and even about replacing private activity by state activity. We are continuing to be successful in this direction of state activity, but now it is desired that the state be engaged in the trade in bread on a vast scale and in its distribution to a population of hundreds of millions. It seems impossible to go any further unless we permit the government to plow next, to sow, and to harvest—and then to publish all newspapers and journals, write stories and novels, and work in the field of art and science, as Bellamy predicts.\textsuperscript{102}

EDUCATION AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ARE NECESSARY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SPIRITUAL STRENGTH OF THE PEOPLE. The budget for public education was significantly increased during the reign of the Emperor Alexander III. This situation firmly began the spreading of parochial schools, the transfer of technical institutions from the Ministry of Finance to the Ministry of Public Enlightenment, and the publication of new university regulations. The government, as before, did not completely remove the zemstvos and towns from participation in public education but limited this participation to the payment of money and regarded public interference in school matters with distrust.

The reform of the classical system, namely the decrease in the number of lessons in ancient languages, the increase in the reading of authors at the expense of grammar, and the abolition of translations from Russian to the ancient languages, apparently remained only on paper. Following the declaration by the Council of State, the pedagogues declared that it was impossible to weaken the study of the grammar of the ancient languages and that it was possible to achieve only one result—the formal abolition of the teaching of natural science in the gymnasiu.

It is thus that the schools which are almost exclu-

100 Starosta, in imperial Russia, was a term broadly used, especially in the peasant world. According to the statutes on the administration of the state peasantry of Apr. 30, 1938, a starshin stood at the head of the village administration, and selskie starosty were his assistants. According to the polozhenie of Feb. 19, 1861, a selskii starosta, elected by the mir, headed the village administration, while the starshin was head of the volost. Elected starosty also headed voluntary workers' associations (zemliachestva) of students in the universities—TR.

101 Starshin referred to an elder, an administrator elected by local communities. Starshin was the term for the village chief on the state lands in the eighteenth century and according to the statutes on the administration of the state peasantry issued Apr. 30, 1838. According to the polozhenie of Feb. 19, 1861, the elected village chief was called the selskii starosta, while the chief of the volost administration was called the volostnoi starshina—TR.

102 Edward Bellamy (1850–1898), American novelist and reformer. Bellamy came from a long line of New England ministers, and although he espoused no particular creed, his essentially religious nature turned him into an impassioned social reformer. Fane came with the publication of Looking Backward: 2000–1887 (1888). This "Utopia of collectivism," advocating state capitalism as a step to state socialism through nonviolent means, was immensely popular and influential. Although familiar with the work of Karl Marx, taking over what he liked about it, Bellamy advocated quite different techniques for achieving a new world—TR.
sively in the hands of the government are sound (there are not many private educational institutions, for even the schools constructed by rural societies, towns, and zemstvos have a governmental character), but it should be recognized that the status of public education is extremely unsatisfactory.

It does not answer important common needs; it is not universal or widely accessible on a primary level for children of both sexes. It did not have the expected influence on the spread of the Russian language to the masses of the alien population. Moreover, it should be recognized that it suffers from a radical shortcoming. The parochial schools have a denominational character; the heterodox, the schismatics, and the foreigners cannot be counted upon to deliver a common education. Such education is not conceivable either in the villages, where there are very few Orthodox Russian parishioners or where the public schools are so necessary to provide for the settlement of the Russian people. For that reason the primary public schools are completely isolated and, on the one hand, do not constitute a step in the transition to intermediate educational institutions, and, on the other, do not give that kind of complete education which every school should give. This might also be said about the urban schools. The intermediate educational institutions of the general educational kind were turned into specialized ones and teach this specialty to the lower classes; whereas the real schools give a finished education, although it is insufficiently complete and satisfactory; and the classical gymnasiums provide an education which is suitable only for matriculating to a higher educational institution, which is far from everything and is totally useless from the point of view of a finished education.

What can be expected from a pupil of a classical gymnasium if he does not go to the university? With a weak knowledge of one's own language (regrettably, this is almost the general rule), with a lack of knowledge of modern languages (these languages are French, German, English, and are known only by those pupils who learned them at home), with a superficial knowledge of history and geography, and with a total unfamiliarity with the natural sciences, and leaving the gymnasium with insufficient preparation for any kind of activity, even if only for a year, there should be time for these pupils to begin to work in everyday walks of life.

Even a university education on the German model (with various distortions) has turned into a parody of that model.

By now even serious people do not admire the administrative and educational order in the foreign universities and educational institutions which correspond to them. The universities, as privileged corporations, have outlived their century, and the old freedom of teaching and attendance should be replaced by a strict, systematic study of science. We were unconscious of any of this.

We confused the university collegial administration and the selection of professors with the universities themselves. While these procedures, of course, had important inconveniences, we replaced the collegial, controlled administration by a bureaucratic one, and the selection of professors was entrusted not to specialists, but to bureaucrats who were influenced by intrigues and favor-seekers. The favorable disposition of the head of a department and personal recommendations have more weight than scholarly work. The decline of science in the universities in the course of five to seven years has been striking. The new arrangement has not advanced a single great scientific strength, to date.

We were troubled, too, by the incomplete and fragmentary nature of university teaching. Actually, professors did not teach science but scraps of that subject, which sometimes even had only a distant relation to that department. In confirmation of this, the professors' examinations lost their complete and serious character, although this happened rarely.

Instead of insisting upon more strict control over the professors and the programs for lectures, and upon the obligatory production by professors of examinations for such a program, the new regulation did abolish all programs for lectures. It also attempted to prohibit the teachers from giving examinations on what was read, and then attempted to introduce one final examination after a four-year stay in the university, overseen by a commission which would be composed of people named at the discretion of the head.

However, recognizing that it is necessary that the student be occupied in some way in the course of four years, the government limited the sphere of free hearing of lectures by a semester examination and the obligation of practical pursuits, which proved to be impossible in the suggested form, since a professor practically cannot be occupied with several hundred students. Finally, despite the regulations, the old translation examinations were turned to in course after course. Pour sauver les apparences, a final examination in special committees remained for certain subjects at the end of four years and was carried out according to ministerial programs. As guides for the answers there were neither textbooks nor lithographed professorial notes, against which a bitter war was conducted. These guides were but answers to questions concerning the ministerial programs which were composed, not by professors but by others. It can be said positively that the standard of the sciences would never have fallen as they have now if one had taken into consideration the demands of lectures and examinations.

What is there then to do?
So that the schools give us a finished education at
their various levels, that is, an education which would prepare a fellow for a future walk of life, all educational institutions should be subdivided into five categories: 1) public schools; 2) lower schools; 3) middle educational institutions (gymnasia and special educational institutions); 4) lycæa; and 5) universities and special higher educational institutions, with advanced courses for independent scientific studies.

The Public Schools

Public schools which are limited to church law, reading, letters, and arithmetic should be, as far as possible, connected with the pursuits of manual labor (artisans, gardeners, truck farmers), which again should be diversified according to locally established schools in the towns and villages. From such schools, simple workers, both urban and rural, can learn easy, definite skills for artisanship or for agricultural work in which they can subsequently improve. The schools could be institutions for the training of children of both sexes. With the proper kind of organization, they could acquire an educational character. In the public schools the age of those who participate should not be fixed with strict precision. All who desire to learn should be admitted to them. In the event of need, a special division for adults should even be instituted.

The Lower Schools

The public schools serve children who, having learned prayers, grammar, and arithmetic, pass on to the lower schools. It would follow that the latter should be established at least in the ratio of one to ten, and, at the slightest opportunity, in a few uezds. They should serve as a stage for movement to the middle educational institutions, both the general and the special ones, and should give a complete education for children who have reached thirteen to fourteen years of age and who apply themselves to practical activity, either because of an aptitude for learning or because they lack the material means to otherwise receive it. The least able of these students could join the ranks of simple workers, while the more able could prove to be suitable for occupations of lower responsibility: shop assistants, minor managers, and so on. The most able have open to them the possibility of being admitted to the middle educational institutions, both the general ones and the special ones.

