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PREFACE

In view of present social and political conditions, pointing to the beginning of the growth of a closer relationship between the old world and the new, it becomes more imperative than ever that mutual understanding and knowledge be the basis of the new relationship. The history of Russian education, from an interpretative point of view, has scarcely been begun, even in Russia, though the materials for it have been collected. It is intended that this first survey shall be followed by other investigations giving, for the various periods, a more detailed account than has been possible in this broader analysis.

I am glad to express my appreciation for the aid and encouragement which have been given me. Professors Monroe, Kilpatrick and Kandel of Teachers’ College have been particularly kind, while to Professor Prince of the Russian Department of Columbia University I owe my first introduction, some five years ago, to the language and the affairs of Russia.

I am also under obligation to my many Russian friends who, however much they have differed in political and social creeds have, one and all, exemplified a spirit of service in giving many hours of their time to a foreigner who had no other claim than a sincere and friendly interest in their land and language.

D. B. L.

July 29, 1919.
CHAPTER I

Introduction

Explanation of Thesis.

This essay will endeavor to trace the following four movements in the history of Russia, and to show their mutual relationships: 1. the growth of democracies in the period from the 9th to the 13th centuries; 2. the evolution of an autocracy, dating from the 13th century; 3. the creation and imposition by this autocracy of a system of education directed to class and politician ends; 4. the resultant struggle against this autocracy and its system of education.

Finally, an examination will be made of the program of the Bolshevik regime as a type of education radically different, in principle and method, from that which it has, for the time being, supplanted, and which claims to be of and for that people whom the previous system neglected.

In other words, an attempt will be made to correlate the social, economic, political and educational evolutions of Russia. It seems, to the writer, that it is easy to trace, in Russia, a clear connection between these different factors of history. Political and economic disaster or dissatisfaction have led to social and educational advancement, newly established security at home and abroad, after a period of disorder, have often led to new social and educational restrictions. The influence of the West is predominant throughout—now leading to reform, again to insular attempts to be self-sufficient; but it cannot be too much insisted that Russian history is a part of that larger field of history represented by Western civilization in general.

The history of education in Russia affords an example of this influence of the West. Under Peter, and even to some extent under some of his immediate predecessors, Russia was literally forced to share in the culture of the West and to think some of her ideas; under some of the later Tsars it was forbidden even to travel abroad. But in every case, under the Romanov dynasty, the principles of Russian education have been formed by and for the sake of the ruling class and the government.
Education has always been considered in Russia, by both the autocracy and its opponents, as an eminently serious and important matter. Russian literature, all but the very lightest, has concerned itself with the question. Education and schools are viewed, and have always been viewed, in intimate connection with life, but the kinds of life for which the reformers and the government wished the schools to prepare were, of necessity, totally different. It was the inability of the government either to stem the tide of the revolutionary movement, or to bring about, under its own direction, the necessary and widely demanded educational and social reforms which led to the present state of affairs. But it must be kept constantly in mind that the social revolution, of which the Soviet government is the culmination, began in a very real sense with Peter the Great. The present is only the historical outcome of a long and intricate struggle between the Russian people and their government which, ready more than once to fall, needed but the final and too disintegrating conditions of the World War to bring it to an end. But the beginning was long ago.

In addition to establishing the main points of the first paragraph, it is hoped that this essay may help to a better understanding of Russia and things Russian. The rest of Europe and, in particular, the people of the United States have not known or understood much of Russia and her history in the past; if we had, there might have been less surprise at the Revolution and more preparation for it. For better or for worse, we of America are, since the war, more closely knit to Europe and its problems, and Russia is a large part of Europe, both from the point of view of resources and size, as well as of population. Her problems are our problems, even if not so acute; and her solutions, whether failures or successes, should be followed closely and accurately, and as they really are, not as interested propaganda too often misrepresents them. Autocratic Russia, like Germany, had a highly centralized national system of education, with very definite national ideals, and a highly specialized conception of mass and class,—and it has all come to nothing. We, of the United States, are also a nation; we, too, have problems not unlike Russia’s, and it is not stretching possibilities to expect that we can perhaps gain in educational outlook by understanding conditions and solutions in both the old and the new Russia. In any case, we can help her. American educational ideas and ideals are well known in Russia, many of them most favorably; American text-books are highly thought of; but we cannot offer adequate or substantial advice without an intimate knowledge of her past and present conditions.
With this in mind, there have been included, together with the Russian references, authorities in translation. Many authoritative presentations of Russian thought exist in Western European languages, though for a thorough investigation, at least at present, acquaintance with the Russian language is necessary. This fact comes out clearly in the case of Russian literature which, to us of the West means, only too often, merely the names and the novels of some few writers, representing one or more aspects of the spirit of the country, but no more representative of the whole than, say, Dickens and Wells would be with us. Educated Russians know the United States better than we know Russia,—and largely because they have taken the trouble to learn English.

Relation of Education to National Life and Character.

What should be the relation of education to national life and character? Several answers can and have been given to this question; Russia, under the old government, answered by attempting to mobilize and organize national life and character in terms of ideals originating in, and in favor of a ruling class. But since these ideals were not at all in accord with the real nature of the people or their ideals, they had to be constantly bolstered up by force of one kind or another. We shall therefore find force as an ever present factor in Russian education. We shall also find that great emphasis has been placed on the so-called "church subjects" and much time devoted to them, particularly in the elementary schools, beyond which the great mass of the people did not progress.

As a general background for the criticism and evaluation of Russian education, as it was under the autocracy, the following democratic principles of the relation of education to life and character are assumed as valid. First, education is a process whereby the individuals of each generation come to understand and to partake of the traditions and the culture of the group and its history, not merely for the sake of understanding these traditions or in order to become subject to them under the domination of a ruling class, but for the sake of thereby becoming unified with the society in which they, as individuals, live and in which they are to be active. Secondly, this activity of the individual should be in terms of the life and activity of the group as a whole, so that the democratically educated individual, in a very real sense, acts for the welfare of the group and finds therein his own. This carries with it several corollaries, conspicuously neglected by the older Russian education. In the first place it means control of the individual by his own ideas
and purposes, socially derived, to be sure, but not by coercion from above; secondly, it means free intercourse of each and every section of the whole group; thirdly, it means progressive adjustment and re-adjustment in terms of both the experiences of the individual and the group; fourthly, it means adaptation of education to local needs and possibilities, in place of a stereotyped abstract idea of "education as such", used to transform all participants to a given type, with the exception of the chosen few who have devised the conception. Finally, it means the same education, so far as the individual can profit by it, for each and all, not a stratified system of mutually exclusive schools for different social and economic groups.

With the above as a background the course of development of education in Russia will be followed from its origins, through the period of the control of the Autocracy, up to the present regime, together with the accompanying social, political and economic factors of each period, in so far as they seem to interact with the educational situation.
CHAPTER II.
The Period Before Peter

The Rise and Development of the Early Democracies.

"The history of Russian education in its organized form can scarcely be said to date back to a period anterior to the time of Peter the Great." (Darlington, Chap. I.) The only schools in existence were those attached to monasteries, and were both few in number and very degenerate. (Denkov). It is necessary, however, before entering upon an examination of the efforts of Peter to supply a system of schools to his country, to examine the nature of the civilization and culture which prevailed before his time. This will involve a brief survey of the history of the period of Russian history extending from the origins to the end of the 17th century—a period of some 200 years.

"The history of Russia affords special facilities for the study of sociology. They originate, firstly, in the comparative simplicity of the processes dominant throughout its course—a simplicity which enables us to examine minutely, not only the workings of the historical forces in general, but also the operation and relative potency of those special factors by which the comparatively non-complex composition of Russian social life has been determined; and secondly, in the peculiar circumstances which have influenced Russian development from the very beginning—circumstances which, while imparting to the nation a distinctive character and genius, have communicated also to the national life a special rate of evolutionary progress." (Kluchevsky, vol. I, p. 1.)

In the course of those migrations in Europe which, at different times resulted in the occupation of Greece, Rome and the center and West of Europe, one of the later was that of the "Slavs." They were known, apparently, to the Greek and Roman writers as "Scythians," and before separation into groups dwelt in the forests and plains beyond and north of the Carpathian mountains. This Carpathian period lasted from approximately the 2nd to the 7th centuries, when the pressure of the Avars forced the Slavs to migrate still further. (Kovalevsky, 101, chap. I.) In their migrations it was the Carpathian mountains which separated the group
as a whole into the Western and Eastern divisions, known to us now, respectively, as the Bohemian-Serb group and the Russians. These latter occupied, at first, but a very small part of modern Russia in Europe, being barred from the North and the Baltic by Finns and Lithuanians, and from the South and the Black Sea by Turkish and Finnish tribes. Thus the middle portion of modern Russia was their first habitat. This brings us to approximately 860 A. D., the time of the English King Alfred, and shows the comparative lateness of development and organization. (Kluchevsky, vol. I, chap. V.; Kovalevsky, 101, chap. 1. For maps, see Beazley, and Milioukov, 103.)

From the time of this early settlement to the coming of the Tatars, that is, from the 9th to the 13th centuries, the history of Russia is a history of democratic and republican ideas and institutions, to a very marked degree. These ideas and institutions they brought with them. Procopius and Maurikius, annalists of the 6th and 7th centuries, at Byzantium, comment on this. "From the remotest period," says Procopius, "the Slavs were known to live in democracies; they discussed their wants in popular assemblies or folkmotes." (Ex Gothica seu Bellum Gothicum, chap. XIV, quoted by Kovalevsky, 101, p. 6.) "The Slavs like liberty," writes the Emperor Maurikius, "they cannot bear unlimited rulers, and are not easily brought to submission." (Strategicum, chap. 11, quoted by Kovalevsky, 101, p. 6.) "The Slavs," says the Emperor Leo, "are a free people, strongly opposed to any subjection." (Tactica seu de Militari, chap. XVIII, quoted by Kovalevsky, 101, p. 6.)

Among the privileges of the folkmotes was that of choosing a ruler, and it was in connection with this right that a beginning was made in the organization of the land and the people. In the Chronicle of Nestor (Beazley, pp. 4, 5), we read, "... and they set themselves to govern themselves, and there was no more justice among them: families disputed with families, and there were discords, and they made war between themselves. Then they said, Let us seek for a Prince to rule over us and judge us according to right. And they went over the sea of the Varangians and went among the Rus... and said to the Rus, Our land is rich and great, but there is no order among us; come then, and rule and govern us. And three brothers joined together, with their families and brought them to Rus..." This is perhaps the first mention of the word we know as "Russia," which is said to be a Finnish term for the Norsemen, describing them as "rowers." This domination lasted only two years when rebellion broke out, the people of the
town of Novgorod saying, "We are but slaves, and suffer evil from Rurik and his nobles." But the revolt was broken, and, "At the end of two years, died Sineus and Truvor, and Rurik made himself master of all the country... . He established himself there (Novgorod), as Prince, and divided among his companions the lands and the towns... ." (Beazley, ibid.)

Thus the first nucleus of consolidation in Russia is in the North,—Novgorod (New Town). But the Rus, under their "Viking" leaders, expanded to the South and began to place under the sway of the Princes of Novgorod the rest of the towns of the land. Pioneers, also of Norse stock, had preceded the Princes of Novgorod, and had even attacked Tsargrad, i.e. Constantinople, about 865. Here again, the source is Nestor. (Beazley). The Patriarch Photius of the Eastern Empire, is also witness to this. (Kluchevsky, vol. I, pp. 70-72).

Kiev was the most important of the towns thus brought under sway of the Norse rulers, and became, in turn, the center for fresh invasions and conquests, as well as the new capital of the Norse-Slavic culture and the chief market for the trade with the East, which was always associated with the conquests of the advancing Princes. There was, as yet, no trade with the Poles or Hungarians, and that with the North homeland was comparatively insignificant.

With the rise of Kiev, the second of the early famous towns, a much broader political development began. As the Princes of this town extended their domains, they also established, as rulers of the conquered territory, relatives or paid retainers, but under such terms that, apart from the paying of tribute, they were as complete in their sovereignty as the Grand Prince of Kiev. There was really a confederation of "city states," with a President at Kiev. During the winter, from November to April, the Grand Prince made a tour of his domains to collect tribute, seldom, at this period, in money. In the Spring preparations were made for the Summer trade and, in June, a great fleet sailed and floated down the Dnieper to the Black Sea and thence to the Byzantine ports. From thence, by the Sea of Azov, the Don and the Volga the trade was carried to the markets of Eastern Islam. The retinue of the Grand Prince was composed of the nobles who were at once the ruling and the merchant class and were accompanied by some private traders. But the bulk of the commerce was, so to speak, official. Treaties were made and broken with the Eastern Empire, involving tax agreements, fines, modus operandi of trading, and so on. (Beazley, pp. 10-17.) In all this two things are of import-
ance for the future development of Russia; first, intercourse with Byzantium led ultimately to the conversion of the Russians by the Eastern Church; secondly, Roman legal conceptions crept into the country, among which the conception of absolutism in ruling, when reinforced by the experiences of the Tatar invasion, led to a complete revolution of the system of government. (Kluchevsky, vol. I, chaps. VI, VII, XII.)

The regent Olga, of Kiev, marks the beginning of state interest in Christianity. In 955 she went on a state visit to Constantinople and was baptized by Constantine VII and the Patriarch of the Church, assuming the new name of Helene. (Chronicle, in Beazley, p. 20.) But it is not until the reign of her grandson, St. Vladimir, that Christianity is officially adopted.

At first a valiant restorer of the old heathendom and defender of the old gods, he came, in later life, both to feel a certain religious unrest among his people and also to become acquainted with other religions. According to the Chronicle, he and his council examined in turn the Jewish, the Mohammedan and the various forms of the Christian faith, coming finally to the conclusion that, of them all, the one most fitted to the nature of the Rus, as well as the most beautiful and the most appealing, and also the one favored by his grandmother Olga, was the Eastern form of Christianity. It is noteworthy that the form of the Eastern service appealed to him and his followers—"For there is no such spectacle on earth, nor one of such beauty. We cannot describe it: we only know that there God dwells in the midst of men." (Beazley, pp. 21-24.) Vladimir married the sister of Basil II and baptized his people by force, in droves in the river, throwing the old gods over a bluff into the stream.

Thus was a momentous decision made and carried out, and its basic cause was trade and the location of trade routes. It is more important than it seems at first sight, for choice of the Eastern Church meant refusal of the claims of the Church of Rome, meant cultural separation from the civilization of the West and from the Romanized Polish Slavs, with momentous consequences in wars and intrigues. It also meant, on the other hand, alliance with a decaying civilization while Russia was herself too young to judge its faults. It is this early union with the East which is the source, in later days, of prejudice against the West and its culture, making the task of Peter and his successors more difficult, and giving rise to political and social problems.
Under Vladimir, early Russia attained its highest power, its greatest expansion and least defective organization, though it did not become a thoroughly unified state. Under his son Yaroslav, the reputed author of the "Russkaya Pravda" or Code of Russian Law, many and brilliant alliances were made with the reigning families of other lands,—Poland, Norway, France and Hungary. Under his rule Kiev is said to have rivalled Constantinople in grandeur, but to maintain it heavy taxes, paid by the peasantry, were necessary. The peasants, to be sure, had not yet lost their ancient heritage of freedom and democracy, but the process was beginning. (Kluchevsky, vol. I, chaps. VI, IX, X.)

The death of Yaroslav showed clearly that only a strong hand had held the Federation together. The next two hundred years are years of internal discord and war, and the hope that Kiev with its Duma might have developed into a true well founded democracy is lost and, to the coming of the Tatars, there is no further supremacy there. Novgorod takes up the leadership.

Russian official historians like to point to the fact of the autocracy as proof that it was inherent in the nature of the Russian people. Kiev, at its height, is disproof of this, Novgorod is even more so. Where the Prince of the former was constrained to take advice before any important action, and to admit the elected City Wardens to his council, the latter goes still further, and may be termed, in no uncertain sense of the words, "the Republic of Novgorod."

From early times the spirit of Novgorod had been famous. When, in 972, Kiev had offered to send an ordinary official to rule the town, in place of the son or nearest relative of the Grand Prince, the city had retorted,—"We know how to find another Prince." Again, in 1102, when the city elected a Prince for itself, it sent a messenger to Kiev, saying, "Novgorod hath sent us to say unto thee, we desire neither thee nor thy son. Send thy sôn only if he have two heads. Already we have Mstislav... reared by us to rule Novgorod." (Chronicle, Beazley, p. 29.) As Kiev declined, Novgorod became more and more democratic. The sovereignty was treated as purely elective, often followed by recall or deposition. But Novgorod was only Novgorod; there was no national spirit or leadership. The relations of the early free towns of Russia would seem to be not dissimilar to those of the Greek City States,—they never realized that in union alone could they be strong, and consequently wasted in internal wars the strength that might have defeated the Tatar when he came, or thrown off the yoke sooner. But
there was as yet no national feeling, since there was, as yet, no real nation.

Lord Novgorod the Great, "Gospodin Veliki Novgorod," is the best example of the city state of the Russian Middle Ages. Kiev and Moscow, in their respective periods, were in some respects of more importance, but no other town had the same self-sufficiency, activity and success. It alone survived, almost unharmed, the invasion of the Tatars, and succumbed only with the rise of Moscow. At its height it is said to have had a population of over 100,000, with 300,000 more subjects without the walls. The ruling Prince was elected, the Church was strong, but all in all, when not divided by party factions, the real power was the Veche, or General Assembly of the citizens. Later, we hear of a "Posadnik," or Governor, in place of the Prince, and elected, like him, by the Veche. (Chronicle, Beazley, pp. 40-42.) Though the Church was powerful, its bishops, too, were elected, and in the Veche was vested the decision for war and peace, for banishment and punishment.

But over and over again certain other characteristics, peculiarly Slavic, appear, such as the principle of the "necessity of unanimity." Many a peaceful solution is lost because a minority oppose it,—and in the Novgorod of the 12th and 13th centuries, to be in a minority meant, often, to be drowned, killed by the sword or expelled. Again lack of political experience, lack of utilitarian ideas,—a characteristic Slavic trait, and the failure to make common cause against the enemy led to dissolution and downfall. Novgorod fell before Moscow in 1471, but the rise to power of this new center in Russia is another story, best considered after the Mongol invasion.

Thus the Norsemen were the first, none too successful agency to try to bring about centralization and a common rule in Russia, and towns like Novgorod are the best proof of their failure. The Tatars are the second, whose regime we will now consider; Moscow was to be the third, and the successful attempt. (Kluchevsky, vol. I, chaps. XIX, XX.)

The Coming of the Tatars.

The Tatars came in 1224 and again during the period from 1227 to 1240, and while there were periods free from active invasion and conquest during the 13th and 14th centuries, none the less the domination of the Asiatics was continuous until the beginning of the 15th century, and complete independence was not won until 1480. Thus in this period of over two hundred years of
Tatar domination we may see a very decisive factor which retarded, directly, by active interference and indirectly, by offering a model of autocratic government once the domination was over, which Moscow used as the means to a permanent establishment of a state.

With the details of the Tatar invasion and domination we are not concerned,—only with the methods which they used to exploit and corrupt the country, incidentally affording Moscow an opportunity to supplant the invader and establish herself in his place. The Chronicle of Novgorod furnishes us with much of the detail. (Quoted in Beazley, pp. 51-55.) All the Russia that we have mentioned, all the free towns and the Federation of Kiev, as well as the numerous dependencies and colonies,—all fell before the Tatar except Novgorod. In its Chronicle we read,—that God, and the sacred apostolic cathedral of the Holy Wisdom, and the prayers of the bishop, of the faithful princes, and of the monks guarded the Republic. Only seventy miles away from the town the invaders turned back. But continued safety was won only at the cost of prompt official submission and the payment of tribute. The Republic “bursts with defiance” but under the wise leadership of Alexander Nevski yielded to the demands of the Tatars and survived, intact though subject, while her great rival Kiev received the full fury of the army of the invader, was sacked (1240) and so thoroughly destroyed that not till the 19th century did she again arise, as capital of Little Russia.

Though the Tatar Khans left to each principality its laws, its constitution and, usually, its dynasty, the authority of the latter became vested in the Tatar Overlord, necessitating for installation of a Prince, for settlement of disputes, for defence against charges,—indeed for any and every important decision or action, lengthy visits to the Khan on the lower Volga, or even at times to the Grand Khan in Asia. The Russian people under the local princes were compelled to pay heavy taxes, whose severity at times provoked rebellion followed by heavy punishment. It was, in large measure, due to the political adroitness of the Princes of Moscow in obtaining the privilege of farming these taxes, that they rose to power at the expense of the other local rulers.

But the influence of the Tatars was not shown only in such external matters of administration and taxation; it was as powerful and perhaps even more lasting in matters purely social. Russian princely and aristocratic families were bribed or forced into marriage with their Tatar lords; social custom, dress and, particularly, the attitude toward women underwent a change and reflected more
and more, with the lengthening of the oriental despotism, ideas and methods peculiar to the East. That the previous influence of Byzantium had created something of this attitude is undoubtedly true, but the consensus of Russian critical opinion is that the Tatar domination doubly encouraged and made permanent what had been only a tendency.

The Tatar domination was also responsible for a great increase in the power of the Church, for the Mongols not only allowed the Russians to follow and enjoy their own Orthodox faith, but even encouraged and supported the Church as an additional means of controlling the country. The churches were exempted from taxation and the authority of the clergy received the same sanction and was placed under much the same system of restrictions as the secular power of the princes. Religion as a factor in Russian life and culture was thus greatly increased and "Orthodoxy" came to be almost synonymous with patriotism,—became, as it were, the outlet for patriotism which was, under the regime of the Tatars, denied other expression.

One other result of the period is worthy of notice. The pre-Mongolian division of power was more or less broken up, and princely power concentrated in the hands of a comparatively few of the stronger among them, subject, of course, to the Khan, while the power of the next rank in society, the Boyars or nobles of high but not princely rank, was weakened. The Tatars maintained Prince against Boyars, and strong Prince against weak Prince, provided the strong Prince was loyal in his attitude toward the Khan. The Tatars, in short, were a stepping stone to centralization, and the Princes of Moscow were those who used the circumstances to best advantage. (Kluchevsky, vol. I, chaps. XVII, XVIII.)

The Rise of Moscow and the Autocracy.

The rise of Moscow may be traced to several causes; its advantageous geographical position, the movements of colonists in her direction, and above all, the policies and personal qualities of her Princes. Moscow is near both the Volga and the Oka, communicates with both by navigable tributaries, lying, thus, in a sort of Mesopotamia, far from the turmoils of the South, not too near the frontier of the East and, consequently, became a harbor for the oppressed peoples of other regions. The Tatar sack of 1293 is almost the only instance of trouble from the Asiatics, though, in common with the rest of the Russian towns and cities, she paid taxes and suffered submission. But the greatest factor in the
growth of Moscow was the character of her Princes,—statesmen of a new order for Russia,—selfish, but far-seeing, and with a policy for both internal and external affairs. They were attentive to money matters; indeed, the first of their great rulers was known as "Kalita," i. e., the Purser.

This Kalita, 1328-1341, recognizing the power and advantages of the Church, obtained permission from the Khan to remove the chief bishopric to Moscow and, by adding to this factor of glory the additional one of obtaining permission to supervise the gathering of tribute from the other princes, created a new national center, which even the Mongols, in the times to come, had to recognize. This connection of the Church’s chief seat with Moscow proved to be permanent, and the growing Church, with its widely scattered threads of influence, its wealth and power, helped to give to the new city a position of overlordship that the other factors reinforced. Moscow became "Mother Moscow," a sacred city.

This Muscovite policy of cunning and utilitarianism was carried on with increased success by Ivan III, "Ivan Veliki," i. e., John the Great, who ruled from 1462 to 1505. With this Ivan we are approaching modern times, and Russia of the period seems to have taken on more of a modern appearance. John is the so-called "Re-uniter of the Russian Land," not yet quite free, at the beginning of the reign, from the foreign Asiatic overlord, but nearly so. Ivan trebled the extent of the Moscow domain, raised it to the dignity of a kingdom, arrested the growth and advance of Poland-Lithuania, brought under the sway of his city all Russians not under Western domination and won a port on the Baltic and on the Arctic. Above all, by his marriage with Sophia Palaiologos, he united his family with the Eastern Empire and claimed thereby, for his country, the inheritance of the dethroned Caesars. He developed intercourse with the West, used Western talent in the service of Russia and was, in many ways, the forerunner of Peter the Great. A real national feeling began to exist, in a profounder and broader sense than had been the case during the period of the free democracies, a national feeling based on the recognition and acclamation of a monarchy. "Muscovy" began to be discovered by the rest of Europe, and travelers’ tales, sources for much of our knowledge of the period, began to appear. The Byzantine crest of the double eagle was adopted as well as the term "Autocrat." The Church supported all this, and Moscow came to be, in the language of the time, "Tsargrad," the third and final Rome, and all that the term implies of centralization and political theory went
with the name. (Kluchevsky, vol. I, chaps. XVI-XVIII, and vol. II, chaps. I-IV.)

The history of Russia from the time of Ivan Veliki, at the beginning of the 16th century to the accession of Peter at the end of the 17th, is the history of the varying fortunes of the Moscow power. Of real democratic assemblies we find no trace, the struggle for power is rather between the upper classes and the monarchy than between the people and the Tsar. The Sobor alone, which indeed bears the name of “General Assembly,” but which is representative rather of the middle and upper classes, made even a pretense of self-government. Tsar and nobles contended for mastery, and each endeavored to have on his side whatever other power or wealth existed in the country. The Sobor was but a pale reflection of the freer institutions of the old period.

The 16th century was a period of conquests and expansion, and a corresponding growth of power of the Tsar, the declaration of “divine right” in the person of Ivan the “Terrible,” the beginning of serfdom through the activities of Boris Godunov, who finally became, himself, Tsar on the death of Ivan’s son. The “smutnoye vremya,” or Time of Troubles began the 17th century, and was followed by the election, by the Sobor of 1613, of Michael Robanov, the founder of the last line of Tsars. The 17th century was a period of internal development, change, reaction, reform, discontent and religious disturbances. This was the heritage of the Time of Troubles; torn asunder by civil war and confusion over the dynasty, Russia had stood comparatively still while the rest of Europe went through the Renaissance and the Reformation. Russia seemed sufficient to herself,—if only she could embody that self in a pure form,—aloof from “heretical Rome,” “degenerate Constantinople” and the rest of the non-Russian world. (Kluchevsky, vol. II, chaps. IV-VI; vol. III, chaps. I-VI, XIII-XVI.

By the end of the 15th century the power of the Veche had been lost except in Novgorod and Pskov. Elsewhere, indeed, it continued to exist, particularly in the southwest, but all elective and political power had disappeared. In 1487, Ivan the Third, with the night of rising Moscow behind him, demanded the submission of Novgorod,—“No assembly, veche: no elected magistrate; and the whole power in the hands of the Tsar.” (Chronicle of Nikon.) Thus far had Moscow grown even at this time. (Kovalevsky, 100, chaps. IV, V.)

