

CHAPTER 13

STROGANOV'S RESIGNATION

The troubles that arose in Stroganov's final year of association with Moscow University boded ill for the school's immediate future. One source of that trouble was the feud between Uvarov and Stroganov, who had become "irreconcilable" enemies since 1835. Stroganov viewed Uvarov as a parvenu; and in the simplest terms, the blue-blooded aristocrat and the brash upstart simply hated each other. Their personal characters also fundamentally clashed--while Stroganov was modest, Uvarov was extremely vain. Stroganov did not like having Uvarov as his superior and, in fact, had often bypassed Uvarov and gone straight to Nicholas, a personal friend.¹

After repeated brushes between the two, Stroganov again came into conflict with the minister over the behavior of Professor Nikita Krylov. Krylov was the dean of the Law Department and a Westerner, but he also had a reputation for immoral behavior, excessive drinking, and bribe-taking. He had married Liubov' Korsha, the sister of Evgenii Korsh, who was the editor of Moskovskiiia vedomosti and a close friend of Granovskii, Redkin, and Kavelin--the latter having married the other sister. At times Krylov behaved cruelly to his wife in

¹Fedor Buslaev, "Moi vospominaniia," Vestnik Evropy, 26 (November 1891): 139-40; Chicherin, Vospominaniia, 28.

public, and once they even came to blows, which set Granovskii, Redkin, and Kavelin against him. Then, in August 1846 Krylov's wife claimed that he was accepting bribes.²

Rumors of Krylov's bribe-taking had been spreading. A noblewoman informed Solov'ev that to insure her son's acceptance into the University, she had to pay Krylov. When Solov'ev tried to tell her that it was impossible, she insisted that it was a well-known fact. When Solov'ev asked Granovskii about the allegation, Granovskii replied that it was "nonsense," but Krylov's wife soon provided evidence. A second-year student named Ustinov received a grade of "1" from Krylov, who then agreed to change it for a fee. The other professors questioned Ustinov, and he confirmed the offer. Kavelin, Korsh, Redkin, and Granovskii all threatened to resign unless Krylov left the school, because they felt that they could no longer work with him.³ Granovskii wrote to Stroganov that Krylov was "not fit to be our colleague" and that he had "tortured his wife and also degraded himself by means of his shameful deals with students."⁴

Stroganov was in a difficult position. He was irritated that a scandal had broken out at his school and that Granovskii and his friends, whom Stroganov had always supported, had threatened to leave, but after he found out the details from the assistant curator, he became convinced of the veracity of the charges

²Chicherin, Vospominaniia, 60-62; Afanas'ev, "Moskovskii universitet," 374-76; and Afanas'ev, "Iz studencheskikh vospominanii," 182-83.

³Solov'ev, Moi zapiski, 97-100.

⁴Granovskii, Granovskii i ego perepiska, 2: 450-51.

and pressed for either Krylov to resign or for Uvarov to transfer him.⁵

The Krylov Affair divided the University after its faculty took sides. Some professors demanded Krylov's immediate retirement, while others claimed that the quarrel with his wife was personal and that there was not enough proof of the bribery charges. According to Boris Chicherin, Uvarov supported Krylov, who proceeded to denounce his former friends to Metropolitan Filaret for anti-Christian views. The final result was a shattering of faculty unity, a further growth in hostility between Uvarov and Stroganov, the breakup of the Westerners party, and the University's loss of three talented men: Kavelin, Korsh, and Redkin. Granovskii tried to resign, but Uvarov would not allow it on the grounds that Granovskii had not yet served his required number of years.⁶

While the Krylov Affair was in full swing, another event occurred that provided the immediate pretext for Stroganov's resignation. In March 1847 a secret society, the Kirillo-Mefodicheskoe Obshchestvo (Society of Saints Cyril and Methodius), was discovered in Kiev. The participants had met occasionally to discuss the history of the Ukraine, the emancipation of the serfs, and a proposed pan-Slavic federation. Nicholas was alarmed by the last idea,⁷ and Uvarov took steps to ensure that the concept of narodnost' (nationality) was

⁵Afanas'ev, "Iz studencheskikh vospominanii," 182-83; Solov'ev, Moi zapiski, 97-100.