The lower schools are divided into four classes corresponding to stated tasks (except religious law) and should improve the skills of reading and letters, the mother tongue and reading and writing Russian (calligraphy). Further, they should teach some drawing, reading, and letters in a new language (French and German), impart some concept of the grammatical forms of the Latin language, a thorough knowledge of geography, a general sketch of universal and Russian history, and a knowledge of arithmetic and geometry. There will be no multiple subjects with the proper teaching plan and leadership (in particular with history). It goes without saying that manual labor should not be banished from the lower schools, but by necessity it should be limited quite a bit. Such lower schools, separated from the gymnasia, could educate a large number of children, not tearing them from their families and not drawing them exclusively to the large cities where the middle educational institutions are located.

The Middle Educational Institutions

The middle educational institution, beginning with the sixth class of the gymnasium, should embrace as its circle of subjects those which concern themselves either with a general or with special education. Thus it is necessary to give the latter even lower classes, thereby admitting the principle that access to the middle classes of the specialized schools should be opened to students from the lower educational institutions. The adherents of classical education, and perhaps even their opponents, object to this plan—especially the former. But we should not lose sight of the fact that the claim is raised for the school not by a single pedagogue, but by the government.

In one article on hygiene (Novoe vremya), it was stated that school hygiene should be sacrificed to pedagogy. With great truth it might be said that pedagogy should be sacrificed to the demands of the state. What does the state need from the middle schools? In terms of a general education, young people with a literary education, people having learned in a well-grounded fashion the geography and history of their homeland, young people to whom the peace of contemporary Western civilization is accessible by means of learning of new languages; young people to whom natural science is not alien and who are prepared for special higher education in the medical, juridical, philological areas, and so on, in universities and who are prepared for different aspects of a technical education in special higher educational institutions.

The limitations of the general course of the fourth class would have been simplified significantly by this organization of educational institutions and would have brought to an end the artificial matriculation to the higher educational institutions.

The Lycea

The fourth stage in the system of educational institutions would consist of middle educational insti-

---

103 Novoe vremya [New times] was a leading right-wing daily (1868–1917) edited by A. A. Suworin from 1876 onward and read widely in imperial and court circles—TR.
tutions for a general education, with two additional classes of lycea which would have the aim of giving greater completeness to middle education. The order of training in all such institutions should be the following: school lessons, recitations, and examinations for passage from class to class.

The Higher Educational Institutions

Turning to higher education, it would finally be able to shake off the university routine which has scarcely been explored by the regulations of 1885. It would follow to divide the university curricula into educational and training institutions. In the former it would be necessary to preserve the basic order accepted for the middle educational institutions, that is, the compulsory attendance at lectures, recitations, examinations, and so on. The existing distinction in the educational system of the universities should consist in programs of teaching and tests, each composed by teachers and approved by the powers created for this purpose, and a three-year course, which apparently is completely sufficient for the study of these subjects. This three-year course might be introduced for all faculties, including even medicine.

After three years and a successful passing of tests, there should follow, for those who desire to continue, a course of education in independent laboratory work as well as independent study, work in archival collections, research in the sources, historical materials, and so forth. This course of study should be free from restriction, but should require an examination as evidence of its completion. This evidence would give the individual the right to teach, with the fulfillment of certain conditions.

It would also be necessary to establish a special learned collegium in the universities and even in the middle educational institutions. Whether it will exist under the direction of a ministry or under the direction of the institution itself, the selection of teachers is now far from satisfactory.

Finally, entrance from the gymnasium and the practical schools into the universities and the special educational institutions would depend not only on a certificate showing completion of a course of study, but also on additional tests on those subjects the knowledge of which is necessary for specialized courses. In general, it is desirable that the practical schools not close off access to the university; rather, the gymnasiums should close off entrance to the higher special and technical institutions.

The Development of the Material Strength of the People

The public well-being was the subject of the special solicitude of the government during the reign of the Emperor Alexander III, precisely as it was under his predecessors. The measures relating to the attainment of this goal are divided into two categories: 1) those relating strictly to the public economy, and 2) those which are strictly financial. Both the former and the latter existed either in law, by which the new is settled or former relations are reformed, or under the private direction of the government, which is very important at a given moment but which does not bring anything new into public or state life. Concerning the latter, there are a great number of private decrees for assistance for one or another enterprise—the collection of arrears, relief of the hungry, relief for those who have lost all their possessions in a fire, and so on. In the reign of the late sovereign, the government did not deviate from the traditions of past reigns in these instances.

There are incomparably important laws which should promote the public welfare and the improvement of the financial system. From the decisions relating to the area of the public economy, it is necessary to note: 1) the creation of the Peasant Bank, and 2) laws concerning the factory workers. Among those laws which aim to improve the financial system, the following deserve attention: 1) the dropping of redemption payments and the abolition of the poll tax,

---

104 "Regulations of 1885," Bunge's error for the university regulations of 1884. These constituted a revival of the regulations recommended by the Delianov Commission in 1880. Generally, these included a number of items: the awarding of fewer, but more lucrative, stipends and the establishment of an effective system of avoiding undesirable influences and discouraging unruly conduct. Further, they included such features as curator interference in council proceedings and state appointment of rectors. The university was to be placed directly under the control of the ministry and its agents: the inspector, rector, and curator. The inspector was to acquire jurisdiction over student activity within and outside the university. A ministerial appointee subordinate to the curator and rector, he owed no responsibility to the university's governing bodies. Moreover, the rector now became the minister's appointed deputy instead of the professors' elected representative, his responsibilities extending beyond personnel and curriculum matters to include the disbursement of funds, the determination of the size of entering classes, and the enforcement of rules for students and visitors. The curator took over the faculty's right to nominate deans, personally supervised the fulfillment of all of the ministry's decrees, and issued his own restrictions on student behavior. Some matters, like the selection of faculty, the organization of student life, and the institution of teaching programs, were decided by the ministry itself. See Allen Sinel, The Classroom and the Chancellery. State Educational Reform in Russia Under Count Dimitry Tolstoy (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), pp. 124-125—TR.

105 The Peasant Land Bank was created in 1883 in order to provide loans at low rates to facilitate the peasants' purchase of land—TR.

106 Bunge refers here to the series of "labor codes" introduced between 1882 and 1886 for which he was largely responsible. See the introduction—TR.
and 2) the extension of taxes to income which hitherto was not subject to taxation.

Measures Which Relate to the Area of the Public Economy

The Peasant Bank

The foundation of the Peasant Bank chiefly had two aims: first, to counter in a practical manner the conviction of the peasants that they have the right to allotments, and to convince them that every expansion of their landownership could only be the result of free transactions with the landowners concerning the purchasing of land; second, to promote the spreading of private agricultural property among the peasants.

Regrettably, this latter goal remains far from being attained. And it could not be attained, because we do not have organized at present the right kind of order (that is, the right of land acquisition, the measuring of land, the compilation of plans and documents on property rights, mortgage books, and so on). Without facilitating a system for all of this, private agricultural property is not conceivable. This latter circumstance is so essential that in the western and southwestern areas of Russia, where the obshchina does not predominate and where by law district ownership is recognized, personal property may not be established. The single exception is Tsarist Poland. There, thanks to the method of consolidating land, we see that the peasantry, freed from service obligations to the pomeshchiks, have attained a significant level of prosperity. There the peasant does not need the stores for foodstuffs, there he pays the taxes which are levied upon him without arrears, and there even peasant credit is better organized, with less nonsense about the kulaks.

No royal reform is necessary for the regulation of peasant land ownership. We need only to facilitate conditions for the formation of private property. For this it is necessary first to finally complete the law on mortgages (laws which guarantee mortgages on property); this is in the interests of all classes. Second, it is necessary to determine minimal plots into which the peasant’s allotment land may be broken up, and to provide for the replacement of obshchina authority by private authority. Third, it is necessary to establish an order for composing and issuing documents, plans, and land acts for private peasant ownership. Fourth, it is necessary to protect small land ownership against sale for debt in a fashion similar to the way in which it was done in some states of North America. And fifth, it is necessary to open sections of the Peasant Land Bank and, in connection with them, local peasant loan offices for short-term credit in the uezds. The means for such a fund could come partly from sums of the reserve capital of the Peasant Bank and partly from supplemental funds which were received for distribution. In this way there would be competition to usury by the kulak class and to Jewish exploitation in the villages.