With the decay of the Veche, and before the creation of the Sobor, there existed but one check on the Tsar,—the “Duma,” or
council of the "Boyars" or nobles. This was not in any sense a
democratic institution, but was some check on the Autocracy, in
that the Prince was obliged to ask and to consider the advice of
the nobles of the Duma in financial, military and executive matters.
Up to the middle of the 15th century there is evidence that the
individual Boyar had the right to withdraw from the service of one
Prince and enter that of another, but with the maturing of the full
power of Moscow the rights of both Duma and individual Boyar
became much restricted, and the body became more and more merely
advisory and aristocratic.

The "Sobor Zemski," or "land assembly" was the creation, in
1550, of Ivan the Terrible. This body was formed by the coalescence
of the Duma and another similar body, the High Commission, to-
gether with representatives of the lower nobility, the military
forces, heads of governmental departments, trade-guilds and the
Church,—all appointed, and mostly drawn from the cities, Moscow
predominating. The members were such as, in the opinion of Ivan,
knew best the difficulties of the time and could offer solutions. The
Sobor has never been abolished by law; it simply ceased to function
under Peter in 1698, but there has been no reason why it should
not have been summoned at any time since had a Tsar so wished.
Its history from 1550 is an interesting, and at times promising at-
ttempt to return to real representation and democracy, but the mem-
bership was never completely representative of all classes, and was
not elected. The Sobor of 1606 elected Shuiski as Tsar, with the
aid of the mob of Moscow, and limited his power with a constitu-
tion. Another Sobor deposed him in 1610 and imposed restrictions
on his successor. The most truly representative Sobor was that
of 1613 which elected Michael Romanov, and which was for the
first two years of his reign the real authority. Michael bound him-
self to the Sobor to make neither peace nor war, to make no new laws
nor to alter old ones, nor to tax without its consent. In 1619 the
Sobor elected the Patriarchate; in 1645 it confirmed the coronation
of Michael's successor, Alexis; in 1682, it pronounced in favor of
Peter, and the last Sobor, of 1698, pronounced judgment on the
Princess Sophia who, in Peter's absence, had tried to usurp the
throne. But as the Romanovs became stronger, and the period since
its last election longer, the necessity of the support of the Sobor
became less apparent, and the institution waned both because of
this increased power of the autocracy as well as the failing spirit
and enterprise of the people, a characteristic of the time, not only
in Russia, but throughout Europe. (Kovalevsky, 100, chap. V; Klut-
cheyevsky, vol. III, chap. IV.)
Recapitulation, Economic Conditions and the Condition of Education to the Time of Peter the Great.

The preceding two sections have given as brief a summary of the political and institutional history of the Slavs from their origins to the accession of Peter as seems commensurable with an adequate understanding of the later developments which are to be our chief concern. It remains for this section to indicate the chief economic factors and conditions, show how they were in part created and in part solved by Western influence, and to sketch the educational conditions of Russia during these years, keeping in mind that education as an organized system really begins with Peter.

The story of the Scandinavian inroad which has been narrated in connection with the early rise of Novgorod is interpreted by some Russian historians as economic in character rather than political. The word "Variagi" is said by Kluchevsky to come from a Russian root, meaning peddler, vendor, tradesman or merchant, and from this point of view the early political development is really to be considered as a trade supremacy by the Northmen who were, perhaps, in possession of the southern and eastern trade before the Slavs entered into the country in great numbers. As a matter of fact, regardless of the real meaning of the legend or chronicle, the influence of these Northerners can be and has often been overestimated. They were probably not numerous and it would seem that they were soon absorbed by inter-marriage and assimilation. That they were an economic influence and an asset in directing the early development of the Slavs there is no question, but from all the evidence it would seem that they were not preponderant in other directions, for the Slavs brought with them, as we have seen, their own political and social habits and methods.

The weight of historical evidence points, then, to a fairly well established trade between the Norsemen and the Black Sea and Azov region, to which the Slavs became heirs. It is noteworthy, in this connection, that the Slavs did not concern themselves with agriculture till the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh centuries, when changed internal and external conditions made it necessary. Trade was everything and determined the nature of the political conditions which we have seen. The chief Slav articles of commerce were furs from the forests, bee products, and slaves, won for the most part in warfare. It was in connection with the decline of export trade and the growth of agriculture that serfdom arose, the several factors mutually influencing one another, from the eleventh century, on. Under such conditions of trade, with ac-
cumulated stores and wealth, it was natural that fortified, semi-independent towns with local government and surrounding dependent environs should grow up. Examples of these have been described. The successive rise and decay of Novgorod, Kiev, Novgorod again and, finally, Moscow is, in part, the reflection of a shifting of economic and commercial importance, from one point of the country to another. Military force often helped to determine this; the Tatars, too, helped in the case of Moscow. As for the Variagi, while part of them were themselves traders, part were also mere mercenaries, hired to protect the trade centers, and usurping the power they had been hired to serve. (Mavor, vol. I, book I, chap. I.)

The transition from this first type of economic life was the result of two factors, first, the growth in the number and value of slaves; second, the Tatar invasion. The Kiev civilization had already begun in the twelfth century to employ slaves in agriculture, and the institution of inheritable estates with attached slave cultivators was beginning to develop, with consequent wealth of a new kind. At the same time the rivalry between neighboring Princes, which had existed under purely trade conditions, now began to take the form of raids on one another's property and estates for the sake of capturing additional slaves. It was this consequent lack of mutual protection and support which made possible the easy conquest by the Tatars in 1229-40. The Tatars swept Kiev out of existence and forced the migration of the Kiev population, slaves and masters, to new regions,—to the Northeast and the plains of the Upper Volga. This is one of the first of the migrations in historic times which has had momentous results. Political and social organization was broken up, and new economic conditions established. In the new region of the Upper Volga we find the establishment of the appanage system corresponding, with characteristic differences, to the feudalism of Western Europe, brought to its most centralized form. The appanage system was built in different economic conditions than feudalism,—the village population in the former being unfixed and distinctly migratory, in the latter bound to the soil. In the former free transfer of "service" was a basic principle, leading to endowment of the free servant with land as a measure to secure permanent obligation to his Prince. In this latter fact we find the germs of serfdom or slavery of the peasant, not to be confused with the slavery of the captives in war of the earlier periods. The origin of serfdom was gradual and a result of economic conditions,—poor productivity, heavy debts and no way in which to pay them.
There was first the debt due the owner of the territory with which the peasant had been "endowed," secondly the state tax. Both were heavy, often amounting to all the wealth produced on the land necessitating hunting, fishing and peasant industries as a supplement to the products of the ground. The additional fact of competition among princely owners, showing itself in stealing cultivators from neighboring smaller estates, or in bribing them to change service, resulted in decay of the smaller estates and consequent embarrassment of the State itself. This is the reason given for the celebrated "Ukaz" of Boris Godunov in 1597, which abolished the right of the peasants to leave land once taken over for cultivation by them. The right of the proprietor over the person of the cultivator was a later development. (Mavor, vol. I, book I, chaps. I-V; Kluchevsky, vol. II, chaps. XII-XIII.)

The question of Western influence is the connecting link between the economic and the educational situation, in all but the very beginnings of the latter. During the 15th and 16th centuries there was intercourse between Russia and the West,—but no marked cultural influence. Only with the 17th century did Russia manifest a sense of inferiority, of mental and moral submission, and begin to show a desire to borrow not mere amenities of life, but views, ideas and fundamental social institutions. This was due fundamentally to one fact,—the inability of the Moscow government to make domestic resources meet material requirements. The old feeling and staunch belief that antiquity had given the country all that was needed for development was no longer firm and valid. Declining faith in national powers and institutions gradually led to a desire for guidance and instruction from the alien and hitherto despised West. Russia saw clearly that the 16th and 17th centuries had produced enormous changes in the West,—centralized states, greater freedom of labor, technical inventions, bourgeois labor and industry,—in all of which she had no part. In Russia the corresponding period had been spent in war, the upkeep of court, government and the privileged classes, none of which had or could have done anything for the betterment of the country as a whole. Thus Russia was more remote from the rest of Europe in the 17th century than she had been at the end of the 15th.

Russian culture of the period was essentially Eastern, Byzantine, and was under the control of the Church as its directing force, yet the Church did little to use that culture for any but its own purposes, paying comparatively little attention to the life of the citizen except as a member of the Church. The economic, the social, the
political life were untouched by the power of the Church, except that the Church supported the claims of the Autocracy. But it offered no forms for civic or social life, and did little to increase the stock of knowledge or means of getting it. On the other hand the influence of the West was introduced by the State and acted directly on manners and customs, introducing new political and social ideas, and opening up new fields of knowledge and introducing new methods. Put in other words, the Church influence was ecclesiastic and embraced in its limited way the whole community, while Western influence was political, and affected the individual citizens as such. These two elements in Russian history persist throughout the succeeding centuries, developing and constantly growing more complicated, and in their light only are many of the problems of Russian history to be clearly understood. Adherents of the East come to be called “Russophiles,” later “Slavophiles”; their opponents are variously called “Gauls,” “Freethinkers,” “Voltaireans,” and finally “Westerners.”

Western influence began with the borrowing of military and technical material, guns, machinery, ships, and then skilled labor to produce them on the spot. Then came foreign officers to train native troops, which had been shown to be decidedly inferior to the forces of the West. Next came the development of mines for iron and the establishment of Russian centers of industry and manufacture, still under the management of foreigners, imported often en bloc and under contract to teach Russian apprentices their trades and methods. From these small beginnings the Moscow government at last came to the realization of the absolute necessity of developing all the resources of the country, and rewards were offered for the discovery of deposits of ores and minerals. Foreign quarters began to spring up in the larger towns, particularly in Moscow, where the German quarter came to be almost a separate town. Thus by 1650 Russia had absorbed a great part of the material culture and technique of the West.

But as yet there was little attempt to introduce Western learning and knowledge. Rather the contrary attempt was made,—to use the material products of the West and yet retain the Eastern attitude of mind. The beginnings of the establishment and growth of the learning of the West date from about 1650, by which time the technical culture was widely diffused. Schools had existed in Russia even in the pre-Mongolian period, in which the rudiments of Christian learning had been taught, by the Church for the most part. The Tatar invasion had effectively destroyed many of these, but
some traditions and books had been preserved, and increased by what few fragments of medieval learning had crept into Russia in the 15th and 16th centuries. The character of these early schools is well indicated by the inscription in Church Slavonic underneath a picture showing an interior with teachers and students: "In order to praise God it is every man's duty to study written signs of words. Thus, by learning, he understands (what is) good, (and) will succeed (in entering) the heavenly realm (together) with the saints. For this reason, Oh Youths, maintain this study; do not waste (your) time and (even) hours in (worldly) amusement." (Text and picture in 67, p. 18.)

But in the early part of the 17th century we find two influences combining to introduce newer and more modern learning,—the Church, and the nobility and people of wealth. The Church's interest was due to the necessity of combatting the influence of the Jesuits, which was rapidly growing in southwestern Russia; the interest of the higher classes was broader. This new attitude of the Church was in direct contradiction to its opinion under Boris Godunov, late in the 16th century, when it discouraged a proposed university on the ground that "it was not wise to entrust the teaching of youth to the Catholics and Lutherans." The most important of the schools established to counteract the Jesuit influence was that at Kiev, founded 1631, by the Kiev Metropolitan, Peter Mogila, a man well versed in Western culture and who had studied at the Sorbonne. It was felt that the heterodoxy had to be fought on its own ground, hence the curriculum was almost a copy of the Jesuit schools of Poland, and included scholastic philosophy, theology, rhetoric, Greek, Latin and Slavonic. The school was divided into eight classes and Latin was used both as the medium of teaching and as the language of conversation for the pupils. It was this academy which furnished the bands of scholars who corrected the sacred books of the Russian Church, and afforded a nucleus for the later work of Peter the Great. It was also the center from which came the translations of works of Western culture, and its graduates were among the first teachers and writers of the following period.

Many private persons of wealth vied with the State and the Church in furthering the enlightenment of Russia. T. M. Rtischev, the trusted adviser of Tsar Alexis, built a monastery near Moscow, and in 1649 summoned at his own expense some thirty learned monks whose function was both to translate foreign books into Russian and to teach the Kiev curriculum to those who wished to enter as scholars. This is but one example among many; other families
of wealth engaged foreign tutors, as did Alexis himself for his children. In 1685 the Moscow Slavo-Graeco-Latin Academy was founded, with much the same object as the Academy at Kiev. Thus did the two radically different motives for the introduction of the new learning continue to spread knowledge of Western culture. The Moscow school was in charge of the two brothers Likhudi, learned Greeks who had taken their doctor's degrees at Padua, and who were, therefore, not to be suspected of heterodoxy. Toward the end of the century they removed to Novgorod and founded still another similar school.

Thus, beginning with the purely material aspects of Western culture, Russia gradually came to feel the need of the thought and teaching behind them, both as propaganda against heterodoxy, and as a background for leisure and social refinement. In this first adoption of the culture of the West the motives are mixed and the moving forces varied. With the next period, that of Peter the Great, education becomes emphatically a matter of State and national concern, and with Peter, as before him, education is closely connected with economic and political conditions. (Kluchevsky, vol. III, chaps. XIII, XIV; Milioukov, 69, vol. II, pp. 250-294.)

This brief survey of the pre-Petrine period has attempted to make clear the main springs of Russian history, and to make possible an understanding of the problems of Russian education as influenced by and in turn influencing the other factors of the national life. Since education was not, until the 18th century, a conspicuous element of Russian history, the emphasis, up to this point, has been on other factors. In the succeeding periods the emphasis will be reversed, and education will receive the major attention, and be interpreted in terms of the other conditions whose beginnings have been sketched in this chapter.

(See also for this whole period in detail, Soloviev, History of Russia. Many sources and documents quoted.)
CHAPTER III.

Peter the Great (1689-1725), to Catherine II (1762)

The preceding chapter has traced the rise and growth of the early democracies, the subsequent rise and development of an autocracy, and the very beginning of the education devoted to state and class ends. We shall be concerned, in this chapter, with the conscious creation of a system of education, designed to further the more material purposes of the government and its policy of educating servants for the state. We shall find, also, the beginnings of that opposition which later becomes so much more open and bitter, and which constitutes the fourth of the movements which we are tracing.

The Problems and the Reforms of Peter.

The reign of Peter is the beginning of many new things in Russia. A man of tremendous vitality and energy, he may justly be said to have attempted to lift Russia as a whole and to place it in the commanding position which he thought her due. The beginnings of both reform and revolution are to be found in his reign.

Even to sketch the details of the activities of his career would be impossible here; we can only summarize his main problems and his solutions, leaving his general educational policy to a following section. The main tasks which lay before Peter were: the political unification of his state, the creation of a satisfactory frontier, the development of the productive powers of the country, and the introduction of modern ideas of culture and living, i.e., the social regeneration of the people. All this is but another way of saying that the West and Russia were more and more parts of a larger Europe, or that the ideas of autocracy, nationalism and (later) orthodoxy were in the process of formation.

As means to the attainment of his purposes Peter, first of all, developed an army and created a navy. In place of the Sobor, which we have seen was declining both in power and real representative value, Peter established a highly centralized bureaucracy, though permitting some degree of local self-government for the cities. Throughout all these activities his knowledge and experi-
ence of the Western nations is apparent. There was, moreover, a contributing cause for the suppression of the historic representative bodies in addition to their decayed character and condition. This was the essentially new kind of government and the radically new ideas which Peter wished to establish. The Sobors, even had they been at this period at their best, were too inculcated with the superstitions and the ideas of old Russia, the very Russia which Peter wished to change. They and the members of which they were composed, had they been ever so truly representative, had no knowledge of the science and the politics of that West which Peter was competing with, were too imbued with religious and class standards, too illiterate. That there had been no schools to teach them did not change the fact, and Peter could not wait for their enlightenment in his own schools. They were also opposed to foreign merchants as free competitors, in a word, they represented all that meant nothing to Peter. Moreover, the time in which Peter was forming his state was throughout Europe a period of suppression of representative government, and a time of “enlightened despotism.” With this Peter became familiar in his travels, indeed, he is credited with expressing a willingness to exchange half his lands for the gift of another Richelieu to teach him how to rule. What he saw, in place of representative assemblies, were well-paid, self-made men in the service of the rulers.

As for economic doctrines, Peter brought back with him the doctrine that a country should import as little as possible and export a maximum. To carry this doctrine out, meant the training of his people, and so hundreds of artisans were gathered and sent to Russia to teach their trades, and his ambassadors at the European courts were literally employment agents to expedite and continue the process. In addition, Russian youths were sent abroad as apprentices, the costs being paid by the state. A still further development was the establishment of factories; when Peter came to the throne there were no large manufacturing plants, while at his death there were some 233 factories and foundries, private or state-owned, or subsidized by the state.

Other changes, more directly social, abound. The breaking down of the oriental seclusion of women, the modification of many other oriental customs, survivors of the influence of the Tatar regime, the spread of culture and education, the abolition of rank due solely to birth and the substitution of service for all and merit in accordance, conscription for the army as well as for industrial and state work and construction, the breaking up of the “house-
hold" as the taxable unit and the substitution of the capitation tax, the creation of a Senate and ten Ministries or colleges, the division of the country into governments, the abolition of the Patriarchate and the substitution of a Holy Synod with a layman at the head, thus making the Church, in a sense, a department of State.—all these were items in the whole scheme of the activities of Peter.

In all this it is important to notice one main cause,—the West. The desire to imitate the West, to compete with the West seems to have been at the bottom of it all. War was the normal and the most frequent state of Russia during Peter's reign and, in a sense, the necessity to win led to reforms, and the reforms enabled further and better warfare, again leading to further reforms. War, Peter said, was the school of the nation to teach it the necessity of reform, and each prolonged the other. But Russia leaves the leadership of Peter definitely turned to the West. (Kluchevsky, vol. IV, chaps. LXI, LXII, LXVII; Soloviev, vol. XVIII, chaps. I-III; Mavor, book I, vol. I, chaps. V, VI; Kovalevsky, 101, chap. IV.)

The Educational Reforms and Creations of Peter.

It is quite comprehensible, then, that Peter should have turned his attention to schools and education. To bring his country even to the beginning of that development which he wished for her, it was impossible to rely forever on imported specialists and artisans. —the Russians themselves must understand the processes and the technique involved. Only in the light of his reforms, projected or carried out, can we understand the new course of education and the new types of schools which were now founded. In principle they were completely the opposite of those few schools which had existed before him and upon his accession. The schools of the 17th century had been religious, had been maintained in the interests of the Church, and their curriculum had been mainly literary; Peter's schools were secular, were a part of the State, and were technical in their curriculum. Peter needed helpers, and these schools were to produce both them and his successors. In these schools there was little or no attempt made to give a liberal education; rather, the minimum of general ability compatible with definite technical knowledge for a career in the service of the State, was the ideal. He tried at one time to use the existing Slavo-Graeco-Latin Academy for his purposes, but found it useless.

Peter's first school, in accordance with his own ideas, was established in 1701, in Moscow,—the School of Mathematics and Navigation. This existed for fifteen years, and produced not only
officers for the navy, but civil and military engineers, school teachers and architects. When the Naval Academy was established in St. Petersburg, in 1715, the Moscow institution became a preparatory school for the new academy. For these schools most of the teachers had to be imported, for there existed no supply in Russia, and few of those sent abroad had acquired sufficient knowledge to teach. A professor of the University of Aberdeen, Farquharson, was director of the Moscow school, and was the author of the first Russian manuals of mathematics. In 1712, during a period of rest from war, Peter founded the School of Engineering and the Artillery School.

From the day of entrance to these schools, the student was considered a servant of the State. Moreover, as by Peter's decree every noble must serve the state, and the only way to such service lay through the schools, it became the obligation of the nobility to go to school. Opposition on the part of the conservative among them, who hated Peter's reforms, led to the opening of the lower grades of these schools to other social classes, thus preparing them for inferior places in the civil service. Peter created a system of ranks or "chin," a hierarchy of civil service. Fourteen ranks existed, of which the four highest were hereditary, and promotion was made to depend on service and position. Teachers, graduates, holders of degrees, all had their appointed "chin."

Peter also initiated the provision of elementary education by the State. It seems to have been the tradition that elementary education could be gotten without schools, and that the latter were necessary for higher or secondary education only. The greater number of reading and writing schools, before the reform of Peter, were those of the religious dissenters, the "raskolniki," though some existed, also, in connection with the monasteries, but in them all the religious motive was predominant. Peter's first move in this direction was the establishment of the "cypher" or arithmetical schools, in 1714. Here were taught reading, writing, arithmetic and the elements of geometry, teachers being supplied from the graduates of the Naval Academy. They were free, and open to all classes, and were later made obligatory for all children aged ten to fifteen, a law being passed that no man might marry unless a graduate. But this ukaz of 1719 could not be enforced. In 1721 a ruling was passed requiring the bishops to establish elementary schools in their respective eparchies. These schools were also supplied with teachers from the various academies, but were under immediate supervision of the Holy Synod. But this double system of schools
weakened the growth of the first cypher schools.—indeed, this is but an early instance of an almost constant duplication of elementary schools. The curriculum of the Synod schools was less technical, and more religious, and this accounted for their greater success. Many of the cypher schools were closed, others were merged into the Eparchial system, though the Holy Synod, after Peter's death, refused, because of their secular nature, to assume charge of the remaining cypher schools. Still another variety of elementary schools was created after Peter's death.—the Garrison Schools for the children of soldiers, in 1732. These constituted still one more source of competition with the cypher schools, so that by 1750 they had completely disappeared.

One other project of Peter which he did not, himself, carry out, remains to be considered,—the creation of an Academy of Sciences, in imitation of those so widely spread throughout the Europe of the time. Peter had entered into correspondence with Wolf, the German philosopher, and with Leibnitz, and had organized a plan for the creation of seventeen professorships, and a gymnasium which was to act as a feeder for the Academy. That is, it was to be at once a learned society, a university and a secondary school. But its history did not match the inspiration which planned it, and Peter died the year before it was opened. (Tolstoy, 71, pp. 1-38; Kniazkov and Serbov, pp. 30-54; Milioukov, 69, vol. II, pp. 295-308; Darlington, pp. 10-15. The account of this period, issued by the Ministry of Public Education, itself, is Source No. 3, "Historical Outline of the Activities of the Ministry of Public Education," Introduction, chap. I.)

*Peter's Successors, to Catherine the Great, 1762.*

The period immediately after the reign of Peter may be characterized as one of decline; Peter's reforms lose, little by little, their full force and direction, and the country, through its highest offices, comes to be more and more ruled and administered by foreigners,—chiefly Germans. Not until Catherine, herself, to be sure, a German, do we again find a firm hand guiding affairs. From 1725 to 1762 six people occupied the throne, often through force, so that the period is known as that of the "palace revolutions." This was largely due to the ukaz of 1722, wherein Peter had proclaimed the right of a ruler to name his successor, thus taking away the power of election which the Assembly or Sobor had formerly possessed.
The aristocracy and the clergy, followed by the great mass of the rest of the people, returned as far as possible to the older ways of life. But all the results and efforts of Peter could not be frustrated. The other side were loud in their praise and regret, and legends kept alive the spirit of reform. The general tendency of the aristocracy and the bureaucracy was to rest on Peter's laurels, devoting themselves to pleasure rather than to the further development of the plans which had been left unfinished by Peter. A successful effort by the aristocracy resulted in the complete enslavement of the people, and the emancipation of their own class,—thus breaking Peter's rule that all should serve the State and have rank and award in accordance with real merit. This was largely the result of the use of the army, especially the regiments of Guards which were composed almost entirely of the sons of the nobility, and which were, during this period, one of the most important factors in disposing of the throne. The period from 1725-1762 is also one of powerful favorites and of court intrigue, and the court favorites, for the most part foreigners, controlled the destinies of the country.

All this activity of the nobility was not sheer haphazard intriguing,—there was a definite effort so to bind the throne that no Tsar might again be as powerful as Peter had been. In 1730 an attempt was made on the part of the nobility to limit Anne by a constitution, but the plan failed. There were, too, ardent Westerners, such as Prince Golitsyn, who wished for reform and culture perhaps as strongly as Peter, but who wished it to be under the control of the aristocracy rather than an autocrat. Under Anne all the vices of an autocrat were exhibited with none of Peter's love for his people and their betterment. Her reign is characterized by the power of German favorites, even the army was under a German, Münich (Russian—Minikh.) The manifesto of 1762 completed the "emancipation" of the "dvoryanstvo" or nobility, and by its provisions they were freed from all but voluntary service to the state, except in moments of national crisis, and the additional obligation of providing for the education of their sons. We shall now consider the educational activities of this period. (Soloviev, vol. XVIII, chap. IV to vol. XXV; chap. I. Kluchevsky, vol. IV, chaps. LXX-LXXIII; Kovalevsky, 101, chap. IV, pp. 109-131; Mavor, vol. I, book I, chap. VII.)

Though the proclamation of 1762 had freed the nobility from the necessity of service, and secured their economic independence, it did not mean that the bureaucracy was to be in other hands, or that there was no further need for an education fitting the upper classes.
Indeed, in the domain of education there was, perhaps, more effort made to carry out the plans of Peter than in any other.

First of all, Peter's projected Academy of Science was opened by Catherine I in 1726, and liberally endowed. Men of European fame were appointed during the next thirty or forty years, such as the Bernoulli brothers, Euler, Bulfinger, Muller, and Schoezer. The conditions of their appointment required that they actually give lectures, and since, for some time no students appeared, they were forced to lecture to one another, until the experiment was tried of importing students from abroad, particularly from Germany. In the gymnasium, which had at first a better fate, the languages of instruction were German and Latin, but students of the higher classes ceased to attend. In both the gymnasium and the Academy proper, the study of languages and mathematics prospered more than that of history, for at that time in Russia, as since also, the subject of history was not really open to free and unbiased investigation. The work of translation, too, which had been part of Peter's plan, was carried on. The Academy, for the first forty years was very differently attended, the number of students varying from two to some twenty, of all classes, for it must be remembered that this institution was not for nobles alone; indeed, the failure of the nobility to attend has been explained by just this fact, that it was not exclusively an upper class institution.

But the desire was growing, on the part of the nobility, for a higher education. New interest in foreign cultures and languages resulted in the sending of children abroad and the importation of foreign tutors, as well as the establishment and growth of private boarding schools, established by foreigners, which sprang up in large numbers during the reign of Elizabeth. The Naval Academy, the Kadetski Korpus (founded 1731), the old Slavo-Graeco-Latin Academy, all numbered many nobles on their lists; by 1764 there were some 27 such institutions giving higher education to some 6000 pupils. At this period there was no governmental control or check upon the private schools, nor any inspection; the ideas of Peter on education had been forgotten, and the suspicion of the State concerning private teaching had not yet risen to the point of active interference. But there was some apprehension, and the first step was that of competition. It was felt that, with more and better facilities provided by the state, with more and better teachers who were also Russians, the growth of the private schools would cease. So, in 1755, the government established the University of Moscow, and following the precedent of Peter, founded a gymnasium in connection with it.
This new university had three faculties, philosophy, law and medicine, all students for the latter two studies being required first to pass through the course in philosophy. The professors were bound to deliver public as well as university lectures, but as Latin, until 1768, was the language used, the public profited little. Strict supervision was exercised by the State over the actual instruction. Owing to the social prejudices of the nobility, there were two gymnasia in connection with the university, one open only to the nobility, the other for the so-called “raznochintsy.” In both, modern languages were an important part of the curriculum, but in the school for the nobility military sciences played a far more important part than in the other, where more plebian and practical sciences were substituted. French or German was the language of the class room, for the majority of the teachers were, as usual, foreigners. Grants and bursaries were given to individual deserving students. In 1758 a similar double gymnasium was established at Kazan, and Shuvalov, who was the prime mover in the University-gymnasium movement of the time, proposed to create two more universities, at St. Petersburg and at Baturin, together with other gymnasia in the main towns, and schools preparatory for the gymnasia in the smaller towns. But the demand was not yet such as to justify such foundations, and the death of Elizabeth effectually put an end to the plans.