⁶Granovskii, Granovskii i ego perepiska, 2: 276-77; Offord, Portrait of Early Russian Liberals, 64.

⁷Dmitrii Golokhvastov, "Ob Ukraino-slavianskom obshchestve (graf S. Uvarov i graf S. Stroganov) 1847 g.," RA, 30, bk. 2 (1892): 335-43; Whittaker, Origins of Russian Education, 214-16.

understood by scholars correctly since it might "be used by ill-intentioned persons for the excitement of minds and the spreading of dangerous propaganda." In a note to the council of St. Petersburg University, Uvarov warned that though the Slavs tended to see Russia as a liberator, "narodnost" meant only "unconditional devotion to [Russian] Orthodoxy and autocracy."⁸

Uvarov then ordered Stroganov to read a similar circular to the Moscow University council, but Stroganov refused, saying that the tsar himself should make the request. Stroganov also maliciously recalled an 1842 directive by Uvarov that stated that questions concerning the concept of narodnost were beyond the boundaries of the curator's office. Stroganov further wanted to receive his own information on the Cyril and Methodius Affair before taking any steps.⁹

Nicholas, though Stroganov's friend, would not tolerate disobedience and found Stroganov's refusal to obey Uvarov, "disgraceful." In August 1847 the tsar directed the head of the Third Section to inform Stroganov that "[he] must never, under any circumstance, depart from the proper behavior towards [his] superior."

The tsar also sent the information on the Society that Stroganov had requested, but in November 1847 Stroganov resigned with the statement that "my understanding of service to Your Majesty cannot be reconciled with [that] of the

⁸Golokhvastov, "Ob Ukraino-slavianskom obshchestve," 347-348; Whittaker, Origins of Modern Russian Education, 217-19; Schiemann, Geschichte Russlands, 4: 128; and Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, 224.

⁹Golokhvastov, "Ob Ukraino-slavianskom obshchestve," 351-52; Nikitenko, Dnevnik, 1: 318-19.

minister of education."¹⁰

Stroganov then sought to get even for the trouble Uvarov had caused him. When in February 1848 the tsar learned of the revolution in France, he received a report from the Third Section calling attention to the "laxity" of Uvarov's supervision over censorship. Baron Modeste Korf, who hoped to get Uvarov's job, also criticized the censorship, and Stroganov, too, sent a note to Nicholas "on the liberalism, communism, and socialism" prevailing in the Ministry of Education.¹¹

¹⁰Golokhvastov, "K istorii Moskovskago universiteta," 247; Golokhvastov, "Ob Ukraino-slavianskom obshchestve," 356, 355.

¹¹Nikitenko, Dnevnik, 1: 311-12; Whittaker, Origins of Russian Education, 224-25; Galskoy, "Ministry of Education," 130; and Schiemann, Geschichte Russlands, 4: 149.

Uvarov defended himself by inquiring of the curators as to the situation in their districts, and although they all responded that everything was quiet, Nicholas still set up a committee to investigate the effectiveness of Uvarov's censorship policies. The committee, chaired by Prince Aleksandr Menshikov, the minister of the navy, included the reactionaries Aleksandr Stroganov (Sergei's brother) and General Dmitrii Buturlin. After the committee recommended the adoption of a stricter censorship code, the tsar formed the Buturlin Committee to serve as a permanent watchdog over the censorship.¹²

Uvarov then sought revenge against Stroganov for his role in Uvarov's difficulties. In the October 1848 issue of the Historical Society's Chteniia appeared the book by Giles Fletcher, an English traveller, Of the Russe-Common-Wealth (1591), that dealt with the reign of Ivan the Terrible. At earlier sessions of the Society, chaired by Stroganov, Mikhail Obolenskii, director of the Main Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, had proposed to publish the original work and a translation. The Society printed and distributed the book to its members at a session, again chaired by Stroganov, in September 1848.¹³

By this time, Stroganov and Uvarov were sworn enemies. When Uvarov came to Moscow, Shevyrev and Pogodin brought the translation to his attention, and Bodienskii, the secretary of the Society, took Uvarov a copy of the book. Within an hour of receiving it, Uvarov summoned Bodienskii to ask who had

¹²Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, 260.