It goes without saying that these measures, which are concerned only with existing peasant land ownership, are insufficient. Here in Russia, the state possesses a huge area of land in Siberia and Central Asia. The surveying of a certain part of these lands and its division into allotments for the peasants, both as a desirable goal for settlement and for villages attached to obshchina land ownership and as a separate peasant household, constitutes a persistent need.

It is impossible to be indifferent to the emigration movement. We must see that the emigrants rely upon their own strength, that they do not receive money from the government, but have firm certainty upon their arrival at certain places that they will not be driven away or moved and that they might acquire land, not for nothing but for some kind of payment, even if spread over many years. We must see that those who settled in the various localities that are still unsurveyed can remain there, in return for a certain payment, and assure them that after the expiration of a certain number of years they will receive the final documents of ownership of the land. For this kind of settlement, it would be necessary to enact laws which prevent the seizure of the great mass of land and its concentration in one person’s hands and the sale of small plots of land for debt.

Finally, it is necessary to consider the promulgation of rural regulations concerning the organization of an administration for the rural population similar to the one introduced not long ago in the Baltic gubernias. The implementation of these measures would have put off our land question for a long time, a question which we created exclusively by ourselves and one which blocks the path toward the improvement of agriculture, the growth of the welfare of the agricultural population by means of spreading private ownership, and a legal settlement of landowners on immense spaces of currently unoccupied land. If what is bestowed on the settlers is insufficient, then this is because the nomads are considered inviolably to be pastoral peoples.
Factory Legislation

If those prospective measures for the improvement of the condition of the agricultural classes are clearly unsatisfactory with respect to their present situation and the means by which the government intends to deal with them (laws, land for colonization, and other measures), then it is impossible to say this about the factory population. This population, in many instances, is not a constant, nor a settled one; rather, it consists of all the rabble from the various ends of Russia who, with few exceptions, live as wanderers, a group which is not always desirous of building a durable nest for itself in the enterprises which feed it.

Of course, given such a state of things, the promulgation of factory legislation is completely impossible—such programs as limiting the number of worker hours and the prohibition of night work for women and children, the establishment of hygienic rules which protect the health and life of the workers, which introduce obligatory training, and which, finally, regulate the order of the entire working day, and so on, as in England. There it is possible by law, in the interests of both negotiating parties—the employers and the workers—to introduce regulations concerning agreements, concerning the investigation of controversies. This vitally necessary legislation was begun in 1882 by limiting the number of working hours for children and by the creation of factory inspectors. The matter was then continued in 1884 and 1886, when laws were worked out for labor agreements and for the investigation of complaints.

These laws are unquestionably important and necessary and are preparing a further structuring of the life of the factory workers, but they do not originate it. The difficulty of the problem is that it depends in the first place on workers who do not always settle in the place of production, who are not domestic, and who are not aware of this necessity. Second, it depends on the factory owners, who understand very little of the social question and the means for its solution. In the third place it depends on society, or rather, on public opinion, which is often split into two extremes, either in homilies to socialism or in the struggle with it, often relying exclusively on physical force. The first matter is therefore the reorganization of the settlement of the factory population. This is not possible without the construction of homes for those workers whose families desire to acquire homes for their own or permanent use.

In fact, it is necessary to establish a family life among the workers and their wives; the creation of means for true human existence should occur to the factory owners and all those who take the conditions of the workers seriously to heart. As experience has shown, this is not a simple matter: It is necessary to strive for honesty, as well as for domestic comfort. But honesty is even more necessary from the factory owners, from society, from the *zemstvos* or the state, and from those who take upon themselves either the construction of lodgings for the workers or leadership in this matter, or, finally, the rendering of assistance of one kind or another to the workers. Thus the real needs of the working class must be taken into consideration, not just idealistic demands. This would be similar to the situation in Berne, Switzerland, where the government is not restricted to construction of quarters of a predetermined kind for the workers, but rather can build those kinds of lodgings which are dictated by the workers on the basis of what is necessary for them and on the basis of how they want the house to be built.

If such a colony of settled workers reached certain dimensions, then it would be necessary to think about public institutions for the workers, institutions which improve their material condition (for example, wash houses, bathhouses, financial institutions, dining rooms, and night work by young workers was allowed only as an exception. The law of June 1, 1882, forbade the employment of children under twelve, limited the working day to eight hours for workers aged twelve to fourteen, and provided for a system of factory inspections. See Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossisskoi imperii, 3rd series, 33 v (St. Petersburg, 1886–1916) 2: pp. 265–266—TR. The law of June 12, 1884, this legislation extended the system of factory inspection and made provision for the education of child workers. Ibid., 4: pp. 366–368—TR. The law of June 3, 1886, entitled "Regulations Concerning Supervision over Establishments of the Factory-Mill Industry, Concerning the Mutual Relations of Factory Owners and Workers, And Concerning an Increase in the Staff of the Factory Inspectorate," applied to workers of both sexes and of all ages, except for those employed in private mining works and in establishments owned by the state. It was divided into three major parts. The first, comprised of general regulations on the hiring of workers, was to go into effect throughout the empire at the time of the law's publication. Part two prescribed the penalties to be imposed upon the workers and employers who violated the law's provisions or otherwise contributed to the disruption of peace in the factories. The third part consisted of regulations concerning supervision over the laws' fulfillment and concerning the mutual relations of factory owners and workers. Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossisskoi imperii 6: pp. 262ff. For a detailed analysis of the law, see Frederick C. Giffen, "The 'First Russian Labor Code': The Law of June 3, 1886," *Russian History/Histoire Russe* 2, 2 (1975), pp. 93–94—TR. The law of June 12, 1884, enacted on June 12, 1884, this legislation extended the system of factory inspection and made provision for the education of child workers. Ibid., 4: pp. 366–368—TR. The reference here is to the Swiss tradition of federal as well as cantonal legislation on behalf of workers. As far back as 1848 Glarus had enacted a law which introduced the shift system for continuous factory work and restricted men's work to thirteen days and eleven night hours. In the 1850s, institutions such as soup kitchens, factory savings groups, and building societies for workers' houses were at a low price or rent were founded for the benefit of craftsmen and laborers by social associations and workers' unions in such places as Berne. Finally, the federal factory law of 1877 enforced the eleven-hour day, restricted night work, and made the free Sunday the rule. Children under fourteen were not admitted to factory work, and night work by young workers was allowed only as an exception. Further provisions dealt with the protection of women. In execution of the law, a federal inspectorate of factories was established. For further discussion, see G. R. Potter, *A Short History of Switzerland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), pp. 307–308—TR.
for bachelors, reading rooms, and so forth). Then closer ties between the interests of the workers and the factory owners could be established.

A share in profits constitutes one of the better methods, if not for the abolition of the social question, then at least for making it less of a burning issue. Participation by the workers might express itself either in the establishment of special shares for them, shares which would accrue either by means of savings or by deducting a certain percentage from their earnings, or by establishing some other method of assessment on other bases. In the Leclaire dye-works factory in England, this type of process was initiated over fifty years ago, simultaneously with similar plans in certain other areas of the United Kingdom. The difficulty lies not in the devising of this or some other formula for determining a sharing of profits. These formulas are very easily found by the interested parties. Rather, the difficulty lies in the fact that the owners themselves had to be convinced that their interest demands the inclusion of the workers in a share of the profits. The argument that it is more advantageous for the workers to receive wages which remove the risk of success or nonsuccess from them, a risk which the owners have taken upon themselves, and who consider it as a loss of a whole year to give a share of the profits to another person, is beneath criticism.

If wages provided the worker an income that would be advantageous for him but disadvantageous for the owners, then why should the factory owner defend that which is opposed to his interests? There can be no doubt that an enterprise should always be considered as supplying necessities to all the people who take part in it. From the proprietor down to the lowliest worker, each person should be allotted a necessary share of the expected receipts. Then there is another aspect to profits and losses. Profits are subject to division and to a deduction of a certain percentage to be used as reserve capital for the payment of possible losses occurring in some other year.