Every incentive was given to raise the number of students at the universities. Each student, regardless of his social station by birth, was presented with a sword upon entrance to the university and received the proper ‘chin’, assured a good position upon entrance into the service of the State, and allowed to count the years of his study as years of service. Free instruction and free quarters were given to many but, in spite of all these efforts, the number of students seeking instruction at the universities was not large. The whole scheme was still in advance of the needs and the demands of the people.

In 1775, by Imperial ukaz an effort was made to bring private schools under governmental control, and all foreigners were ordered to submit to examination at St. Petersburg, at the Academy of Sciences, before teaching or opening schools. But in the absence of a system of inspection and control this early effort at supervision failed in practice. (Milioukov, 69. vol. II. pp. 308-313. Tolstoy, 71, pp. 15-47. Kniazkov and Serbov, pp. 54-60. Darlington, pp. 15-21. Source 3, Introduction, chap. 1.)
CHAPTER IV.

Catherine II to Alexander I. 1762-1801

The Policies and Activities of Catherine.

After Peter, Catherine is the next great outstanding figure met with in the course of Russian history. The time between had produced no great reformer or teacher; Catherine was to prove to be both, but in a different sense than Peter. Catherine was a German princess, and usurped the throne, condemning her son, the rightful heir, to spend thirty-four years virtually in imprisonment. In a sense, Catherine was rather the reflection of her age than the creator of its spirit; she accomplished her reforms rather by following current philosophical principles than by setting herself a goal and rushing to it, regardless of obstacles, as had Peter. She was more cautious, played at politics rather than at war, and never hesitated to undo what has been done if circumstances pointed that way. The ideals of Catherine, though but partially attained by her, remained in power until the freeing of the serfs under Alexander II, in 1861.

Catherine was the first Russian ruler who could read and write; she may be termed the first who was really educated. But her education was an aristocratic one, and this was reflected not only in her efforts for the schools, but in her general policy.

Apart from predominantly external matters such as the three partitions of Poland, the conquest of the Crimea and the acquisition of the northern coast of the Black Sea, as well as altered foreign policies, with a shift to Austria and France away from Prussia, the reign of Catherine is remarkable for the attention paid to social and class reforms. The chief aim of the state and the Autocracy was not the extension of territory or even the consolidation of that which existed, but rather the well being of the subjects of the country, an aim which, however far short Catherine came in fulfilling it, was none the less definitely and frequently expressed by her. Under Peter internal well being had been more or less of a means to other things, under Catherine it becomes an end in itself. Nor is it only from above that the efforts were made for social reform,—the beginning of social rebellion is also found. Unfortunately, Catherine was unable to see that social reform could and must take place from
some other point of view than from that of the nobility. It is perhaps because of this error at the very basis of her plans and reasonings, that she only began, rather than finished a process of change, to which each succeeding reign has contributed its share.

Catherine's ideas of reform and advancement bore yet another contrast to those of Peter; they were cultural, not technical, and pre-eminently French in origin, and she endeavored to bring them about by commissions and discussions rather than by edict and law. Reason was more of a religion to her than the faith of the church. Montesquieu was her principal guide and inspiration, and his 'Spirit of Laws' her chief source for her doctrines,—often, to be sure mis-read and mis-quoted. She showed a tendency to use just those doctrines which fitted in with existing conditions and her predetermined plans, and one which best fitted in with these things was, "Nobility is the natural support of autocracy". It was not that Catherine did not wish well to the lower orders, but she overvalued her dependence on the upper classes. Thus the Legislative Commission of 1766, for which Catherine prepared a lengthy philosophical guide, the 'Nakaz', or Instructions, accomplished but little, for while the Nakaz was in theory radical, Catherine rallied to the support of the nobles when the question of the freeing of the serfs was brought up. Furthermore, the light representation of Church and lower classes in this commission left the vote in the hands of the nobility. There were good intentions and good theory, at least on the part of Catherine, but that was all. Still further, there had been risings of peasants in the preceding years, and the question was a delicate one. As a final result of all the discussions, the nobles gained an even more secure and satisfactory position for the time being, and the serfs reached a still more unsatisfactory condition, with the one rather barren consolation that serfdom had been recognized as bad in principle, and the idea of self-liberation had been circulated. Even the 'Imperial Free Economical Society' which Catherine founded in 1765 produced nothing but essays; no action on the prize question, "The Relative Advantages of Private and Public Ownership of Land," was taken.

But the peasants themselves were becoming more active. From 1762-1769, and sporadically, to 1775 there were outbreaks and uprisings on the part of the peasants, culminating in 1775 in the rebellion of Pugachev. Pugachev was an illiterate rascal, but he promised, posing as Peter III, to liberate the peasants, destroy the nobility, grant full religious freedom and to shut Catherine up in a convent. It was a social and economic war against the nobility, in principle and in fact. For a year, with an army of peasants and Cos-
sacks he terrorized the whole basin of the Volga, capturing towns, destroying property and constantly growing stronger, even troops going over to his cause. It was not until late in 1775 that a large force brought these disorders to an end. But the whole movement was an omen of future discord and social struggles.

It was again practical applications of radical principles, this time in France, that made of Catherine a reactionary at the end of her reign. The French Revolution alarmed her; radical writers were imprisoned and exiled; it was perhaps too much to expect of her that she should permit the application of her theories to make her position less secure and force her to be less of an autocrat in her person and her place. (Kovalevsky, 101, chap. V. Kornilov, vol. I, Introduction. Mavor, vol. I, Book II, chap. V. Soloviev, vol. XXV, chap. II to vol. XXIX, chap. II.)

*Educational Reforms and Growth from 1762-1801.*

It is clear that, in spite of Catherine’s beliefs, the lower classes suffered during her reign. But looking at the condition of other affairs, there is quite enough to justify the calling of her reign brilliant. Literature and drama flourished, Catherine herself wrote and was a patron of art. Memoirs and journalism were part of the literary atmosphere, and the Russian Academy of Letters was founded in 1783. Though German by birth, and French by intellectual leaning, she yet was able keenly to feel the spirit and thought of that part of Russia—the nobility—with which she identified herself. The movement for the assimilation and the inculcation of Western culture which Peter had begun, perhaps too soon, reached its zenith under Catherine, but it was now cultural rather than technical, and this time so profoundly modified Russian society, apart from the lower classes, that politically and intellectually Russia became acknowledged as a part of Europe. The reign of France and French throughout the continent was repeated in Russia; the capital became French in manners, literature, language and philosophy. Yet it may be doubted if the influence was after all very deep, in view of the horror and reaction subsequent to the French revolution; it was not until ideas of freedom penetrated lower than the nobility that they found fertile and nourishing soil.

In matters of educational theory, Catherine turned to Montaigne, Rousseau, Basedow and Locke. Indeed, her “Instructions” to Prince Saltykov, tutor to the Grand Dukes, contain almost exact summaries of passages from Locke’s “Thoughts” (see Tolstoy, 71, for parallel passages, pp. 91-100. Appendix.) Catherine’s aims were
as different from those of Peter as his had been to those of the Church. Following Montaigne, she considered education as a force for moulding the future, to produce a cultured individual and race, to form conduct and character, to shape both body and mind. There was no trace of the utilitarian technical ideas of Peter, directing his educational activities for the advancement of the power and productive forces of the State. Catherine's activities extended over education for girls, a cadet school for the sons of gentlemen, a scheme for compulsory national education, learned societies, higher education, control of private schools and the training of teachers.

As early as 1770 Catherine was busy with plans for a system of compulsory education for all the males, instruction in which was to last eight months. The first act in carrying out this plan was the decree of 1775, establishing 'prikazy obstchestvennago prizreniia', or Boards of Public Assistance. Upon these boards devolved the duty of founding and maintaining schools in all towns and the more populous villages. There was one Board for each 'government', the number of which she had increased from the ten of Peter to fifty, but as only some 15000 roubles were granted to each Board, practical difficulties forbade the carrying out of the project. Catherine continued to work at her plan, corresponded with Grimm in Germany and invited him to supervise the education of the Empire. Upon his refusal, and following the advice of Joseph II of Austria, whose system of primary education she had decided to adopt, she invited a Serbian, Jankovicz, who was familiar with both the Russian language and the Austrian school system, to come to Russia and take charge. In 1782 a Board or Commission for the Establishment of Schools was created, with Jankovicz as one member, and with the task of providing schools, teachers and texts. In 1786 was promulgated the Statute relating to National Schools. In imitation of the Austrian system, two grades of schools (primary) were provided, glavnyia or major, in the main towns, and malyia or minor, in the villages and district towns. The major school had four classes, the three first each a year in length, the last, two years, whereas the minor school in district towns had but two classes, in villages, but one class. The curriculum extended from the three R's with religion and grammar in the lowest class of the village minor school to geometry, mechanics, architecture and physics in the fourth class of the major school. Control was in the hands of the Commission, but delegated, in practice, to each local prikaz or Board of the 1775 decree. But one of the essential details of the Austrian system, namely the establishment of provincial Normal schools was not carried out in Russia, with a consequent dearth of teachers, for the one
training school, established at St. Petersburg, could not supply the demand. The gaps were filled, as far as possible, with pupils of the schools and teachers from the ecclesiastical seminaries.

The success of these schools was not as great as was expected. In the first place, funds, both for teachers as well as for the maintenance of the schools themselves, were lacking, and while local contributions often sufficed to keep them open, when these failed, the schools closed. Moreover the nobility did not send their children to these schools, preferring private tutors or the exclusive schools for the upper classes. Thus it was mainly the schools established in large centers, where there were families of the trading, middle-class order, that the schools prospered. Lack of teachers, money and supervising genius were the main causes of the disappointing results of Catherine's plans.

For the education of girls, Catherine pursued quite a different plan. Up to this period, the education of girls had taken place at home or in convents; of schools there had been few or none except the private schools, a product of her reign, and attended mostly by the children of resident foreigners. In 1764 plans were sanctioned for a school, at Smolny Monastery, of two departments, one for the middle class pupils, the other for the girls of the nobility. This school admitting girls from six to eighteen, was composed of four grades, and had a different curriculum for the two different social classes: household management and domestic science being given to the middle class pupils in place of the more 'polite' subjects for the nobility, while at the same time they had in common a course of general studies, such as Russian and foreign languages, arithmetic, geography and history. French was the language of instruction up to 1783, when Russian, on the advice of the School Commission, was substituted. All this was an excellent means of breaking up the last lingering traces of an oriental attitude toward women, and the beginning of future educational schemes for them.

Other special institutions were opened during Catherine's reign; the Shliakhetnyi Korpus, a cadet school for the sons of gentlemen; the Corps of Pages, in 1785; the School of Mines, in 1774; and the 'Blagorodnyi Pansion', a secondary boarding school, in connection with Moscow University, in 1778. The Russian Academy of Letters, founded in 1783, has been mentioned, and had for its special duty the purification of the Russian language. Indeed, all through her reign, Catherine was constantly endeavoring to have Russian used wherever possible in teaching.

In spite of all these efforts to make the Russian educational system fit for the social needs of the time, it was quite evident, from
the fact that so many sought their education abroad, that the schools were not satisfactory. Glasgow, Leipzig, Gottingen, Edinburgh, Oxford, Paris, Strassburg,—all contained Russian students; and in addition to this higher education abroad, there were the private schools which we have already mentioned, kept by foreigners, usually Frenchmen or Germans, who used their native language in their teaching. Foreign tutors employed in families were very numerous. These conditions led to state action in the matter.

In 1757 ineffectual efforts had been made to do away with the least desirable of the foreign tutors and teachers in Russia. But the first serious effort was that of Catherine in 1784, when the School Commission was directed thoroughly to investigate private schools and boarding establishments and carefully and thoroughly examine the owners and teachers. Those kept by foreigners satisfied the investigators better than those kept by Russians, only one of the former and all of the latter being closed. Those allowed to continue were placed under the control of the Commission and made to come up to requirements. By the Nakaz of the same date it became the duty of the Director of National (primary) Schools to supervise both the teaching and the premises of the private schools. Russian was made an obligatory subject, and half yearly examinations of the pupils in the presence of the Director were required, who had to submit, in his turn, a yearly report on the private schools under his supervision. The right to open further private schools was made subject to the permission of the Commission, who were first to be satisfied concerning curriculum, methods and teachers. This is the beginning of the later strict supervision of all educational activities proceeding from other than state authority. While this action did much to set a standard for education, low as it was, it also prevented the experimentation in the nature of different types of education suited to the character of the different classes of Russian society, and permitted the universal rule of one type, imposed from above, and suited best to the ideas of the upper classes.

The period of Catherine is also noteworthy for an expression of a social demand for better education, coming from the middle class. This was the movement initiated by the journalist Novikov, Professor Schwartz of Moscow University, and the Freemason circle of Moscow. The whole movement was influenced by the philanthropic motive, and Novikov as early as 1775 had published and written in the interests of this movement. In 1777 he established two schools in St. Petersburg, which were maintained from the profits of his journal, 'Utrennii Svet',—Morning Light. In 1779 he
went to Moscow and leased the University Press from the authorities, and began the period of his greatest activity, publishing books, editing magazines, opening book-shops, translating from foreign sources, and gathering, together with Schwartz, who had been appointed Inspector of the university's pedagogical seminary, a group of students and workers, devoted to the propagating of their doctrines. One of his main ideas was to further the enlightenment of the Russian people by bringing in well-qualified teachers from abroad, and by also training native Russians to second them. He founded 'The Friendly Learned Society,' one of the objects of which was to raise funds for the education of Russians both abroad and at home. The historian, Karamzin, was thus educated. All this seems very innocent, but Catherine had become alarmed at the practical application of ideas to the reforms of government in France, and ordered the persecution of the Masons and the Learned Society, finally bringing about the imprisonment of Novikov for a term of fifteen years in the fortress of Schusselburg. This was but one more instance, in addition to the affair of the private schools, of the interference of the State in any activity concerning itself with education, and effectually set back the spirit of public service in education for many years.

Thus, all in all, the whole 18th century, in spite of efforts on the part of both Peter and Catherine for the lower and middle classes, had really bettered only the nobility to any very appreciable degree. The clergy and the upper classes of cultured men and women had prospered and progressed, but largely at the expense of the other portions of the whole society. The nobility and their class ideas had prevented the full fruition of a comprehensive system for the education of classes below them,—and one class, the serfs, had received no attention at all. Indeed, for several generations yet to come, until late in the 19th century, no effective scheme was to be found for them. It is estimated that out of the whole population of Russia at the end of the 18th century, only 1 in 800 was receiving any education.

Catherine's son, Paul, ruled from 1796 to 1801, with no very noteworthy results. He was a reactionary in education as in all other things, but reigned too short a time to accomplish very much. (Milioukov, 69, vol. II, pgs. 313-29; Tolstoy, 71, pgs. 28-100. Kniazkov and Serbov, pp 61-159; Darlington, pp. 21-35. For detailed study with plans and documents, see Betsky's contemporary account. Source 3, Introduction, chaps. II, III.)
CHAPTER V.

ALEXANDER I. 1801-1825

Political and Economic Adjustments under Alexander.

With Alexander and the beginning of the 19th century, we are very near to our own time, and Russian society as well as the influences producing reform and reaction become infinitely more complex. Russia, under Alexander, is more than ever a part of Europe.

Paul had been a despot, but not an enlightened one as his mother had been, and only the shortness of his reign prevented him from undoing all that she had done, in her autocratic way, to further the affairs of Russia. So Paul comes to resemble the successors of Peter, in that he lies, as a bitter reactionary, between the nobler and greater Catherine and Alexander. Paul had pleased only the Church, had closed the printing presses, forbade the importation of books, recalled the students from foreign universities, and made the entrance of foreigners into Holy Russia almost impossible. So the accession of Alexander, who was thought to be a liberal, and more like his grandmother than his father, was hailed by all classes. Paul had bred social disturbances, too, and they have extended from high to low in rank, and in 1801, a court conspiracy, supposed to have sought merely his abdication, had resulted in his death.

But the influence of Catherine lived still in her grandson; she had separated him from his father and attended herself to his education, bringing him into contact with the people and thoughts that had influenced her. His tutor had been a Swiss revolutionary, Laharpe, and from him Alexander absorbed the French revolutionary tendencies and beliefs in free institutions which characterized the years of his reign up to 1812. But, again, like Catherine, Alexander was a theorist and a dreamer, and contact with the world of facts and reality brought him, as it had brought her, to a reactionary point of view. The turning point came in 1812.

His first act was to reverse the decrees of Paul concerning the press, the importation of books, the right to study abroad and the freedom of entrance of foreigners. In a manifesto published on the day of his accession, he promised to rule 'according to the laws and
spirit' of Catherine. But the spirit of Paul lived in him, too, though it was to take time and trouble to develop it. He gathered around him a circle of friends,—radicals, who constituted a 'secret council', and produced innumerable schemes of reform, all highly abstract and ignoring the actual conditions of the empire. But, beyond re-organizing the Council of State, the Senate and the Ministries, only one thing of even comparative importance was accomplished. In 1803, a law was promulgated, as a result of their deliberations, which permitted land-owners to liberate their serfs, on conditions fixed by mutual agreement, and sanctioned by the State. Naturally, this led to the freedom of very few of the serfs, but it marked the beginning of a new spirit, quite different from that of the time of Catherine, and one that was to gather increasing momentum with the coming years. The actual freeing of the serfs did not come, however, until 1861.

The intricacies of the wars with France (Napoleon), Sweden, the Caucasus, Turkey and Persia do not concern us here; the social changes resulting from the intercourse of his army with the rest of Europe will be traced in the following section. After the treaty of Tilsit, in 1807, Alexander again turned to internal questions and reform, and enlisted the aid of Michael Speransky, the son of a country priest, and a man of remarkable talent. Upon order, Speransky drew up a constitution granting to all ranks, even serfs, civil rights, and to all property owners, political rights. This implied freedom for the serfs. and the scheme carried with it a whole new set of political institutions, designed to render the power of the throne quite as authoritative as under the old system. So difficult was it for even a reformer of liberal ideas to think outside the limited ideas of autocracy. Little of the plan was actually adopted; the scheme is more a part of the history of Russian thought than of political reform, but it shows the tendency.

By 1812 the alliance of Napoleon and Alexander had reached the breaking point, and Napoleon invaded Russia, reaching Moscow, only to retreat in disorder and defeat. Alexander, following him, achieved by his successes a new political position in Europe. The Concert of Europe formed in 1815, to preserve Europe from revolutionary principles and to guarantee the status quo and the peace of the continent, was followed by the Holy Alliance of Alexander. The events of the years 1812-1815 had proven to be the turning point in his career, and the mysticism which had always been a part of his nature now seemed to rule it. According to the terms of the Alliance, Russia, Austria and Prussia bound themselves to 'base
their conduct in the administration of their respective states... on no other rules than the principles of the Christian religion...

But the military success of Russia was paid for by the impoverishment of the country. Money had to be borrowed from abroad. Industry and manufacturing had developed only slowly, and the superior value of free as opposed to serf labor was not yet fully or universally believed. This led to questions of tariff and the best way of aiding the factories as producers of wealth, and this in turn to the question of labor and the serfs. In 1816-1819 the peasants of the Baltic provinces received their personal freedom, but remained in economic dependency on their former owners, who retained the possession of the land. In 1818 Alexander's minister Arakcheev was ordered to prepare a scheme for the gradual emancipation of the serfs, which 'would not be burdensome for the landowners, or likely to need the use of compulsion'. Alexander died unexpectedly, in 1825, just after ordering an inquiry into the secret societies which had been for some time agitating for reform. These will be considered in the next section. (Kornilov, vol. I, chaps., IV-XIII. Mavor, vol. I, Book II, chap. VII., Book III, chap. III. Short summary in Beazley, Book III, chap I. Zilliacus, chap. I. Kovalevsky, 101, chap. VI.)

The Social Unrest and the Secret Societies.

The beginning of the social unrest which has characterized Russia with increasing power and extent with the evolution of the country, began, in a very real sense, with Peter the Great. Social unrest had existed before him, but the type of disturbance and dissatisfaction which is at issue here is the gradually growing discontent with the autocracy, and the efforts made to overthrow it and put in its place a representative form of government. Peter literally flung his country into the current of European and Western civilization, and it was not to be expected that she would absorb only those elements of that civilization which were pleasing to the State. With the acquisition of technique and outward culture, with the learning of the arts and sciences of trade and industry, the foundations were laid of political and social upheaval which, though they took long to mature, none the less were prolific of consequences in the long run of a century. Nor did the playing with radical ideas and the promising of freedom and reform, which was so characteristic of such rulers as Catherine and Alexander I, have any effect in stemming the tide.—rather it heaped up a greater mass of dissatisfaction which, when it found opportunity for action, cared less for
consequences than might have been the case with a movement that had had a history of partial success behind it.

It was the struggle against Napoleon that gave the opportunity and the inspiration for collective activity against the system of autocracy. Alexander's troops, both officers and men, in their invasion of Germany and France, and in their association with their allies, absorbed a new spirit and a new inspiration. Europe was full of democratic ideas and democratic action which not even the despotism of Napoleon had been able to destroy. It was seen that the Germans owed much of their freedom, in spite of an oppressive government, to the Tugendbund and the leaders of that movement, and in France they found universal evidence of the powers and abilities of a nation imbued with the traditions of the Revolution, and finally the Carbonari of Italy appealed to the more violent and impatient among the Russian thinkers who were dreaming and planning for a Russian republic.

After the signing of peace and the return of the troops, conspiracy became prevalent, and Alexander's theoretical liberalism only encouraged it; moreover, at this very period, Alexander was turning his back upon his earlier beliefs and plans and falling more and more under the influence of the reactionary minister, Arakcheev, and driving still further the spirit of rebellion which judicious reforms might have satisfied before it became definitely organized and committed to action. The organizations took the forms of clubs, masonic orders, literary and educational circles and, finally, purely political organizations. Muraviev, Orlov, N. Turgeniev, are names connected with the early movement; the 'Circle of the Lovers of Nature' developed into the 'Society of United Slavs', and finally merged with the 'Southern Society', the most significant of the early secret societies. In 1816 the 'Union of Salvation' or of 'The Faithful and True Sons of the Fatherland', was founded by Muraviev, a colonel in the army, and organized by Pestel, an adjutant. The latter was in favor of the more radical constitutions and methods of the Italian secret societies; the former for legal co-operation with the Government for gradual amelioration of conditions, basing his ideas on the constitution of the Tugendbund. The Society finally accepted the more moderate platform, and named itself, in 1818, 'The Union of Welfare'. The propaganda of this organization was directed in four ways: first, philanthropic, for the relief of peasant conditions; second, educational, for the army, the main agent in this matter using Lancasterian schools among the regiments and the people of the section they were quartered in; third, the betterment of justice, and
the working out of new conceptions for courts; fourth, economic, for improving the financial affairs of the nation.

By 1819 the membership of the Welfare association had grown to some 200, and with increased dissatisfaction with the government, the policy of the order seemed, to many, far too conservative. In addition to this internal discord, a serious mutiny among some of the troops led to a decision for disbanding. In 1821 the society was disbanded, to reform, however, almost immediately, in two new groups,—'The Northern Society', moderate, under Muraviev, and 'The Southern Society', radical, under Pestel. Pestel preached not only regicide, but the necessity of the annihilation of the entire royal family, while Muraviev was working for a limited monarchy.

Plans, on the part of Pestel's organization, had proceeded so far as the perfecting of a scheme to make the Emperor prisoner, during his presence at the review of the Southern Army, to seize the fortified towns of the district, and then to communicate with the Northern section, who in turn would arrest the most important and dangerous members of the government there. But the unexpected death of Alexander upset the plot, which might well, in view of the circumstances, and the lack of secret police, have been successful. In the uncertainty of the moment, with a new candidate for the throne, Nicholas, to be considered, their plans went astray, and after open insurrection and fighting, the entire conspiracy was broken up, and the leaders, including Pestel and Muraviev, hanged. Such was the 'December' uprising, and the 'Dekabrists'. (Kornilov, vol. I, chaps. XII, XIII. Zilliacus, chap. I. Kovalevsky, 101, chap. VI. Mavor, vol. I, Book II, chap. VIII. Milioukov, 103, chap. V to pg. 260, and chap. IV, pp. 160-180. Ivanov-Razumnik, vol. I, chap III.)

Educational Construction and Reaction under Alexander.

In educational as in other matters, Alexander showed both a constructive and a later reactionary spirit, the year 1812 being the approximate date of division. The early period was influenced by the ideas and feelings which he had received in his early training, from grandmother and tutor, the later years by the facts of the world around him, when he had found that his theories were of little use and only too often misunderstood and carried to extremes beyond his intentions. Religious mysticism, too, had much to do with his reaction in the second half of his reign.

It is interesting to note the social construction of Russia at the beginning of the 19th century. The peasantry constituted some 94.5%, the lower ranks of the urban population some 2.5%, the
merchants less than 1%, the parish clergy some 1%, finally the nobles and officials, from 1.25 to 1.5%. The total population was at that time about 36,000,000, composed of various races (see Mavor, vol. I, appendix II.) under domination of the Russians. (For further details on these statistics. see Kornilov, vol. I, chap. II.) The division of this total mass of population into 'intelligentzia' and 'people', which had begun in Peter's day, and which had not been the condition in the old primitive Russia, still existed at the beginning of the 19th century. Peter it will be remembered, had paid some attention to the education of the masses, but his schools had, none the less, created the first generation of intelligentzia; Catherine had also turned her attention to schools for all, but the intelligentzia had prospered most.

Alexander's educational problem, as he saw it, was to create an adequate and permanent national system of schools, which should at once avoid the superficialities of Catherine and the too materialistic bias of Peter, and provide opportunities for all classes of society. His chief advisors were his old tutor, La Harpe, and a group of nobles, Novosiltsev, Count Zavadovsky and Prince Czartorysky, together with Speransky, Stroganov and a number of others. In 1802, Alexander abolished the School Commission and created in its place the 'Ministerstvo Narodnago Prosvestcheniiia', or Ministry of Public Enlightenment. The first minister to occupy the post was Count Zavadovsky, a mere figurehead, whose work was really done by M. N. Muraviev, an early tutor of the Tsar. The supervision of this new ministry extended over all educational institutions, public libraries, museums, public and private printing presses, the censorship of printed matter, with the exception of the schools under control of the military and naval authorities, the Cadet Corps, the schools of the Holy Synod and the Girls' schools under the protection of the Empress Marie. As a consequence, budgets, reports and investigations have never been under one supreme authority. From 1803-1804 regulations and statutes reorganized the Empire into educational districts and governments, with a Curator (Popechitel) for each of the six districts in full charge of affairs, but residing at St. Petersburg. Three more Universities were founded and three others projected, their constitutions being framed on German models.