¹³Sergei Belokurov, "Delo Fletchera," 1848-1864 gg. (Moscow, 1910), 3-11.

allowed its printing. Eventually, Stroganov explained that he had approved it because he felt that it was an important historical work, often cited by Karamzin, and because the number of recipients of the book was very small.¹⁴

Uvarov informed the tsar that the work contained "deprecatory remarks" about Russia. He then insinuated that Stroganov was lax in approving its printing. After a short investigation, Nicholas banned distribution of the book and ordered Bodianskii's transfer to Kazan University; but Bodianskii refused to go-- Stroganov advised him to stay--and, instead, retired from the University. Although Stroganov complained to the tsar that it was "Uvarov's personal enmity toward [him]" that motivated the "affair," the tsar gave Stroganov a severe reprimand, and Stroganov went into seclusion.¹⁵

Meanwhile, Uvarov's time as minister of education was also growing short. In late 1848, according to Bodianskii, Stroganov had a talk with the tsar:

After dinner I walked with him to the fireplace and while smoking a small cigar, the tsar asked me: "What were you publishing?" "Sire," I responded, "I printed what we were supposed to print. Fletcher's work concerns the reign of Ivan the Terrible and his son Fedor. All the terrible matters noted at that time by the foreigner about Russia does not in the slightest bit relate to the present. Uvarov, because of his personal hostility

¹⁴Belokurov, Delo Fletchera, 13-15.

¹⁵"K delu ob izdanii istorii Fletchera," RS, 65 (January 1890): 54; Belokurov, Delo Fletchera, 13-15; Whittaker, Origins of Russian Education, 227; and Schiemann, Geschichte Russlands, 4: 150.

to me, decided to make some noise, and he presented it to your Highness as some sort of evil. But, I printed it in the journal of a scholarly society, formerly under my chairmanship, which had a very small circle of readers, primarily scholars.... "Good, Good," exclaimed the sovereign, "we will smooth everything over soon and the man who suffered as a result of Uvarov [Bodianskii] will be returned immediately to his place when Uvarov is no longer minister and this, I tell you, will happen soon."¹⁶

Despite the revolutions in Europe, the Russian universities remained peaceful in 1848, and when Uvarov inspected Moscow that fall he reported:

That not only is nothing seditious taking place, but also my observations...of the general mood confirm that the fermentation of minds has quieted in view of European events.¹⁷

Nonetheless, Nicholas, reacting to European events, began to issue restrictions on the universities. For example, in March 1848 the tsar banned study abroad, and in December he raised the tuition fee to fifty silver rubles at each university.¹⁸

¹⁶Kochubinskii, "Bodianskii v ego dnevnike," 517; Belokurov, Delo Fletchera, 15-16, 32-34. Bodianskii was again secretary of the society from 1857 to 1877, and Stroganov was chairman from 1857 to 1874. Later efforts to publish the Fletcher translation, however, failed. In 1864 after a favorable report by the minister of education, the matter reached the Council of Ministers, but Alexander II confirmed the minority decision and refused to authorize its printing.

¹⁷"Obshchii otchet 1848," 137; Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, 260.

¹⁸"O vozvyshenii platy za uchenie vysshikh i srednikh uchebnykh zavedeniakh," Sbornik postanovlenii, 2: pt.2, pp.

Further repressive measures soon followed. In late 1848 Nicholas limited enrollment at each university to a total of three hundred students, not counting state-supported students or medical students, and the universities could not admit students until enough had graduated to reduce enrollment below the new maximum.¹⁹ In October 1849 the tsar set stricter limitations on university governance when he decreed that henceforth the minister would appoint rectors, confirmed by the tsar, for an indefinite term. Deans would still be elected for four years, but the minister could dismiss or replace them at any time.²⁰ In 1850 systematic supervision of university lectures began. Nicholas informed professors that they now had to have detailed lecture notes reviewed and approved by the deans and rector, who no longer taught but just supervised lectures and academics.²¹

Additionally, the regime took steps of a class nature. Two decrees in early 1850 restricted university admission to the nobility and forbade religious

842-43; Ikonnikov, "Russkie universitety," 102; Fedosov, Letopis', 74; and Johnson, Russia's Educational Heritage, 99-100.