All the foregoing leads to the conclusion that the solution of this problem is closely connected with a radical change in relations between people in the customs of the entire industrial population—both the owners and the workers. It is necessary that we make certain that the former do not create a solid future for their descendants by means of easy profits from what Wagner calls "a combination of circumstances" (konjunkturon). We must also make certain that the strength and influence of the ruling classes is not based simply on the well-being of the working class which is connected to them by special interests. We must also see to it that the latter become aware that only by relying on capital, and not by being inimical to it, can they achieve an improvement in their material and moral way of life. Further, they should expect this improvement to come not from the state, but rather from their own labor and friendly cooperation with the industrialists and from giving them their hands in joint action.

Measures for the Improvement of the Financial System

The late Aleksander Ageyevich Abaza said in a speech made in the Council of State that a reform of...
taxes completely changed the poll tax, and that then there could be no further reform in the tax system.

One cannot say this.

The correct system of taxation is based on that combination of direct and indirect taxes which achieve an extremely important goal: a distribution of the tax burden that is feasible in relation to the income of private persons and which serves to satisfy both their personal, and even public, needs. In the first place, this goal might not be achieved by a single direct tax, because the calculation of private income, notwithstanding the keenest methods, will never be satisfactory. In the second place, it may not be possible by indirect taxes alone, in particular by taxes on consumption, because there is no conformity in the consumption made by private people and that of the public by which they make themselves comfortable. Not even speaking about the fact that a person might abstain from one article or another covered by taxes, there is no doubt that very often it is just the opposite: namely, necessity compels one to pay taxes, in particular if a tax is one imposed on the necessities of life or even on something that is not a necessity of life as it concerns all of the general needs.

Just one observation is sufficient to clear up the need for tax reform in the course of time. On the one hand, those sources of income which can be calculated in a preliminary fashion change with the development of one or another branch of the economy. On the other hand, indirect taxes should be subject to change in view of the changes in tastes, in the needs of the people, and the convenience of investment. There is another consideration associated with this: the need to strengthen the financial power of the state forces the government to turn to forms of taxes which permit us to attain our goals sooner, that is, to increase its income.

At present we have the following taxes:

I. Direct Taxes
1. The remainder of the poll tax in Siberia
2. Peasant Redemption payments, formerly pomeshchik and state taxes
3. An increase in the collection in the Caucasus
4. State land taxes and other kinds of land taxes in Kingdom Poland and the Transcaucasian area
5. Taxes for urban real property
6. Taxes for insurance
7. Taxes for the bezmezdnyi transfer of property
8. Peasant duties
9. Patent duties, levied under the names of duties for the right of trade and industry and interest duties
10. Supplementary duties from trade and industry and interest duties

II. Indirect Taxes
1. Liquor taxes
2. Tobacco taxes
3. Excise from the sugar beet industry and duties from lump sugar
4. Excise from oil
5. Excise from matches
6. Customs duties
7. Stamp duties and taxes of various designations

In eleven articles, the direct taxes are named, except for the direct taxes proper, that is, those collected from certain persons with fixed incomes and in an established time, and those taxes which serve either as supplements to direct taxes or even as a substitute for them. Among the former are taxes on the bezmezdnyi transfer of property and land taxes, while among the latter are patent dues for the right of trade and industry.

Reform in Direct Taxes

A careful review of the above list leads one to the conclusion that among the direct taxes and their corresponding duties are found:

1. The Poll Tax. After the abolition of the collection of this tax in European Russia, only in Siberia has it not been abolished or replaced by other taxes. This demands the introduction of reform in the rest of Russia; for Siberia, the replacement of the poll tax by a land tax has a special importance. In the arrangement for land, the tax should establish a rational use of land in Siberia. Perhaps it should further serve as the beginning of the formation of private property in land in our Asiatic possessions.

2. Redemption Money. The redemption money of the former pomeshchik peasants used for interest on and cancellation of redemption notes which were issued ends at the expiration of the term named for making these payments—that is, at the final paying off of the securities themselves.

Thus two articles will have disappeared after thirty-nine years from state budgets: an income of forty-nine million rubles in redemption money and the expenditure of forty-nine million rubles which were used for the payment of interest and the cancellation of redemption notes.

Further, the redemption payments of the state peasants are found in yet another condition. In these payments the following taxes were given a new name: poll
taxes and obrok. They should end after forty-two years. But since they are not for the payment of interest, or paying off redemption notes, or general state expenses, then after forty-two years the forty million rubles should disappear from the budget as expenditures. It is necessary to think about their replacement ahead of time.

In 1885 it was difficult to foresee anything that would replace the forty million rubles after forty-two years, an amount which will be necessary to balance the budget in the 1930s, because it will be necessary in this calamitous year to seek resources for the offsetting of the present deficit, along with the fact that it is necessary to think about the future. It was difficult to think about entering into an agreement with the minister of state properties about measures which, in my opinion, could give only one palpable result: namely, the sale of state lands in Siberia and in Central Asia to peasants. At the time, Abaza observed, "A chaque jour sa peine." This was fair, but not completely.

When the redemption notes are liquidated by the purchase of allotments by the former pomeschik peasants and when the redemption money of the state peasants is ended, then of course the question of the review of land taxes may arise. Meanwhile, however, the conversion of Siberian land into private peasant property cannot be prevented.

If we sell these lands under condition of the payment of five kopecks per desiatin per year for forty-nine years, and if one-hundred million desiatins could be converted for sale, and if the sums gained from the sale could be turned to the liquidation of the state debt, then after forty-two years a sum may be redeemed the interest from which amounts to the forty million rubles which we seek.

Of course, against this operation it might be objected that it is carried into effect against the funds paying off the state debt, but will a system be adopted which cancels the debt by a cash system, or will the sale of land simply be carried out with the establishment of a five-kopeck obrok fee for the right of purchasing it? This might be necessary, in order to acquire a resource of no small importance for the state treasury. It is necessary only to seriously and energetically begin land survey work to develop a general plan. Further, it will lead to the conviction that in order for us to establish Russia's power in Asia, the maintenance of nomadic life is not necessary, just in order to obtain several thousand khirghiz horses, but the location of settlers there, and Russian citizenship for them, are necessary. It is necessary, too, that this land survey be carried out with an understanding of the local conditions of colonization and agriculture.

3, 4, 5, 6. Land Taxes and Taxes on Construction. The different kinds of production taxes, home taxes, land taxes, and taxes on urban real property should, with time, yield place to two sorts of taxes:

1. Taxes on land property
2. Taxes on construction

Both these and even other kinds of taxes might retain certain peculiarities according to local conditions, but such a practice is desirable only if suitable.

Regarding taxes on land property, it is not realistic to calculate on their great growth. The income of landowners is very changeable and has changed from year to year and under the influence of various causes: the construction of roads, the opening of new places of residence, and so on. Counting on an average income from the land according to the usual methods of cultivation (that is, usual according to locale), the land tax should be very moderate, because in a year of bad harvest the landowners sometimes do not receive an income at all. At present there has arisen in France the idea of predetermining land taxes for the satisfaction of the local needs of the departments and communities alone.

Here, as everywhere, the Ministry of Finance confronts the difficult problem of establishing a correct and proportional taxation. At present there exists in Russia an apportionment system, and the apportionment itself is carried out to a great extent on the basis of land taxation. There is scarcely any basis for deviating from this order. It is necessary only to include the local administration in participation in the apportionment, in particular to include the financial administration in the person of the tax inspector.

Our tax on construction is very unsatisfactory. In the first place, it is collected in cities, and then only from houseowners. In the second place, it is collected in certain places in conjunction with the land tax (in Kingdom Poland and in the Transcaucasia area). In the third place, in European Russia, with the exception of Kingdom Poland, it is not collected outside the cities and the mestechki. In the fourth place, the tax on insured real property and the tax on urban real prop-
property according to assessment are still levied independent of the tax on urban property.

In order to establish a more regular income from tax on construction, it is necessary to take the following measures: In the first place, establish a general state tax on construction, both in the cities and outside them, so that a certain percentage of the tax can be used for the benefit of the cities and a certain percentage for the use of the emstvos. In the second place, establish a rent tax in the cities for local expenses, a tax determined according to rent on the actual quarters occupied by the pomeshchik, not excluding even those occupied by homeowners. In the third place, change the tax on insurance and turn it into a tax on construction in general. Perhaps it might be the most rational policy to begin by releasing from taxes on insurance that property which is insured in societies of mutual insurance and a corresponding sum put down to a general state tax on construction, because under the terms which exist between insurance joint-stock companies, the deliverance of homeowners from tax for insurance could be turned to the use not of the owners but of the joint-stock companies.