The universities were considered of paramount importance for two reasons: in the first place, it had been seen that one of the main difficulties in the way of the creation of a good system of schools in Russia had been the lack of well qualified teachers, and the 'preliminary rules' for the universities required that each should have a training school attached, where students should be maintained at the
expense of the state, upon binding themselves to serve for six years after graduation; in the second place, a part of the actual administration of the schools was to be in their hands.

In addition to the founding of the new universities, a new complete system of secondary and primary schools, three grades, were established: each chief provincial town was to have at least one gymnasium, each district town at least one district school, and each parish, if possible, one parish school. The surviving major and minor schools of Catherine were reorganized and assimilated. The Council of each district, which governed the universities, also controlled the primary and secondary schools through an annually appointed Schools Committee of six professors under the leadership of the rector of the university.

The intimate connection between the educational plans of Alexander and the general political situation is shown clearly in a report of Speransky in 1803. "In the present state of affairs we do not find the first elements necessary for the establishment of a constitutional order. How it is possible to separate the legislative power (from the executive) without an independent institution for its maintenance? How introduce such an institution . . . in the absence of education? How develop a public opinion, create a national spirit without freedom of the press? How allow or introduce freedom of the press in the absence of education? . . . How can the laws be observed without education . . . ?" (Quoted by Kornilov, vol. I, pps. 109-110.) Yet either to abolish serfdom in the absence of education, or to spread education under the conditions of serfdom, seemed dangerous, if not impossible. Slow and cautious efforts for gradual amelioration seemed the only method to escape from this dilemma. But Alexander and his co-workers were perhaps the first to see the real problem, for Peter had forced his ideas on an unwilling society, and Catherine had seen only a part of the difficulties involved.

The same effort to prepare the ground for social and political advancement is apparent in the curriculum of the gymnasium where, in addition to science, mathematics, Latin and modern languages, there were given courses in logic, aesthetics, psychology, ethics, law and jurisprudence and political economy. It was an effort to give a complete general education to those who could not go as far as the University. This aim is stated both in the Statutes, and by Count Razumovsky, the Minister of Education in 1812, in a letter to Rommel,—"Je crois devoir vous mettre au fait des vues, que l’on a suivies dans le plan d’enseignement actuel . . . tout le monde ne pouvant pas avoir l’occasion de continuer les études aux universités,
et les gymnases recevant des enfants de tous le états, gentilshommes négociants, artisans et autres, ceux d'entre eux,—qui sont obligés d'achever leurs études aux gymnases, où qui selon leur état n'ont pas besoin d'asquérir des connaissances plus étendues, ont l'occasion d'y acquérir des notions des objects surmentionnés, autant qu'ajus conviennent à chaque état. . . .” (Quoted, Darlington, p. 42.)

But while motivated by the highest ideals, Alexander's plans, like those of his predecessors, were not fully in accordance with the actual conditions. It will be remembered that some 94.5% of the inhabitants of Russia at the beginning of the 19th century were peasants. There was also too much imitation of foreign models, especially in the case of the universities.

Difficulties began to arise in two directions: first, the self government of the universities clashed with the rest of the autocratic system, and many of the better and more valuable professors resigned when it became apparent that the self government was only a theory; second, many of the professors were foreigners, still, and lectured in Latin, which was not well understood for the good and sufficient reason that the training of students in this language, in view of lack of previous opportunities to learn it, was very poor. Students were often admitted to the university with no knowledge of Latin, merely upon their pledge to acquire the language during their residence. It can be readily seen that advanced subjects of instruction, presented in an unfamiliar or unknown language were of little value to the students, or Russian society, as a whole. One further difficulty existed in the class feeling of the nobility who disdained to send their sons to institutions attended by members of the lower classes, and in their desire to hasten the entrance of their sons into the public service which a long term of schooling delayed. But the ukaz of 1809 made a university diploma or its equivalent a necessary condition for entrance into public service and, to meet the class feeling, dormitories were established in connection with the universities for the use of the sons of the upper classes.

Nor was the condition of the gymnasia, the district schools and the parish schools any better; many of the same difficulties existed with the addition of those peculiar to each type. The gymnasia suffered from the same class feeling, competition with private schools and special schools for the nobility, the length of their course, the lack of good teachers, the character of the curriculum, which, with the best theoretical motives, crowded too much into the course for practical assimilation and use,—a fact which was the basis of the criticism of the next Tsar. The district schools suffered from the too early withdrawal of the students, poor teachers, and lack of
funds. The parish schools were in the worst condition; no public funds were available, and the cost of their upkeep was born by the generosity of individuals, church and lay, and the local authorities, the nobility as a class doing little or nothing. In spite of all that could be done, the parish schools of the Act of 1804 practically disappeared in the course of a few years.

By 1810 it was quite evident that the educational reforms and administration of 1803-4 had failed. The group of reformers who had guided the early plans of Alexander gave way to Speransky, a man of intellect and ability, but cautious, and with a belief that all things should progress together, and holding that education, without freedom, or vice versa, would be destructive to the country. In 1811, private schools were subjected to still further discipline and required to pay a tax of 5% on all receipts from fees. But nothing was done, in a large way, until the appointment of Count Uvarov, in 1810, as Curator of the St. Petersburg District, a scholar who, both in this capacity and later as Minister of Education, has had very great effect on the progress of education in Russia. In 1811 he presented a series of proposals to the Minister of Public Instruction, which involved a readjustment of the aims of the schools, bringing them more nearly in accord with the real conditions of the society of the time, though they involved, perhaps, a theoretical retrogression. He advocated the study of such subjects in the gymnasium as were appropriate to the age and conditions of the students, leaving the advanced legal and philosophical studies for the university. This meant concentration on religion, the mother tongue, history, geography, mathematics, literature, grammar and the classical languages. "The general aim of the gymnasium is to prepare its pupils for the ... universities." The classics were introduced by Uvarov because he was a student of the subject, and because, as stated above, the gymnasium had failed, heretofore, to provide the necessary knowledge of Latin to enable students at the universities to follow the lecturers who spoke in that language. Thus was introduced the study of the classics, destined to prove a subject of constant debate for later educators. So successful was the scheme of Uvarov, and so wide was the agreement among educators that it suited the conditions of the time that, in 1819, it was adopted for all the districts of Russia.

The burning of Moscow occurred in 1812, and the year marks a turning point not only in the history of external and foreign affairs in Russia, but in its internal affairs as well. International matters rather than internal welfare now occupied Alexander's attention, and the general reaction of the ruling classes of Europe and
their fear of liberal ideas dominated him. Moreover, the result on the people of Russia, as a whole, was to bring about a revulsion against foreign ideas and foreign customs, manifesting itself particularly in a new feeling against foreign teachers. Russian thought, as a whole, became more conservative, more narrowly national, as a reaction against the foreign invader, the Anti-Christ, who had transgressed against Holy Russia. All classes shared in this attitude, and the really free minds became less numerous and less able to work out their ideas. Only among the secret societies discussed in the last section was there freedom of thought, and action directed to a freeing of the country. Religion became, both with Tsar and with the nobles a new instrument for the preservation of the status quo.—Alexander, it is said, was wont to open the New Testament, at random, for guidance on the questions of the day. The English Bible Society, founded a branch in Russia in 1812; the Jesuits, too, played a part in the affairs of the country at this time.

The spirit of reaction first showed itself in the field of education. Magnitsky, a member of the Council of Education, wrote, at this period, “The whole mischief which has been observed in our universities has been caused by the education, the books and the men we have imported from the German universities. There the infection of belief and revolutionary principles which started in England and gained additional strength in pre-revolutionary France has been erected into a . . . system.” (Quoted, Darlington, pg. 55.) The religious motive in education appeared in the person of Prince A. N. Golitzin, who became head of the Bible Society soon after its foundation, and who was also Super-Procurator of the Holy Synod, a boyhood friend of the Tsar, in his youth a free thinker, but who had become a mystic in his later life. Branches of the Society were established throughout the country and soon brought anew to the attention of the authorities the need for elementary schools, for if the society was to be sincere in its attempts to popularize the Bible, of necessity it had to provide the means for learning to read it. In 1815, Golitzin became Minister of Education and in 1817 the Ministry of Public Instruction was combined with the Holy Synod. The Act of 1817 read, in part, “Desiring to have Christian piety as the permanent basis of true enlightenment, we have deemed it useful to unite the work of education with the work of all creeds into one department under the name of the Ministry of Public Worship and Popular Education”. (Quoted, Kornilov, vol. I, pg. 189.) An example of the lengths to which this tendency went in the hands of some of the reactionaries, is the University of Kazan, to which Magnitsky was sent by Golitzin, in 1819, to make a special inquiry. Mag-
nitsky wished to close the institution entirely but, opposed by Uvarov and the Tsar in this, he completely reorganized it; eleven professors were dismissed, a special director for morals appointed, and the curriculum so changed as practically to make it that of a theological seminary. In the instructions issued to the director of morals, we read, “The aim of the Government in the education of students is the training up of faithful sons of the Orthodox Church, loyal subjects of the Tsar, good and useful servants of the fatherland. . . . The soul of education and the supreme virtue of a citizen is humility; and therefore is the most important virtue in a student. . . . Students who distinguished themselves in the Christian virtues were to be preferred before all others . . . ” (Quoted, Darlington, p. 58.) The classics, science and history must agree with the teachings of scripture. Disobedient students were confined in cells and forced to wear cards with the inscription, ‘sinner’ upon them. The schools of the Jesuits numbered six in 1804, and had a great vogue with the upper classes, and owing to the liberality of the early years of the reign of Alexander were not disturbed. By 1812 the power of the Jesuits had increased sufficiently to procure the elevation of their college at Polotsk to a status equal to that of the Russian Universities, and they were in a fair way to continuing their hitherto successful propaganda, when suspicion of political disaffection and the general reaction against foreign influences in Russia caused their expulsion.

The results of Magnitsky’s ‘inquiry’ at Kazan were extreme, but the same tendency was followed elsewhere, and the universities accordingly became even less capable of directing the course of education and culture in Russia. Popular elementary education made little progress. Under Golitzin, an attempt was made to introduce the system of Lancaster, and in 1813, Dr. Joseph Hammel was sent to England, officially, to study the system. In 1814 the Tsar, himself, while in London, met William Allen, and became interested in his plans. During the next few years several Russian students were sent to Paris and to Borough Road to be trained sufficiently well to establish the system in their country on their return. In 1818-1819 Allen came to Russia and had several interviews with the Tsar and with other members of the Bureaucracy. Yet all that came of it were some few schools in the larger towns, some schools formed on that system on the estates of a few nobles of liberal tendencies, and Lancastrian schools for soldiers. It was proposed to replace all district and parish schools in Kazan district by those of the new type, but the proposal was never carried out.
Golitzin was succeeded by Admiral Shishkov in 1824, an orthodox Russian, whose general attitude was that which later came to be called “Slavophilism.” His views on education (quoted by Darlington, pg. 63) set forth the main ideas which were to control the policies of the Ministry for the next era. “Learning without faith and without morality does not constitute national happiness. Learning is as hurtful in a bad man as it is useful in a good man. . . . To teach the whole people, or a disproportionate number of them, to read and write would do more harm than good. To instruct a farmer’s son in rhetoric would be to make of him a bad and worthless, if not a positively dangerous citizen. But instruction in the rules of conduct and in Christian virtues and good morals is necessary to everybody . . . .” (Kniazkov and Serbov, pgs. 161-198. Miljoukov, 69, vol. II, pgs. 329-346; Kornilov, vol. I, pgs. 55-57, 68-70, 89, 98-101, 111-113, 145, 172, 187-193, 200; Darlington, pgs. 36-63; Source 3, Part I, chaps. I-VIII; Part II, chaps. I-VII; Part III, chap. II.)
Nicholas, the third son of Paul, had been brought up and educated quite differently from his eldest brother, Alexander. He had been educated, under the direction of his mother, by a strict disciplinarian, General Lamsdorf, and a French emigré, Du-Pouge, and all his instruction was intended to produce a hatred for the revolutionary and liberal ideas of Europe. In 1816, at the age of twenty, he toured through Russia, Western Europe and England. He came back from this hurried, superficial trip with an intensified hatred and disgust for popular government, and devoted himself to restoring discipline in the brigade of the Guards of which he was appointed commander. In 1817 he became a General and almost to the end of his reign he was, characteristically, interested in the question of 'discipline' in the army. In 1817 he married the Prussian Princess Charlotte.

The first business that occupied Nicholas was that of the December Uprising, to which he devoted practically all his time and energy for six months, endeavoring both to punish all those concerned in it, and also to discover what just causes, if any, had led to the rebellion. The trials themselves were parodies of justice and the incarnation of autocratic despotism, but Nicholas clearly saw, beneath all the activity of the revolutionists, signs of real and justified dissatisfaction and discontent. By his orders, a report was drawn up by an investigation committee, based on the testimony and written statements of the conspirators which Borovkov, the secretary, summarized, in part, as follows, "It is necessary to grant clear, positive laws; to establish justice through fastest court proceedings; to elevate the moral education of the clergy; . . . ; to resurrect commerce and industry . . . ; to direct education in accordance with the status of the pupils; to improve the condition of the farmers; to abolish the humiliating sale of men . . . ".

(Quoted, Kornilov, vol. I, pg. 235.) Nicholas did not rate the Decembrists as merely a body of youthful dreamers, he saw clearly that they had included men of experience and real ability, and he
planned to use their ideas and their statements in governing his country.

In 1826, Nicholas issued his Coronation Manifesto, and his principles became apparent. "Not by impertinent, destructive dreams (from below), but from above, are gradually perfected the statutes of the land, are corrected the faults, are rectified the abuses." (Quoted, Kornilov, vol. I, pg. 236.) This was an expression of the advice of Karamzin, the historian, who was the predominant influence in the early years of Nicholas' reign, and who was a firm believer in the necessity of autocracy for Russia as the only condition under which reforms could be brought about. Speransky, who had now outgrown his early idealism, was another trusted adviser, and, later, Uvarov, with his narrow educational creed of 'Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationalism'. Under the influence of such men as these the principle of Autocracy developed and grew year by year, becoming, finally pure unenlightened despotism. It was not that Nicholas and his advisers were opposed to reform, but the principles through which they wished to bring it about, 'from above', contained in themselves the ground of failure.

The thirty year reign of Nicholas is marked by two points of division, the first of which came in 1831, the time of the July revolution in France, and the Polish insurrection. The six years up to this period had seen the codification of the laws, endless projects for reform that led to nothing, the creation of the 'Third Section', or secret police, and some educational legislation. But the banishment of his friend, Charles X. from France and the fall of his sister, the Queen of the Netherlands, followed by the insurrection of 1831-2 in Poland led to the final abandonment of whatever ideas of liberality had still persisted. The rest of his reign is characterized by constant efforts to subdue all tendencies toward revolutionary ideas both at home and abroad, and the Tsar sought a close alliance with Prussia and Austria to further this, basing his internal program on the doctrine of Uvarov,—'Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationalism.'

The problem of serfdom and the condition of the serfs was becoming the most important of all the questions which troubled the country. The serf population was rapidly increasing, estates could not pay for the mode of life which had been adopted by the nobility, (some 50% of them had been mortgaged by 1843), and the reign of Nicholas saw nearly six hundred separate revolts of serfs in one or another part of the country, half of which had to be suppressed with the aid of troops. In view of all this, the idea of the liberation of the serfs was more frequently and more seriously considered than heretofore, but the consensus of opinion among the nobles was that,
while the serfs should be liberated, the ownership of the lands should remain with the nobility. In 1842 a law was published which permitted the owners to liberate serfs, but with the additional condition, not in the similar law of 1803, that the peasants be allowed to retain what land they had cultivated. With compromises of this sort the question was carried along to the next reign.

Throughout the beginning of the reign of Nicholas, industry was developing. The number of factories increased, new industries, particularly cotton, grew up, and free labor came more into use. Estate-factories, worked by serf labor, diminished in number, and kustarny, or home labor increased, competing, often quite successfully, with the factories. The government protected this home labor, as it aided the nobility in making a success of their estates and helped postpone the day of final settlement of the question of the freeing of the serfs. But nothing in the nature of an industrial revolution took place, or was to be seen in the immediate future.

With the French revolution of 1848 and the restoration of a republic, Nicholas became, if possible, even more despotic and reactionary, the remaining years to 1855 constituting the third period of his reign. His Manifesto of that year was full of threats against the Western 'rebels', and he seems to have taken yet more seriously upon himself the role of 'protector of monarchies', and in particular, absolutism. He aided Austria, with troops, to put down the Hungarian revolt, and demanded from Friedrich Wilhelm more rigorous treatment of the revolutionary elements in his kingdom, particularly in Prussian Poland. This renewed attitude of reaction was, as usual, immediately visible in the conduct of internal affairs, increased severity of censorship, increased vigilance in the observation of those who were 'suspect', still further limitation of education and the imposition of religious motives and studies, prohibition against traveling abroad, without personal permission of the Tsar, which was very rarely given, and the addition to the Civil Service Statute, giving the authorities the right to dismiss, without trial or explanation, any official considered 'unworthy'.

Yet beneath it all the breakdown of Autocracy as a principle was being prepared. The iron discipline and severity in the army had made it a much admired and respected instrument of the Tsar; at home and in Europe it was feared; when all else was criticised, even the enemies of the government felt sincerely that, as an army, the Russian troops and officers were eminently worthy of praise and admiration. In 1853 the war with Turkey began, the fateful Crimean War, and the Russian machine, apart from the individual bravery
of officers and men, was shown to be criminally incompetent and hopelessly dishonest. The despised Turks fought successfully against the Russians. Russian ships had to be sunk in the harbor of Sevastopol, the fortress itself capitulated. Stores had been plundered, or never sent to the front, ammunition was wrong or missing, equipment was wanting, resources were exhausted,—the whole system proved to be a failure.

Nicholas died in 1855, a year before the end of the War, but he lived to see the beginning of the popular and universal movement against his principles of reform and control 'from above'. It had become quite evident that nothing but an absolutely fundamental change in the whole policy of Tsardom could right the wrongs and delivery the country. Submission to the power of the throne vanished with this clear proof of its incompetence; writers in prose and verse vied with one another in picturing the discontent of the country, and neither police nor censor could prevent the circulation of the revolutionary propaganda. "Stand forth, O Tsar", one of them reads, "before the judgment seat of God and history. Thou hast mercilessly trodden the truth under foot, thou hast oppressed liberty, and hast been the slave of thy own passions. ... Sue for pardon, and seek counsel. Throw thyself into the arms of the People. There is no other salvation for thee." (Quoted, Zilliacus, pg. 33.) With such a condition within and without the country, even the author of it would, of necessity, have had to modify his policies or render his country up to anarchy; his son and heir was left with the problem to solve. (Kornilov, vol I, chaps. XIV-XVII, XIX. Kovalevsky, 101, chap. VII to pg. 192. Mavor, vol I, Book II, chap. IX, X; vol. II, Book IV, chaps. I, III; Beazley, Book III, chap. II; Zilliacus, chap. II.)

**Autocracy and Society.**

The immediate effect of the suppression of the Decembrist uprising was the weakening of the power of the revolutionary circles. Those who were not either exiled or sentenced to death were, for the time being, silenced and without leaders. In the middle of the 19th century, Herzen wrote, in memory of the earlier period, "Thirty years ago, Russia of the future existed exclusively among a few boys who had just passed their childhood ... This new life vegetated as grass ... on the lips of a crater which has not yet cooled." (Kornilov, vol. I, pg. 283.) But as this generation grew up it became split into two sections,—those who followed the current which had begun in the days of Catherine, the ideas of the
French Revolution, the inspiration of the Dekabrists, and those who followed the new stream, coming from Germany, the stream of German idealism, post-Kantian philosophy, Hegelianism, which had entered Russia during the first quarter of the century. By 1825 the adherents of the newer ideology were in the majority, and the university students of that period found that Hegel and Schelling formed the basis of the teachings of many of the better professors of science, history and literature. At Moscow University was a small group of men, destined to play an immense part in the intellectual development of Russia,—Belinsky, Aksakov, Bakunin, Granovsky, and Herzen. By the beginning of the 'forties two tendencies in radical thought were apparent,—Westerners, such as Herzen, Bakunin, and Belinsky, and the idealistic Slavophils, such as Aksakov and Kireievsky, and it was unfortunately true, so far as progress against a common enemy was concerned, that they often hindered and quarreled with each other.

Against all such activity as this Nicholas was, from the very beginning of his reign, most vigilant. In addition to the ordinary censor, he established, as early as 1828, three others, and official circulars were frequently issued which forbade all mention of this or that occurrence or episode at home or abroad,—'for official reasons'. Foreign books and newspapers were forbidden entrance, unless of the most innocent character, that is, not dealing, in the slightest degree with politics. But in spite of the most excessive precautions, the spread of ideas continued both by word of mouth, in the numerous secret meetings, and through the publications, openly issued in Russia, in which forbidden thoughts were carefully concealed to all but the initiate, in chosen words and phrases, and through other publications such as Herzen's 'Kolokol' (The Bell), published monthly in London, and smuggled into Russia and there secretly circulated. That this secrecy on the part of writers against the existing state of affairs was justified, is evident from the treatment given to one thinker who did speak out and publish his opinion on matters theoretically wholly within the domain of the Tsar,—Chaadaiev. In 1836, Chaadaiev published in the "Telescope," a philosophical magazine edited by Professor Nadezhdin of Moscow University, a "Philosophical Letter". In it he not so much criticised Russian affairs, as voiced a hopeless despair at the past, the present and the future of Russia,—"We live in indifference to all, in a narrow horizon, with no past or future . . . " For Russia to become like other nations she must "begin over again the whole education of man . . . " (Quoted, Kornilov, vol I, pg. 287.) The magazine was suppressed, the editor exiled, the censor who per-
mitted the letter to be passed was dismissed, and ChaadaieV was officially declared insane, and reports of his condition, at stated intervals, ordered to be delivered to the Tsar. With the events of 1848, the repression of the police became, if possible, even more stringent, and a small circle of literary men and officers, who met simply to discuss literature were sentenced to death,—among them the young Dostoevsky. The government was simply striking in all directions, blindly and in terror of what it could not find.

It is little wonder, then, that the defeats of the Crimean War met with rejoicing on the part even of staunch patriots. Sevastopol fell that “God might reveal all the rottenness of the system of government, all the results of the principle of ‘throttle’.” (Aksakov): “We were convinced that defeat would be more endurable and more beneficial for Russia than the conditions under which we were living,” (Koshelev): “We have fallen, not before the forces of the Western Alliance, but as a result of our own internal weakness,” (Samarin). Quoted, Beazley, pgs. 423-424; Kornilov, vol. I, chaps. XVIII, XIX. Ziliacus, chap. II. Mavor, vol. I, Book 11, chaps. IX, X; Ivanov-Razumnik, vol. I, chaps. VI-VIII.)

Autocracy, and Education as ‘Discipline’.

The lesson of December, 1825, was apparently never forgotten by Nicholas, but it would seem that his efforts, not only in the general affairs of his country, but in education, were directed rather to reproduce such occurrences than to remove the causes. What little promise there had been in the theories of Catherine and the early liberality of Alexander for the eventual development of a universal, free and approximately democratic system of education was completely thwarted, for a long time to come, by the new ideas and methods of Nicholas.

Some six months after his accession he appointed Shishkov as president of a committee for the organization of educational institutions, whose task was the introduction of uniformity of administration and methods, and a vigilant supervision of texts and notebooks. He was particularly adverse to the educational system of 1804, condemning it as too diffuse, too superficial, and ordering the creation of a curriculum that would be concentrated, that would aim at character as well as knowledge,—and in particular, of the kind he considered supreme, an obedient, loyal, ‘disciplined’, conservative character. Another of his personal demands was the abolishing of the continuity between the various steps in the school system, whereby those of the lower classes had been enabled to advance to the very
summit of the system. Believing that moral and social harm was done by educating the children of all ranks in the same schools, he ordered that, while children of the peasants and lower classes might be admitted to parish and district schools, the gymnasia and universities and other institutions of higher rank must be reserved exclusively for those of 'svobodnya sostoiannia', or 'free orders of society'. The investigations of the Committee extended over a period of two and a half years, and their findings were promulgated in the Statutes and Regulations of 1828-1835, the main points of which may be summarized as follows: In the first place, the instructions of the Emperor concerning the right of entry into educational institutions, was embodied in the regulations, and gymnasia and universities were definitely reserved to the nobility and the officials, the parish and district schools being particularly intended for the education of others,—the latter, "to afford the children of tradesmen, artisans, and other town-dwellers... such instruction as would be most useful to them, having regard to their manner of life and their special needs and customs." As the Committee expressed it, "... a public system of education should aim at securing for the children of each class such a training as would fit them to be useful and contented in that rank of life to which it had pleased a Most High Providence to call them at their birth, ..." (Quoted, Darlington, pg. 67.) In the second place, the class and political aims of education at this period were fully developed, and the formula of Uvarov, Minister from 1833-1849, so literally accepted and followed that the schools under its domination became a mere department of internal affairs. In an investigation of the University of Moscow, before he became Minister, Uvarov wrote, "I firmly believe we shall be able to avoid these mistakes, (i. e., the pernicious influence of Western European ideas), and shall succeed in gradually capturing the minds of the youth and bringing them to that point where there must merge together—a regulated, fundamental education with a deep conviction and warm belief in the true-Russian conservative principles of Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationalism, which present the last anchor of our salvation and the surest pledge of the strength and majesty of our country", and advocated "the multiplication of mental dikes for the struggle with destructive notions". He declared when Minister that he wished to prolong Russia's youth and would die happy if he could hold back the development of the country for about half a century. (Quoted, Kornilov, vol. I, pgs. 280-281.) This effort of the State to control education in its own interests led, naturally to a stricter control over private educational
institutions, and the limitation of the right to travel or to be educated abroad.

The universities, too, came under new regulations, embodied in the Statute of 1835, by Uvarov. The Dekabrist Uprising had resulted in a degeneration of the universities, for many of the professors and other university officials had been implicated in the rebellion, and the temporary measures to relieve the situation, even the sending of students to study abroad and so meet the requirements for the various chairs in the universities, had not resulted in entire success. To prevent the universities from again becoming centers of revolutionary disturbances, their autonomy was taken away and they were deprived of all control over other parts of the educational system.