¹⁹"Ob ogranichenii chisla studentov v universitetakh," "Ob umen'shenii chisla studentov v universitetakh," and "O zapreshchenii studentam meditsinskogo fakul'teta v universitetakh perekhodit' v drugie fakul'tety," Sbornik postanovlenii, 2: pt. 2, pp. 877-81, 934.

²⁰"Ob izmenenii poriadka naznacheniiia rektorov i dekanov v universitety," Sbornik postanovlenii, 2: pt. 2, 915-16; "O priniatii za pravila, chtoby iskliuchaemye iz universitetov studenty ne ostavalis na meste zhitel'stva v tom zhe gorode," Sbornik postanovlenii, 2: pt. 2, 932; and Ikonnikov, "Russkie universitety," 103.

²¹Ikonnikov, "Russkie universitety," 103; Eimontova, Russkie universitety, 44-45, 46.

sectarians, the "Old Believers," to enroll. As a result of all these measures, the number of university students fell from 4,006 in 1848 to 3,018 in 1850.²²

Uvarov finally retired in the fall of 1849, and Prince Platon Shirinskii-Shikhmatov, his deputy since 1832, replaced him. Shirinskii reportedly once said, "You should know that I have neither a mind nor a will of my own, I am merely a blind tool of the emperor's will."²³

Reaction and Moscow University

²²"O pereimenovanii v fakul'tety otdelenii filosofskago fakul'teta v universitetakh," Sbornik postanovlenii, 2: pt. 2, 942-43; "O priniatii v universitety preimushchestvenno molodykh liudei, imeiushchikh pravo na vystuplenie v grazhdanskiu sluzhbu," Sbornik postanovlenii, 2: pt. 2, 943-47; and Allister, "Reform of Higher Education," 256.

²³Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, 226, 227-28; Riasanovsky, Nicholas I and Official Nationality, 42.

Moscow University suffered along with the other universities from the turn to reaction in 1848. First, there was a significant turnover of personnel. After Stroganov left, Golokhvastov, the assistant curator since 1834, took over but only stayed until September 1849, when he retired because of illness. Nakhimov, the inspector, left the University two months after Stroganov, also because of an illness.²⁴ Other professors who soon left or died included Filomafitskii, Hoffmann, Kavelin, Redkin, and Sokol'skii. In June 1849 when the tsar closed the Nobles' Institute, Chivilev, the director, also left the University. Rumors had circulated that Nicholas, while visiting the school, had found a button missing on a student's uniform.²⁵ In December 1849, however, Bodianskii did get his old job back, as promised by the tsar.²⁶

In the midst of this exodus, government interference continued to escalate. In January 1850 the minister suddenly named Arkadii Al'fonskii to take the place of Perevoshchikov as rector. The minister also confirmed Shevyrev as dean, despite the fact that the council had elected Granovskii, who was now the subject, along with Kudriavtsev, of a "most strict, secret supervision." Granovskii

²⁴Golokhvastov, "K istorii Moskovskago universiteta," 246-47.

²⁵"Soobrazheniia o zakrytii Moskovskago Dvorianskago instituta," Sbornik postanovlenii, 2: pt. 2, 884-88; "Ob uchrezhdenii v Moskve Chetvertoi gimnazii," Sbornik postanovlenii, 2: pt. 2, 888; and Georgievskii, "Moi vospominaniia," (May 1916): 284-85.