7, 8. Tax on Bezmezdnii Transfer of Property and Serf Taxes. The tax on the bezmezdnii transfer of property and serf (peasant) taxes serves as something of a supplement to this tax on incomes from real property. Their purpose is to achieve those receipts which eluded other taxation and which serve to increase capital. The tax on the transfer of real property may receive further development with time. Although there were petitions to change it, it is impossible not to recognize the groundlessness of such petitions, because the tax is levied on property minus all debts. Therefore, to create such a payment by installment along with the receipts actually collected makes no sense. The suggestion of combining this tax with the land tax or with the construction tax would lead to a great burden on owners who are already in debt.

The high peasant tax is another matter. It is so high because many sales of real property occur not from speculative aims but for the payment of debts or as a result of a difficult economic situation. Thus there is no doubt that the levy of 4 per cent on the value of property burdened by debt might actually constitute not 1 to 8 per cent but 12 to 20 per cent and more levied, in addition to that without any installments.

9, 10, 11. Direct Taxation on Trade and Industry. A regular levying of taxes which are applied to industry, trade, and business constitutes one of the most difficult financial problems. Our ancient guild duties established a patent tax on supposed capital. Count Kankrin made the first improvement in this tax, but the essence of its improvement with respect to 1885 (when it was introduced, together with guild taxes and licenses) was that it was subdivided into sections of special patents for trade rooms and for the employment of shop assistants and others. But since these improvements were not great, proportional taxation was not achieved. A totally uniform undertaking, but not one of an identical dimension, and under different conditions, could pay 1.1 per cent from receipts. For example, one bank would give a million rubles of pure profit and another would give 10 per cent, if receipts amounted to ten thousand rubles overall. Just such a disproportion in taxation occurred in patent dues from small trade and industry.

The minister of finance is confronted in the present instance with the option of either going further in the improvement of the adopted system and introducing a more complicated classification (as in Germany, where the classification is connected to the apportionment system, and as in France, where the tax levied on factory production, handicrafts, and trade consists of several parts and is estimated on the basis of certain indicators which predict receipts) or of retaining the previous tax as inviolable for the present and introducing only a supplementary tax. The second path was chosen, and along with it a proportional system was accepted from the standpoint of eliminating a complicated calculation. The general amount of the tax was determined on the basis of an approximate calculation, one which was subject to levies on factories, industry, trade, and businesses in the empire, amounting, in the first instance, to 2.5 million rubles. This figure was assessed on the basis of the above-mentioned calculations for each gubernia and then was presented to gubernia committees to make an apportionment according to uezds. In turn it was incumbent on certain urban and uezd committees to make an apportionment of the city and uezd sums according to receipts from the different taxpayers. At the same time, it was decided to levy a 3 per cent tax on the net income of the joint-stock companies.

Aside from the fact that this method established an effective guarantee of a regular internal apportionment, it should be noted that all other ways of determining the profitability of enterprises according to the indications stated in the law or the immediate calculation of receipts would certainly lead to great inaccuracy. Moreover, by preserving the disproportion inevitable in such taxes for localities which are remote from each other, such inaccuracy was not eliminated within even the boundaries of a single uezd or of a single city.

But the method of taxation begun by the Council

120 Count Yegor Frantsevich Kankrin (1774–1845), Russian state figure, minister of finance (1823–1844), and a proponent of the preservation of serfdom. He conscientiously delayed the development of industry, viewing the workers as a threat to the existing order. A believer in protectionism, he was responsible between 1839 and 1843 for the monetary reforms known as the Kankrin Reforms, which essentially consisted of backing the Russian currency with silver—TR.
of State at the suggestion of the minister of finance and approved by the emperor had yet another significance: In connection with the taxation of income from monetary capital, a single category of income tax was in fact introduced to which it is necessary to turn as the first urgent financial need in the strengthening of the tax.

12. Income Tax. Naturally this raises the question, Why was an income tax not simply and directly proposed and introduced?

It can be positively stated that such a tax was not acceptable to us and would have aroused an outcry among the landowners, not only because of its burdensomeness but also because the situation of land ownership in the 1880s (1881–1886) was, except for 1882 alone, totally distressing.

We have a totally vague idea about income tax, the more so because it has numerous forms:

In the first place, the income tax sometimes assumes the totality of several taxes which are calculated and assessed on various bases: namely, on land, from the standpoint of industrial and commercial enterprises, on monetary capital, on the free professions, salaries, and other personal incomes. In the second place, an additional tax to the one which exists, in the amount of several percentages, is not equal for different incomes. In the third place, it may be a tax levied totally independent and irrespective of other taxes, a tax on the income of each individual person, one in which a person who receives an income of less than a certain dimension is freed from the tax. Such a tax levied on land, on construction, capital, business, and so on, gives only a certain indication concerning the ways used to calculate such taxes. But the landowners, factory owners, and merchants are taxable with regard to the reality of their income, that is, less the percentages and cancellation of the debt. Properly speaking, even the latter form deserves the name income tax.

The income tax is not made use of in our situation, by the way, as a result of the influence of Leroy-Beaulieu.\footnote{121 Paul Leroy-Beaulieu (1843–1916), French economist. After studying law in Paris, he traveled in England and then went to Bonn and Berlin for further study. He made his debut as a writer in 1867 with the prize essay on \emph{L'état moral et intellectuel des classes ouvrières et de son influence sur le taux des salaires} (Paris, 1868) and at the age of twenty-seven won four prizes offered by the Institute. From 1869 he collaborated on the \emph{Revue des deux mondes} and in 1871 became editor of the \emph{Journal des débats}. When Boutmy formed the \emph{École libre des sciences politiques} in 1872, Leroy-Beaulieu accepted the chair of public finance. In 1873 he founded \emph{Économiste français} and became its editor. One of the outstanding representatives of economic liberalism in France, his views were formulated in a number of works and elaborated in the \emph{Traité théorétique et pratique d'économie politique} (Paris, 1881). He argued that the Ricardian law of rent had no present application and that the subsistence theory of wages and its derivation, the iron law of wages, existed only in the imagination of their authors. In his value theory, from the income tax out of a fear of extreme democracy and socialism, which could impart to it the form of a progressive tax and throw the tax burden on the more well-to-do elements of the population. These fears are, of course, exaggerated. In England, a more aristocratic country, the income tax operates with greater success, and the aristocrat is not in the least afraid of an increase of this tax and even of a certain degree of its graduation for the less well-to-do classes. Being partly conscious of these fears, Leroy-Beaulieu and Leon Sey\footnote{122 Leon Sey (1826–1896), French political leader and economist. Well known in his own time as a writer on economic subjects, Sey was more important as a political figure than as an economist. Nevertheless his economic doctrines struck a golden mean between monarchy and socialism. For further information consult Georges Michel, \emph{Leon Sey} (Paris, 1899); and see article on Sey in \emph{Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences} 13: pp. 559–560—\emph{TR}.} refer, by the way, to the fact that the income tax in France does not produce the same revenues as in Great Britain, because in the former there is less great wealth than in the latter (as if the income tax falls only on large incomes, and as if the income of the middle classes does not serve as its chief source). Then they point to the fact that an income tax is superfluous because personal incomes in France are already taxed and that this would be a double tax. But this is untrue: The income tax should serve as a corrective to the other direct taxes which are assessed on the assumed average incomes, but these are not averaged incomes but actual ones. Only with the income tax can a more moderate tax on the middle-income property be established, and in this way it does not burden the taxpayers but serves to equalize the tax rating by levying a tax on real income in general.

The Result of the Reform of the Direct Taxes

Now those things which must necessarily be done in the area of direct taxes in order to improve the system of taxation can be summed up.

First, having turned the remainder of the poll tax into an \emph{obrok} tax on land from now until its redemption, it will be necessary to give a push to Russian colonization in Siberia and Central Asia in the interest of state and public economic and political concerns and in this way acquire definite means: 1) to make up the 40 million rubles of redemption payments by the...
state peasants which we now receive and which should end after forty-two years, and 2) to develop industry and develop the natural riches of northern and central Asia, and 3) to strengthen the Russian element in northern and central Asia.