The most severe expression, however, of autocracy in education came after the events of 1848, when university students were required to wear a special uniform and follow certain regulations when appearing in public, courses in European public law, comparative constitutional law, social statistics, were abolished, and philosophy and psychology might be taught only by orthodox (Greek) professors of theology and strictly in accordance with the creed of the church. Professors were required to submit to the government the actual lectures which they intended to give as well as the lists for further reading on the part of students, and deans were required to report the smallest deviations from the approved copies of lectures. Tuition fees were raised, inspectors of morals appointed for each school, text-books limited, the gymnasium course extended to seven and that of the district schools to five years, all with the intention of making the task of obtaining an education and, in case of beginning it the attainment of 'chin', as difficult as possible for all those not possessed of wealth and rank. One further effort to strengthen the bond between the members of the nobility and to intensify the distinctions of class was the introduction of boarding houses for the gymnasia, to which access was denied to all but those students whose parents belonged to the eighth or higher ranks of the nobility. This was also a part of the general effort to make the state institutions in every respect as attractive as the better private boarding schools, and in 1833 the establishment of new private boarding schools in either Moscow or St. Petersburg was forbidden, and the right to open such, anywhere, granted only to Russian subjects if, in addition, it could be shown that the facilities offered by the state in the place in question were inadequate. Later regulations were still stricter.

In March, 1849, six months before he resigned, Uvarov reversed his policy in the question of the classics for the secondary
schools. It seemed to the government at this time, in contrast to earlier and also later opinions, that the study of the classics was dangerous, and tended to undermine the loyalty to the doctrines of Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationalism. This, of course, was a reflection of the events of 1848, and the current official view-point was that the study of the classics "encouraged republican sentiments." The course of the gymnasium was divided into two parts,—a "general," and a "special," the latter commencing with the fourth class, and permitting specialization in law, mathematics or the classics, according to the future career of the student. Latin was required only for entrance to the universities, and Greek only for the pursuit of philology. Naturally this disorganized the whole secondary system, and the reasoning behind it should be compared with that of the period of the "restoration" of the classics in 1871.

The general attitude of autocracy in education was reflected in the treatment of the question of primary education, particularly in the rural districts. Practically nothing was done by the Ministry of Public Enlightenment, and the one movement which stands out in the whole of Nicholas' reign is that of the Ministry of Imperial Domains, which began to establish, after 1830, village schools for peasants with the purpose of training clerks for the work of rural administration. By 1853 there were some 3,000 of these schools with an average of 50 pupils. There also existed so-called "shkoly gramoty," or reading and writing schools which were not official, but which did considerable toward diminishing the illiteracy of the rural population. Parish schools of the Ministry of Education also existed, but the attention and care of the Ministry was not directed to them.

But, in spite of restrictions and the imposition of principles directed rather to the furtherance of political power than the welfare of the schools, education and culture made considerable progress in the reign of Nicholas. This may be attributed to several factors: first, the turning of attention inward to the country and its problems, resulting in a study of its history, its ancient culture, its language and its institutions, to an extent hitherto not equalled; secondly, the impossibility of further imitation of contemporary European institutions and ideology, and the consequent maturing of previously imported doctrines and the spontaneous development of characteristically Russian attitudes; thirdly, the severe and concentrated study of what the curricula of the various schools did permit; fourthly, and of the greatest significance, the fact of a vast increase of eminently superior thinkers in the country, resulting in what has been called the Renaissance of the Forties, a
movement which was embodied in writings of history, law, philosophy, science and literature, and of which the University of Moscow was the center, creating for herself a place in the intellectual history of the country which she has never entirely lost. It was this which gave such impetus to study and to the ideal of obtaining an education, that regulations were almost of no avail to those who had seriously determined to obtain it, and so alarmed the government that the already strict rules of the early period of Nicholas' reign were still further modified to restrain the movement toward the gymnasia and universities. It is in this stimulus to education that we find the beginning of the later movement, of the 'sixties, for the spread of elementary schools. The restrictions of 1848 and later were but a temporary interruption of this growth. (Kornilov, vol. I. chaps. XV, XVIII, XIX; Milioukov, 69, vol. II, pp. 346-356; Kniazkov and Serbov, pp. 199-237; Darlington, pp. 63-86; Source 3, part III, chaps. II-VII; part IV, chaps. II-VIII.)
CHAPTER VII.

ALEXANDER II, 1855-1881

The Great Reforms and Subsequent Reaction.

It is a curious fact that the chief rulers considered up to this time should have had, each of them, a period of reform and construction, and a period of reaction; Alexander II differed, in this respect, not at all from Catherine, Alexander I and Nicholas I. Of all the outstanding rulers of Russia Peter alone seems to have persevered in his creative work to the end of his reign. The dividing year with Alexander II was 1866, the year of the first attempt on his life, though symptoms of reaction appear earlier, in 1861.

The failure of Russian arms in the Crimean War roused the general public from the depression and fear which had controlled it since the excessive reaction of the period of 1848. Interest in public affairs revived, and it was quite apparent to all that only vast changes in the management of the country could prevent general and widespread disorder. The censorship which had prevailed up to the death of Nicholas had not prevented the circulation of manuscript copies of treasonable material, and in them the system of the late Tsar was as mercilessly criticized as in the public handbills which appeared after the defeat. Pogodin’s “Political Letters” are a good example of the criticism which circulated in intellectual circles. “The Emperor, charmed by the brilliant reports (of his ministers) has no real knowledge of the condition of Russia. . . . All the ways through which thought might find expression have been closed. The officials think only of how to gain the good will of their superior, . . . They form one friendly, secret, masonic society . . . They regard every thinking man as an enemy . . .” (Quoted, Beazley, pp. 424-425.)

Alexander II had been a warm admirer of the policies of his father, who had kept him busy and trained him thoroughly in the affairs of state, but he had seen the breakdown of the system in the years of the war, when even Nicholas had begun to lose faith. The death of his father left Alexander with an enormous and heroic task, and one that required immediate attention and
prompt measures of relief. The first few months of his reign the war still demanded every attention and when peace was concluded, Prince Gorchakov wrote to the emperor,—"It is fortunate that we have made peace, for we could have fought no longer." As a preliminary relief, before the consideration of the means to more extensive reforms, the censorship was lightened, prohibition against foreign travel removed, the position of the universities bettered, and some of the restrictions on the students removed. In 1856 Alexander gave the first intimation of the direction of his first reforms in addressing the nobles of Moscow, and opened up the whole question of the liberation of the serfs, a matter that was to occupy much of his time in his reign, and was to lead to a whole new set of problems. "It is better," he said, "to begin the abolition of serfdom from above, than to wait until it begins to abolish itself from below," and asked the nobles "to think how this may be accomplished." (Quoted, Beazley, p. 426.) This came as a surprise, but it seemed to Alexander that this question must be settled before any other.

In response to this request for advice the nobility simply waited for the government again to take the initiative, though they realized that the end of serfdom was at hand. The question was, What would be the conditions of the emancipation? There were two clearly different situations, which demanded, the nobles believed, entirely different settlement of the question. In the fertile provinces of the center and south of Russia, where the nobles derived their income from the land by the unpaid labor of the serfs, they were willing to liberate them without payment, for the freed peasants would have, of necessity, to work for the nobles, who held it a requisite part of the reform that they themselves retain the ownership of the land. North of Moscow an entirely different situation obtained, for the land was not profitable to work in face of the competition from the south, and the income of the nobility was derived more from the payments made by the peasants for permission to work in the factories of the towns, than from agriculture. These landowners, consequently, demanded that the peasants pay for their freedom, but were, on the other hand, willing to give up some of their land. To satisfy both these camps required a compromise.

In March, 1861, the Act of Emancipation was published. All the peasants were allowed 'perpetual possession' of some land, paying yearly dues for the use of it. By agreement with the original landowners they could come to own it outright, paying a sum, advanced by the Government, the so-called 'redemption' payments,'
equal to the use-rent for 16 and 2-3 years. The amount of land assigned to each "household" or peasant varied in the different districts, and in most cases was smaller than that which they had worked for themselves, as serfs. In order therefore to pay their taxes, they had to rent more land, or labor for the old owners or follow some other occupation than agriculture. Thus the act of 1861 contained many unsolved problems.

One of the first questions which arose was that of local government, and the law of 1864 endeavored to solve it. The management of local affairs for each district was entrusted to a council elected by the local inhabitants, and while the original plan had been to unite all classes of each district into one electoral body without distinctions of class, the beginning of the wave of reform and conservatism was able so to modify this that property became the basis of the new institution. The large landowners became more largely represented than the peasants, but were not able to obtain an absolute preponderance. Each district had its own council or Zemstvo constantly in session, and the activities of the Zemstvos in a given province were to be co-ordinated by a Provincial Council. Both districts and provinces varied enormously in size, and no smaller unit than the district was provided. The duties of the Zemstvos were to keep up the roads, provide for famine relief, maintain existing elementary schools, hospitals and similar institutions and supervise agricultural matters.

Among the reforms one of the most efficient was that of the law. Proceedings in the courts were made public, and the ancient rules of procedure were replaced with the modern system of prosecution and defense, and trial by jury for all but political cases and certain offenses by officials was introduced. This constituted one of the most radical reforms, but suffered with the rest of the new ideas when the era of reaction came.

The attempt on the life of Alexander in 1866 intensified the reaction which had shown itself in '64, in connection with the stamping out of the Polish rebellion of that year, and its force was at once directed against all that had hitherto been shown a measure of freedom. Education, in particular, suffered. The presidents of the Zemstvos were made responsible, in 1867, for the prevention even of mere discussion on subjects beyond their control, reports of their activities were subject to the censorship of the government, and they were not allowed to publish accounts of the different works they were engaged in. The right of the public to attend their meetings was curtailed. The courts suffered, also, and the appointment of judges was tampered with. A new type of censorship, in addition
to the old prohibitive system was introduced, and the so-called "punitive censorship" made editors responsible, after publication, for anything and everything which the official in charge wished to construe as contrary to the best interests of the autocracy. Public opinion began, once more, to reach that condition in which it had been at the beginning of the Crimean War.

The inevitable result of all this repression, particularly after many and sincere promises and shows of reform, was the building up again of active resistance in those of the population who had both education and initiative, and the courage and wit to use it. The following section will trace the evolution of the new liberal tendencies as well as that of the more bitter and more physically active revolutionists, whose activity led, eventually, to the assassination of the Tsar, in March, 1881, on the afternoon of the same day on which he had earlier approved a new series of reforms, advocated by the Minister of the Interior, Loris-Melilsov. (Kornilov, vol. II, chaps. XX-XXII, XXVI, XXXII-XXXIV, XXXVI, XXXVII. Kovalevsky 101, chaps. VII-IX. Mavor, vol. I, Book II, chaps. XII, XIII; Book III, chaps. V, VI; vol. II, Book IV, chaps. IV-VII.)

*Growth of Organized Social Thought and Action.*

With the initiation of the reforms of the earlier period of the reign of Alexander II, there also began a development of social and political evolution that not even the reaction of the later period could entirely check. These reforms, giving a new freedom and a new self-government to the millions of serfs, who necessarily had to have some education, and who, obtaining that education, were in a position to demand and help in obtaining still greater opportunities, together with the new legal system, created a new social Russia. The nobility, too, rather inconsistently displeased with the action of the government in freeing the serfs, though it had asked and waited for suggestions from the nobles, were exhibiting bitterness and dissatisfaction. The class interest of the nobility as distinct from that of the government itself was growing, but this purely oligarchical tendency was balanced by a more generous and liberal expression of a part of them, who identified themselves with society as a whole and demanded still further universal, liberal reforms. These were the so-called "kayushchisya dvoryane," or "conscience-stricken gentry". A third group of social workers was that of the younger generation of the educated "raznochintsy", or men of mixed classes, more democratic and somewhat distrustful of the "liberal" ideas of the second group of nobles.
Radical opinion was growing and, no longer confining itself to small groups of officers and secret societies, small in numbers, began the effort to educate the public, and to win converts on the basis of a definite program of criticism and reform. Reform "from above" began to seem endlessly long in coming, and inadequate when it did come. Members of all classes seemed motivated by a sincere desire to advance the well-being of everybody else. "In the years 1860-1865 a bitter dispute was being fought out in nearly all well-to-do families between parents and their sons and daughters, who claimed the right to determine their life according to their own ideals and aspirations. . . . After a hard and bitter struggle many of them gained their personal independence, and desired to use it, not for their personal convenience, but for the purpose of spreading among the people that knowledge by which they had secured their own freedom." (Kropotkin, p. 301.) Radical opinion, moreover, was acquiring a philosophy. Chernishevsky, Dobrolyubov, Pisarev, so-called "critics," were fashioning a social philosophy which was to have a far-reaching effect on their own and succeeding generations. Pisarev carried the principle of "emancipation" to a conclusion which was literally what it was, in the phrase of the day, called, "Nihilism," demanding the freeing of the human mind from all religious, moral, and intellectual bonds, from all traditions, whether of family, of ideals or of conduct. This was philosophy, and a doctrine of thought and words, but the "doctrine of the deed" was to follow and to put literally into effect the teaching of the critics. In 1861 active revolutionary groups were organized, some of them advocating immediate social revolution, others the preparing of the ground for the time when revolution must inevitably come, of itself. The circulation of revolutionary proclamations, broadcast, in 1861, and a series of incendiary fires in St. Petersburg in 1862 brought on action by the government against the growing movement. The "Sovremennik" (Contemporary) of Chernishevsky and the "Russkoe Slovo" (Russian Word) of Pisarev were suspended from publication for eight months, and Chernishevsky sentenced to fourteen years in Siberia. These activities and the Polish rebellion of 1863-1864, which the government held revolutionaries responsible for, did much to discredit their activities, and the attempt of 1866 on the life of the Emperor was met, on the one hand, by increased vigilance of the state and, on the other hand, by a movement against revolution, on the part of the "liberals". The radical journals were entirely suppressed and numerous changes made in ministerial posts in favor of the reactionary party.
But new leaders and a new movement sprang up among the radical element. Lavrov and Mikhailovsky took the place of Chernishevsky and Pisarev and the personal element of the earlier teaching became combined with a social element that was more constructive. The new basis of progress was to be the physical, moral and intellectual development of the individual and the embodiment of truth and justice in social rather than political forms. The minority who were already cultured were to become a force to bring enlightenment to the uncultured majority. Again, a group ready to put such doctrines into immediate practice sprang up, of which Bakunin was the leader, who added to this teaching the additional doctrine that such a cultural emancipation for society could take place only with the complete destruction of the authority of the state, by means of a social revolution. So, by another road, the revolutionists were back to the same conclusion. But all the revolutionary groups were in agreement that to advance the interests of the "people", it was necessary to "go in among them". Thus arose the "v narod", or "the going among the people" movement, and early in the year 1874 large numbers of young men and women went out into the rural districts and lived among the actual peasantry, endeavoring to teach them the principles which had actuated their own thoughts and feelings. The movement which started with the idea and the hope of thus finding a new source for the materialization of the necessary force for the overturning of society ended disastrously, for the revolutionists were quite misunderstood by the peasants, to whom the abstract ideas of the propaganda meant little or nothing. Furthermore, the revolutionists were easily followed by police agents, aided, at times, by the very peasants whom the workers were endeavoring to "save". One outstanding gain was made by the workers in this movement,—they saw clearly that the peasant, whose one hope and desire was "land, and more land", could only be reached by a much more definite and concrete appeal. The revolutionists, in other words, began to see what the real needs of society were, as opposed to the abstract formulation of a philosophical creed, suitable only to the "cultivated minority".

As a first move in a new direction, the "Land and Liberty" society was formed, in 1876, the very definite aim of which was the attraction of the peasant class by arousing in them the hope of a new distribution of land. This question continues to be an important factor in all revolutionary activity to the present time. The two currents constantly seen in Russian social movements, were in evidence here, and the society broke up into an "active", terrorizing group, and a group that continued to appeal to propaganda, and
which once more "went in among the people". In 1879, the separate divisions of the Land and Liberty Society became known as the "Black Partition" (peaceful propagandists), and the "Will of the People" (active terrorists). Public opinion again leaned to the side of the revolutionists, in view of the increased severity and reaction of the government, and the nucleus of this new public expression embodied itself in the Zemstvos, to which the government appealed for aid against the revolutionists. The Zemstvos, with few exceptions, showed a new spirit of revolt, replying to the requests of the government with such phrases as, "society could only struggle against subversive ideas, if it possessed the necessary weapons, freedom of speech, of opinion, and of the press". About 1879, an organization of Zemstvo leaders, called the "Zemstvo Union" met with some of the revolutionary leaders and asked for a cessation of active terrorism, to give the government an opportunity to introduce its promised reforms, but the government failed to live up to the hopes and expectations of the time. Consequently, there was a revival of the most extreme acts of terrorism, culminating in the assassination of the Emperor. (Kornilov, vol. I, chaps. XXIII-XXV, XXXV, XXXVI. Mavor, vol. I, Book II, chap. IX; vol. II, Book IV, chaps. IV-VII. Zilliacus, chaps. III-VI. Ivanov-Razumnik, vol. I, chap. VIII, vol. II, chaps. I-III.)

*Education, Society and Alexander.*

Education shared in the reforms that so strongly characterized the early years of Alexander's reign, and co-incident with this new freedom there arose a pedagogic literature of criticism and construction. Pirgov's "Voprosy Zhizni" (Questions of Life) is an example, appearing in 1856 and presenting the thesis that the object of education is to make men, not to prepare students for special callings. This was, of course, in direct contradiction to the doctrine of autocracy, that education was to make good followers of Orthodoxy. Autocracy and Nationalism, for all three of these terms have latent within them the idea of "each to his class and his calling". To the Russians who believed that the primary schools were mere efficiency institutions to give the required minimum of literacy to the lower classes, and the secondary and higher institutions mere avenues to state employment, this was an entirely new way of looking at the matter. General literary magazines began to give space to educational articles and several distinctly educational journals appeared, such as the "Zhurnal dlia Vospitaniia." (Journal of Education), the "Uchitel" (Teacher) and the "Pedagogicheskii Sbornik" (Peda-
gogical Collection), all of which played an important part under the new freedom of the press in enlightening the public on educational matters as seen from another angle than that of the state. Under the general impetus of reform all branches of education made progress, private schools, Sunday schools, universities, schools for girls and public lectures.

The freeing of the serfs was, in itself, a fact to give rise to immense planning along educational lines. Now that these millions of men and women were free, and were to have some measure of self government, it could hardly be expected that they would assume their new responsibilities without some measure of guidance, and the new generation, that was to be born and grow up free, could not be left in the same condition of ignorance as had been their fathers and mothers. Slavophiles and Westerners agreed in this matter, however much they differed in other respects regarding the nature and function of the serf in Russian history, and there was some talk of introducing a compulsory system such as that of Germany. The newly freed serfs, too, took their position seriously, and had every desire to fulfill the demands of their new situation in society.

The economic effects of the freeing of the serfs reacted, in many instances on the nobility, particularly on the poorer among them. Many found themselves under the necessity of so educating their sons and daughters that they might be able to earn their living, and hence the demand for higher education for men and women rose rapidly. And with the freeing of the serfs restriction was, theoretically at least, removed from the boy or girl of lower social rank who aspired to rise in educational circles and in the service of the state. The resulting unprecedented influx into institutions of all kinds led to a greater increase in available candidates for posts in the civil service than the demand. The freedom of labor to move from one point to another initiated an era of development of natural resources, and this, in turn, to a demand for technical and professional education that has lasted to the present day.

The reactionary wave, however, followed so closely on the ear of reform, that the former began almost before the reforms were expressed in laws and statutes. The Polish rebellion, of 1861, was in part the cause of the change, for it seemed, at that time, that the youth of the universities had been instrumental in helping the Poles, and in spreading revolutionary doctrines. The University of St. Petersburg was temporarily closed in 1861. This whole movement of reform and reaction existing side by side was the reflection of the conflicting ideals of two generations,—the old and the new. Turgeniev, in his novel, "Fathers and Sons" has pictured this differ-
ence within the society of the period, a difference which grew with time, and which inevitably attracted to one side or the other all those active in social affairs. But the university reforms of '63 and the primary schools reforms of '64 were enacted before the full force of reaction had been brought to bear.

Dmitri Tolstoy, the reactionary minister, came to office in 1866. Previous to his accession, educational policy had been guided, to an unprecedented extent for Russia, by public opinion, and laws of a very liberal nature had been framed. The universities were one of the first institutions to receive attention. Since the middle of the preceding reign the universities had fallen below even the Russian standard, and in comparison with those of Western Europe they were quite evidently inferior. This condition was due to the lack of sufficient good teachers from Russian sources, the prohibition against inviting foreign instructors, the lowness of salaries, the difficulty of the examinations for the necessary higher degrees, the complexity and consequent superficiality with which the course of study was followed in the universities, the defective preparation afforded by the gymnasia in Latin and modern languages, which were necessary for adequate work in the universities, and finally the poverty of the universities and the indifference of the public of the period preceding the reforms. Vacancies in some chairs, unsatisfactory incumbents of others, disorders on the part of the students were the outward signs of this unsatisfactory condition. The reform of '63 was framed as early as '58 and then given long and serious examination before being put into effect, so that when it was promulgated, the reaction of the "fathers" and the state had already begun. The same policy was followed in the reforms of the primary system, to be considered next, so that for the first time the reforms really represented, to some degree, public feeling and beliefs. The reforms aimed at greater self-government of the universities and consequently placed the authority in the Council of the University; and a University Court, for the trial of students in connection with university order, was established, consisting of three professors. Details of instruction, and decisions concerning the granting of degrees, bursaries, and remission of fees were also vested in the Council. A new class of university lectures, Privat-Docents, was created, in order to afford a supply of professors, salaries were raised, though not quite in the proportion in which the cost of living, due to the greater development and complexity of Russian life, had risen, the number of chairs was increased and the material equipment of libraries, museums and laboratories was financed. Admission to the Universities was now made dependent
on a leaving certificate, the "attestat zrelosti", from the secondary school of the candidate, instead of on an admission examination of the university. A move to admit women "auditors" was defeated at this time. Governing the whole scheme of reform was a new definition of the purpose of the universities,—contrasting greatly with that of the regulations of 1804 and 1835. Where the former had considered the universities as a branch of the system for preparation for civil service in the interests of the state, the new attitude emphasized "learning for its own sake" and strove to make the universities centers of research and scholarship. This was not yet in accord with the idea of the "critics" that only social service justified the possession of education, but it was nearer than the old conception had been. The system of "chin" or rank as a means of attracting students and rewarding those who were successful was criticised, but not done away with, for reasons of immediate expediency. We shall see that the first acts of Tolstoy were directed toward the nullification of many of these principles and privileges.

In 1858, Kovalevsky, as Minister of Education, began the framing of reforms for both primary and secondary education, and in '62 a special committee, formed of representatives from all the Ministries which had any control over elementary schools, was created, to consider means of co-ordinating all such schools under the Ministry of Public Education. Both schemes of reform were printed in the languages of Western Europe and sent abroad for criticism. In the meantime many elementary schools had been opened, under the Ministry of the Interior, in rural districts, and the Holy Synod had also been very active in opening parish schools while private initiative had partaken in the movement to educate the lower classes with considerable success. Leo Tolstoy's school at Yasnaya Poliana, his own estate, had been a great success and the source of his pedagogical principles as expressed in his Essays on Pedagogy. As a result of this activity and the increased attendance at higher institutions, it has been estimated that one out of each one hundred and seventy of the population of the middle of the 19th century were receiving some education. This does not take into account the "reading and writing" schools of irregular and illegal existence, which were established by unqualified and poorly educated private individuals in practically every village.

The question arose, in connection with the reforms, whether it were advisable to have the Holy Synod, rather than the Minister of Public Instruction control the elementary schools, a question which had arisen before and was to remain a subject of constant discussion. As a solution of the matter, while all schools at that time in
the charge of the Holy Synod were allowed to remain so, it was ordered that the Minister of Public Education should establish schools throughout the Empire, which should remain under his charge, and that the two Ministries should co-operate as far as possible. This co-operation, in fact, has not been very great. Another question was whether the elementary schools should be made compulsory. The different systems of Prussia, France and England were considered; that of Prussia, requiring attendance between definite ages for all children, was considered impossible for the Russia of that period, both because of expense, lack of sufficient teachers, wide distribution of the rural inhabitants and the poverty of the peasants; that of France, requiring the establishment of schools by each commune, was also rejected, for much the same reasons; that of England, somewhat modified, was finally adopted, and the Government contented itself with compelling nothing, but establishing model schools and encouraging private enterprise, and even subsidizing them, in case of necessity. This satisfied the demand for a share in the field of education on the part of private and social interests. But it was a strange reflection of the backwardness of the whole movement of education in Russia, that this element of private initiative came into the system at a time when other countries, after trying it, had come to the decision that it was not satisfactory and when even England, the country imitated, was gradually coming to the same conclusion.

Another question debated at length was that of the relative control of the local Zemstvos and the Ministry of Education. Kовалевский favored the Zemstvos, and reflected the advanced opinion of the time, but the decision was finally reached to limit the power of the Zemstvos to the provision and maintenance of schools, the Ministry to administer and control them. The curriculum of the primary school was defined to consist of Religion and the three R’s, together with church singing, if it was possible to provide it. No distinction of faith or rank, or of sex, if separate schools could not be provided, was to prevent entrance to these schools, and the question of fees was left to the decision of the Zemstvo providing the school. But these advances, as we shall see, were greatly modified by Tolstoy upon his accession.

The dispute of 1849-51 concerning the value and place of the classics in the secondary schools had left them with a curriculum which satisfied neither side,—the schools became neither "classical" nor yet "real" in a definite sense. So the same dispute came up again in connection with the complete reforming of the schools which took place in this first portion of the reign of the second
Alexander. Opinion was now quite in favor of the non-classical schools and had not yet come to see that both types might be established and maintained at the same time. But the Ministry had come to see this as a wise plan and so, after many revisions, the 1864 Statute regarding secondary schools created three types, a Latin-Gymnasium, a Latin-Greek-Gymnasium and a non-classical Gymnasium. Lack of teachers of Greek prevented the establishment of many of the second type. One important distinction concerning these schools was embodied in their relation to higher institutions: graduates of the classical school of either type were ipso facto admitted to the universities, graduates of the "real" school were admitted only to the higher technical institutions. All this really settled nothing and left the adherents of both sides dissatisfied, for each party wanted its own type of secondary school to be the sole type. In 1871 the partisans of the classical school won, for the time being, a complete victory. This will be taken up under the reactionary period.

Education for girls and women made great progress in the reign of Alexander, particularly that for the middle classes, for the higher classes and the clergy had already been provided for. In '58 provision was made for two grades of day schools for girls, one with a course of six, the other with a course of three years, based on a study of girls' education in Germany, ordered by the Empress Maria. These were open to all classes, and were transformed, in 1870, into a ten years' course of gymnasium and pro-gymnasium, with a supplementary course of one year in pedagogy for those who intended to teach. These schools were under charge of the Ministry of Education, but others quite similar were opened under the Department of the Empress Maria. This naturally led to a demand for still higher education for women, and in view of the attitude of the government in 1863, in refusing to permit auditors, many women had gone to foreign universities. As a result of propaganda begun by Madame Konradi in 1867, who was editor of the "Nedelia", a movement was started which attained, first, the right to attend "advanced courses" which were given in the evenings, Sundays and holy days, voluntarily by the professors of St. Petersburg University. Four years later, in 1876, in order to prevent further "emigration" for education on the part of women, provision was made for their higher education in University towns, admission to these courses being made dependent on the completion of a secondary school, or similar status. In 1881 this course was extended to four years. Similar results were attained in the field of medicine.
The strict attitude of the government toward private schools also relaxed, many of the restrictions of the previous reign were removed, and private schools allowed to be established, but subject to inspection to show that they were at least equal to those of the state, particularly as regarded curriculum and teaching staff. Right of entrance to the universities from the private secondary schools was made dependent upon the passing of an examination mutually agreed upon by the owner and the state.