²⁶"Osip Bodianskii v ego dnevnike, 1850-1852 gg.," ed. I. Pavlovskii, RS, 64 (October 1889): 397.

also had to appear before Metropolitan Filaret and defend his lectures.²⁷

At the same time, the University suffered other reverses. For example, in June 1850 the city refused to contribute its financial share of the University's Hospital Clinic, forcing the government to make good the difference.²⁸ The press also slowed the pace of its work, losing income as a result. In 1850 only sixty-eight private works were published, and for the first time no books were printed at University expense.²⁹ In line with developments elsewhere in the country, the number of students fell from 1,198 in 1847 to 821 in 1850.³⁰

Stroganov after Moscow University

After his retirement in 1847 and until his death in 1882, Stroganov continued to play a major role in government affairs, including education, especially after Alexander II became tsar in 1855.³¹ In the new reign, Stroganov resumed chairmanship of the Historical Society, was briefly governor-general of Moscow, supervised the education of the tsarevich Nikolai Aleksandrovich, participated in the work of the Main Commission, where he voted to support the

²⁷Fedosov, Letopis', 76-77; Eimontova, Russkie universitety, 102.

²⁸"Ob otpuske summy na sodержanie fakul'tetskii klimiki Moskovskago universiteta iz prezhnago istochnika," Sbornik postanovlenii, 2: pt. 2, 992.

²⁹Trifonov, 225 let, 76.

³⁰"Srvnritel'nyia vedomosti o sostoianii uchebnykh zavedeniakh v Rossii," Zhurnal, 58 (1848): 6-7; 66 (1850): 36-37; 74 (1852): 18-19.

³¹"Stroganov," 527-28; Whittaker, Origins of Russian Education, 242.

Emancipation, and played a major role in the drawing up of the liberal 1863 university statute.³²

Stroganov's last major political act occurred just after the assassination of Alexander II in March 1881, when the Council of Ministers was debating whether to implement the reform project that Alexander II had signed just before his death. The project, conceived by Count Mikhail Loris-Melikov, the minister of the interior, envisioned allowing some selected representation from society in higher government counsels. Stroganov spoke "firmly and decisively" against the project, and Konstantin Pobedonostsev, the new tsar's tutor and close advisor, recommended that Alexander III listen to Stroganov:

He is a man of truth, an old servant of your forefathers, the witness and agent of great historical events. He is on the edge of the grave, but his head is clear, and his heart is Russian. There is not another man in Russia with whom it would be better for you to consult.³³

Stroganov died Easter night, 28 March 1882, in St. Petersburg and was buried in the Aleksandr Nevskii Monastery. Petr Valuev, a former minister of the interior, wrote in his diary that yet "another fragment of the past has

³²"Moskovskie general-gubernatory, graf S. G. Stroganov i P. A. Tuchkov, 1864," RA, 43, bk. 1 (1905): 70-71; Fedor A. Oom, "Vospominaniia," RA, 34, bk. 2 (1896): 252-53; Petr Valuev, Dnevnik, 2 vols. (Moscow, 1961), 1: 66; Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, 364-65; Johnson, Russia's Educational Heritage, 140; and Alston, Education and the State, 49-50.

³³"Pis'ma K. P. Pobedonostseva v Aleksandru III," Krasnyi arkhiv, 4 (1923): 322, 331-32; Petr Valuev, Dnevnik, vol. 3 (Petrograd, 1919), 151; S. A. Stroganov, "Iz dnevnika grafa S. A. Stroganova," Dela i dni, 1 (1920): 427-28.

disappeared."³⁴ Stroganov was the last in the direct line of his family as both his son Aleksandr and grandson Sergei Aleksandrovich had died before him.

The bitter feud between Stroganov and Uvarov that culminated in the former's resignation clearly did not benefit Moscow University. For example, the Krylov Affair split the faculty into opposing camps, and the Fletcher Affair essentially deprived the public of the work of an important scholarly society. Stroganov's denunciation of Uvarov in early 1848 also was not beneficial to the University, as it further contributed to the tsar's growing reactionary tendencies.

Once Stroganov left his position, the University was vulnerable to the same reaction that enveloped the other Russian universities in 1848. The number of students dropped, the school lost a series of important professors, and the activities of the press and societies declined. This put a halt to the growing professionalization of the University and its leading intellectual impact on society that had been occurring while Stroganov was curator.

³⁴Valuev, Dnevnik, 3: 189