Second, it will be necessary to introduce more uniformity in state land taxes, to establish their more regular apportionment with the participation of the zemstvos (with the deduction of part of the receipts from the land), and to achieve conformity of this tax as much as possible with the average profit from the land.

Third, it will be necessary to extend the tax on urban real property to construction in the cities and uezds, with the assignment of a certain share of the receipts for use by the zemstvos and the towns, which should take part in the calculation and the assessment of taxes at a specific rate according to average income from construction.

Fourth, having decreased to a certain degree the collection of income from urban construction, it will be necessary to introduce a tax on urban dwellings.

Fifth, it will be necessary to develop, as far as conditions allow, a tax on the bezmezdnyi transfer of property.

Sixth, it will be necessary to lower peasant taxes.

Seventh, a tax on insurance will be necessary, at least on that construction which is subject to mutual insurance, a tax which will become a tax on income from construction in general.

Eighth, it will be necessary to carry out a further improvement in the patent dues for right of trade and business.

Ninth, it will be necessary to establish a general income tax, one which should be levied on all aspects of private incomes in excess of five hundred rubles. The income tax should consist of a tax on incomes which are furnished by real properties and capital of various kinds, on those furnished by capital connected with labor, and finally on personal earnings. The first should be taxed at several thousand times more than the second, and the second several more than the third. The dimension of taxation should be determined, according to England's example, at several kopecks on the ruble and be very moderate, so that together with taxation on moderate income from land, construction, and diverse capital, there will not be a burden on the taxpayer.

Indirect Taxes

Indirect taxes were introduced here to a significant degree with great effort, but it is impossible to expect that a lessening of the dimensions of taxes for the use of certain commodities would lead to such an increase in their use that the total income received would remain as it was previously. A significant increase in public contentment is necessary for this to happen. However, it is necessary to be on the alert for a change in use itself and, as far as possible, to promote the development of the use of those articles which are harmless for the health and well-being of the people—tea, coffee, sugar, and so on.

1. The Liquor Tax. In the first place, the drink tax is worthy of special attention. Here the problem of the government is not so much fiscal (the fiscal goal was attained—it is necessary only not to ruin it) as economic and moral. A more important financial result might be expected from a limitation on the use of spirits and from measures against hard drinking from the standpoint of a rise in public well-being than from an increase of revenues supplied by the liquor duties.

Measures taken heretofore did not achieve their aims, partly because they were not in a proper form, combined with and supported by the activities of the Ministry of the Interior, that is, by the police. At the same time, it is necessary to say that for the police to take the trouble to enforce these measures, they must be at full strength, and they are frankly too few in number. Moreover, orders which provided for the enactment of the law were not given—that is, laws which prevented the transformation of enterprises for the sale of off-premises alcoholic beverages. Finally, laws against alcoholism which envisioned repressive measures and punishment were not promulgated.

Without all of this, there is no possibility of a Gottenburg system in Russia. Besides, the question still remains whether this system is possible anywhere except in the cities or in places where there is a continuous agricultural population, and not scattered farms.

2. Customs Duties. Customs duties demand a serious review. It is necessary to construct a system which will establish reasonable protection and to use such duties to assign the majority of the receipts from imports to the task of easing the burden on agriculture and consumption by the poorest classes.

3. Stamp Duties. The stamp taxes require still more review. They are arbitrary, complicated, and irregular. It is necessary to replace them by direct taxes when the opportunity presents itself. It will be necessary also to limit them to a small number, and more necessary still to moderate the taxes on applications.

[123] The Gottenburg System was a means of limiting alcohol consumption introduced in Sweden in 1865. Under this system, the Swedes attempted to check the spread of alcoholism by eliminating the economic incentive in the liquor traffic. It operated through joint stock corporations, having local monopolies for the retail sale of brandy. It was only partially successful because it did not cope with the manufacture and importation of alcoholic beverages and the sale of beer and wine. See Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences 9: p. 506—7R.
The Reform of the Financial Administration

Finally, it is necessary to complete the reform of the financial administration. Perhaps it will be necessary to add an assistant or a special police officer to the tax inspector in order to collect the above-mentioned taxes, one who should be freed from control of the general police. Further, it is necessary to create collectors in connection with the inspection.124

It is necessary at present to retain the representatives from the villages, but we must see to it that these representatives are confirmed, controlled, and rewarded according to an established order and degree that they are responsible people. The old order, under which relations between the tax collectors and the taxpayers was viewed as their private affair, should be made way for a new one in which these obligations take on a state character.

In conclusion, it should be noted that it would perhaps be useful to form financial councils or committees under the chairmanship of the governor in the guberniia. Not meddling in administrative or management matters, it would be the council’s or its departments’ function to control or confirm the apportionment of direct taxes, to authorize drinking establishments, to take measures for the prevention of smuggling, to oversee korchemstva,125 to resolve questions of defaulters’ solvency which demand general measures, and finally to establish some kind of general guberniia administration. In general, the council or its departments should not embarrass the financial administration in the least, but should make use of the regularity of gubernatorial control.

[SUPPLEMENT TO IV.] SOCIALISM AND THE STRUGGLE WITH IT

What are socialism and communism? What are the causes of their origins and development?

At present the understanding of socialism and communism is often confused because the first turned into the second. Under the term socialism is understood that social order in which it becomes possible for mankind to achieve happiness. The forms of that order can be numerous. But one of them—the one in which personal private property, both the means of production and the use of the objects of consumption, are done away with—that is communism.

It is clear from this that socialism is not an accidental phenomenon, and is not one of those delusions which are easily eliminated by irrefutable argument, logic, or truth obtained by observation of phenomena. Socialism arises always when social discipline is weakened; when mankind ceases to be resigned to bearing life’s burdens; when the wealth of others excites one’s insatiable desires; when social ferment creates doubts in men about the justice, legality, or stability of religion or the social order; and when a man stops being satisfied with that which is (his surroundings and the relations among which he lives) and begins to seek happiness and its conditions. The conception of happiness is, of course, very flexible. Plato sought it for citizens, politically full and equal persons in all levels of the state and property institutions; the sectarians of the Middle Ages (Thomas More and others) sought it in property relations.

In a more complete form, socialism began its development at the time of Saint-Simon and his disciples, with dreams of the establishment of the rule of industry, science, and art, and the organization of a new society. It expresses its basic principle in the formula “à chacun selon sa capacité, à chaque capacité selon ses œuvres.”126 Conformity to this formula demands the abolition of inheritance and personal private property. The state, or, as one of Saint-Simonian thought, “le père supreme,” is personally invested with supreme power, which he himself named “qui se pose,” or, as another one thought (Bazard),127 an institution similar to one which allows its property to all according to their labor. Thus, much more emphasis is placed on the state than in medieval theories.

At that time, a private person was often without rights when the matter concerned the welfare of the state. The state regulated personal activity, as was demanded by the interests of the state as a whole. And

---

124 Emphasis in the original—TR.
125 Bunge is referring here to the prohibition which denied Jews the right to sell liquor in the villages—TR.
before these demands, personal interests became silent, since they were recognized as legitimate only when they were not in opposition to state interests. In socialism, the role of the state remains purely official: It should serve the realization of the individual personal happiness of each and every one of its citizens. In return, it is given despotic power, the power to command not only in the area of law and general state matters as before, but in administrative matters, personal matters, and property matters. The medieval state did not deny private property, but often took it away and confiscated it. It did not even deny private economic transactions, but sometimes fixed tariffs for trade, work, and so on. In socialism—"de chacun selon ses forces, à chacun selon ses besoins"—the state distributes property and income among private persons, and all manifestations of personality, all freedoms, are destroyed. But in return the state and its organs remain responsible for everything and before all private persons. It is understandable that this political or legal socialistic order required an idea for its justification, which suggested a further development of its principles and could not remain in the form of abstract demands.

The idea of socialism was first expressed in definite form with Fourier, who recognized that the aim of man is happiness, and that happiness consists in having many passions and the means for their satisfaction or, more importantly, the means of striving for their satisfaction. Ignoring all the fantastic passions in the activity and combinations devised by Fourier, the passions of the senses (sens), the passions of organization (mecanistantes), it is impossible not to recognize that Fourier more clearly and definitely than all of his predecessors stated the idea of socialism and gave its implementation a sensual, purely French nuance. To give man the possibility "to delight in life"—this is the only legitimate principle which Fourier and the later socialists recognized, although the understanding of what constituted "happiness" varied. Fourier even suggested that striving for the satisfaction of the passions caused more delight, more "happiness," than their satisfaction. It goes without saying that such a striving assumes that the attainment of goals should be unrealizable.