All these new regulations and new schools went far toward satisfying the demand for education and would, if undisturbed, have doubtless proven the basis for a still more liberal and modern school system. But the reforms were destined to be once more overturned.

The new university regulations had been in force only three years when Tolstoy became Minister of Education, and began his determined plans once more to subject the universities to centralization and complete control. The events of 1861-4 and 1866 were, of course, the cause. From 1872 to 1879, the year of his dismissal, numerous reports were submitted on the subject, and many conferences held, and though it seemed for a moment, in 1879, that liberal ideas would, after all, prevail, the murder of the Tsar in 1881 turned the scale. The new regulations, however, were not actually put into operation until 1884, under Alexander III.

The 1864 law for primary education was quite as unsatisfactory to Tolstoy as the freedom of the universities had been. The two new types of primary schools which he founded he placed under the charge, not of the School Councils, but directly under the Ministry, and in 1869 the Zemstvo institutions were brought under stricter control by means of the newly created inspectors of primary schools, and finally in '74 the control of the local nobility over the Zemstvo schools was made stronger.

Similarly in the field of secondary education, reaction gained the upper hand. The question of the classics is bound up with the changes in this field. The classics had been losing what little favor they had enjoyed among educational and cultural leaders, and with the growing independence in spiritual and intellectual matters from the West, the reaction against the classics had also grown. Moreover, they were not so integral a part of the civilization or the language of the Slavic world, and the leaning toward realism in thought and literature of the period led still further away from them. But the Government, in the period of educational reaction under Tolstoy, turned to the classics for these very reasons. Just because the classics were remote in their bearings from modern, and
particularly modern Russian, life, for this very reason they would offer good subjects of study for Russian youth in the universities. Classicism, it was held, would distract them from current matters and focus their attention on a dim and distant past where heresy of opinion would not reflect in daily life and action. Classics, then, and mathematics were to be the chief subjects of the secondary field. Moreover the specious argument was also used that the material progress of the West was the result of the absorption of the classical culture, and was in direct proportion, in each country, to the degree in which it had been assimilated. The banishment of the classics of the 1849-50 period was held to be the cause of Nihilism and the social unrest among the students. History, Russian, science and modern languages were shown to be subjects in which personal opinions could also be conveyed; the classics would be, it was held, politically sterile. The Statutes of 1871 carried these principles into effect.

One other instance of the interest of the general public in education was the Sunday School movement of the first period of the reign of Alexander II, though their development, like that of all other popular movements, was checked by the later reaction. These schools were primarily concerned with secular education, were open to all comers, and were taught gratuitously by students of the universities and gymnasia as well as by regular professors of established state institutions, while expenses were met by contributions, the earnings of concerts and from other private sources. The movement began in the Kiev Educational District, the prime mover being the Curator, Pirogov. It was inspired entirely by a desire to aid the newly freed serfs, and the government was, at first, entirely favorably inclined toward them. But by 1862, when some hundreds of these schools had been established, the attitude of the authorities changed, and in that year, they were ordered closed until they could be reorganized on a new basis. This was due to a report that the teaching in a few of the schools had been against religion, property and the State, and while the schools were again permitted to open in accordance with the laws of '64 and '74, under state control, the movement did not regain its old enthusiasm until after 1890, in the reign of Alexander III.

Thus the whole spirit of progress and reform disappeared under the Ministry of Tolstoy, a man not opposed to education, but with very narrow and limited conceptions of its nature and its principles, its purposes and the methods of attaining them. He was called to office largely as a result of a reaction which had already started, and which was, in its turn, due to social activities and propaganda that expressed a hatred for existing conditions, and because it did so was
condemned to be itself stamped out, and the possibility of its rebirth prevented. Thus with the increased centralization and conservatism of the closing years of Alexander’s reign, and remembering the fate which he met, we shall be prepared to see still further vacillation and readjustments in the field of education in the next reign, the period of Alexander III. (Kornilov, vol. II, chaps. XXVII, XXXI, XXXV. Milioukov, 69, vol. II, pp. 356-367. Chekhov, chaps. I, II, III to p. 168, and throughout. Darlington, pp. 87-132. Source 3, Part V, chaps. II-VIII; Part VI, chaps. II-IX; Part VII, chaps. II-X; Part VIII, chaps. II-III.)
CHAPTER VIII.

ALEXANDER III, 1881-1894

The Beginning of the Great Reaction.

It will be remembered that Alexander II was assassinated on the afternoon of the day on which he had approved of a series of reform proposed by his Minister. Alexander III, his second son, though by nature not liberal, had gained some reputation along that line, and this, coupled with the fact that he decided to adopt the plans as approved by his father, gave some hope that his reign would not be entirely reactionary. But Alexander III proved to be no exception to his predecessors, in being able to shift his policy as time went on, so that we find in his reign the beginning of perhaps the darkest period of repression in modern Russian history, leading directly to revolution, and in the time of his successor, to the present Communist state of the Bolsheviks. There was some little indecision at first as well as a blurring of the exact nature of the policy which was going to prevail. For the remainder of 1881 it seemed that reform would gain the lead, and the matter was debated at court, as in society in general, by the adherents of each policy, some representing the new reforms as equivalent to the ruin of Russia, others calling them the one salvation of the country. The new Minister of the Interior, Ignatiev, a Slavophile, announced in May, that the state wished to unite people and government, and would allow, for this purpose, local self government, and would restore the Zemstvos to their former position and to prove its sincerity summoned, in June of 1881, workers of the Zemstvos in order to confer with them. But this mere promise of reform was not to continue long. Already in April of the same year the Tsar had issued a Manifesto, reading, in part, "In the midst of our great grief God's voice commands us to stand firm at the helm of the government, relying upon Divine Providence, with faith in the power and truth of the Autocracy which, for the benefit of the people, we are called upon to strengthen and guard from any encroachments". (Quoted, Kornilov, vol. II, p. 252.) This could hardly be construed as other than the triumph of the reactionary party at court; and so it was. Yet it may well be doubted if the Tsar himself was the director of affairs, for two
outstanding figures dominate the whole of his reign, Tolstoy and Pobiedonostsev. The former was the same Tolstoy who had nullified all educational reforms in the preceding reign, and who now became Minister of the Interior; the latter was, if possible, even more reactionary, had been the tutor of the Tsar, was called in the phrase of the time, the “nihilist” of reaction, and had become, in 1880, Procurator of the Holy Synod. The period of Alexander III is, in a sense, the period of their dominance, and nowhere else is the spirit and the letter of the reactionary element so well and so powerfully expressed as in the latter’s Essays, translated in English as “Reflections of a Russian Statesman.” Only the revolution of 1905 was to break their power.

With the accession of Tolstoy to the Ministry of the Interior, the government seemed to feel safe in its policy of coercion. The schools and the Zemstvos were the first institutions to feel the effects. Failing in the attempt to close the Zemstvo schools, he endeavored, by a new Law of the Zemstvos, drawn up in collaboration with Pazukhin, a highly class-conscious noble and land owner, which was intended to restore the old class system as far as possible. The Zemstvo law of ’64 had, it is true, been based on property, but no single group had been allowed to overbalance the other two; the new law, of 1890, gave the “gentry” a legal majority in most of the Zemstvos, the rights of the peasants being greatly restricted. “Land Captains” were chosen from the nobility of each district, given dictatorial powers over the communal life of the peasantry, and were thus able to rule quite arbitrarily, and even to interfere in private affairs. Moreover, the economic condition of the peasants became worse as their number and the general population became greater, for with the advent of larger new generations among them, the amount of land after subdivision among a family was very small, and by this time in many cases exhausted by poor methods of farming. Land was high in price, sometimes unobtainable, and only the better off among the peasants could purchase it, so many went to the towns, or migrated to Siberia. Those who remained on the original land were, in many cases, subject to famine, the death rate was high as well as the disease ratio. The only relief the government saw fit to offer was some reduction in the “redemption payments”, and the establishment of a bank for loans. But again the richer among them were the only ones to benefit by these meager concessions. In 1891-1892 came the inevitable results,—twenty provinces were swept with famine and disease. The government held back, but the educated public, particularly the students, threw themselves into the work of relief, and thus began a new movement of
understanding between the “black” peasant and the class of the educated and socially broad-minded.

In the '70s there had been an industrial boom, but it had been short lived, for wages had soon fallen, and strikes were frequent. The period of development, constituting Russia’s “industrial revolution” was to come in the last few years of the 19th century, but the period immediately before it produced a crisis in which the government had to interfere. Child labor for those below twelve years of age was forbidden, the hours of labor for those between twelve and fifteen were limited to eight per day, and it was forbidden to employ children in night labor. Inspectors were appointed to see to the enforcement of these regulations, and conditions were revealed, inconceivably vile. The years 1884 to 1886 saw the issue of several beneficial laws in this direction, but it was quite evident that Russia was approaching an industrial organization of society in the large centers with all the economic and social problems that such a growth involves. But, curiously enough, the workers themselves were not allowed to strive for their own betterment, and participation in a strike became a criminal offense. In connection with this condition of a large class of people, Russia was being affected by the West in a new direction, by the rapid and prolific influx of capital. The years 1900 to 1902 showed the results of “over-production”, and from then to the War of 1905-1906 the development was slower.

Russia was developing in still other directions, and the colonization of Siberia as well as the conquest of Central Asia showed at once her power and her necessities, for the need of land was a fundamental cause of this growth, though the latter movement was also prompted by the need of subduing hostile neighbors. The details of these projects, however, seem outside the immediate field of this essay. But in connection with the development in the Far East, we meet with a factor which influenced the future course of Russia’s career to a tremendous extent. By 1858 Russia had forced the cession of a considerable territory from China, including the harbor of Vladivostok, but when she attempted in '61 to establish a naval base midway between Korea and Japan, it became evident to the latter country that Russia constituted a menace to her. For some thirty years however, the matter rested, but quite evidently held within itself the germs of a future war with Japan. The war, itself, did not come in the time of Alexander, but in the reign of his successor, Nicholas II, but the causes stretched back a long way, and the results a corresponding distance into the future.

Poland, too, was a factor in the development under Alexander, but it is better considered under the social movements of the
reign. Foreign affairs and the diplomatic-political dealings with Western Europe, particularly with Germany, had little influence on the course of the internal development of Russia and showed no traceable effects on her institutions or social life, for Russia, since Alexander I, had more and more turned herself to the working out of those ideas which she had already received from the West, and those ideas which seemed, whether truly or not, to be particularly and essentially national and Slavic. (Kornilov, vol. II, chaps. XXXVIII-XLI. Mavor, vol. II, Book IV, chaps. VIII, X; Book VI, chap. V. Zilliacus, chaps. VII, IX, X, XII. Beazley, Book III, chaps. V and VI to pp. 518.)

The Broadening Social Movement

That Russia was growing in complexity and instability is clearly shown by the social movements of the period of Alexander III. They have an appearance of being far better adapted to circumstances in methods and theories than their predecessors, and while they fall short of their ultimate purposes, the situation is apparently left in the hands of a succeeding group of leaders.—destined, as events proved, to follow on the heels of the defeated state of the period of the Great War.

The repression of the Zemstvos by Tolstoy has been mentioned, as well as the labor legislation, forced by the terrible conditions of life of the factory workers, and the exhaustion and scarcity of land. All these were mutual causes and effects of the social changes. The famine of 1891 had brought the peasant and the social worker into really sympathetic relations, and the new bond was not allowed to be broken. The gentry land-owners, furthermore, were losing the economic basis of a ruling class; their land was not being worked profitably, the payments for the land given to the peasants in '61 had been, in many cases, spent, or surrendered for debts to the state, so that as the new century was dawning, more and more of the gentry were entering commercial and professional life, selling their estates and losing their special privileges. So, in spite of Tolstoy’s legislation of 1890, giving control to the resident gentry, little by little the Zemstvos grew in self-government, helped by the liberal, educated members of the community,—and doctors, engineers, veterinaries, agriculturalists, many of whom had passed the liberal stage and were out and out radicals. From 1890 on, rapid progress was made in the organization and maintenance by the Zemstvos of schools, medical service, hospitals, treatment for the insane, measures against epidemics and famines, libraries, book-shops, lectures, agricultural
experimental stations, insurance for stock and crops, prevention of fire, and many other services which the government had not and evidently did not intend to supply. The Zemstvos were the movers in all this, and were making not only a social but a financial success of their undertakings, when once more, toward the end of Alexander's reign, the government became alarmed and began to use the old repressive measures. The full development of this conflict is the opening phase of the period of Nicholas II.

The revolutionary movement, proper, shows a characteristic change; instead of appealing to the peasant, who had proven unreliable and unenlightened, the new propaganda was directed to the growing class of factory workers, who were rapidly making of themselves a true proletariat, dependent entirely upon industry for wages, and residing in the large centers. It is in this period of the revolutionary movement that we find the beginning of the active formulation and preaching of the theories of the German Marx, whose Communist Manifesto of 1848 supplies the motto for the Soviet Republic of the present day. There began a combination of political and economic aims which endeavored to utilize the workman as the source of power to bring them about. But as only the economic side of the program appealed to the workman, a case again of lack of training and education, the political side was temporarily abandoned. The full fruition of this, like the Zemstvo movement came only with the accession of Nicholas. All this was partly the work of the active party of the Land and Freedom society which had split in 1879, as described in the last section on social movements. In 1880 this party, the "Will of the People" section, published in its secretly-printed organ a program for reconstruction, embodying the following demands,—a permanent representative assembly, self-government for the provinces, complete freedom of press, speech, meeting, election and conscience, universal suffrage, militia in place of an army, nationalization of the soil, transfer of factories to the workmen. In view of the program of the Bolsheviks, whose period is but forty years later, these items, particularly the last two, are of interest. After the assassination of Alexander II, the revolutionaries turned again to propaganda, and made the army, as well as the workman, the chief field of their labors. Several times it seemed as if adequate leadership would have precipitated an outburst, but each time the government was forwarned or, in one way or another, was able to prevent a critical situation. Terrorist methods were constantly in evidence, dynamite factories were established secretly, and when one had been discovered, another took its place. Public outrages were frequent, as well as attempts on the life of the
Tsar. But these methods were not productive of the desired results. for men as brave as the revolutionists were to be found in any number to take the place of assassinated officials, and violence always recoiled on the terrorists with greater severity than was profitable. It was in part this disadvantageous side of the terrorist activity which led to the broader movement of the group endeavoring to convert the workmen, for a larger body than a few desperate and reckless terrorists was necessary for the accomplishment of the social purposes which inspired even the most violent acts. So the revolutionists turned to the printing press as a more satisfactory instrument wherewith to accomplish their ends, and scores of secret presses were established in the period between the accession and the death of Alexander. There was, furthermore, a union of thought and activity of all the various revolutionary and radical groups of workers, who began to realize that only with the union of them all, would be possible even their continued existence, not to speak of their continued working against the constantly increasing vigilance and power of the police and secret organizations operating against them. Their fuller power was to be exhibited in the next reign. (Kornilov, vol. II, chaps. XXXIX-XLI. Mavor, vol. II, Book IV, chaps. VIII, IX; Book VI, chap. V. Zilliacus, chaps. VII, X, XII. Ivanov-Razumnik, vol. II, chaps. IV-VI.)

*The Effects of the Great Reaction in Education*

The first Minister of Education, Nikolai, was not adverse to reform in education, but under pressure of the general court attitude he resigned, in 1882, to be succeeded by the former assistant of Count Tolstoy, Delianov, and with the latter's accession, there was no question that the schools would be conducted in the same way as Tolstoy had himself administered them during his time of office. The aims of the Autocracy, in the field of education, were Russification and centralization, ruthlessly pursued. This policy was carried out by restricting the universities still further, giving the Church an increased share in the control of primary education, limiting the rights of Jews and the lower classes, and requiring the use of Russian as the language of teaching in the Lutheran Baltic schools.

The universities, as usual, as the hot-bed of independent thought, were the first to receive attention. Delianov, before the Imperial Council, pictured the universities as degenerate institutions, which had been corrupted by the freedom which they had had, and which had become the center for the "anti-governmental" ideas among the youth of the country. "The root of the evil," said
Delianov, "lies in the fact that the Government has held itself aloof from university instruction, and has left it to the individual discretion of the professors, and to the equally arbitrary decision of Faculty meetings and the University Council, . . . who could not possibly supervise their work with anything like superior authority. . . ."

(Quoted, Darlington, p. 133.) In 1884, after consultation and discussion by the Imperial Council, the majority of whom did not at that time favor the proposed stringent regulations, the Tsar approved the act, the passage of which was due largely to the determined perseverance of Tolstoy and Delianov. The universities had now reached the lowest limit of self-control, for at no time, not even in the period of Nicholas I, had the control been so strict, nor university freedom, of both students and officers, so circumscribed. All members of the universities now became state appointed officials, and through examining commissions and examination syllabuses control of the course of study and the right to graduate was insured to the government. The choice of the students both as to the courses and the electives as well as the hours of attendance, was also rigidly defined, and made much narrower than in the period immediately preceding.

The changes in the secondary schools were neither extensive nor important. The real schools were criticised as not satisfactory, and under competition with the new technical schools described later, were turned into "general" schools, i.e., they ceased to be schools where a "special" education was given. The regulations of '88 increased the hours of modern language study, mathematics, Russian, history and nature study, and decreased the hours devoted to technical studies. In 1890 the curriculum of the classical school also underwent revision, and Russian and religion were stressed more, and the classics less; though these changes pleased neither side of the partisans of the old controversy.

The most constructive work of the reign was done in the reorganization and enlargement of the field of technical education, which had had a comparatively recent development, dating back for its beginnings, apart from Peter, to not earlier than 1865. These schools, furthermore, unlike those of Peter, had been and were for primary and intermediate work, whereas Peter's had been higher in grade. In 1881, such of these schools as had been already established under the Ministry of Finance and various other ministries were transferred to the Ministry of Public Education, in order to make uniform the regulations which governed them, and to outline a policy for their future development. The Ukaz of '88 determined the de-
tails of the reorganization, provided definitely for two grades, intermediate and lower, and for trade schools, intended to prepare for definite trades. Apprentice schools and lower trade schools for the rural districts followed in 1893-1895.

But the most important of all the measures taken in this reign was in connection with primary education, for the changes in secondary and technical education were comparatively insignificant, and the restrictions placed upon the universities so familiar that they did not constitute a new departure. In connection with the whole attitude toward the primary schools, attention must again be drawn to the essays of Pobiedonostsev, for they contain in clear and detailed form the whole reactionary spirit of the period. It had become evident that the Zemstvos, in spite of their efforts and determination, had not accomplished the huge task of bringing elementary education within reach of all the rural dwellers. Attention was therefore directed to the hitherto despised and illegal "shkoly gramotnosti," or reading-and-writing schools, which existed in practically all rural districts, and it was proposed to make their existence legal and encourage them, in the hope of thus bringing at least the rudiments of learning within reach of all. It was also felt that the teachers of these schools were, from their very ignorance, incapable of spreading revolutionary doctrines. So in '81 a regulation was issued legalizing them, and the "shkoly gramotnosti" at once became famous, the fervid nationalists and Slavophiles hailing them as the one genuine Russian educational institution, the one thing not borrowed from abroad, and they became, as time went on, an increasingly important factor in Russian education. This may, in no very uncertain sense, be considered an advance, though the "shkoly gramotnosti" were not the equivalent of the ideal which had been sought for "all the people". But three years later a step was taken that was greatly to limit the field of primary education. This was the edict of '84 which set up a rival primary school system side by side with the regular one,—the new schools being in charge of the Holy Synod and permeated with the religious element in method and curriculum. This was due to "dissatisfaction" with the Zemstvo schools and those of the Ministry of Education, because they did not have the right religious atmosphere nor the right sort of "orthodox" teachers. Though the teaching of religion was obligatory in all primary schools, the priest who was appointed to give the religious lesson had no further control of teaching, and often, in the absence of a priest, a lay teacher assumed his functions, with no guarantee that his teaching would be in accord with the creed of the Orthodox Church. All this, ac-
cording to the Church party, tended to secularise the primary schools, which should be, they contended, definitely religious in tone. Moreover, the "v narod" movement had shown that the primary school could be made an instrument for the propagation of revolutionary doctrines, and the fact that many revolutionists had been school teachers had also been definitely proven. The new Holy Synod schools which were opened in 1884, with the object "of strengthening among the people the Orthodox teaching of faith and Christian morals, and of imparting useful elementary knowledge", were of two types, a two year school and a four year school, the former consisting of one class, and the latter of two. The curriculum consisted of religion, church singing, reading of Russian and Church Slavonic (the "holy" language), writing and elementary arithmetic. The longer course added Russian and Church history. Thus out of a total of some twenty-five hours instruction per week, church subjects occupied approximately half the time, and all instruction was given by the clergy or immediately under their supervision and in accord with their principles. For the supervision of the whole system, the Synod created an organization similar to that of the Ministry of Public Education and for funds relied on local contributions and private gifts, as did the Zemstvos, but received, in addition, aid from the imperial treasury. Appeals, on their part, to the Zemstvos did not generally meet with success. In 1891 all of the "shkoly gramotnosti" were placed in charge of the Synod, and it was also decreed that all new Sunday Schools, not connected with a definite day school, should also come under its protection and administration. Thus a very favorably placed rival system of the regular elementary schools was created and started on its career, controversy between them being inevitable and a final settlement impossible until such time as one of them should retire from the field. This did not take place until the edict of the Soviet Republic definitely made all schools secular.

Certain other activities of the Ministry of Education are also important indications of the general policy of the period,—first, the russification of the Lutheran schools of the Baltic provinces and Poland, and secondly, the treatment accorded the Jews, socially and in the field of education. In 1886 to 1894 the Baltic schools were gradually made a purely Russian institution, and in 1885 the same process, begun in Poland in the period of 1868, was completed. The Jews were subject to the same "russification" process, but with stricter measures and even more deplorable results. The "temporary laws" of 1882, aimed at that race, have continued in force to
the period just before the present, and the narrowing and curtailing of both the habitation districts and the rights of education have been a consistent part of the policy of Nicholas II. Jews, according to the regulation of '82, were not allowed to hold public or state positions, were forbidden to buy real estate outside of towns, and by the regulations of 1886, were allowed only a proportion of 10% in the universities within the Pale of Settlement, that is Poland and South-Western Russia, in spite of the fact that by far the greatest proportion of the whole population was Jewish, while in the two capitals, Moscow and St. Petersburg, the proportion was limited to 2%. Pobiedonostsev is credited with the prediction that the restrictions against the Jews would "convert a third, a third would emigrate, and the rest would die of hunger". It was claimed that the Jews were revolutionists,—and this was the remedy. To sum up the whole attitude of the reign on its social side the following quotation given by Darlington, p. 147, from the Ministerial Circular of 1887, is excellent,—"... Thus, in strict accordance with this regulation, gymnasias and progymnasias are dispensed from receiving the children of coachmen, lacqueys, cooks, washerwomen, small tradesmen, and the like, whose children, with the exception, perhaps, of those who are gifted with extraordinary capacities, ought by no means to be transferred from the sphere to which they belong, and thus brought, as many years' experience has shown, to slight their parents, to feel dissatisfied with their lot, and to conceive an aversion to the existing inequality of fortune which is in the nature of things unavoidable". (Kornilov, vol. II, chaps. XXXVIII-XLI. Milioukov, 69, pp. 367-389. Chekhov, chaps. III, V, VI. Source 3, Part VIII, chaps. IV-X.)
CHAPTER IX

Nicholas II, 1894-1917

The Continuance of the Great Reaction

The thirteen years of Alexander III and the twenty-three of Nicholas II really form, in considering their characteristics, one large period,—the Great Reaction, for, with occasional gleams of promise here and there, the whole is merely a continuous effort on the part of the State and the Church to subdue, once and for all, the rising power of the opposition. In another sense, too, the two reigns are part of one another, in that the completion and fruition of the first is seen only in the second, for the comparatively short period of Alexander did not permit the gathering storm of social revolution to fully mature. Finally, the same personality, Pobiedonostsev, was all powerful under Nicholas, as he had been under Alexander.

The Russian people, with all the memories of their history in the past, and with recollections of Alexander III, yet looked forward with hope and confidence to the new Tsar. His first Manifesto was looked for with eagerness, for in it would doubtless be readable his attitude and purpose. But it was only hope, for the first acts of the new Tsar showed with unmistakable clearness that the policy of his father would be his own. The address of the representatives of the Zemstvo of Tver was the occasion of the first expression of policy. It read, in part, "... We allow ourselves to indulge in the hope that on the height of the Throne the voice of the people and the expression of its desires will be heard and listened to. ... We earnestly hope that during your reign the rights of individuals, as well as those of already existing representative bodies, will be protected permanently and energetically. ... We expect, Gracious Sovereign, that these representative bodies will be allowed to voice their opinions in matters in which they are concerned. ...". It must be remembered, too, that this was a sincere and moderate expression of opinion from a legal and representative deputation, not a demand from a revolutionary body, yet the answer was as well adapted to the one as the other. "... It has been brought to My knowledge," answered the Tsar, "that during the last few months there have been heard in some Zemstvos the voices of some who have indulged
in the senseless dreams with respect to the participation of the Zemstvos in the general direction of the internal affairs of the State. Let it be known by all that I shall devote my whole power to the best service of the people, but that the principle of Autocracy will be maintained by me as firmly as by my lamented father". (Kornilov, vol. II, pp. 277-278.) Thus was clear notice served on the country that there would be no change in policy or method, and that Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationalism were still to be the aims and ideal of the state and the throne.

This statement was received with indignation and astonishment by both conservatives and revolutionists. To the latter, who had seen their own efforts combatted and suppressed, this was a new and a legal appeal, and that even this should meet with disapproval, only the more united them in their more violent methods of appeal. Their reply and the renewal of their struggle will be considered in the next section.

It is difficult, in the reign of Alexander, to separate sharply the threads of internal and external affairs, for Russia had been, as was noticed previously, growing more and more complex. Consequently, it was not so much ideas imported from abroad, nor fears of the occurrence at home of events taking place in other countries, as actual events involving Russia and the outside world which modified, in this and the immediately preceding reigns, the course of development of her civilization. The event which now re-directed the course of her activities was the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905, calling to mind, in the magnitude of its results, both the Crimean War, and the disaster of 1917.

We traced the expansion of Russia, in the last reign, to that point of the intrusion into the Far East when Japan realized that Russia was to be her chief menace. From the accession of Nicholas a still more active policy was adopted, and the Trans-Siberian Railway continued. The victory of Japan over China in 1894-1895 closed, for the time, the road to Russia's expansion, but when Japan had been forced to yield, through diplomacy, the fruits of her victory, Russia immediately continued her former advance, and through her own diplomacy, money and the excuse of protecting her interests during the Boxer rebellion, occupied Manchuria and began to penetrate even into Korea. Japan proposed negotiations, was treated with contempt, broke off diplomatic relations, and initiated a war which was to have huge significance for Russia, both abroad and at home. Russia was unprepared for war, internal affairs were bad, and after a series of severe losses by land and by sea, she concluded
peace on terms favoring Japan, and turned her attention to internal affairs, which were rapidly becoming desperate.

From 1905 to 1914, the year of the outbreak of the Great War, Russia was in an almost constant state of turmoil and disorder, the outline of which will be presented in the next section, and by the latter year was on the verge of just such another revolution as had occurred in 1905, when the news of a new war redirected the attention of all to the necessity of repelling an alien enemy. Again war and the failures of an inefficient Autocracy and dishonest Bureaucracy led to revolution, this time completely overwhelming State and Throne, and leaving as inheritors of the Tsars, first, a temporary Constitutional regime and then the present Soviet Republic. The events of 1917 to the present will be considered in the next chapter. (Kornilov, Russia under Nicholas II, chaps. I-IV. Beazley, Book III, chap. VI, pp. 518-546. Mavor, vol. II, Book IV, chaps. IX-XII; Book V, chaps. VII, VIII; Book VI, chaps. I, IV, V, VII, X, XI, XIII, XIV.)


The attitude of the Zemstvos at the beginning of the reign of Nicholas, and the latter's uncompromising policy of adherence to the principles of his father, were indicated in the quotations of the last section. The growing opposition on the part both of the Zemstvos as well as the more violent bodies of workers constitutes the main story of the reign up to the revolution of 1905. Education is treated much as under Alexander III, and the attention of society, while taking it for granted that reforms must be granted in the field of education, is turned more and more to political and economic questions, a broader field, and including the former as part of it.

It soon became quite apparent that, no matter how courteous and how moderate the demands of the Zemstvos were, they constituted in essence a policy and a principle utterly at variance with the state, and that either the self-government of the Zemstvos or the autocracy of the state would eventually have to yield. Compromise was inherently impossible. Count Witte who had become Minister of Finance in 1894 wrote a short essay on the subject (Autocracy and the Zemstvos) in which he clearly points out that the progress of the Zemstvos and their ideas of self-government must eventually lead to constitutionalism, and that the government must definitely decide to foster such a movement or crush it out. The latter policy was decided upon, and from 1899 to 1904 a severe campaign was carried on against them, petitions submitted by them on
matters closely connected with their legal sphere of work were rejected, Zemstvos were forbidden to form unions or to meet in common, and they were even forbidden to organize famine relief campaigns. New restrictions were made against the Zemstvo schools, and efforts were made to prevent them publishing literature for their schools or for the peasants. In 1902 they were forbidden to collect statistical material, or to hire expert workers for the sanitary and veterinary work unless the government could certify that they were "sound" politically.

Naturally the moderate Zemstvo opinion grew stronger, tended to become allied with the more radical element, and, above all, like other movements in this period, verged toward a political propaganda. In 1902, a congress of Zemstvo leaders, headed by Shipov, passed a series of resolutions condemning the policy of the government, and another council in 1903 asked that all laws dealing with local affairs be first submitted to the Zemstvos for criticism. The local Zemstvos continued to become more and more liberal, even discussing political questions, a subject strictly forbidden, and leading in many cases to exile and imprisonment. In 1902 the movement acquired a journal, "Osvobozhdenie" (Liberation), published abroad, and intended to unite the opinion of the various sections of the country. Finally, in 1904, as a result of activity on the part of the more liberal both within and without the Zemstvos, there was formed the "Soyuz Osvobozhdenia" (Union of Liberation), which took as its aims the political emancipation of Russia by means of the abolition of autocracy and the establishment of a democratic constitutional regime. Thus from purely economic local matters, the Zemstvos were forced, by the unyielding policy of the government, to which they had originally been entirely loyal, to the last extreme of political activity motivated by a desire to overthrow the state and the throne.

In the meantime, side by side with this movement of the Zemstvos, there was also constant activity on the part of the revolutionists, who turned this time more and more to the proletariat of the towns and cities. To the famous address of the members of the Tver Zemstvo, whom Nicholas had rebuked, the revolutionists replied by a letter published abroad, which takes up the challenge of the Tsar: "You have spoken, and your words are at present known everywhere in Russia; ay, in the whole civilized world. Until now you were unknown, but since yesterday you have become a definite factor in the situation of the country, about whom there is no room left for senseless dreams." . . . First of all, you are badly informed
about the tendencies against which you have decided to raise your voice in your speech. There has not been heard in one single assembly of any Zemstvo one single word against that autocracy which is so dear to your heart. . . . In one word, the only thing that was in question was the desire to see fall and crumble to the ground that wall of bureaucracy and courtierdom that has always parted the sovereign from the Russian people. . . . Your speech has strengthened in others the determination to fight to the bitter end against a hateful order of things, and to fight it with all the means they may have at their disposal and in their power. You have been the first to begin the struggle, and it will not be long before you find yourself entangled by it”. (Kornilov, vol. II, pp. 279-280.) As one of the first moves Plekhanov and other members of the “Black Partition” founded, some little time after the formation of that organization, a still further subdivision, the “Liberation of Labor” Party and still later, in 1898, a congress of various socialistic groups resulted in the formation of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party, with a program concentrating on economic questions, and using strikes as a method of obtaining results. From 1895 to 1896 so many strikes were organized, that the police of Moscow obtained official permission to organize strikes themselves among the workers of Moscow, in order thus to draw them away from the socialistic and revolutionary parties, and break up the unanimity of the movement. But the strikes got beyond their control, had to be suppressed with bloodshed, and accomplished the double purpose of discouraging this so-called “Police Socialism” and also once more showing the revolutionists the uselessness of purely economic activity, since it could be so easily imitated by the opposition. Thus, within the ranks of the Social Democrats, began a bitter struggle between the more conservative and the more radical, the “economists” and the “politicians”, resulting, in a conference held at Brussels, in 1903, in a split within the party. The moderate minority, favoring “orthodox Marxism” and believing in peaceful methods and the use of the existing parliamentary methods, became the “Mensheviks”; the more violent majority of that time, hating slower methods of reform and the greater gains of the “bourgeois” elements, became, under the leadership of Lenin, the “Bolsheviks”. These Social Revolutionists, or Bolsheviki, carried on the tradition of the former “Will of the People” party, using terroristic methods, and working for the people as a whole, and endeavoring to educate both the peasant and the proletariat of the towns and cities to the point where they would use an opportunity to bring about the promised “revolution”. The
Bolsheviki were, furthermore, not interested in the immediate material welfare of the peasant, for they wished to bring about, if possible, his transformation into a part of the "propertyless proletariat". Into the details of the terroristic acts of this whole period it is not necessary to go, but many assassinations took place, including that of the Minister of Education, Bogolepov. The government, on its side, strove constantly to make existence still more unendurable; hundreds of students were exiled, the press was forbidden to discuss almost 2,000 new subjects, in addition to innumerable old ones, all the repressive measures against meetings and discussions were doubly enforced, and rebellious university students were flogged and forced to enlist in the army as punishment.

The year 1904 was one which saw a rapidly rising storm of opposition in all sections and among adherents of all parties. Branches of the Union of Liberation, previously mentioned, were formed in the provinces, and many of the Zemstvos, Tver in particular, suffered for their views and propaganda. Pleve, as Minister of the Interior, used his utmost power of repression, in the expressed belief that the opposition did not represent the general view of society, refused to sanction the re-election of Shipov at Moscow, though as leader and originator of the Zemstov movement the latter had done all he could to restrain action in legal and moderate channels. In July Pleve was assassinated, one of the almost innumerable relentless bureaucrats who were killed by the terrorists of this period. His successor, Svyatopolk-Mirsky, resembled in many respects that Loris-Melikov of the reign of Alexander II, and begged for a policy of mutual "trust" between the people and the state. But the people were better organized than in 1880 as well as less disposed to trust the government that had so often betrayed it. The Union of Liberation together with other liberal leaders held a congress in St. Petersburg and agreed on a series of resolutions, the so-called "eleven points", which were presented to the new minister. They were the same moderate democratic demands that had been made over and over again, but this time they were the official utterance of a sober and determined organization. None the less they were rejected, largely through the instrumentality of Pobiedonostsev and the Grand Dukes, but became the slogan of all the actively striving elements of the time, forming a basis for agreement between many classes and groups hitherto without any definite points of contact other than dissatisfaction with the existing state of affairs. A "banquet movement" arose, and spread throughout Russia, a series of dinners at which professional men, lawyers, doctors, engineers and teachers
expressed entire agreement with the demands of the "eleven points". The government, as usual when alarmed, became irresolute, and for a few days showed a tendency to compromise, but a promising edict of December 25 was overthrown in two days and the demands of the Zemstvos declared contrary to the fundamental laws of the Empire, meetings were forbidden, and the Zemstvos cautioned to restrict their activity to affairs that properly lay within their province. (Kornilov, Russia Under Nicholas, chaps I, II. Zilliacus, chaps. XIII, XVIII. Mavor, Vol. II, Book IV, chaps. IX-XII; Book V, chaps. VII, VIII; Book VI, chaps I, IV, V, VII, X, XI, XIII, XIV.)

The 1905 Revolution, and the "Constitutional Regime".

From the revolution of 1905 to the revolution of 1917 is perhaps the last period in the history of the Romanovs, and in it all the striving and, hitherto, unsuccessful efforts of the opposition break the power of the autocratic state twice: the first time, only for the moment; the second time, in 1917, perhaps for ever, for it seems unlikely that the "old Russia" will ever return. The whole reign of Nicholas seems crowded with significant incident and activity, but this last period is, in many ways, the most crowded of all in the history of the country.

The year 1905 began with a movement of the proletariat, under "Father" Gapon, a government agent, who had formed a Factory Workers' Society in Petersburg, under the governmental plan of directing the workers to purely economic questions under their own indirect supervision. But, as in other cases, the movement grew beyond the control of Gapon, and some 13,000 factory workers, whose demands for an eight hour day and better treatment were refused, decided to present a petition to the Emperor. Their procession was fired on and some 500 killed, though they had been orderly, and had not been led by revolutionists. This "Bloody Sunday" had the effect of once again discrediting the government and turning the masses even more strongly to the bitterest of revolutionary methods and ideas, as well as leading to still further strikes, both in the factories and in the universities, where the students "struck" in sympathy.

This was in January; in March the government, seriously alarmed, resolved to compromise. The Tsar's message upon the appointment of Bulygin in place of Mirsky, and after the assassination of Grand Duke Sergey, announced, "I am resolved henceforth, with the help of God, to summon the worthiest men elected by the
people for participation in the drafting and consideration of legislative measures.” (Kornilov, vol. II, p. 302.) This, however, was no longer enough to satisfy the country, and the Zemstvos continued their demands for a representative government full and free, and no mere share in “discussion.” In May the Union of Unions under Milionkov was formed, uniting the liberals of the Zemstvos with the professional classes. The disasters of the Russian-Japanese War were now a fundamental element in the agitation and distrust throughout the country, and even further concessions on the part of the government were of no avail. Even the promise of a Duma could not hold back the disorder. Banks, railways, peasants, factory workers, clerks in the law courts, postal and telegraph employees, employees of water and light plants,—one and all ceased to work, assembled, and came into open conflict with police and troops. Part of the Union of Unions and a section of Zemstvo workers formed the Constitutional Democratic Party (Kadets), and in St. Petersburg was formed the Council of Workmen’s Delegates, dominated by the revolutionaries. The government had lost control, and even adopted the revolutionary tactics of the radicals, forming the Union of True Russian People, and the Black Hundreds or Black Gangs. Pogroms were the order of the day—directed by the government against radical and Jew, student and workman, for they were all classed together by the government as objects to the policy of the state. A manifesto of October, in spite of all this secret activity of the government, announced that freedom of speech, conscience and meeting would be granted, but not a representative assembly. A new strike was called for November for the final victory over the last reservation of the government, but lacked the unanimity of the one of the preceding month and broke down. The promises already given had satisfied many, and the nation was no longer fundamentally united, while the government was continuing its organization of reactionary forces. For the remainder of the year the revolution lost in strength, and the gentry and the more conservative middle class, alarmed at the violence of the radicals, turned to the government as the lesser of two evils, relied on its promises; and by their moral aid carried the government over the year to 1906, when the tide once again turned in favor of the state.

With the return of the confidence and power of the government, the punishment meted out was indescribably severe. Every effort was made so to stamp out the very roots of radical activity and propaganda, that never again would even the semblance of a
revolution be possible. But such methods have never accomplished their purposes. The history of the period between the return to power of the government and the outbreak of the War in 1914 parallels that of 1900 to the revolution of 1905 plus the added element of the attempt of the government to make the fulfillment of its promises of 1905 a matter of words rather than deeds. The promised Duma did indeed come to exist, but was handicapped and thwarted in every direction, and its elections tampered with. Into the details of this period we do not need to go, but their result was to bring the country once more to a regime of strikes (1911), with a Duma (the fourth) openly censuring the government, and with armed conflicts in the streets. The progress of the War itself was but the final turning point in the struggle, and under the pressure of defeat and weakness, Nicholas II ushered out the Romanov dynasty. (Kornilov, Russia Under Nicholas II, chaps. II-IV; Mayor, vol. II, as above: Zilliacus, chaps. XVII, XVIII; Ivanov Razumnik, vol. II, chaps. VIII-IX.)

The Last Phase of Autocratic Education.

In education, as in other matters, the reign of Nicholas is a continuation of that of Alexander III, with the addition of a more particular attention to elementary education, and an attempt, under social pressure, to organize the field of these schools more satisfactorily. But the end of the reign, complicated by the events of the Great War, leaves the main problems of education unsolved by any other standard than the policy of compromise which the government, as usual, adopted. The program of the Soviet Minister of Education, which followed the Bolshevik success, has no connection with the official inheritance in the educational field, which the Romanovs left. It was to be a working out of the most radical of the tendencies which the Tsar and his Ministry were most active in suppressing.

The public interest in education, which had been characteristic of the period of the Zemstvo growth, and which had started under Alexander II, began to show itself, also from 1890 on. New educational journals were started, and the daily press again concerned itself with the eternal question of "reform in education."

Primary education was the most pressing question, and received the first attention. The movement of the last reign to extend elementary education, by whatever means possible, continued, both economic and humanitarian motives being combined, for the social workers and revolutionists were interested in the latter and the
government in the former. The general public, too, had been impressed by the results of the famine of 1891-1892 and readily saw that a little education and a few schools might well prevent the recurrence of such a condition. In 1894 the Educational Committee at St. Petersburg, which had been investigating the question of elementary education, reported, in part, as follows,—“The introduction of universal (elementary) education appears to be one of the most important and the most pressing of the problems of our time. . . . General education ought not to be founded on a low level, i. e., on the existing degenerated and run-down schools. . . . For the working out of a plan for the introduction of general education the whole population of school age ought to be taken into account . . . General education ought to be founded on the principle of no fees. . . . The introduction, in our time, of compulsory education does not appear to be justified.” (Quoted, in Russian, Kaptelev, p. 83.)

Delianov retired from the Ministry in 1896, and after a temporary director for two years, Bogolepov assumed charge in 1898, bringing a varied experience in educational matters to bear on his problems. While Bogolepov introduced little or nothing that was new, his control, till his assassination in 1901, was characterized by activity, particularly in elementary education. As he saw the situation, an increase in schools was necessary, as many children were being neglected and many schools were overcrowded, but it was also necessary to have firm control of the schools,—private enterprise could not be permitted to do too much. He therefore encouraged the establishment of schools of the “1828” type, under direct control of the Ministry of Education and in no way subject to the control of the Zemstvos, and also made easier the opening of so-called “Ministerial” Schools, by giving greater leeway to local officials and by increasing grants for them. During his tenure of office, the number of all primary schools increased some 25%. Due to the increase in the number of these two types of schools the share of the Government in providing elementary education was naturally proportionally larger, though all types of schools became more numerous. The payments of the government show a steady rise during the reign of Nicholas, and when the Zemstvo schools are also taken into account, it may readily be seen that no other period had witnessed such an extension of primary schooling. The following figures are instructive: In 1903, the Ministry of Education spent R 5,784,672; in 1906, R. 8,286,672; in 1909, R. 22,884,672; in 1910, R. 35,884,672; in 1916, R. 72,336,609. (For
first four, see Kapterev, p. 85; for last, see Russian Year Book, 1916.)

This growth of primary education naturally led to a still greater demand for teachers, who had always been more or less lacking in Russia, due, of course, to the fundamental poverty of institutions for training them, as well as to the restrictions which hedged them around, and the very poor pay granted for their services. To remedy part of this, Bogolepov created a pension fund in 1900, established temporary pedagogical courses throughout the country, and removed some of the restrictions, such as freedom of teachers' conferences.

That the government was really sincerely interested in the question of elementary education and its problems, at least as it saw them, is shown by still another bill, proposed but not enacted in 1907. The provisions of this bill were framed to make education in the rural districts both easier, and more under the central control. Many children of school age, particularly girls, did not attend the existing schools, because of the distance which separated them from the actual building, necessitating, often, that elementary school children live at the school for the week, returning only on Sundays. This naturally raised all sorts of difficulties and problems of food, lodging, the mingling of the sexes and so on, and placed a tremendous burden on the teacher of the school who was virtually responsible for the children every hour of the school week, day and night. The bill recommended, in part (1), All children of both sexes ought to be able to go to a school with a full course, regularly organized, i. e., four years in length, with not more than 50 pupils to one teacher . . . ; (2) Each school ought to serve a region of not more than three versts in radius. (Kapterev, Russian, p. 86.) That a law needed to be proposed for these requirements shows the actual condition of the schools. By 1910 about half of the Zemstvos had actually introduced general education, either completely under their own control, or partly under control of the government. The whole sum spent on primary education, for 1910, was R. 70,713,773. (Kapterev, p. 93.) For further statistics, see appendix.

The question of making elementary education compulsory was one of the most debated of the period; there is little doubt that the government was gradually coming to some solution of the difficulties connected with it.—largely financial and regional. But the War of 1914, as well as the troubles of the 1905-6 period, interfered. With the government, however, it would seem to have been almost
a purely economic motive that activated them, for the old ideas of
class and station had by no means disappeared. In 1911 the ques-
tion was submitted for consideration to the teachers of the elemen-
tary schools, meeting at Moscow; some 85% thought compulsory
education desirable; 8% necessary; 9% that it was possible, on
certain conditions; 62% that it was possible, as conditions were.
(Kapterev, p. 96.) But, as the author just quoted says, "A law
for compulsory education is not the first moment but the last mo-
ment in the struggle against the ignorance of the people, the time
for it will only come when it is shown, apart from all the acknowl-
edged needs and existing measures for obtaining universal educa-
tion, that it has not been attained simply because of the barbarous
egoism, indifference and low ideals of parents. But Russia is yet
far from this, . . ." (p. 101.) It is, from many points, an economic
matter; the government would prosper,—but the individual parent
does not want to spare the son or daughter from the work on the
farm or in the house.

In the field of secondary education one document of great im-
portance was issued, the Circular of the Minister of Education for
1899, under Bogolepov, summoning a conference of educational
experts, to suggest reforms and necessary changes. The circular
calls attention to the uselessness of the established system of sec-
ondary education, the lack of physical and moral training, the too
early specialization, the disorganization of the program the poor
teaching and insufficient instruction in material knowledge and sci-
ence, and the excessive predominance of the classics. The purpose
of this Commission was not only to frame a theoretical program for
reconstruction, but also to make the practical suggestions for the
working out of the reforms, paying particular attention to physical
and moral training, and the principles of Orthodoxy, Autocracy
and Nationalism.

The proposals when completed were submitted to still another
Committee, but before they could be embodied in practice, Bogo-
lepow was assassinated. His successor, General Vannovski, took
up the question, and summoned still another Commission, which ar-
vived at very different conclusions from the first and second bodies,
recommending, for example, the abolition of the dual system of
gymnasia and the substitution of a single type school, with classics
only as an elective in the upper grades, the removal of the classics
from the list of admission requirements for the universities, and
making the entrance into the gymnasium from the primary school
easier. The Emperor confirmed these matters for a trial period of
a year, but other advice prevailed, and Vannovski resigned, being succeeded by Professor Sänger, formerly of the Moscow University. The question of reform of the secondary schools was, by order, to be his chief concern, and temporary measures were adopted until such time as a new complete system should be worked out. By these temporary measures the status quo of the period before the series of Commissions was, practically, maintained, with the addition, for the sake of the inculcation of the ideals of Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationalism, and the practice of moral training, of boarding houses, where pupils might, as a group, be brought under the proper influences. Greek, however, was made optional in the majority of the schools.

The students, too, were beginning to take a hand in the discussion, so that the so-called "smutnoe vremia" or period of troubles of the academic year 1905-1906 were preceded by a period of years in which the students of the gymnasium formed unions or clubs for the discussion both of political and academic matters, more or less in imitation of the university students and the revolutionists. The Unions of the south and the north were characteristically different, the south being more violently political. For example, the Northern Union, formed in St. Petersburg in 1903-04, and continuing to exist for some five years, framed its problems thus: "The raising of the intellectual and moral level of students, and the arousing in them, as a body, of a deep and living interest in the social and political activity of the day." The Union wished to aid the students "to work out a finished, scientifically founded, progressive, social-political Weltanschauung (lit. 'contemplation of the world.')" In 1903 the organization of the gymnasium students in the south formed the "Union of Youth" and a committee, in March of that year, made public the following resolution: "To form among the students of the middle schools such an organization which would prepare these young people . . . for the struggle for their rights . . ." (See Kaptanov for these and further details, pp. 61-62.)

The year 1905 saw many and determined strikes on the part of both the university and the gymnasium students; indeed, even the schoolboys of still lower rank entered into the general movement of protest against the government and into the expression of sympathy with the revolutionists and striking workmen. But the movement had other elements besides that of protest against the government in general. The students demanded, in agreement with the principles of the organizations mentioned above, reform in the
school system. But the return of strength and confidence of the
government after the last strikes and the beginning of disorganiza-
tion on the part of the revolutionists resulted in the same meas-
ures of repression and the same return of bitter supervision in the
schools as in the general conduct of the country. The reaction
was terrible; between 1905 and 1909, the period of greatest re-
action, there were over 45,000 suicides in Russia, the greatest num-
ber, naturally, being among the intelligent and educated, and the
greatest proportion being of people between 15 and 20 years of
age. (Kornilov, vol. II, p. 332.) Nothing further was done ma-
terially to alter the secondary school beyond the stage in which the
regime of Sänger left it, though the number of pupils attending
the gymnasia has constantly risen, except to make supervision
stricter, in order to prevent the recurrence of the troubles of
1905-06.

The history of the universities of this period is much the same
story of gradually a rising tide of rebellion, of subsequent revolt
and bitter repression. The disorders broke out earlier in this field,
were more frequent, and were suppressed with, perhaps, more sev-
erity. But the vital questions were left just as much unsolved in
the case of the universities as in the case of the rest of the educa-
tional field, though here, as elsewhere, the number of students grew
constantly throughout the period. That some radical change would
have been inherently necessary after the War of 1914 is quite evi-
dent, but the government did not survive to foster or suppress the
growing power of the educated body of students and teachers.

The universities, like the other parts of the system, suffered
from the vacillating purposes and changing plans of the number of
Ministers, for this period of Alexander is noted for the number
of men who held the post of Minister of Education. Under Bogo-
lepow, some additions to the field of the university work were made,
—a new Faculty of Law at Tomsk, a new Faculty of Medicine at
Odessa, and the establishment of the famous Oriental Institute at
Vladivostok. But the serious student disorders in the universities
during 1899 put an end to constructive work, and turned the at-
tention of the government to the necessity of suppressing the or-
ganizations which had grown up among the students. The Laws
and Regulations for Universities expressly forbade any and every
form of organization, but the students had formed them so much
on the style of the secret revolutionary bodies that their strength
and number had not been suspected. A quotation of some of the
rules bearing on the subject will make clear the nature of the uni-
versity life which students were supposed to lead: "Students are considered as individual members (visitors) of the university and therefore no action on their part is permitted which bears a corporate character. On this account the presentation of addresses and petitions signed by several persons, the sending of deputations, or the exhibition of any notices whatever in the names of the students, are forbidden. N. B.—No notices may be put up without the signature of the inspector or his assistant. . . . Within the buildings, courts, and grounds of the university the organization of students' reading rooms, dining or food clubs, and also of theatrical representations, concerts, balls, and other similar public assemblies not having a scientific character, is absolutely forbidden. . . . Students are forbidden to hold any meetings or gatherings for deliberation in common on any matters whatsoever or to deliver public speeches, and they are likewise forbidden to establish any common funds whatsoever." (Quoted, Darlington, pp. 445-6.) Since the students did not obey these regulations the occasions of punishment and resistance were frequent, though they rose to perhaps the greatest height in 1899. For some three months, in that year, the trouble continued, the police even going so far as to flog the students with whips, in the streets of St. Petersburg. Two days later the students struck, declared the university "closed," and pledged themselves to remain away from the university until personal inviolability was granted to all students of both sexes. Throughout Russia some 13,000 students struck, and the Tsar issued an Ukaz ordering the strikers to be forcibly enlisted in the army regardless of their special privileges. Many professors were dismissed from Moscow and St. Petersburg. In 1900 a group of about one thousand students met in Kiev to discuss the situation, and upon the reporting of the occurrence by the rector, the university was surrounded by Cossacks and police, half the gathering arrested, almost two hundred drafted into the army and the rest expelled. Similar movements took place in all the university towns, the workmen often joining with the students. In St. Petersburg, on another occasion, seven students, among them a woman, were killed. It was one month after this affair that Bogolepov was killed by an ex-student. The student movement and the revolutionary movement became more and more affiliated and processions of students and workmen paraded up and down the city with the cry of "Doloi Samoderzhaviye," i. e., Down with the Aristocracy.

As a consequence the government summoned the usual conference to consider the matter, but the only measures were addi-
tional precautions against the recurrence of the outbreak. The number of inspectors for the universities was increased to three times the former number, making about one inspector to each 150 students, and students were restricted in their choice of universities. Exactly the same outbreaks took place in 1905-06 when some little measure of freedom was obtained, only to be abruptly taken away again in 1910 under Schwarz and by his successor Kasso. The year 1911 saw the same strikes and the same police methods. This time the government tried to solve the difficulty by a closer scrutiny of the university professors, more than a hundred of whom, the very best, resigned under pressure, and their places were taken by those "desirable politically" to the government.

Thus the whole policy of the period, except in the field of elementary education, was one of coercion and suppression, with revolt against it. The only constructive work, that of the elementary schools, was motivated by a desire to raise the productive powers of the country, to which may be added, as another example of the same motive, a growth of technical schools and the creation (1896) of commercial and business schools and classes and courses in commercial knowledge. By 1904 this enterprise had grown very considerably, but naturally involved little or no disturbance or discussion. (Kapterev, chaps. IV, V, VI; Kornilov, vol. II, Nicholas II, chaps. II-IV; Darlington, pp. 150-160; Source 3, part IX, chaps. II-VI.)
CHAPTER X.

THE TRANSITION TO THE BOLSHEVIKI

The Two Revolutions.