For this reason, socialism represents a gradual development of its own principles. With Saint-Simon and his disciples, it was still not completely clear what the state was to do. Becoming the general heir and distributing this inheritance according to an abstract formula does not do away with private industry. With Louis Blanc and LaSalle, the idea of public workshops constructed and supported by the state was advanced. With the Marxists, we have the matter of the communes which are organized by industry, and further into communal unions—that which Proudhon meant in his *État-Anarchie*—in which power is abolished, and only administration remains.

Finally, since life did not offer a form of community in which the demands of socialism, its basic ideas, and even the principle of organization of society by this idea itself could be realized, it was then understood that the socialists should seek these forms in their own fantasies. In their turn, such fantasies were very often the point of departure for the development of the principle of social organization. Beginning with The *Republic* of Plato and ending with The *Twentieth Century* (Bellamy), there is strung out a series of socialistic novels which present a mixture of dreams of technological improvements, the application of which is tied to the realization of the prosperity of mankind. This is primarily material prosperity, under conditions of the construction of a society which guarantees to each and every one of the esthetic enjoyments.

If the new anarchists, Bakunin and his followers,
preach and strive for destruction of the current social order, they do it, of course, not from a desire to plunge the human world into nothingness and to find bliss (nirvana) in it but, rather, under the pretext that the old order was not suitable and that the new one is better and should arise by the destruction of the old.

Thus, in order to establish the happiness of man or his enjoyment as a goal of public life, a principle of social organization for the attainment of this happiness was then set forth, an organization from which all defects, crimes and offenses, poverty, misery, and suffering were banished. Finally, a picture of a public life which presents a graphic realization of happiness in the land and makes reference to certain philanthropic institutions by which, in one form or another, the projects of the socialist novel have been accomplished is drawn for man.

But can it be demanded from all people who have any life experience for themselves that they all react soberly and calmly, without enthusiasm, to a promise to which these authors apparently are not bound but in which they promise everything that the people lack at present?

I also asked who of the poor or of the ardent philanthropists cares to argue about the fact that human nature is far from equal, that one person finds “happiness” in crude material enjoyments, another one in science, art, and in the satisfaction of spiritual needs, the third, finally, in his own deprivation, combined with the fulfillment of a feeling of duty and self-sacrifice? Who would argue that people who have everything that is necessary for happiness to the broadest extent of their understanding do not themselves have the use of it, and that, finally, that “thing” in which one man finds happiness constitutes suffering for another? All dramas based on unrequited love, on love which takes away happiness from a third person, perhaps these could be abolished by the realization of a socialist order? Fourier, who depicted a voluptuous picture of sensual enjoyment, did not foresee that one man finds happiness constitutes suffering for another? All people are equal before God and, in this sense, are brothers (Christ did not make a distinction between Jews and non-Jews). This equality before God does not rule out political inequality or class distinctions, just as it does not exclude property and intellectual and physical inequality. If deviation from the idea of Christianity entails suffering and ashes, then there is no doubt that its appeal to the egotistical use of the equality of Christianity by one or another element of
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135 Idyllic love, as depicted in the Greek pastoral poem about Daphnis and Chloe ascribed to Longus (fourth or fifth century A.D.) and in a later version by Amyot (1559)—TR.
society demands a rebuff, just as people have need of defense when inequality of property, intellect, and physique becomes a means of oppression.

MEASURES FOR COMBATTING SOCIALISM

But if socialism is that evil which will destroy morals, duty, freedom, and personality will perish, is not the loss of all hope for a successful struggle with socialism possible? And should society not perish from those evils which it begets, or from evils which are inherent in it? No, life is a struggle, but everything is possible; this is the weakness of socialism. Consequently, there is a necessity for supreme power and for its protection in human societies. But the supreme power cannot act directly: It needs agents, it needs the assistance of society itself, and finally it needs laws and institutions. They serve to satisfy the needs of the moment by the establishment of possible justice in the land, justice for each and every person alike by those means which, at the given moment, are themselves most suitable. In other words, the problem of the supreme power and its institutions consists in facilitating for every person conditions for the acquisition of property and capital, for freedom and competition in those institutions which restrain the oppressive strength of monopolies.

We see from the foregoing that the struggle with socialism appears difficult. It is very easy for the government to stray onto a dangerous path.

First, with the present religious conditions, it is morally and economically impossible to organize a commune with common property, common production, and common consumption and to replace personal ownership, the individual farm and consumption. If the scope of state and public economic activity was significantly broadened in the course of the last half of the present century (the conversion of the railways and telegraphs into state enterprises, the construction of waterworks, lighting, the public railway enterprises by cities, the horse-railways, and so on) and still greater expansion is foreseen in the more distant future, then the efforts made at changing the free private economy by the state or public still has not had its final word. This expansion has still not abolished the private economy, and along with it the individual and free man.

The government would enter onto a dangerous path if it entered those fields which private industry has conducted with success, if it took into its head to monopolize the mining industry, factories, and foundries. If, with the establishment of a railway tariff, the government takes its stand in the difficult position of an owner, one who must not only look after the profits but also concern itself with the satisfaction of the desires of its clients, furnishing them with certain privileges or accommodations with respect to the impor-

tation of goods which they feel necessary or of products used by them, then it is understandable that the fixing of real wages in foundry enterprises and the establishment of the value of raw materials acquired by the treasury and by products given up for sale all present a great difficulty. The incursion of the state into factory and mill enterprises would establish the principle of the unlimited power of the administration with respect to the establishment of prices, a power heretofore unknown and which, of course, will be the mightiest of all possible coalitions of capitalists.

But it might be objected that this power will not be unilateral, that it will have justice and the common good as its goals. Of course this is necessary so that the state economy can exist. But will this always be the case? Might not there be demanded from the treasury and administration which, along with the bad conduct of the economy, is not as answerable for its pickpocketing as a private administration, that it be by its nature both just and intelligent, as well as reasonable? Does not the weakening of the wellsprings of human activity which is inevitable in every communistic economy follow from this? Does not the decline of the spirit of resourcefulness and striving for improvement and innovation follow?

To whatever degree these pessimistic suggestions are not allowed, there is extremely little likelihood that the state could successfully replace private enterprise everywhere and in everything.

It is the government where the public economy might receive a broader application, but even there there exists a situation in which it is necessary to be careful about its introduction. The main conditions for success are good discipline and honest administration. Where there is not such an administration, as for example in Turkey, a total public economy would be folly.

The state might act more freely in the legislative area, organizing or promoting the construction of everything that directly or indirectly furthers the acquisition of real property (houses and land) and the accumulation of capital, the safeguarding of the labor of working children, women, and adults (laws concerning workers), the extension of education, and so on. But this is not enough. There is still a need for laws and family spirit of opposition to socialism in its coarsest forms, a need of measures certain of immediate satisfaction.

Measures taken against socialism call for no little caution, because they count on the elimination of certain circumstances which often accompany socialism but in and of themselves are not radical causes of harm. It is supposed that freedom and autonomy open one’s eyes. It is further supposed that if mass education is more developed, then the people will understand that the elimination of personal agricultural property, [and the establishment of] public workshops, the
eight-hour work day, and profit-sharing, which are furnished by capital and private enterprise, do not assure every person, whether he is industrious or slothful, an abundance of all earthly goods. Finally, they believe that the people will understand that the “happiness” which socialism promises is stricter under communist notions. It is supposed, on the other hand, that strict discipline, the maintenance of repression, curbs, and the limitation of public education to a single religious persuasion, with the principle of literacy, or even by the study alone of prayers and the principle of truth by means of oral transmission, without literacy, would protect the masses against the infection which the press is spreading. It is argued that these measures would keep them strong in their faith, firm in the old obedience, and firm in that moral eminence which is difficult for man, and keep them from tasting the so-called fruits of enlightenment. Both sides err, because the seeking of happiness is inherent in man.