The two streams of propaganda which we have seen throughout the course of the development of the opposition in Russia are found again to be rivals in the activities of the period of the Great War and the immediate period after it. The Bolsheviki, who were a portion of the party of the Marxian Social Democratic Labor Party, and the more conservative liberal leaders of the Zemstvo movement and the party for Constitutional reform, continued the struggle against the Tsar and autocracy, but not with the same aims and methods. It was the first success of the Constitutionalists that gave the opportunity for the later success of Lenin and the Bolsheviki. Into the details of the two revolutions it is not possible to go here, but a slight sketch of the chief events will make understandable the final triumph of the party of Lenin, as well as the basis of the educational decrees which his Minister of Education has issued.

The disturbances of 1905-06 which we have sketched, though suppressed, broke out again in 1910, continuing, sporadically until 1913-14, with protests against the Balkan Wars, militarism in general, as well as the old protest against the system of government and its methods. The consensus of opinion asserts that the year 1914-15 would have seen a far wider and far more successful attempt to overthrow the government than had yet been made, but the beginning of the Great War, for the time being, turned the attention of all to external rather than internal events. The country, as a whole, with remarkable unanimity, and with astonishing patriotism rallied to the defense of the country, regardless of class or creed, and Nicholas II probably never had a more united people than in the first few months of the War. The Bolsheviki and the Mensheviki and one or two other Socialist groups alone abstained from voting war credits in the Duma, though some of them supported the War later on. It is also highly probable that the Bolsheviki conspired against the government and the conduct of the War, in the very beginning, and several of the Bolsheviki members
of the Duna were arrested in November. Lenin, who had not yet arrived in Russia, believed that the defeat of Russia would be the best first step to the overthrow of the government. At a conference held in Petrograd, as the capital was now called, it had been proven, according to the government, that the Bolshevik element were about to circulate their doctrines among the army, urging that "from the standpoint of the working-class and of the laboring masses of all the nations of Russia, the defeat of the monarchy of the Tsar and of his armies would be of extremely little consequence." From this, the members of parties holding such a view became known as "Porazhentsi," i.e., "Defeatists"; but this did not prove, as was claimed then and since, that they were in the pay of Germany. Perhaps some of them were, but this would have to be established on other grounds, for their position was quite understandable.

The majority of the Socialists, on the other hand, took quite the contrary point of view. The following passage from their Manifesto to the Laboring Class shows their attitude: "We, the undersigned, belong to different shades of Russian Socialistic thought. We differ on many things, but we firmly agree in that the defeat of Russia in her struggle with Germany would mean her defeat in her struggle for freedom. . . ." (From the text of the whole Manifesto, quoted by Spargo, pp. 95-100.)

With the Porazhentsi, however, another element was working,—not in open and friendly agreement, but with the same purposes at heart,—the so-called Germanophiles. It must not be forgotten that Catherine the Great was a German and that five out of six succeeding Tsars married German wives, and that Nicholas the Second was almost purely German in blood. Moreover, the bureaucracy had been started with German aid and enterprise, and has always contained a very considerable percentage of officials whose greatest inheritance was German. In the Great War as in the wars with Turkey and with Japan, official dishonesty as well as official dishonesty had much to do with failures in military efficiency, and in evoking public and revolutionary action. After the early successes of the Russian army this element did all it could to dis-organize affairs, and succeeded admirably in so doing. So badly were matters going in the army that the municipalities and the Zemstvos formed unions to do the work and furnish the supplies that the government was failing to provide, and both founded hospitals, feeding stations, transportation service and manufacturing centers, as well as furnishing tents, boots, socks and numerous other things which
were missing. With the spirit and heart of Russia and the Russian people there was nothing wrong,—circumstances alone, in the form of a corrupt bureaucracy were against them, and their work was, as usual, hindered and forbidden. Even the Duma was ordered indefinitely suspended (September, 1915.) The Black Hundreds were active, public aid was crushed, and the belief prevailed throughout the country that the court and the bureaucracy were planning a separate peace.

The year 1916 was a continuation, on a larger scale, of the activities, the plots, the Manifestos and the disorders of the previous year. When the Duma met in November, the country was ripe for revolt, awaiting only the action and the leadership of the Duma. Still the matter hung fire. The action of the government in appointing the worst of reactionaries to the most important positions, is good ground for believing that it really wished for a revolution as the easiest solution of the external and internal difficulties. The opening of the Duma for 1917 was postponed twice. The country was disorganized by strikes, famine and terror. Once more the government tried "police socialism" and endeavored to provoke sufficiently serious riots and disorder to necessitate the use of troops, and thus round up the active and dangerous elements in the cities,—but, as had always been the case when this method was tried, the matter got beyond control. This time the troops sympathized with the rioters, took care not to hurt them, and in the end, after a few days, openly joined with them. The government had lost the last means for its defense. On March 15th the Tsar resigned, and Prince Lvov formed a temporary government, to keep control until such time as the Constituent Assembly should meet and decide on the candidacy of Grand Duke Michael, the brother of the Tsar, whom he had named as his successor after first considering his own son. Michael refused, however, to reign without the sanction of a representative body. All this was the fruition of the first revolution of 1917, a purely political affair in which the people played little part, and which was accomplished largely by the educated and propertied men of the Duma, who did not represent, as a provisional government, the main masses of the country.

From March on, a second revolution, destined to overtake and overthrow the first, was in process of formation. This was to be a social revolution, a revolution of the lower classes, and led by men of an entirely different school of thought, with socialistic and Marxian ideology in place of that of a representative democracy.
The Provisional Government at once proceeded to issue Manifestos, removing limitation of class and race and guaranteeing freedom of speech, press and religion. But it could not satisfy the masses, who had come to the point of distrusting all kinds of government other than their own local and class methods. In the meantime the Council of Workmen's and (later) Soldiers' Delegates, which had been formed in February, 1917, in imitation of the similar bodies of 1905-1906, had been growing in strength and turning from the Menshevik doctrines and control which had first characterized it to Bolshevik principles, so that its Manifestos gradually changed from a demand for a Constituent Assembly to open defiance of the government of Prince Lvov. This Council was the basis of the Soviet form of government, the word "Soviet" meaning Council. Little by little the power of the Councils grew and the Provisional Government weakened. The period of Soviet Russia was at hand.

In April Lenin and several other Bolshevik leaders arrived in Russia, bringing with them a definitely worked-out plan of campaign, one based on purely economic and class ideas and demanding the absolute destruction of all capitalistic machinery, whether of state or society, and appealing to and for the sake of the proletariat. "Democracy" in Lenin's phrase was a "bourgeois conception," and in his scheme for the reconstruction of Russia, there was little of what the Western world calls by that name. Indeed, in strict accord with this belief, the party of the Bolsheviks soon ceased to call themselves a section of the Social Democratic Party, of which they were the actual descendants, choosing instead the name of "Communist Party." What Lenin advocated was a purely Soviet form of government, in which the working class and the "poorest," i.e., property-less, peasantry would have power and constitute delegates. In May, Trotsky arrived in Petrograd, like Lenin, an old revolutionist.

From May until November there was constant playing for supreme power between the Provisional Government, with Kerensky as Premier, and the Soviets under Trotsky and Lenin, ending on the 7th of that month, with the utter triumph of the latter and the flight and escape of Kerensky. The remainder of the Provisional Government were placed under arrest, and the "dictatorship of the proletariat" began, with Lenin as President of the Council of People's Commissaries, as the new government was called, and Trotsky as Commissioner of Foreign Affairs. (Spargo, pp. 76-208; Reed, chaps. I-IV; Lenin, Soviets at Work.)
The Educational Philosophy of the Bolsheviki.

It is seemingly possible to speak only of the educational philosophy of the Soviet Republic, for we have no evidence, at present, beyond the First Annual Report of Commissar of Education Lunacharsky, for 1918, of what has been done in contradistinction to what is being planned. Of the latter material there is sufficient to show a radically different system of education from that of the autocracy, and one which differs, moreover, in many particulars, from the educational philosophy of any other country. Reed’s book as well as The Liberator, The Modern School, The Nation and The New Republic supply many of the documents, but the main source is the, at present, unpublished material of the Soviet Bureau of New York, from which most of the following is drawn.

The educational system and philosophy of the Bolsheviki party is in absolute accord with its economic and class ideas, and reflects the doctrines of Lenin and his party in every respect. As far as possible the system will be presented in the words of the original documents.

“In a country kept artificially in ignorance, the task of education could not find full development on the day following the People’s Revolution, which transferred the power to the toiling masses. It is evident, however, that neither the conquest of political power nor the attainment of the position of economic mastery of the country, could be lasting, if the people should not also attain knowledge. Only a high level of public education could make possible a conscious governing-by-the-people,—which should embrace large masses. During the interval an important role had to be played by the Intelligentsia, which had enjoyed the odious privilege of exclusive erudition, and was considered in Russia to be in sympathy with the people. In the time of the 1905-06 revolution, Kautsky pointed out with hope the fact that in Russia the task of the working class would be made easier by its sincere ally, the revolutionary Intelligentsia. Kautsky did not foresee at that time that, at the moment of the concrete realization of his dreams, at the hour of the social revolution, even he himself would turn enemy to the proletarian vanguard.

“However, there is no evil without its accompanying good. The abominable sabotage on the part of the majority of the Russian Intelligentsia, and in particular, of the so-called socialist Intelligentsia, proved an excellent lesson for the proletariat, laying stress upon the unalterable necessity for the proletarian to acquire
real knowledge immediately—for himself, so far as possible, and in full measure for his children.

"The leadership in this important task has fallen to the Commissariat for Public Instruction." (Annual Report, Lunacharsky, for 1918. Liberator, May, 1919.)

The organization and control of education under the Soviets is naturally different from the system of the Tsars; the same report goes on to describe this new method of organization,—"At the head of the Commissariat stands the People's Commissar and his assistant, and the staff, consisting at present of seven people, which decides all current affairs that are outside the competence of the branch superintendents. Basic problems are solved by a State Board of Education, which, besides the members of the staff and the branch superintendents, includes also representatives from the centers of the Soviet Government, from the labor unions and the workers' cultural organizations, and from that part of the body of the teachers which is taking a stand of loyal co-operation with the Soviet power.

"Finally, problems of especial importance, for instance, regarding a school reform, are considered at the All-Russian Conventions, the first of which, well attended, harmonious, and imbued with communistic ideals, took place in Moscow, in the month of August (1918).

"In the provinces the work of public education is being directed by the Departments of Public Instruction attached to the provincial (gubernia), county (ouyezd), city, and lastly, the volost, Executive Committees. The provincial, county, and city departments, corresponding to the Central staff, have attached to them Councils of Public Instruction corresponding, in the provinces, to the State Board." (Lunacharsky, report for 1918.)

The Commissar has also unified the school system: "In place of schools of all varieties and kinds—which formerly were sharply divided into a lower school for the plain people, and the middle school for the privileged classes and the well-to-do people, and divided, further into schools for boys and those for girls, into technical and classical secondary schools, general and special school institutions—the Commissariat has introduced the Unified Workers' School, covering the entire length of the course of instruction.

"The unity of this school should be understood in two ways: first, that the class divisions are abolished and the school adopts a continuous grade system. In principle, every child of the Russian Republic enters a school of an identical type and has the same

113
chances as every other to complete its higher education. Second, that up to the age of 16, all specialization is omitted. It is self-understood that this does not hinder the adoption of the principle of individual attention, and of the greatest possible variety of forms inside each school. But specialization in the full meaning of the word is permitted only after attaining the age of 16, and upon the foundation of a general and polytechnical education acquired already. The school is declared an absolutely lay institution; diplomas, in their character of certificates granting special rights, are abolished; the classical languages are declared non-obligatory.

"This school, unified in principle, is divided into two grades: the first of five years' duration, and the second of four years. This nine years' course is declared to be in principle obligatory.

"Our school will be in fact accessible to all. To attain this end, not only are all tuition fees abolished, but the children are provided with gratuitous hot food, and the poorest children with shoes and clothing. It goes without saying that all school manuals are offered to the children free of charge by the school." (Same report.)

After some discussion of the difficulties involved and the methods of meeting them, Lunacharsky proceeds to the statement of some of the fundamental aims of the school, and particularly in "Work as the Basis of Education."

"The labor character of the school consists in the fact that labor, pedagogical as well as, in particular, productive labor, will be made a basis of teaching.

"In the primary schools it will be mostly work within the walls of the school: in the kitchen, in the garden, in special workshops, etc. The labor must be of a productive character—in this way, in particular, that the children serve the needs of the community so far as their strength will permit them.

"In the secondary schools the productive and the broad social character of labor is emphasized still more sharply. We deal here with children from thirteen years up. From this age there is possible an easy but real labor outside of the school; the participation in factory or shop work, the helping in serious farm work, the cooperation in some business enterprise, the co-operation in some social or state undertaking. From this age up we are uniting the labor of the children, the participation of the child in the social struggle for existence, and its development with its education. The school, without losing sight of the youngster, protecting it from harm, turning each act of its labor to the benefit of its general
physical and mental development, will lead it into the very tangle of social productive work.” (Same report.)

The report, which covers only some five double-column magazine pages, then deals with City and Country School, Salaries, Educating the Teacher, Advanced Education, Libraries, Music, Art and the Theatres, for all these come within the field of activities of the Minister of Education under the Soviet regime. The report of the All-Russian Teachers’ Congress, referred to by Lunacharsky, should be consulted in this connection. It is reported in “The Modern School,” for November, 1918.

The documents of the Soviet Bureau of New York City, covering some fifty printed pages of highly interesting material, give greater details of organization, procedure and philosophy. Document No. 3, the paper of Commissary Lepeshinsky, read at the First Congress, contains some passages well worth quoting: “It has become customary to accuse the new government of indifference toward the cultural values of the past, and particularly, of disrupting the schools. Such an accusation is obviously wrong. In so far as the school stands for wrong principles, breeding privileges and a spirit of utilitarianism, and is a servant of the ruling classes, it has been destroyed. Such a school system was an instrument to befog the consciousness of the masses and crippled the children physically and spiritually. The destruction of the old school system, as an integral part of the whole social structure of the past was brought about not by a group of individuals, but by the elemental force of life itself. History had paved the way for such a destruction, and it had become a pressing necessity of the present revolutionary period.” The paper then goes on to cover much the same ground as the report of Lunacharsky, with the addition of a stress on the creative and artistic elements in the child and the curriculum, and an insistence on the necessity of an inherent relationship between the activities of school and life. There has quite evidently been a considerable study and absorption of the doctrines of education current in Europe and America during the last thirty years, although no direct references are made. But it seems to be a fact, not at present supportable by documentary evidence, that American schools and American school and college books have been both the admiration and the ideal of the radical Russian educators, many texts having been translated into Russian. It is quite possible that some little of this enthusiasm has been supplanted by criticism on the part of the present educators in Russia, because of the believed connection of our culture with a spirit too capitalistic and mercenary.
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Document No. 7 of the Soviet Bureau opens up the interesting question of schools for workmen, being the report of an issued statement of the Soviet of Railroad Workers' Deputies regarding the opening of schools for the teaching of drawing, painting, designing, mathematics and modeling for members of the Soviet and their children. Documents No. 9 and No. 10 go into the question of servants and service, showing the social principles which are to underly the school system of the Soviets.—the "socialistic schools." The same principles of activity for life, for productivity, for social service is inherent in them all.

It would be possible to quote many more pages of extracts from these documents, but enough has been given to show two things: first, the absolute break with the spirit, the organization and the methods of the old education under the autocracy: second, the essentially socialistic character of the new system, which, entirely apart from any judgment of the political aims and methods of the Bolshevik, and apart, too, from any estimate of the present existence of schools embodying these principles, may surely be considered to meet, far more adequately, the provisions for a system of education, tentatively laid down in the introduction to this sketch. It will be of the greatest interest and value to watch, if the Bolshevik regime continues, the application and the working out of these radically new principles in Russian education.
APPENDIX

Statistics of Population, Literacy, Religions, School Attendance, Budgets, Etc.
SOME GENERAL STATISTICS OF POPULATION, RELIGIONS AND LITERACY.

(A) CHIEF RACES IN PERCENTAGES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Russians</th>
<th>Turco-Tartars</th>
<th>Poles</th>
<th>Finns</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Lithuanians</th>
<th>Germanic</th>
<th>Carpathians</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Armenian</th>
<th>Mongol</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Russia</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Vistula Provinces</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasus</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siberia</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Empire</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Russian Year Book, 1916.)

(B) CHIEF RELIGIONS IN PERCENTAGES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Orthodox</th>
<th>Pro-</th>
<th>Mol-</th>
<th>Cath-</th>
<th>tes-</th>
<th>Non-</th>
<th>Christ's</th>
<th>Christ's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medians.</td>
<td>olic.</td>
<td>tants</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>(other)</td>
<td>(other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Russia</td>
<td>83.58</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Vistula Provinces</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>74.32</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasus</td>
<td>50.94</td>
<td>34.54</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siberia</td>
<td>89.97</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>90.29</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire</td>
<td>69.90</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures would seem to indicate a close connection between race and religion. (Compare with Table A.)

(Russian Year Book, 1916.)

(C) DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION, 1913:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area in sq. verst</th>
<th>Total Inhab's</th>
<th>Total Rural per sq. verst</th>
<th>Rural Town Pop. Pct.</th>
<th>Rural Pop. Pct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Russia</td>
<td>4,250,575</td>
<td>125,683,800</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Vistula Provinces</td>
<td>99,691</td>
<td>11,960,500</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasus</td>
<td>412,311</td>
<td>12,512,800</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siberia</td>
<td>10,996,346</td>
<td>9,788,400</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>3,110,624</td>
<td>10,957,400</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>286,041</td>
<td>3,196,700</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire</td>
<td>19,155,589</td>
<td>174,099,600</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(D) Occupations in Percentages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration &amp; Professions</th>
<th>Army and Navy</th>
<th>Clergy &amp; Church Attendants</th>
<th>Domestic &amp; Day Labor, etc.</th>
<th>Private Means &amp; Penioners</th>
<th>Agriculture, Fishing, Hunting, etc.</th>
<th>Manufactures, Industry, Mining</th>
<th>Communication and Traffic</th>
<th>Trade and Commerce</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Russia</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Vistula Provinces</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasus</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siberia</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Russian Year Book, 1916.)

(E) Statistics of Illiteracy and School Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whole Population</th>
<th>Of Those Over 9</th>
<th>Being Taught (1912)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Russia</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Vistula Provinces</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasus</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siberia</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(Pre-Caucasus 4.91, Trans-Caucasus 2.98)**

Out of a total (1912) of 8,030,088 scholars—
6,697,385 or 83.4% attended elementary schools.
467,558 or 5.8% attended secondary schools.
251,732 or 3.1% attended special elementary and secondary schools.
68,671 or .9% attended higher educational establishments.
544,742 or 6.8% attended private schools, foreign church schools and various non-Christian schools of religious character.

(Russian Year Book, 1916.)

The figures of the second table of the preceding page have been somewhat differently arranged by the Statesman's Year Book for 1918, but are in very close agreement. The rearrangement is as follows:

Students attending the various types of schools:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1912)</th>
<th>Total No. of High Schools</th>
<th>Middle Schools</th>
<th>Special Schools</th>
<th>Primary Schools</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Russia</td>
<td>95,381</td>
<td>58,370</td>
<td>373,746</td>
<td>196,279</td>
<td>5,523,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>7,022</td>
<td>4,674</td>
<td>23,376</td>
<td>19,022</td>
<td>291,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circaucasia</td>
<td>2,635</td>
<td>8,896</td>
<td>3,571</td>
<td>165,410</td>
<td>177,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcaucasia</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>12,735</td>
<td>4,481</td>
<td>127,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siberia</td>
<td>6,245</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>21,205</td>
<td>9,299</td>
<td>308,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>8,693</td>
<td>11,773</td>
<td>4,416</td>
<td>95,785</td>
<td>111,947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAND TOTAL... 122,524 65,752 451,731 237,038 6,512,173 7,266,694 119
To this total of 7,266,694 must be added:

- Pupils of lay or religious Private schools \( \ldots \) 206,961
- Schools for blind, deaf and dumb \( \ldots \) 958
- Non-Christian religious schools \( \ldots \) 329,585
- Not classified in all above \( \ldots \) 233,911

Final Grand Total \( \ldots \) 8,038,109

The total as given on preceding page for 1912 by the Russian Year Book was 8,030,088, a fairly close agreement.

\(^1\) Exclusive of the cities of Petrograd, Kronstadt and Baku, as well as the governments of Warsaw and Tiflis and the Province of Kamchatka.
\(^2\) Middle and Primary Special Schools.

(F) **Statistics of University Attendance:**

There are ten universities in Russia with the following distribution of students and faculties of study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>1912</th>
<th>1905</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>9,942</td>
<td>5,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrograd</td>
<td>8,446</td>
<td>4,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieff</td>
<td>4,098</td>
<td>3,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharkoff</td>
<td>5,274</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiefif (Yurieff)</td>
<td>2,749</td>
<td>1,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharkoff</td>
<td>5,274</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorpat(^1)</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>1,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw(^2)</td>
<td>3,484</td>
<td>1,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiefif</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>2,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomsk</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratov</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>(Founded 1909)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1905</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisprudence</td>
<td>15,254</td>
<td>9,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physico-math.</td>
<td>9,859</td>
<td>5,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>9,385</td>
<td>5,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist-Philolog.</td>
<td>3,384</td>
<td>1,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental Lang.</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>267*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divinity</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>147**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{\ast}\) (Petrograd only?)
\(^{\ast\ast}\) (Dorpat only? Lutheran)
The religion of these students was as follows: (1911)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek Catholic</td>
<td>27,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>3,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>2,768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Darlington and Russian Year Book, 1916)*

In addition to the above universities there are three others founded recently for which statistics of attendance are not at present available. These are:

Shaniavsky (General Alphonse), founded 1908 (?) by funds from the General after whom it is named.

Women's University at Petrograd, founded 1916. (With power to confer the doctorate.)

Perm University, founded 1917.

Total number of University students January 1, 1914............. 39,027

*(Statesmen's Year Book, 1918)*

(G) Educational Budget for 1916:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry/Department</th>
<th>Roubles Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>165,159,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Scientific Societies</td>
<td>2,868,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Universities</td>
<td>10,687,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Secondary and Special</td>
<td>38,477,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Primary</td>
<td>72,336,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Teaching Staff</td>
<td>3,686,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Buildings and Repairs</td>
<td>11,697,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Interior</td>
<td>446,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Synod Church Schools</td>
<td>22,152,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance (Art and Education)</td>
<td>132,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>967,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of Communication</td>
<td>1,056,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce and Industry (Science and Education)</td>
<td>4,586,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
<td>9,380,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of War</td>
<td>20,864,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Marine</td>
<td>2,331,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>246,580,415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rouble in normal times is about $0.50.

*(Russian Year Book, 1916.)*

General Remarks in Explanation of Above Budgets:

The present and past organization of education in Russia has been in the hands not only of the Ministry of Education, but also subject to the control of other Ministries. In general, the Ministry of Education (Public) has had control of what are called institutions of "general" education,—
whereas the so-called "special" institutions have been under the supervision of those particular Departments of State most interested in their development and success.

Thus, the universities, gymnasia, pro-gymnasia, real schools, and a part (minor %) of the primary schools are administered by the Ministry of Public Education, (Ministerstvo Narodnago Prosvestheniia). The theological academies and seminaries are under the Holy Synod, commercial schools under Ministry of Finance, engineering schools under Ministry of Ways of Communication, etc. But the Ministry of Public Instruction has also control of most of the intermediate and primary technical and trade schools and some places of "general" education are not under its control. More detail of this will be given under the separate treatment of the several types of schools. The following table will give an idea of the administration of primary schools.

(H) Administration of Primary Schools, 1898:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry of Public Instruction</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Scholars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holy Synod</td>
<td>40,028</td>
<td>67,907</td>
<td>1,476,124*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>46,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>20,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Institutions of Empress Maria</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>5,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Philanthropic Society</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>2,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court and Domains</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>78,699</strong></td>
<td><strong>154,652</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,203,246</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In 1904, under control of the Ministry of Public Instruction were 3,200,835 children, and under the Holy Synod, 1902, 1,782,883.

(Quoted by Darlington as from the official statements of the Ministry of Public Instruction.)

To supplement the preceding table (H), the Statesman's Year Book for 1918 gives the following figures as from the Census of 1911:

控制的初级学校，—1911年1月:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry of Public Instruction</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Scholars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holy Synod</td>
<td>37,922</td>
<td>66,525*</td>
<td>1,793,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>2,691</td>
<td>6,729</td>
<td>201,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,295</strong></td>
<td><strong>203,273</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,180,510</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A study of Table (H) brings out the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry of Public Instruction</th>
<th>Schools %</th>
<th>Teachers %</th>
<th>Scholars %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holy Synod</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*
ALSO of all above schools 1,785 or 2.3% were primary schools for adults, attended by 89,945 persons, men and women.

ALSO in the Russian Primary Schools:
As a whole, there is one teacher for each. 27.2 scholars Ministry of Public Instruction, one teacher for each 31.5 scholars Holy Synod, one teacher for each 22. scholars All other, one teacher for each 29.4 scholars

ALSO, the average number of scholars in each Primary School is:
In all Russia, 53.4; Ministry of Public Instruction, 71.5; Holy Synod, 36.9; All others, 47.4.

Of the total of 4,203,246 pupils of the above table for the year 1898, 75% were males and 25% females. (Approximate.) Of the total of 76,914 schools attended by children, 90% were in the country and only 10% in the towns.

(Darlington.)

Still later and more official figures are given for the Primary Schools (under the M. P. E. only) in an article in the Review of Reviews for July, 1916. This purports to be extracts from the Report of the Ministry of Public Education of its activity from 1911 to 1915. In comparing these figures with those of the preceding two tables it must be remembered that here we are speaking of the primary schools of one Ministry only. This report states that on January 1, 1915, there were 80,801 elementary schools, 71,795 in towns and 9,006 rural. This is an increase of 32.3% since 1911, and several times the increase in % of population. The number of pupils in these schools on the same date was 5,942,000, an increase of 35.7% over those of 1911. (Given as 4,411,000.) The increase of girl pupils in rural districts was 47%. For these schools there were, in 1915, 146,000 teachers, an increase of 38.6%, giving 40.7 pupils per teacher. In 1911, the ratio of male to female teacher was 43.5%, but in 1915 only 37%, showing a gain in the proportionate number of women teaching in the public elementary schools under the Ministry of Public Education. This later ratio becomes 30% in those governments with Zemstvos, and 56% in those without.

Statistics of Middle Schools, January, 1914 (St's Year Book, 1918)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>No. of Pupils.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>441 Gymnasia</td>
<td>147,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Pro-Gymnasia</td>
<td>4,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284 Real Schools</td>
<td>80,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Normal Schools</td>
<td>1,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 Normal Seminaries</td>
<td>19,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>837 Girls Gymnasia</td>
<td>341,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 Girls Pro-Gymnasia</td>
<td>11,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Cadet Corps</td>
<td>29,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Gymnasia of Empress Marie (1912)</td>
<td>17,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Institutions of Empress Marie (1912)</td>
<td>9,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Seminaries (1913)</td>
<td>22,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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