It is impossible to say that the welfare of the working class was less in the second half of the nineteenth century than it was in the first and that there was not a clear striving for social justice (Staatssocialismus, in Germany). Meanwhile socialism has not become extinct and has instead assumed the dreadful form of an international union. It is impossible not to recognize that the less educated man is, the more coarse are his instincts, and that the more limited his understanding, the more his rush toward happiness takes a ferocious form. This is demonstrated by the history of the peasant risings of Razin, Pugachev, the
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136 The reference to the International Socialist Congress here is most likely to the First International Working Man’s Association (1864–1876) founded by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, and possibly to the Second International, founded in 1889 on Marxist principles, which lasted until 1914—TR.

137 Stepan Timofeyevich Razin, also known as Stenka Razin, (d. 1671) cossack leader and rebel of seventeenth-century Russia. After a career of adventure and brigandage in the area of the lower Volga, in 1669–1670 he became the focus of a jacquerie of the cossacks and peasants in the area of the lower Volga. For a time, it seemed to threaten the stability of the central government. He was eventually betrayed, captured, and executed in 1671—TR.

138 Emelian Ivanovich Pugachev (1742–1775), leader of the greatest cossack and peasant rebellion in Russian history. Son of a cossack landowner, he took part in the Seven Years’ War (1756–1763) and the Russo-Turkish War of 1768–1774. Arrested for desertion in 1772, he was imprisoned and sentenced to deportation to Siberia. Escaping in 1773, he appeared in the steppes east of Volga, proclaiming himself to be the Emperor Peter III, who had died under mysterious circumstances only to be succeeded by his wife Catherine II (The Great) (r. 1762–1796). His movement rapidly gained momentum and support because of both the unpopularity of the German-born Catherine and endemic peasant discontent at the exactions

of the landowning class. He was so successful that for two years (1773–1775) he seriously threatened the government, until he was betrayed, captured, and executed in 1775—TR.

139 Bunge here is referring to Russia’s revolutionary intelligentsia, especially those so-called new men of the sixties who had experienced the frustrations and sectarian religious ideas of the less developed regions of Russia and among whom were an unusually large number of former seminarians and children of clergymen. They were, by and large, men possessed by a “certain passion for absolute answers,” such as Nicholai Dobrolubov (1836–1861) and Nicholai Gavrilovich Chernyshevsky (1828–1889). For a discussion of this phenomenon, see Franco Venturi, Roots of Revolution (New York: Knopf, 1960), pts. 7–8, and James H. Billington, The Icon and the Axe (New York: Knopf, 1970), p. 745. See also Evgenii Lampert, Sons Against Fathers. Studies in Russian Radicalism and Revolution (London: Oxford University Press, 1965)—TR.
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Poles, 13, 36; and idea of Russian federation, 36
Polonism, 36
Political parties, 47
Political reform, 6
Poll tax, 59, 63
Ponomarev, 68
Pokrovskoe vedomosti, 38n
Polexhenii, 58
Position on Jews, (1804), 26
Proclamation of January 20, 1809, and union of Russia and Poland, 40n
Press, Russian, 45
Primary Swedish Descent, 41
Private initiative, Russia, 56
Profit sharing, 62, 72
Protectionism, 8, 43n
Proudhon, Pierre Joseph, 69, 70; and mutualism, 69n
Provisional administration, local, 53
Public Enlightenment, Ministry of, 56
Public opinion, Russian, 19, 20
Public schools, Russian, 58
Public welfare, 59
Pugachev, Emelian Ivanovich, 72
Quotas, in Russia, 32, 33
Race, 11
Racism, in Russia, 11
Railways, Russian, 18; construction and management of, 9; freight rates of, 9
Razin, Stenka. See Razin Stepan Timofeyevich
 Razin, Stepan Timofeyevich, 72
Razumovskii, Andrei Kirilovich, 54
Redemption payments, 8, 59, 63
Redemption payments, Russian, 63
Reform, 20; inadequacy of by Alexander II, 50; judicial, 50; of ministries, 49, 50; of structure of Russian government, 44; of urban government, 21
Rekruchina, 26n
Reforms, 32
Reutern, Mikhail Khristoforovich, 6n; as Minister of Finance, 8
Rumania, 44; influence of in Bessarabia, 44n
Russia, multi-racial composition of, 45
Russian Empire, 42
Russian language, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 55, 56, 57; use of in Finland, 43; use of in Muslim schools, 44; use in Poland, 36, 37; use in Polish Catholic services, 38, 39
Russian people, 55, 56, 57; development of material strength of, 59; material strength of, 56; spiritual strength of, 56
Rusovia, 45
Russo-Turkish War (1768-1774), 72n; of 1877-1878, 27n
Rzhond, 36
Saint-Petersburg, 45
Samari, Iurii Feodorovich, 33
Schismatics, 36n
Schlachta, 36n
Schools, Russian, 56, 57, 58
Sel'skoe obschestvo. See Village Gathering
Seminarists, 72
Senate, Imperial Ruling, 47
Serf taxes. See peasant taxes
Serfdom, abolition of, 18
Serfs, emancipation of, 6
Service, in Guberniias, 48
Siberia, colonization in, 66; Committee on (1852), 47
Sigismund I, King of Poland, 36
Sigismund-Augustus, King of Poland, 36n
Sismondi, Jean Simonde de, 23n
Slavophiles, 19
Socialism, 39n, 40, 41; compared with Christianity, 70; critique of, 70; definition of, 68; measures for combatting, 71; struggle with, 68
Social justice, 72
Social reform, 6
Speranskii, Mikhail Mikhailovich, 7n, 44n, 54n
Stamp duties, 67
Stamp taxes. See stamp duties
Starostyi, 32, 44, 56, 56n
State Chancellery, 49
State Economy, Department of, 62n
State Property, Ministry of, 48
State service, restrictions on Poles in, 37
Stolypin, Peter Arkadeevich, 15
Stundist, 35
Stundists. See stundism
Suvorin, Aleksei Sergeevich, 58n
Suvorov, Prince Aleksandr Arkadevich, 34
Svod Zakonov Rossiskoi imperii. See Code of Laws of the Russian Empire
Switzerland, 61
Swedish language, 41, 43
Switzerland, 65n
Tax collectors, 68
Taxation, Russia, 8, 63
Tax collectors, 68
Talmud, 29
Tammerfors privileges, 43
Taxation, Russia, 8, 63
Tax collection, 68
Tolstoi, Count Dmitrii Andreevich, 16, 28
Turkey, 44
Turkestan, 44
Ukraine, 38, 39
Ukrainians, 11
Ultranationalism, 11
Universities, Russian, 56, 57, 59n
Urban construction, income from, 67
Urban government, 21
Uvarov, Sergei Semenovich, 12
Vakuf, 45, 46
Valuev, Count Peter Alekseevich, 11, 34; Minister of Interior on Vasili’chikov, Prince Peter Alekseevich, 29
Village, 15, 44; assembly in, 13, 40; institutions, 43; in Poland, 13, 40; institutions, 49; participation in apportionment of land taxes, 67; reform of, 50; role in education, 56, 57; taxation of, 65
Volk, 45, 46
Volk, 32, 33, 56; administration of, 32; budgets of, 56; courts of, 32; taxes in, 56
VonFleheve, Vyacheslav Konstantinovich, 28
Vyshnegradskii, Ivan Alekseevich, 6
Wagner, Adolf, 62; and Grundlegung und Finanzwissenschaft, 62n
Westerners, 19
Witte, Count Sergius Iulevich, 6, 10, 48; Minister of Interior, 6n
Women, 61
Working hours, 61
Zagrobnye zapiski. See Notes from the Grave
Zainchikovskii, P. A., 9, 10; and Rossiskoi samoderzhavie v kontse XIX Stoletii, 10n
Zemstvos, 13, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 40, 43, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 61, 67; conflict of with Guberniia administration, 50; creation of, 18; functions of, 21; in Bessarabia, 43; in Poland, 13, 40, institutions, 49; participation in apportionment of land taxes, 67; reform of, 50; role in education, 56, 57; taxes 65
Zemskii Nachalniks, 49, 53, 54, 56; relationship to central administration, 54; relationship to Dvorianstvo, 54
Zemskii sobor, 48
Zmd, 39
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